

Lecture 24: MAC for Arbitrary Length Messages

Previous lecture, we constructed MACs for fixed length messages

- The GGM Pseudo-random Function (PRF) Construction
 - **Given.** Pseudo-random Generator (PRG)
 $G: \{0, 1\}^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{2k}$
 - **We Constructed.** PRF $F_{sk}(m)$ using the GGM construction from the domain $\{0, 1\}^n$ to the range $\{0, 1\}^k$
- The MAC scheme was provided by (Gen, Mac, Ver)

- Gen(). Return $sk \xleftarrow{\$} \{0, 1\}^k$
- Mac_{sk}(m). Return $\tau = F_{sk}(m)$
- Ver_{sk}($\tilde{m}, \tilde{\tau}$). Return $\tilde{\tau} == F_{sk}(\tilde{m})$

- This construction is secure only for fixed-length messages
- We need different secret key for every length of the message. Otherwise, we can perform length-extension attacks

Goal of this Lecture

- Suppose we are given a MAC scheme $(\text{Gen}', \text{Mac}', \text{Ver}')$ that is secure only for B -bit messages and generates tags of length k
- We want to construct a MAC scheme $(\text{Gen}, \text{Mac}, \text{Ver})$ that is secure for arbitrary length messages

First Proposal I

The students proposed the following construction

Gen(). Return $sk = \text{Gen}'()$

Mac_{sk}(m).

- 1 Pad the message m so that the length of m is a multiple of B
- 2 Break m into n/B blocks $(m^{(1)}, m^{(2)}, \dots, m^{(n/B)})$ such that each block $m^{(i)}$ has size B
- 3 For $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n/B\}$: Compute $\tau^{(i)} = \text{Mac}'_{sk}(m^{(i)})$
- 4 Return $\tau = (\tau^{(1)}, \tau^{(2)}, \dots, \tau^{(n/B)})$

Ver_{sk}($\tilde{m}, \tilde{\tau}$).

- 1 Let $\tilde{m} = (\tilde{m}^{(1)}, \tilde{m}^{(2)}, \dots, \tilde{m}^{(t)})$ (each block of length B)
- 2 Let $\tilde{\tau} = (\tilde{\tau}^{(1)}, \tilde{\tau}^{(2)}, \dots, \tilde{\tau}^{(t)})$ (each block of length k)
- 3 Return true if and only if for all $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$, the expression $\text{Ver}'_{sk}(\tilde{m}^{(i)}, \tilde{\tau}^{(i)})$ is true

First Proposal II

Attacks on the Scheme. This scheme is insecure. The students proposed the following attacks.

Suppose the adversary sees the message

$m = (m^{(1)}, m^{(2)}, \dots, m^{(n/B)})$ and the tag

$\tau = (\tau^{(1)}, \tau^{(2)}, \dots, \tau^{(n/B)})$.

① **Permuting.**

The adversary can construct m' from m by arbitrarily permuting the blocks of the message m . The adversary can construct the corresponding τ' from τ by performing the same permutation of blocks on the tag τ .

2 Shortening/Extending.

The adversary can construct m' from m by dropping blocks from m . The adversary can construct the corresponding τ' from τ by dropping the tags for those blocks in the tag τ .

The adversary can also construct m' from m by repeating some blocks of m . The adversary can construct the corresponding τ' from τ by repeating the tags for those blocks in the tag τ .

3 Splicing.

Suppose the adversary sees another message

$$\hat{m} = (\hat{m}^{(1)}, \hat{m}^{(2)}, \dots, \hat{m}^{(n/B)}) \text{ and its tag}$$

$$\hat{\tau} = (\hat{\tau}^{(1)}, \hat{\tau}^{(2)}, \dots, \hat{\tau}^{(n/B)})$$

The adversary can construct m' from the messages m and \hat{m} by splicing blocks. The adversary can construct the corresponding τ' from the tags τ and $\hat{\tau}$ by splicing the corresponding blocks from the tags τ and $\hat{\tau}$.

For example, the tag of the message $(m^{(1)}, \hat{m}^{(2)}, \dots, \hat{m}^{(n/B)})$ is $(\tau^{(1)}, \hat{\tau}^{(2)}, \dots, \hat{\tau}^{(n/B)})$

- ④ Combination of the attacks mentioned above.
For example, the adversary can splice, extend, and permute!

Preventing the Attacks

Students proposed the following fixes.

- Prevent Permutation. We can include the information in each $\tau^{(i)}$ that it is the tag of the message-block at position i , then permutation attacks cannot be performed.
- Prevent Shortening/Extension. We can include the information in each $\tau^{(i)}$ that it is the tag of the message of total length n , then shortening/extension attacks cannot be performed.
- Prevent Splicing. We can include a time-stamp in each $\tau^{(i)}$ so that we cannot splice messages at two different time instances. (We shall use a *slightly different technique* but I wanted to summarize the proposals of the students)

Secure MAC Scheme for Arbitrary-length Messages I

- $\text{Gen}()$. Return $\text{sk} = \text{Gen}'()$

Secure MAC Scheme for Arbitrary-length Messages II

- $\text{Mac}_{\text{sk}}(m)$.

- 1 Pad m to make its length a multiple of $B/4$
- 2 Break m into $4n/B$ blocks of size $B/4$ each. We represent this as $m = (m^{(1)}, m^{(2)}, \dots, m^{(4n/B)})$
- 3 Pick $r \xleftarrow{\$} \{0, 1\}^{B/4}$
- 4 Let $[n]_2$ represent the $(B/4)$ -bit representation of the number n in binary
- 5 Let $[i]_2$ represent the $(B/4)$ -bit representation of the number i in binary
- 6 For each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, 4n/B\}$ create the following block

$$m^{+(i)} = (\overbrace{r}^{B/4\text{-bits}}, \overbrace{[n]_2}^{B/4\text{-bits}}, \overbrace{[i]_2}^{B/4\text{-bits}}, \overbrace{m^{(i)}}^{B/4\text{-bits}})$$

- 7 For each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, 4n/B\}$ create the tag $\tau^{(i)} = \text{Mac}'_{\text{sk}}(m^{+(i)})$
- 8 Return $\tau = (r, \tau^{(1)}, \tau^{(2)}, \dots, \tau^{(4n/B)})$

Secure MAC Scheme for Arbitrary-length Messages III

- $\text{Ver}_{\text{sk}}(\tilde{m}, \tilde{\tau})$.
 - 1 Interpret $\tilde{m} = (\tilde{m}^{(1)}, \tilde{m}^{(2)}, \dots, \tilde{m}^{(t)})$, where each block is of length B
 - 2 Interpret $\tilde{\tau} = (\tilde{r}, \tilde{\tau}^{(1)}, \tilde{\tau}^{(2)}, \dots, \tilde{\tau}^{(t)})$, where \tilde{r} is of length $B/4$ and each block $\tilde{\tau}^{(i)}$ is of length k
 - 3 Let $\tilde{n} = t \times (B/4)$, the length of the message \tilde{m}
 - 4 For each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, t\}$ construct the following block

$$\tilde{m}^{+(i)} = (\tilde{r}, [\tilde{n}]_2, [i]_2, \tilde{m}^{(i)})$$

- 5 Accept $(\tilde{m}, \tilde{\tau})$ if for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, t\}$ the test $\text{Ver}'_{\text{sk}}(\tilde{m}^{+(i)}, \tilde{\tau}^{(i)})$ accepts

- Note that we can assume that all random strings “ r ” are unique. Because, by birthday bound, we need to tag roughly $\sqrt{|2^{B/4}|} = 2^{B/8}$ messages before we can expect one collision. If we choose $B = 800$, then we will (with high probability) see unique “ r ” strings. This, effectively, serves as a “time stamp”
- Check that all the attacks that we discussed cannot be performed against this new MAC scheme (Gen, Mac, Ver)
- **Very Important.** We emphasize that “protecting against known attacks” does not imply security of a MAC scheme. We can formally prove the security of the MAC scheme that we have described above. The proof is beyond the scope of this course.