

Message Authentication Codes and Length Extension Attacks

1. Background Study

Name :

Ahmed Mohammed Adel Ibrahim - **2205096**

Abdelrahman Ayman Saad Abdelhalim - **2205033**

Ahmed Mohammed Bekhit - **2205136**

COURSE : Data Integrity and Authentication

Doctor : Maged Abdelaty

References : [RFC 2104-Cryptanalysis of MD5 and SHA-1- Glenn Askins](#)

1. Introduction : What is Message Authentication Codes :

Message Authentication Codes provide **symmetric-key data integrity and authenticity**. Given a secret key K and message M , a MAC algorithm outputs a fixed-size tag T such that only parties knowing K can generate or verify T :

$$T = \text{MAC}(K, M)$$

Upon receipt, the verifier recomputes $\text{MAC}(K, M)$ and compares it to T . A match ensures:

- **Integrity**: M was not altered in transit.
- **Authenticity**: M originates from an entity possessing K .

MACs are widely used in network protocols, APIs, and software packages to protect messages and files.

2. MAC = hash($K \parallel M$): Naive Construction :

A simple MAC approach prepends the key to the message:

$$\text{NaiveMAC}(K, M) = H(K \parallel M)$$

where H is a cryptographic hash. Though straightforward, this construction inherits vulnerabilities of the **hash's compression structure**.

2.1 Merkle-Damgard Hash Structure

Most legacy hashes follow the Merkle-Damard design:

1. **Padding**: The message is padded to a multiple of block size (64 bytes) by appending $0x80$, zero bytes, then a 64-bit length field.
2. **Compression Function**: Processes each 64-byte block sequentially, updating an internal state IV .
3. **Output**: The final state yields the hash digest.

Because the digest equals the final internal state, an attacker knowing $H(K \parallel M)$ effectively knows the state after processing $K \parallel M$.

3. Length Extension Attack :

A length extension attack exploits the ability to resume hashing from a known internal state.

1. **Intercept** a valid (M, T) where $T = H(K || M)$.
2. **Guess** the length of K , say L bytes.
3. **Compute** Padding for $K || M$ as the hash would:
 - Let original bit length = $8 \cdot (L + |M|)$.
 - Padding = $0x80 + k$ bytes of $0x00 + 8$ -byte length.
4. **Resume Hashing**: Use the intercepted digest as the initial state and hash your extension E .
5. **Forge**: New tag $T' = H_{\text{finalstate}}(E)$.
6. Construct the forged message:
 $M_{\text{forged}} = M || \text{padding} || E$
and MAC T' verifies under **NaiveMAC**.

3.1 Numeric Example in MD5

- Block size: 64 bytes.
- Suppose K length $L = 16$, $|M| = 20$.
- Total = 36 bytes \rightarrow needs $1 (0x80) + 27 (0x00) + 8 (\text{length}) = 36$ padding.
- Forge $E = "\&admin=true"$.

The attacker computes:

$\text{new_mac, forged} = \text{hashpump}(\text{orig_mac}, M, E, 16)$

producing a valid $(M_{\text{forged}}, \text{new_mac})$ without knowing K .

4. Insecurity of NaiveMAC :

Because $H(K \parallel M)$ leaks internal hash state:

- **Incremental Processing:** Attackers forge MACs for extended messages.
- **Key Prepend Weakness:** Prepending doesn't bind the key to the outer hash structure.

Consequences: Any system relying on this MAC is fully compromised—attackers can append arbitrary data and retain valid tags.

C. Secure Alternative: HMAC

Defined in **RFC 2104**, HMAC wraps the hash in two layers:

$$\text{HMAC}(K, M) = H((K' \oplus \text{opad}) \parallel H((K' \oplus \text{ipad}) \parallel M))$$

- $K' = K$ padded or truncated to block size.
- $\text{ipad} = 0x36$ repeated, $\text{opad} = 0x5c$ repeated.
- Hiding of inner hash state under outer hash prevents length extension.

Security: Proven resistant to extension attacks and widely implemented in cryptographic libraries- (It is explained in more detail in the file [\(MAC and LEA \(2.Mitigation Write-Up\)](#))

-Thank You-