

# Crypto VI: Message Integrity / Authentication Codes and Encryption

## *Cryptographic Hardware for Embedded Systems* *ECE 3170*

Fall 2025

Assoc. Prof. Vincent John Mooney III

Georgia Institute of Technology

# Reading Assignment

- Please read Chapter 18 part 14 of the course textbook by Schneier
- Also NOTE that these lecture notes contain updated information not contained in the course textbook by Schneier – you are still responsible for understanding this lecture!!!

# Notation from Katz and Lindell

- $\{X\}$  is a set of elements of type  $X$
- $m$  is a message in plaintext
  - $m$  is composed of smaller blocks  $m_i$  suitable for individual encryption steps
  - $m = \{m_i\}$
- $c$  is ciphertext corresponding to message  $m$
- $c_i$  is a ciphertext block corresponding to message block  $m_i$
- $Enc_k$  is encryption with key  $k$ 
  - $c \leftarrow Enc_k(m)$
- $Dec_k$  is decryption with key  $k$ 
  - $m \leftarrow Dec_k(c)$
- $MAC_k$  is generation of a message authentication code  $t$  with key  $k$ 
  - $t \leftarrow Mac_k(m)$  or, alternatively,  $t \leftarrow Mac_k(c)$
- $\langle a, b \rangle$  is a concatenation of  $a$  followed by  $b$

# Message Authentication

- Recall that authentication is the act of declaring something (e.g., a person, a message, or an item such as a car) to be authentic, where an identity is said to be authentic if the claimed identity truly corresponds to the thing (person, message, car, etc.)
- A message is authenticated if the identity of the sender is authenticated and the integrity of the message is verified
- We want to prevent *undetected* message tampering
- We begin by assuming the existence of a procedure we call a *Message Authentication Code* or MAC
  - E.g., can use an appropriate one-way hash function with a key
  - Typically the message length is much larger than the MAC output

# Approaches

- Two keys:  $k_E$  for encryption and  $k_M$  for message authentication
- Encrypt-and-authenticate
  - $c \leftarrow Enc_{k_E}(m)$
  - $t \leftarrow Mac_{k_M}(m)$
  - Transmit  $\langle c, t \rangle$
- Authenticate-then-encrypt
  - $t \leftarrow Mac_{k_M}(m)$
  - $c \leftarrow Enc_{k_E}(m, t)$
  - Transmit  $c$
- Encrypt-then-authenticate
  - $c \leftarrow Enc_{k_E}(m)$
  - $t \leftarrow Mac_{k_M}(c)$
  - Transmit  $\langle c, t \rangle$

# Encrypt-and-authenticate

- First problem: cryptanalyst can look for clues regarding  $m$  using  $t$ 
  - $t \leftarrow \text{Mac}_{k_M}(m)$
  - E.g., suppose the first bit of the tag always equals the first bit of the message
- Second problem: deterministic MAC
  - For a deterministic MAC, the tag is identical if the message is identical and the same key ( $k_M$ ) is used – this is typically true during a single session
  - In practice, most one-way hash functions used for MACs are deterministic
  - An eavesdropper then knows when the same message has been sent twice, and hence this approach is not secure against CPA

# Authenticate-then-encrypt

- Problem: CPA
  - Consider an attack based on error messages
    - If an error in the padding is detected, a “bad padding” error may be returned
  - Since it is the case that  $c \leftarrow \text{Enc}_k(m,t)$ , there are now *two* potential sources of decryption error
  - Consider the modified decryption algorithm...

# Encrypt-then-authenticate

- Given  $k_E$ ,  $k_M$ , MAC and  $\pi_E = (Enc, Dec)$
- Define  $Enc'$  and  $Dec'$  as follows
  - $Enc'(m)$ :
    - $c \leftarrow Enc_{k_E}(m)$
    - $t \leftarrow Mac_{k_M}(c)$
    - Ciphertext output is  $\langle c, t \rangle$
  - $Dec'(\langle c, t \rangle)$ :
    - First check if  $Mac_{k_M}(c) = t$
    - If yes, output  $Dec_{k_E}(c)$
    - If no, output that there has been an error



