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Motivation: Challenge-Response Revisited

Question: Break this identification mechanism if encryption is CTR.
Solution: Authenticated Encryption

Transfer $5 to account 12345

Privacy

Encryption scheme

Authenticated Encryption
Achieve both of these aims

Authenticity

MAC
Authenticated Encryption (AE)
Emerged ~ 2000

Begin with two realizations

1. Authenticity is routinely needed/assumed
2. “Standard” privacy mechanisms don’t provide it

Provide an easier-to-correctly-use abstraction boundary
AE Syntax

Key Gen

\[ K \rightarrow \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \$ \rightarrow K \]

Encrypt

\[ M \rightarrow \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \$ \rightarrow C \]

Decrypt

\[ C \rightarrow \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \{ M, \perp \} \]

Decryption may reject invalid ciphertexts
Defining Security for AE

- Use Left-or-Right security for privacy

Auth $\mathcal{E}$

- **Initialize()**
  
  $K \leftarrow \mathcal{K}$
  
  Return $\mathcal{E}_K(M)$

- **Enc**
  
  $M$ to $C$

- **Finalize($C'$)**
  
  Return $(\mathcal{D}_K(C') \neq \bot)$

Adv$^\text{auth}$ $^T$ $(A) = \Pr[\text{Auth}^A_{\mathcal{E}} \Rightarrow 1]$

Authenticity

Must never receive from Enc
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Plain Encryption Doesn’t Provide Authenticity

**Question:** Does CBC provide authenticity?

**Answer:** No, because any ciphertext has valid decryption.
A Bad Fix: CBC with Redundancy

On decryption, verify the decrypted last block is zero.

**Question**: Break the authenticity of this scheme with a single Enc query
An Attack

\[ C_0 \quad C_1 \quad C_2 \quad C_3 \]

\[ M_1 \quad 0^n \]

\[ E_K \quad C_1 \quad E_K \quad C_2 \quad E_K \quad C_3 \]

\[ C_0 \quad C_1 \quad C_2 \]

\[ E_K^{-1} \quad M_1 \quad E_K^{-1} \quad 0^n \]
Complex Redundancy Doesn’t Help

Some (unkeyed) “redundancy” function, such as checksum

The redundancy is verified upon decryption

**Question:** Break the authenticity of this scheme with a single Enc query
An Attack

\[ \text{Enc} \]

\[ M \rightarrow M_1 \rightarrow h(M_1) \]

\[ A \]

\[ C_0 \rightarrow C_1 \rightarrow C_2 \rightarrow C_3 \]

\[ C_0 \rightarrow M_1 \rightarrow h(M_1) \rightarrow E_K \rightarrow C_1 \rightarrow C_2 \rightarrow C_3 \]

\[ C_1 \rightarrow E_K \rightarrow C_2 \rightarrow E_K \rightarrow C_3 \rightarrow E_K \rightarrow C_0 \rightarrow M_1 \rightarrow h(M_1) \rightarrow E_K^{-1} \rightarrow C_1 \rightarrow C_2 \rightarrow E_K^{-1} \rightarrow \]
A Case Study: WEP

Used in IEEE WiFi standard

24-bit IV is a part of the ciphertext
Attack 1: Exploiting Short IV

Assume all messages are of the same length, and fairly long

**Goal:** recover at least one message
Attack 1: Exploiting Short IV

Aim for an IV collision

For 24-bit IV’s, how many ctx to wait for collision prob ≈ 0.5?
Attack 1: Exploiting Short IV

\[ M \quad \text{CRC}(M) \]

\[ \text{IV} \quad K \rightarrow \text{RC4} \rightarrow C \]

\[ \text{IV} || C_1 \quad \text{IV} || C_2 \]

Same IV, can recover \( M_1 \oplus M_2 \)
Attack 2: Chop-Chop Attack

Goal: recover the underlying message by exploiting Dec queries
Attack 2: Chop-Chop Attack
Illustrated Via A Simpler Variant of WEP

Example: Parity(10011) = 1 ⊕ 0 ⊕ 0 ⊕ 1 ⊕ 1 = 1
Attack 2: Chop-Chop Attack
Illustrated For 4-bit Message
Decryption In CloseUp

\[ C_1 \, C_2 \, C_3 \, C_4 \, C_5 \]

\[ \text{IV} \quad K \quad \text{RC4} \quad \text{Parity}(M) \]

\[ M_1 \, M_2 \, M_3 \, M_4 \]

Compare with \( \text{Parity}(M_1M_2M_3) \)
Exploit Decryption Response

If valid, $M_1 \oplus M_2 \oplus M_3 \oplus M_4 = 0$
Exploit Decryption Response

If invalid, \( M_1 \oplus M_2 \oplus M_3 \oplus M_4 = 1 \)
Exploit Decryption Response

Learn $M_1 \oplus M_2 \oplus M_3 \oplus M_4$
Exploit Decryption Even Further

Learn $M_1 \oplus M_2 \oplus M_3$
Solve A System of Linear Equations

\[
\begin{align*}
M_1 \oplus M_2 \oplus M_3 \oplus M_4 &= \square \\
M_1 \oplus M_2 \oplus M_3 &= \square \\
M_1 \oplus M_2 &= \square \\
M_1 &= \square
\end{align*}
\]
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Constructing AE: Generic Composition

A good PRF, such as Encrypted CBC-MAC

Privacy-only encryption (such as CTR/CBC)

Compose them to build AE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encrypt-and-MAC</td>
<td>SSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAC-then-Encrypt</td>
<td>SSL/TLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encrypt-then-MAC</td>
<td>IPSec</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Encrypt-and-MAC: Simple Composition

No privacy: encrypting the same message results in the same tag
No authenticity if one can modify $C$ such that decryption is unchanged.
Encrypt-and-MAC in SSH

\[
\begin{align*}
M &\xrightarrow{\text{Encode}} \text{len}(M) || \text{len}(\text{pad}) \\
M &\xrightarrow{\text{CBC}} C \\
\end{align*}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Privacy</th>
<th>Authenticity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{counter} &\xrightarrow{F_{Km}} T \\
\end{align*}
\]
MAC-then-Encrypt

Privacy | Authenticity
---|---
Yes | No

for some bad encryption scheme

No authenticity if one can modify $C$ such that decryption is unchanged.
MAC-then-Encrypt in TLS

\[ M \xrightarrow{F_{K_m}} T \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Privacy</th>
<th>Authenticity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CBC

C
Encrypt-then-MAC

\[ M \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_{K_e} \rightarrow C \rightarrow F_{K_m} \rightarrow T \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Privacy</th>
<th>Authenticity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Common Pitfall in Implementing EtM

Happened in ISO 1972 standard, and in RNCryptor of iOS

Forget to feed IV into MAC

Break auth with one query

Diagram:

$M_1$ $\rightarrow$ $E_K$ $\rightarrow$ $C_0$

$M_2$ $\rightarrow$ $E_K$ $\rightarrow$ $C_1$

$M_3$ $\rightarrow$ $E_K$ $\rightarrow$ $C_2$

$E_K$ $\rightarrow$ $MAC$
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The Padding-Oracle Attack

“Lucky Thirteen” attack snarfs cookies protected by SSL encryption
Exploit is the latest to subvert crypto used to secure Web transactions.

Meaner POODLE bug that bypasses TLS crypto bites 10 percent of websites
Some of the world’s leading sites are vulnerable to an easier, more simplified attack.

Researchers poke hole in custom crypto built for Amazon Web Services
Even when engineers do everything by the book, secure crypto is still hard.

New TLS encryption-busting attack also impacts the newer TLS 1.3
Researchers discover yet another Bleichenbacher attack variation (yawn!).
Attack Model: Chosen Prefix Secret Suffix

Goal: Recover $M$
This Model Is Realistic: Attacking SSL

Encrypted communication via SSL

Visit attacker.com

Cookie with bank.com

Bank of America

bank.com
This Model Is Realistic: Attacking SSL

- Request resource /AA at bank.com
- Encrypted communication via SSL
- cookie with bank.com
- attacker.com
This Model Is Realistic: Attacking SSL

encrypted

GET /AA  cookie: $M$

attacker.com

bank.com
This Model Is Realistic: Attacking SSL

Enc oracle

GET /AA cookie: $M$

Encrypted

Dec oracle

Bank of America

bank.com
Encryption In SSL: MAC-then-Encrypt
Padding In SSL Encryption

Consider byte strings only

- 31 bytes, 1 byte
- 24 bytes, 7 bytes, 1 byte
- 16 bytes, 15 bytes, 1 byte

block length is 16 bytes
The Attack in Action
Illustration For Two-block Message

Aim: Recover the message byte by byte
Recover Last Byte of First Block

\[ \mathcal{E}_K(M_1M_2) \]

\[ C_0 C_1 C_2 C_3 C_4 \]
Recover Last Byte of **First Block**
CBC Decryption

To pass MAC check, want the last byte of $V$ to be 15

Pass with prob $\sim 1/256$

$V = M_1 \oplus C_0 \oplus C_3$
Exploit Decryption Output

If valid, last byte of $V = M_1 \oplus C_0 \oplus C_3$ is 15

Learn last byte of $M_1$
Exploit Decryption Output

If invalid, restart

A

Dec

After $t$ attempts, succeed with prob $\sim 1 - (1 - 1/256)^t$ times
Patching Via Different Padding

Secure if implement properly
Careless Implementation Leads To Attack

- Secure if return a single error signal
- Broken if tell what kind of error it is.
Scanning For Vulnerable Implementations

"Given final block not properly padded"

Spring boot  Eclipse  PKCS12  Javax  Java  Intellij  Android Studio  Images  AES

About 16,000 results (0.32 seconds)

Stack Overflow
https://stackoverflow.com › questions › given-final-bl...

Given final block not properly padded - java

Nov 8, 2011 — BadPaddingException: Given final block not properly padded. Such issues can arise if a bad key is used during decryption.
7 answers · Top answer: If you try to decrypt PKCS5-padded data with the wrong key, and then ...

Given final block not properly padded exception - Stack Overflow
Apr 11, 2018

Given final block not properly padded. AES Decryption - Stack ...
Nov 13, 2022

Given final block not properly padded. Such issues can arise if ...
Jul 10, 2020

"Get Key Failed: Given final block not properly padded" when I ...
Sep 22, 2021

More results from stackoverflow.com
Implementation Is Hard: **Timing Leakage**
How To Attack
Illustration For Two-block Message

\[ \mathcal{E}_K(M_1M_2) \]
Recover Last Byte of Second Block

\[ C_0 \quad C_1 \quad C_2 \quad C_3 \quad C_4 \]

Enc \rightarrow \text{random} \leftarrow Dec

\[ C_0 \quad R \quad C_2 \]
CBC Decryption

If V ends with a zero byte

Bad tag signal