Securing 802.11 (WiFi) networks

Srdjan Čapkun

Department of Computer Science ETH Zurich

Introduction to WiFi



Why security is more of a concern in wireless?

- no inherent physical protection
 - physical connections between devices are replaced by logical associations
 - sending and receiving messages do not need physical access to the network infrastructure (cables, hubs, routers, etc.)
- broadcast communications
 - wireless usually means radio, which (generally) has a broadcast nature
 - transmissions can be overheard by anyone in range
 - anyone can generate transmissions,
 - which will be received by other devices in range
 - which will interfere with other nearby transmissions and may prevent their correct reception (jamming)
- eavesdropping is easy
- ➢ injecting bogus messages into the network is easy
- replaying previously recorded messages is easy
- ➢ illegitimate access to the network and its services is easy
- denial of service is easily achieved by jamming

Wireless communication security requirements

- confidentiality
 - messages sent over wireless links must be encrypted
- authenticity
 - origin of messages received over wireless links must be verified
- replay detection
 - freshness of messages received over wireless links must be checked
- integrity
 - modifying messages on-the-fly (during radio transmission) is not so easy, but possible ...
 - integrity of messages received over wireless links must be verified
- access control
 - access to the network services should be provided only to legitimate entities
 - access control should be permanent
 - it is not enough to check the legitimacy of an entity only when it joins the network and its logical associations are established, because logical associations can be hijacked
- protection against jamming

802.11 security issues

- Physical (e.g., jamming, ...) (see previous lectures)
- Today:
 - Network access (user authentication)
- Reading assignment (replaces next lecture):
 - Cheating (fairness / unfair allocation of throughput)

802.11 access protection

Introduction to WiFi



Access mechanisms

open network (no protection)

- assumption: there are no unauthorized users in the range of the network
- problems: range is hard to determine (unpredictable propagation of the signals, directional antennas, ...)

closed network

- using SSIDs for authentication (Service Set Identifier)
- MAC filtering
- shared keys
- authentication servers

MAC filtering

- MAC address filtering
 - only devices with certain MAC addresses are allowed to associate
 - needs pre-registration of all device at the AP
- MAC can be sniffed and forged
 - sent in clear text in each packet (can be sniffed)
 - can be forged

Device identification – MAC addresses

- "Hardcoded" addresses in WiFi cards ("unique device identifiers")
 - all devices have different addresses
- Concept taken over from ethernet addresses

| >ipconf ∶ | ig ∕all | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------|------------|------|-----|---|-----|-----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|----|---|
| Ethernet | t adapter | Wir | e 10 | ess | N | etı | WOI | rk | Co | onr | neo | ct: | io | n = |
| k Cannad | Media Sta Descript | ate ion | : | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | • | : | Media disconnected Intel(R) PRO/Wirele |
| K Connec | Physical | Add | re | ss. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | : | 00-13-02-B8-9A-1B |

802.11 MAC header



- Addr. 1 = All stations filter on this address.
- Addr. 2 = Transmitter Address (TA).
- Addr. 3 = Dependent on *To* and *From DS* bits.

3 simple steps for overcoming MAC filtering

- 1. Put your card in promiscuous mode (accepts all packets).
- 2. Sniff the traffic and find out which MAC addresses are accepted by the AP

| @ few packets.cap - Ethereal | | | <u>_ 8 × </u> |
|--|--|--|---------------|
| <u>Eile E</u> dit <u>V</u> iew ⊆apture <u>A</u> nalyze <u>H</u> elp | | | Ethoroal |
| | ❷ 否 ⊉ ⊡ Q Q @ ()# [| | |
| No Time Delta Source | Destination | Protocol Info | |
| 13 14.817570 14.817570 192.168.0. | 10 192.168.0.2 | TCP 1242 > 80 [SYN] Seq=1404510823 Ack=0 wir | =655 |
| 14 14.817689 0.000119 192.168.0. | 2 192.168.0.10 10 192.168.0.2 | TCP 80 > 1242 [SYN, ACK] SEq=3001013104 ACK= TCP 1242 > 80 [ACK] Seg=1404510824 Ack=36616 | 1510 |
| 16 14.819035 0.000857 192.168.0.3 | 10 192.168.0.2 | HTTP GET / HTTP/1.1 | |
| 17 14.975815 0.156780 192.168.0. | 2 192.168.0.10 | TCP 80 > 1242 [ACK] Seq=3661615105 Ack=14045 | 1123 |
| 23 19.382555 4.406740 192.168.0.3 | 10 192.168.0.2 | TCP 1242 > 80 [FIN, ACK] Seq=1404511234 Ack= | 3661 |
| 24 19.382634 0.000079 192.168.0. 52 54 234482 34 851848 192 168 0 | 2 192.108.0.10 | HTTP HTTP/1 1 403 Forbidden (text/html) | |
| 53 54.235272 0.000790 192.168.0.1 | 10 192.168.0.2 | TCP 1242 > 80 [RST] Seg=1404511235 Ack=36604 | 4707 |
| 54 58.137063 3.901791 192.168.0. | 10 192.168.0.2 | TCP 1244 > 135 [SYN] Seq=1414452237 Ack=0 W | n=65 |
| 55 58.137176 0.000113 192.168.0. | 2 192.168.0.10 | TCP 135 > 1244 [SYN, ACK] Seq=3672465192 Ack | =141 |
| 56 58.137527 0.000351 192.168.0.3 | 10 192.168.0.2 | TCP 1244 > 135 [ACK] Seq=1414452238 Ack=3672 | 4651 |
| 58 58 188933 0 050941 192 168 0 | 10 192.108.0.2 | DCERPC Bind: Call_1d: 57 DOID: TOXIDRESOIVER | 840 |
| 59 58.189601 0.000668 192.168.0.1 | 10 192.168.0.2 | IOXIDR(ComplexPing request AddToSet=0 DelFromS6 | t=1 |
| 60 58.202631 0.013030 192.168.0. | 2 192.168.0.10 | IOXIDR: ComplexPing response -> Unknown (0x00000 | 778) |
| 61 58.203457 0.000826 192.168.0.1 | 10 192.168.0.2 | TOXIDR: ComplexPind request AddToSet=0 DelEromSe | rt=1Î ⊻ |
| <u> </u> | | | |
| ▷ Frame 16 (464 bytes on wire, 464 bytes | captured) | | |
| D Ethernet II. Src: 00:04:61:4a:1e:95. Ds | t: 00:0b:5d:20:cd:02 | | |
| N Internet Protocol Src Addr: 192 168 0 | 10 (192 168 0 10) Dst Addr 19 | 2 168 0 2 (192 168 0 2) | |
| N Transmission Control Brotocol Src Bort | · 1242 (1242) Det Dort - 80 (80 |) Spg: 1404510824 Ack: 2661615105 Lop: 410 | |
| Weentext Transfer Distorel | . 1242 (1242), DSC POLC. 80 (80) |), Sed. 1404310824, ACK. 3001013103, EEN. 410 | |
| ✓ Hypercext Transfer Protocol | | | |
| p GET / HTTP/I.I(r(H | | | |
| Host: 192.168.0.2\r\n | | | |
| User-Agent: Mozilla/5.0 (Windows; U; V | windows NT 5.0; en-US; rv:1.5) (| Gecko/20031007\r\n | |
| Accept: text/xml,application/xml,appl | ication/xhtml+xml,text/html;q=0. | .9,text/plain;q=0.8,image/png,image/jpeg,image/gi | f;q= |
| Accept-Language: en-us,en;q=0.5\r\n | | | |
| Accept-Encoding: gzip,deflate\r\n | | | |
| Accept-Charset: ISO-8859-1,utf-8;q=0. | 7,*;q=0.7\r\n | | |
| Keep-Alive: 300\r\n | | | |
| Connection: keep-alive\r\n | | | • |
| | | | |
| 0000 00 0b 5d 20 cd 02 00 04 61 4a 1e 9 | 5 08 00 45 00] aJ | E. | |
| 0010 01 c2 d1 6d 40 00 80 06 a6 6b c0 a | 8 00 0a c0 a8m@k | | |
| 0020 00 02 04 da 00 50 53 b7 22 68 da 3 | F d0 01 50 18PS. "h.?F | P. | |
| 0040 2f 31 2e 31 0d 0a 48 6f 73 74 3a 2 | J 46 J4 J4 JU HQ GE / H 0 31 39 32 2e /1.1 Ho st: 19: | 2. | |
| 0050 21 26 20 20 20 20 20 00 00 55 72 6 | 5 77 74 41 67 169 0 7 Upp 7 | | |
| Filter: tcp | 🛨 🕂 Expression 🗞 | i⊆lear 🛛 🖉 Apply 🛛 File: few packets.cap 24 KB 00:0 P: 104 D: 19 M: 0 | |
| | | | |

3. Change your MAC address (need a card that can do that)

ifconfig ath0 hw ether <mac address of C>

SSID-based access control

- SSID = Service Set IDentifier (network name)
- a 32-character unique identifier
- attached to the header of packets
- acts as a password when a mobile device tries to connect to the WLAN
- SSID differentiates one WLAN from another
- all devices attempting to connect to a specific WLAN must use the same SSID

SSID-based access control

- SSIDs can be sniffed *(e.g. <u>http://www.ethereal.com</u>)*
 - advertised by the APs
 - contained in SSID response frames
- Overcomming SSID-based access control
 - Sniff SSID (either sent by the clients or advertised by the AP)
 - Set your SSID to the same value ...
- MAC/SSID access control: not a bad protection from unskilled neighbors (much better than no authentication/protection)

MAC/SSID sniffing and MAC forging will be shown in the exercises.

Protected access using WEP

- WEP = Wired Equivalent Privacy – part of the IEEE 802.11 specification
- goal
 - make the WiFi network at least as secure as a wired LAN (that has no particular protection mechanisms)
 - WEP has never intended to achieve strong security
 - (at the end, it hasn't achieved even weak security)
- services
 - access control to the network
 - message confidentiality
 - message integrity

WEP-authentication (1)

- Based on a shared key between the station and the AP (40 bit or 104 bit)
- Based on the RC4 symmetric stream cipher
- 24-bit Initialization Vector (IV)



- The payload of every packet is encrypted (confidentiality) with its CRC value (integrity)
- Authentication through 'classical' challenge-response authentication protocol ... using the shared key ...

WEP-authentication (2)



auth. request (choosing best AP)

challenge

response

auth. decision

.... if authentication successful

association request

association reply

user can now send data

WEP-authentication (3)

- Challenge text sent in payload in cleartext (128 octets), random IV used
- Response sent in payload encrypted with the key shared between the AP and the station



WEP - Authentication frame format



- MSDU = MAC Service Data Unit
 - this is the message
- ICV = Integrity Check Value (encrypted CRC)
 - protects message integrity
- IV = Initialization Vector is used to expand the key
 - expands the key

WEP confidentiality/integrity protection (1)



- RC4 Generates a key stream of a desired length from the key
- The key stream is XORed with plaintext data
- The result is ciphertext data

WEP confidentiality/integrity protection (2)

- RC4 is a stream cipher
 - given a short input key, it produces a pseudorandom sequence (key stream)
 - the key stream is always the same for the same key
- The output of the key stream is XORed with the plaintext to obtain a ciphertext:



WEP – Keys

- two kinds of keys are allowed by the standard
 - default key (also called shared key, group key, multicast key, broadcast key, key)
 - key mapping keys (also called individual key, per-station key, unique key)



- in practice, often only default keys are supported
 - the default key is manually installed in every STA and the AP
 - each STA uses the same shared secret key → in principle, STAs can decrypt each other's messages

WEP – Management of default keys

- the default key is a group key, and group keys need to be changed when a member leaves the group
 - e.g., when someone leaves the company and shouldn't have access to the network anymore
- it is practically impossible to change the default key in every device simultaneously
- hence, WEP supports multiple default keys to help the smooth change of keys
 - one of the keys is called the active key
 - the active key is used to encrypt messages
 - any key can be used to decrypt messages
 - the message header contains a key ID that allows the receiver to find out which key should be used to decrypt the message

WEP – The key change process



WEP flaws – Authentication and access control

- authentication is one-way only
 - AP is not authenticated to STA
 - STA may associate to a rogue AP
- the same shared secret key is used for authentication and encryption
 - weaknesses in any of the two protocol can be used to break the key
 - different keys for different functions are desirable
- no session key is established during authentication
 - access control is not continuous
 - once a STA has authenticated and associated to the AP, an attacker send messages using the MAC address of STA
 - correctly encrypted messages cannot be produced by the attacker, but replay of STA messages is still possible
- STA can be impersonated
 - ... next slide

WEP flaws – Authentication and access control

• recall that authentication is based on a challenge-response protocol:

```
AP → STA: r
STA → AP: IV | r \oplus K
```

. . .

...

where K is a 128 bit RC4 output on IV and the shared secret

- an attacker can compute $r \oplus (r \oplus K) = K$
- then it can use K to impersonate STA later:

```
AP → attacker: r'
attacker → AP: IV | r' \oplus K
```

WEP flaws – Integrity and replay protection

- there's no replay protection at all
 - IV is not mandated to be incremented after each message
- attacker can manipulate messages despite the ICV mechanism and encryption
 - CRC is a linear function wrt to XOR:

 $CRC(X \oplus Y) = CRC(X) \oplus CRC(Y)$

- attacker observes (M | CRC(M)) \oplus K where K is the RC4 output
- for any ΔM , the attacker can compute CRC(ΔM)
- hence, the attacker can compute:

 $((M | CRC(M)) \oplus K) \oplus (\Delta M | CRC(\Delta M)) =$ $((M \oplus \Delta M) | (CRC(M) \oplus CRC(\Delta M))) \oplus K =$ $((M \oplus \Delta M) | CRC(M \oplus \Delta M)) \oplus K$

WEP flaws – Confidentiality

- IV reuse
 - IV space is too small
 - IV size is only 24 bits \rightarrow there are 16,777,216 possible IVs
 - after around 17 million messages, IVs are reused
 - a busy AP at 11 Mbps is capable for transmitting 700 packets per second → IV space is used up in around 7 hours
 - in many implementations IVs are initialized with 0 on startup
 - if several devices are switched on nearly at the same time, they all use the same sequence of IVs
 - if they all use the same default key (which is the common case), then IV collisions are readily available to an attacker
- weak RC4 keys
 - for some seed values (called weak keys), the beginning of the RC4 output is not really random
 - if a weak key is used, then the first few bytes of the output reveals a lot of information about the key → breaking the key is made easier
 - for this reason, crypto experts suggest to always throw away the first 256 bytes of the RC4 output, but WEP doesn't do that
 - due to the use of IVs, eventually a weak key will be used, and the attacker will know that, because the IV is sent in clear
 - \rightarrow WEP encryption can be broken by capturing a few million messages !!! 28

WEP – Lessons learnt

- 1. engineering security protocols is a **very** risky business
 - you may combine otherwise strong building blocks in a wrong way and obtain an insecure system at the end
 - example:
 - stream ciphers alone are OK
 - challenge-response protocols for entity authentication are OK
 - but they shouldn't be combined
 - example:
 - encrypting a message digest to obtain an ICV is a good principle
 - but it doesn't work if the message digest function is linear wrt to the encryption function
 - don't do it alone (unless you are a security expert)
 - functional properties can be tested, but security is a non-functional property → it is extremely difficult to tell if a system is secure or not
 - using an expert in the design phase pays out (fixing the system after deployment will be much more expensive)
 - experts will not guarantee that your system is 100% secure
 - but at least they know many pitfalls that you don't
 - they know the details of crypto algorithms better than you do
- 2. avoid the use of WEP (as much as possible)

Two-time pad problem

If the key stream is the same for each message, then it can be retrieved easily (with known plaintext) and can be reused for generating new messages ...



Initialization Vector

- Initialization vector (IV) alters the key stream
- Augments the key to generate a new key stream
- As the IV changes, so does the key stream change
- Takes care of the key reuse ?



Two-time pad problem

- In 802.11 IV is a 24 bit integer value
- 40 bit keys is augmented to 64 bits and a 104 bit key to 128 bits
- IV is sent in the clear (the receiver needs to know the vector to decrypt the message)
- 24 bits = only 16 million packets before the IV repeats itself

Implications to confidentiality

- If P1 \oplus K = C1 and P2 \oplus K = C2 then C1 \oplus C2 = P1 \oplus K \oplus P2 \oplus K = P1 \oplus P2
- If the attacker learns part of one plaintext he can recover the other.
- Usually, having an XOR of two plaintexts enables the attacker to recover both of them.

More trouble

- Attacker knows the plaintext and the ciphertext (i.e. challenges the station and gets encrypted replies)
- It can then store all 2^24 (IV,Key stream) pairs (2^24x1500 = 24 GB)
- Next time that an attacker sees an encrypted packet, it can match it to the (IV, Key stream) pair (IV is in the packet) and XOR with the Key stream to obtain the plaintext !!!

Message authentication in WEP

- Authentication is performed using Integrity Check Value (ICV) is an encrypted CRC-32
 Problem:
- It is independent of the secret and of the IV
- It is linear: $c(M \oplus D) = c(M) \oplus c(D)$



Message modification

Station and AP share a key (K);

Message M is encrypted into C = RC4(K,IV) \oplus <M,CRC(M)>

- An attacker chooses D and wants the AP to accept that a fake message F=D⊕M came from the Station
- Attacker uses CRC-32 and RC4 linearity (all stream ciphers are linear), therefore

 $- C' = C \oplus \langle D, CRC(D) \rangle$

- Receiver will decrypt the packet $<M', CRC(M') > = RC4(K,IV) \oplus C'$ $= C \oplus <D, CRC(D) > \oplus RC4(K,IV)$ $= <M, CRC(M) > \oplus <D, CRC(D) >$ $= <M \oplus D, CRC(M) \oplus CRC(D) >$
 - $= \langle M \oplus D, CRC(M \oplus D) \rangle = \langle F, CRC(F) \rangle$

Message Injection

- The attacker only needs one message with known plaintext and a known ciphertext
- Gets the Key stream from the ciphertext and plaintext and uses it on a fake message F and CRC(F)
- This works as CRC does not depend on the key (would work also if SHA-1 or other hash functions would be used for ICV)

Getting a plaintext/ciphertext pair

- Just challenge a sender with your nonce and it will send you back an encrypted response.
- No authentication of the AP by the station !!!
- Or simply observe one round of authentication by the AP and a legitimate station ...

Authentication spoofing

- The adversary sees a single exchange between the AP and the station, (plaintext, ciphertext)
- Computes the key stream
- Then tries to associate with the same AP:
 - AP sends a challenge N
 - Station sends a reply K⊕<N,CRC(N)>
 - AND AP ASSOCIATES the station AS THE IV is chosen by the station
 - Catastrophic design !!!

Further WEP weakness (RC4 vulnerabilities)

- Scott R. Fluhrer, Itsik Mantin, Adi Shamir, Weaknesses in the Key Scheduling Algorithm of RC4 Proceedings of SAC 01
- William A. Arbaugh. Narendar Shankar. YC Justin Wan, Your 802.11 Wireless Network has No Clothes, IEEE Wireless Communications, December 2002.
- 802.11 WEP is flawed*
- A WEP key can be derived in 1M to 4M frames using statistical analysis
- Attacker is passive, and only 'listens' to wireless LAN
- Implemented in the AirSnort application

WEP crack will be shown during the exercises.

WEP Summary

- WEP is insecure
- publicly available tools are available to crack it
- it is still better than no protection
- Two major problems:
 - IV size/use
 - CRC does not depend on the key
- Some solutions
 - extending the size of the IV
 - replacing CRC with a strong MAC that depends on the key
- Lessons:
 - use existing (tested) protocol design
 - make the design process open and transparent (the secrecy is in the key NOT in the design) $^{\rm 41}$

After WEP - back to the basics

Wireless authentication

- User-based, centralized, strong authentication
- Mutual authentication of client and network

Wireless privacy

- Strong, effective encryption
- Effective message integrity check
- Centralized, dynamic key management

We need ...

Encryption Algorithm

- Mechanism to provide data privacy
- Message Integrity Check
 - Ensures data frames are tamper free and truly from the source address
- Authentication Framework
 - Framework to facilitate authentication of messages between clients, access point, and AAA server

Authentication Algorithm

– Mechanism to validate client credentials

802.11i – wireless security done well

- AES replaces RC4 w/TKIP
- Dubbed "WPA2" by WiFi Alliance
- Robust Security Network (RSN) for establishing secure communcations
 - Uses 802.1x for authentication
 - Replaces TKIP
- Counter Mode with Cipher Block Chaining (CCMP) for encryption
 - CCM mode of AES
 - 128-bit keys, 48-bit IV
 - CBC-MAC provides data integrity/authentication
 - CCMP mandatory with RSN
 - WRAP was initial selection, licensing rights/problems got in the way

802.11i components



802.11i

- IEEE 802.11i defines a new type of wireless network called a robust security network (RSN)
- Transitional security network (TSN): Both RSN and WEP systems can operate in parallel.
- Most existing Wi-Fi cards cannot be upgraded to RSN as AES is not supported in all hardware
- All cards can be upgraded to WPA (RC4 supported in all hardware due to WEP)

WPA / RSN

- Temporal Key Integrity Protocol (TKIP): based on the capabilities of existing Wi-Fi products.
- TKIP is allowed as an optional mode under RSN.
- Wi-Fi alliance adopted a new security approach based on the draft RSN but only specifying TKIP. This subset of RSN is called as WPA
- RSN also supports the AES cipher algorithm in addition to TKIP, whereas WPA focuses on TKIP.
- RSN and WPA share a single security architecture under which TKIP or AES based security protocols can operate.
- This architecture includes upper-level authentication, secret key distribution, and key renewal.

TKIP – enhanced encryption / integrity

- TKIP has to be secure and available as an upgrade to WEP systems.
- The implementation of WEP almost depends on the hardware assist functions.
- The hardware assist functions in these earlier systems cannot support AES-CCMP.
- TKIP uses existing RC4 and upgrades the firmware.

TKIP – new generation of RC4 seed value

Per-packet key mixing



Changes from WEP to TKIP

- Message integrity: add a message integrity protocol.
- IV selection and use: as counter (sequence no)
- Per-packet key Mixing
- Increase the size of IV.
- Key management.

IV selection and use

- IV size: 24 bits -> 48 bits
- IV use as a sequence number to avoid replay attacks.
- IV is constructed to avoid certain "weak keys." (RC4 has some weak keys)

TKIP Message Integrity Code (MIC)

- ICV offers no real protection at all.
- All the well-known methods need a new cryptographic algorithm or require fast multiply operation.
- Michael uses no multiplications, just shift and add operations.
- Michael is vulnerable to brute force attacks.

TKIP - MIC overview (continued)

- MIC Message Integrity Code
 - Protects against bit-flip attacks by adding tamper-proof hash to messages
 - Must be implemented on clients & AP
 - Hash of (random num + MAC header + sequence number + payload)
 - Sequence number must be in order or packet rejected
 - Part of firmware, not O/S

802.11i protocol steps

Discovery

– AP advertises network security capabilities to STAs

802.1x authentication

- Mutually authenticate STA and AS
- Generate Master Key as a side effect of authentication
- Generate Pairwise MK as an access authorization token
- Generate 4 keys for encryption/integrity

Not for home use – securing businesses

How RSN Works



- 1. Client sends request for association and security negotiation to AP, which forward to WLAN switch.
- 2. WLAN switch passes request to Authentication Server (RADIUS).
- 3. RADIUS authenticates client.
- 4. Switch and client initiate 4 way key negotiation to create unique session key. Switch pushes key, which is AES encrypted to AP. AES encrypts all data traffic.

802.11i overview

| ccess Poi | nt | |
|------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | | |
| uthenticat | ion | |
| → ← | | ev distribution |
| • | | |
| → | | |
| | ry uthenticati → ← R → | ry Jthentication → ← RADIUS ko |

802.11i authentication overview

At the end of authentication

- The AS and STA have established a session
- The AS and STA possess a mutually authenticated Master Key
- Master Key represents decision to grant access based on authentication
- STA and AS have derived PMK
- PMK is an authorization token to enforce access control decision
- AS has distributed PMK to the STA's AP

WPA and RSN key Hierarchy



- MK ≠ PMK or AP could make access control decisions
- instead of AS
- MK is fresh and bound to the session between STA and AS
- PMK is bound to this STA and this AP

Key derivation

Four separate keys for two layers' protection:

- EAP handshake and user's data.
 - Data Encryption key
 - Data Integrity key
 - EAPOL-Key Encryption key
 - EAPOL-Key Integrity key
- Pairwise transient key (PTK): the four keys
- Once that the keys are chosen:
 - TKIP encryption
 - TKIP MIC

In summary: WEP vs. WPA vs. WPA2

| | WEP | WPA | WPA2 |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| Encryption | RC4 | RC4 | AES |
| Key rotation | None | Dynamic session keys | Dynamic session keys |
| Key distribution | Manually typed into each device | Automatic distribution available | Automatic distribution available |
| Authentication | Uses WEP key as AuthC | Can use 802.1x & EAP | Can use 802.1x & EAP |

Conclusion: 802.11 authentication approaches



- Closed network
 - SSID can be captured with passive monitoring
- MAC filtering
 - MACs can be sniffed/spoofed
- WEP
 - Can be cracked online/offline given enough traffic & time
- Change keys frequently
 - Traffic can still be decrypted offline
- Place APs on DMZ
 - Requires VPN access to get back into network
- Use VPN
 - Doesn't handle roaming
- Authentication portal
 - Example: Nocat
 - More stuff to configure
- WPA and/or EAP