

TD 5 – Message authentication codes

Exercise 1.*Insecure MACs*

Let E_k be block cipher of block length λ .

1. Let $\text{Mac}_k(m_1 \parallel \dots \parallel m_\ell) = E_k(m_*)$ where each m_i has length λ and $m_* = m_1 \oplus m_2 \oplus \dots \oplus m_\ell$. Prove that however good is the block cipher, this MAC is insecure. *Hint. One query is sufficient for a universal forgery.*
2. Let $\text{Mac}_k(m_1 \parallel \dots \parallel m_\ell) = E_k(m_1) \oplus \dots \oplus E_k(m_\ell)$ where each m_i has length λ . Prove that however good is the block cipher, this MAC is insecure.

Exercise 2.*SuffixMAC*

Let $H : \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^n$ be a Merkle-Damgård hash function, built from a compression function $f : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^w \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^n$. Let F be the iterated compression function such that $H(m) = F(\text{pad}(m))$ where $\text{pad}(m) = m \parallel \text{pad}_{|m|}$.

Define $\text{SuffixMac}_H : \{0, 1\}^\kappa \times \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^n$ by $\text{SuffixMac}_H(k, m) = H(m \parallel k)$.

1.
 - i. What is the (generic) complexity of finding a collision $F(m) = F(m')$?
 - ii. Does the complexity changes if one requires m and m' to be of the same length $\ell > n$?
2. Let $m \neq m'$ of a same length kw , such that $F(m) = F(m')$.
 - i. Give an existential forgery attack for SuffixMac_H with one query.
 - ii. What is the total cost of the attack, if one has to compute m and m' ?
 - iii. Is the attack interesting if $\kappa = n/2$? And if $\kappa = n$?

Exercise 3.*GMAC security*

Recall that $\text{GMAC}_{k_1 \parallel k_2}(m) = (r, m(k_1) + E_{k_2}(r))$ where $r \leftarrow \{0, 1\}^{128}$, E is a block cipher with block size 128 and $m(k)$ is defined as follows: $m \in \{0, 1\}^*$ is split into 128-bit blocks $m_0, \dots, m_{\ell-1}$ and $m(k) = m_0k + m_1k^2 + \dots + m_{\ell-1}k^\ell$ where each block m_i and k are interpreted as elements of the finite field $\mathbb{F}_{2^{128}}$ with 2^{128} elements.

To study the security of GMAC, we define the *strong* EUF-CMA game:¹

- Challenger: $k \leftarrow k_1 \parallel k_2$
- Adversary: queries $m^1, \dots, m^q$ and gets valid tags $t^i = (r^i, s^i)$, $1 \leq i \leq q$
- Adversary: outputs a pair (m, t) where $(m, t) \notin \{(m^1, t^1), \dots, (m^q, t^q)\}$

Note that the adversary may output $m = m^i$ for some i as long as $t \neq t^i$.

Let $(m, (r, s))$ be the pair output by the adversary. The goal is to bound the probability that (r, s) is a valid tag for m , in the *ideal block cipher model*: E_{k_2} is replaced by a random function $f : \{0, 1\}^{128} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{128}$ in GMAC.

1. Intuitively, why is the advantage of an adversary almost the same with a good block cipher E or a random function f ?

¹Strong existential unforgeability under chosen message attack.

Let C be the event “ $\exists i \neq j, r^i = r^j$ ”, N be the event “ $\forall i, r \neq r^i$ ” and V be the event “ $(m, (r, s))$ is a valid pair.”

2. (optional) Prove that $\Pr[V] \leq \Pr[C] + \Pr[V|N] + \Pr[V|\neg C \wedge \neg N]$. *Hint. Prove it for any events V, C, N using twice the law of total probability.*
3. Give an upper bound on $\Pr[C]$.
4. Prove that $\Pr[V|N] \leq 2^{-128}$. *Hint. Translate $\Pr[V|N]$ into plain English.*
5. We now bound $\Pr[V|\neg C \wedge \neg N]$. We assume that $\neg C \wedge \neg N$ holds.
 - i. Translate $\Pr[V|\neg C \wedge \neg N]$ into plain English.
 - ii. Prove that the adversary learns no information on k_1 from its queries.
 - iii. Prove that there exists i such that (r, s) is a valid tag for m if and only if $m(k) - m^i(k) = s - s^i$.
 - iv. Prove that $\Pr[V|\neg C \wedge \neg N] \leq L/2^{135}$ where $L = \max(|m|, |m^1|, \dots, |m^q|)$.
6. Conclude on the maximal advantage of an adversary, independently of its running time.