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## Introduction : MAC

Message Authentication Code (MAC) : $\mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$

- Tag $T=\operatorname{MAC}_{K}(M)$ for message $M$, using key $K$
- If $\mathrm{MAC}_{K}$ is a PRF, it is a secure MAC


Blockcipher modes of operation for MAC : CBC-MAC, CMAC, etc.

## MACs from TBC

## Recent trend

Use tweakable blockcipher (TBC) for MAC to improve simplicity/efficiency/security

TBC is an extension of ordinal BC, formalized by Liskov et al. [LRW02]

- $\widetilde{E}: \mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$, tweak $T \in \mathcal{T}$ is a public input
- $(K, T) \in \mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{T}$ specifies a permutation over $\mathcal{M}$
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## MACs from TBC

Two TBC-based MACs :

- PMAC1 by Rogaway at Asiacrypt'04 [Rog04] :
- Simple. Introduced as an abstraction of PMAC for security proof
- Parallelizable
- Efficient, $n$ msg bits per $1 n$-bit-block TBC call
- Secure up to $2^{n / 2}$ queries : birthday bound (upBB) security
- PMAC_TBC1k by Naito at ProvSec'15 [Nai15] :
- Extend the chain value of PMAC1 in a similar to Yasuda's PMAC_plus [Yas11]
- Parallelizable
- Efficient, almost the same \# of TBC calls as PMAC1
- Secure up to $2^{n}$ queries : beyond birthday bound (BBB) security

The proposals of List and Nandi, and our contributions List and Nandi at CT-RSA'17 [LN17]: refine and extend [Nai15].

- PMAC2x and PMACx for MAC
- SIVx for Deterministic Authenticated Encryption (DAE)

Claimed BBB security for them : secure for $q \ll 2^{n}$ queries

## The proposals of List and Nandi, and our contributions

 List and Nandi at CT-RSA'17 [LN17]: refine and extend [Nai15].- PMAC2x and PMACx for MAC
- SIVx for Deterministic Authenticated Encryption (DAE)

Claimed BBB security for them : secure for $q \ll 2^{n}$ queries
Our contributions
We invalidate the security claims for all of them,

- by showing attacks w/ $q \approx 2^{n / 2}$ queries (thus upBB-secure at best).
- for both distinguisher and (very powerful) forgery


## PMAC2x [LN17]

- Parallel application of TBC to message blocks $M[i]$
- $2 n$-bit chain and $2 n$-bit output ( $U, V$ )
- When the last block is full $(|M[m]|=n)$ : no pad



## PMAC2x [LN17]

- Parallel application of TBC to message blocks $M[i]$
- $2 n$-bit chain and $2 n$-bit output ( $U, V$ )
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## PMACx [LN17]

- $n$-bit-output variant of PMAC2x obtained by $T=U \oplus V$
- Same handling of last block as PMAC2x
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Security bounds for PMAX2x and PMACx [LN17]
$O\left(q^{2} / 2^{2 n}+q^{3} / 2^{3 n}\right)$, thus BBB-secure

## Differences from PMAC_TBC1k [Nai15]

The structures are the same, but
(1) Output extension (from $n$ to $2 n$ by PMAC2x), w/o additional cost
(2) Refined security bounds
(3) More efficient padding

- PMAC_TBC1k : $M$ is always padded. If $|M| \bmod n=0$ (integral blocks) we need one more block
- PMAC2x : $M$ is padded only if $|M| \bmod n \neq 0$.
- Similar to PMAC1. Improved short-input efficiency
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## The last one seems a nice optimization, but contains a significant flaw

## Birthday attack on PMAC2x

- $Q=2^{(n / 2)-1}$, query $2 Q=2^{n / 2}$ single-block messages
- The first set: distinct $M_{1}, \ldots, M_{Q}$ s.t. $\left|M_{i}\right|=n$ for $1 \leq i \leq Q$
- The second set: distinct $M_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, M_{Q}^{\prime}$ s.t. $\left|M_{j}^{\prime}\right|<n$ for $1 \leq j \leq Q$



## Birthday attack on PMAC2x

- Two message sets are given to independent random permutations
- Thus, TBC outputs ( $\bullet$ ) can collide!
- W.H.P., $X_{i}=X_{j}^{\prime}$ for some $i$ and $j$, in which case $Y_{i}=Y_{j}^{\prime}$
- $\left(U_{i}, V_{i}\right)=\left(U_{j}^{\prime}, V_{j}^{\prime}\right)$ for PMAC2x, but this is unlikely for a random function that outputs $2 n$ bits
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## Extension to longer blocks and forgery

The attack can be easily extended to two directions

- Distinguisher for longer messages
- One can prepend any fixed integer blocks
- $M_{i}=M_{\text {pre }} \| M_{i}[m]$ and $M_{j}^{\prime}=M_{\text {pre }} \| M_{j}^{\prime}[m]$, for $\left|M_{\text {pre }}\right|=n(m-1)$
- works because TBC calls for message hashing are parallel
- Almost universal forgery attack
- Perform the above attack to detect collisions for $M_{i}$ and $M_{j}^{\prime}$
- Chang the prefix from $M_{\text {pre }}$ to (any integer blocks of ) $\hat{M}_{\text {pre }}$
- Query the tag for $\hat{M}_{i}=\hat{M}_{\text {pre }} \| M_{i}[m]$
- The tag for $\hat{M}_{j}^{\prime}=\hat{M}_{\mathrm{pre}} \| M_{j}^{\prime}[m]$ will be the same
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## Extension to PMACx

The attack can be extended to PMACx with slight modifications

## SIVx : application to DAE

DAE : authenticated encryption (AE) w/o nonce

- introduced by Rogaway and Shrimpton at EUROCRYPT'06 [RS06]
- takes associated data (AD) $A$, plaintext $M$
- outputs ciphertext $C$ and tag $T$
(Generic) SIV [RS06] : DAE construction using PRF F and IV-based encryption $\mathcal{E}$
(1) $T \leftarrow F_{K}(A, M)$
(2) $C \leftarrow \mathcal{E}_{K^{\prime}}^{T}(M)(T$ as IV$)$
(3) return $(C, T)$

Adopted by many DAE proposals: (BC-based instance of) SIV [RS06], SCT at CRYPTO'16 [PS16], ZAE at CRYPTO'17 [IMPS17]

## SIVx is an instance of SIV

- a variant of PMAC2x as $F$ (vPMAC2x)
- PHASHx (PMAC2x w/o final TBCs) independently applied to $A$ and $M$, using distinct tweaks
- Take XOR of outputs, finalize as PMAC2x
- IVCTRT [PS16] as $\mathcal{E}$



## Birthday attack against SIVx

Forgery against vPMAC2x implies forgery against SIVx

- The padding-based attack works as well as PMAC2x
- E.g. by fixing $M$ and attack AD part



## Birthday attack against SIVx

Even if padding is safe (e.g. as PMAC_TBC1k), still vulnerable

- Let $M_{i}=M_{\text {pre }}\left\|M_{i}[m], A_{i}=A_{\text {pre }}\right\| A_{i}[m]$ (the same length)
- Query $\left(M_{1}, A_{1}\right), \ldots,\left(M_{q}, A_{q}\right)$ for $q=2^{n / 2}$
- The diff is only in the last blocks
- If $X_{i} \oplus X_{j}=0^{n}, Y_{i} \oplus Y_{j}=2\left(X_{i} \oplus X_{j}\right)=0^{n}$ and the output collides



## Birthday attack against SIVx

- $X_{i} \oplus X_{j}=Z_{i}^{A}[m] \oplus Z_{j}^{A}[m] \oplus Z_{i}^{M}[m] \oplus Z_{j}^{M}[m]$
- $2^{n / 2}$ queries are enough to see a collision on 4 outputs of two independent random permutations
- extension to $a \neq m$ is possible (see the paper)



## Concluding remarks : what went wrong

- (All) Wrong padding method : only useful for upBB-secure schemes
- Each TBC output for $M[i]$ must be distinct for BBB-security
- (SIVx) Wrong parallel composition (XOR) of PHASHx
- The cause is mostly from the fact that PHASHx is $O\left(2^{-2 n}\right)$-Almost universal but not $O\left(2^{-2 n}\right)$-Almost XOR universal !
- (consider the single-block case: collision prob is zero but XOR differential prob is $1 /\left(2^{n}-1\right)$ or 0 )
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Fix on [LN17]
ePrint version of [LN17] fixed them

- Same padding as PMAC_TBC1k
- Encode $(A, M)$ and give to single PMAC2x for SIVx
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## Fix on [LN17]

ePrint version of [LN17] fixed them

- Same padding as PMAC_TBC1k
- Encode $(A, M)$ and give to single PMAC2x for SIVx


## Lessons learned

- Be careful when you adopt techniques used in upBB-secure schemes to build BBB-secure schemes!


## Thank you!

