# EAX: A Conventional Authenticated-Encryption Mode

M. Bellare* P. Rogaway† D. Wagner‡

September 9, 2003

**Abstract**

We propose a block-cipher mode of operation, called EAX, for authenticated-encryption with associated-data (AEAD). Given a nonce $N$, a message $M$, and a header $H$, the mode protects the privacy of $M$ and the authenticity of both $M$ and $H$. Strings $N, M, H \in \{0,1\}^*$ are arbitrary, and the mode uses $2\lceil |M|/n \rceil + \lceil |H|/n \rceil + \lceil |N|/n \rceil$ block-cipher calls when these strings are nonempty and $n$ is the block length of the underlying block cipher. Among EAX's characteristics are that it is on-line (the length of a message isn't needed to begin processing it) and a fixed header can be pre-processed, effectively removing the per-message cost of binding it to the ciphertext. EAX is obtained by instantiating a simple generic-composition method, EAX2, and then collapsing its two keys into one. EAX is provably secure under a standard complexity-theoretic assumption.

EAX was designed in response to the expressed need of several standardization bodies, including NIST, IETF and IEEE 802.11, for a patent-free AEAD scheme. Such a scheme would have to be *conventional*, meaning it would make two passes, one aimed at achieving privacy and one aimed at achieving authenticity. EAX aims to fill this need by doing as well as possible within the space of conventional schemes with regard to issues of efficiency, simplicity, elegance, ease of correct use, and provable-security guarantees. EAX is an alternative to CCM [19].

**Keywords:** Authenticated encryption, message authentication, CBC MAC, modes of operation, OMAC, provable security.

* Department of Computer Science & Engineering, University of California at San Diego, 9500 Gilman Drive, La Jolla, California 92093, USA. E-mail: mihir@cs.ucsd.edu WWW: www-cse.ucsd.edu/users/mihir/

† Department of Computer Science, University of California at Davis, Davis, California 95616, USA; and Department of Computer Science, Faculty of Science, Chiang Mai University, Chiang Mai 50200, Thailand. E-mail: rogaway@cs.ucdavis.edu WWW: www.cs.ucdavis.edu/~rogaway/

‡ Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley, California 94720, USA. E-mail: daw@cs.berkeley.edu WWW: http://www.cs.berkeley.edu/~daw/

# Contents


**1 Introduction** **3**

**2 The EAX Algorithm** **4**

**3 Discussion of EAX** **7**

**4 Intellectual Property Statement** **9**

**5 EAX2 Algorithm** **11**

**6 Definitions** **11**

**7 Security Results** **13**

**8 Acknowledgments** **15**

**A Proofs of security of EAX2** **17**

**B Proof of Security of the Tweakable-OMAC Extension** **23**

**C Proofs of security of EAX** **31**

**D Recommended API** **33**

**E Test Vectors** **38**

# 1 Introduction

AE AND AEAD. An authenticated encryption (AE) scheme is a symmetric-key mechanism by which a message $M$ is a transformed into a ciphertext $CT$ with the goal that $CT$ protect both privacy *and* authenticity of $M$. The last few years have seen increasing interest and development effort in this domain. For the purposes of this paper it is useful to distinguish two classes of schemes. The first are schemes that make two passes through the data, one aimed at providing privacy and the other at providing authenticity. We call such schemes *conventional*. A common method of designing conventional schemes is by "generic composition," where one pass is based on a (privacy-only) symmetric-encryption scheme and the other pass on a message authentication code (MAC), each using a different key. Comparative analyses of various generic composition methods can be found in [5, 6, 14]. The second, more modern class of schemes, that we call *unconventional* make only a single pass through the data, using a single key, and have cost about half that of conventional schemes. These include IAPM [12], OCB [17] and XCBC [9].

After the emergence of these new AE schemes, it was realized that often times not all the data should be encrypted—in many applications we have a mixture of secret and non-secret data, and it would be nice to have a mode of operation that provides privacy for the secret data and authenticity for both types of data. Thus was born the notion of *authenticated-encryption with associated-data* (AEAD) [16]. The non-secret data is called the *associated data* or the *header*. Conventional AEAD schemes may again be designed via generic composition. An unconventional one, based on OCB, is dot-OCB [16].

THE NEED FOR A NEW CONVENTIONAL SCHEME. Numerous bodies, including NIST, IETF and IEEE802.11, are interested in standardizing an AEAD scheme, but have been deterred from standardizing any of the new unconventional (one pass) schemes due to patents related to them. To be patent-avoiding, a scheme would have to be conventional (two pass). The need has accordingly been expressed for a conventional AEAD scheme that is "as good as possible" subject to this constraint.

While a generic composition based scheme is an obvious solution, it would not be considered adequate since it entails two keys instead of one. What is envisaged is a block-cipher based, single-key using scheme. One such proposal, by Whiting, Housley, and Ferguson [19], is the AEAD scheme called CCM. But CCM embodies limitations that have nothing to do with the Intellectual Property (IP) that it works to avoid [18].

This paper makes two contributions. First, we isolate various goals that we consider important for a conventional AEAD scheme suitable for standardization. Second, we specify a new AEAD scheme, EAX, that achieves all these goals. These goals relate to issues of efficiency, simplicity, elegance, ease of correct use, and provable-security guarantees. We will see that unlike EAX, CCM does not achieve all these goals.

EAX GOALS. We want a nonce-using, block-cipher-based AEAD scheme. It should provide both privacy, in the sense of indistinguishability from random bits, and integrity, in the sense of an adversary's inability to produce a new but valid (nonce, header, ciphertext) triple [16]. Nothing should be assumed about the nonces except that they are non-repeating. Security must be demonstrated using the standard, provable-security approach. The scheme should employ no tool beyond a block cipher $E\colon \mathsf{Key} \times \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}^n$ that it is based on. We should assume nothing about $E$ beyond its security in the sense of a pseudorandom permutation (PRP). We expect that $E$ will often be instantiated by AES, but we should make no restrictions in this direction (such as insisting that $n = 128$). The scheme should be simple and natural (so, in particular, it should avoid complicated length-annotation). It should be a "conventional" AEAD scheme, making a separate privacy pass and authenticity pass, using no known IP.

We wanted our AEAD scheme to be flexible in the functionality it provides. It should support arbitrary-length messages: the message space should be $\{0,1\}^*$. The key space of the AEAD should be the key space Key of the underlying block cipher. We wanted to support nonces as long as the block length[1] ; that is, the nonce space should include $\{0,1\}^n$. Any tag length $\tau \in [0..n]$ should be possible, to allow each user to select how much security she wants from the integrity guarantees and how many bits she has to pay for this.[2] The above considerations imply that the only user-tunable parameters should be $E$ and $\tau$.

We took on some fairly aggressive performance goals. First, message expansion should be no more than required: the length of the ciphertext (which, following the conventions of [17], excludes the nonce) should be only $\tau$ bits more than the length of the plaintext. Implementations should be able to profitably pre-process static associated data; for example, if we have an unchanging header attached to every packet, authenticating this header should have no significant cost after a single pre-computation. There should be an efficient pseudorandom function (PRF) directly accessible through the defined interface of the AEAD scheme—as efficient as other conventional PRFs. Key-setup should be efficient and all block-cipher calls should use the same underlying key, so that we do not incur the cost of key scheduling more than once. For both encryption and decryption, we want to use only the forward direction of the block cipher, so that hardware implementations do not need to implement the decryption functionality of the block cipher. The scheme should be on-line for both the plaintext $M$ and the associated data $H$, which means that one can process streaming data on-the-fly, using constant memory, not knowing when the stream will stop.

EAX RATIONALE. EAX achieves all the above goals. Still, one might ask why EAX as opposed to the dot-OCB AEAD scheme of [16]? The latter not only achieves these goals but makes about half the number of block cipher calls made by CCM and EAX. The reason, as we have already discussed, is that the unconventional (one pass) schemes like dot-OCB are subject to patents, and standardization bodies have (for whatever reason) expressed the intent of standardizing a conventional (two pass) scheme, even at the cost of the factor of two in performance, in order to avoid patents. The merit of this judgment is debatable, and one can debate it, but the pragmatic reality is that there emerges a need for a conventional scheme, like EAX, that is as good as possible subject to the two-pass constraint. Lack of a scheme like EAX will simply lead to an inferior scheme being standardized, which is to the disadvantage of the user community. Accordingly, EAX addresses a very real and practical, even if somewhat unconventionally motivated, crypto-engineering problem, and has the potential for widespread usage and adoption.

## 2 The EAX Algorithm

PRELIMINARIES. All strings in this paper are over the binary alphabet $\{0,1\}$. For $\mathcal{L}$ a set of strings and $n \geq 0$ a number, we let $\mathcal{L}^n$ and $\mathcal{L}^*$ have their usual meanings. The concatenation of strings $X$ and $Y$ is denoted $X \,\|\, Y$ or simply $X\,Y$. The string of length 0, called the *empty string*, is denoted $\varepsilon$. If $X \in \{0,1\}^*$ we let $|X|$ denote its length, in bits. If $X \in \{0,1\}^*$ and $\ell \leq |X|$ then the first $\ell$ bits of $X$ are denoted $X$ [first $\ell$ bits]. When $X \in \{0,1\}^n$ is a nonempty string and $t \in \mathbb{N}$ is a number we let $X+t$ be the $n$-bit string that results from regarding $X$ as a nonnegative number $x$ (binary notation, most-significant-bit first), adding $x$ to $t$, taking the result modulo $2^n$, and converting this number back into an $n$-bit string. If $t \in [0..2^n-1]$ we let $[t]_n$ denote the encoding of $t$ into an $n$-bit binary string (msb first, lsb last). If $X$ and $P$ are strings then we let

[1] Here we will over-achieve, allowing a nonce space of $\{0,1\}^*$.

[2] Note that since our AEAD scheme is bit-oriented and not byte-oriented, $\tau$ is the number of bits, not bytes, of the tag.

**Algorithm** $\mathrm{CBC}_K\ (M)$

10 Let $M_1 \cdots M_m \leftarrow M$ where $|M_i| = n$
11 $C_0 \leftarrow 0^n$
12 **for** $i \leftarrow 1$ **to** $m$ **do**
13 $\quad C_i \leftarrow E_K(M_i \oplus C_{i-1})$
14 **return** $C_m$

**Algorithm** $\mathrm{CTR}_K^{\mathcal{N}}\ (M)$

20 $m \leftarrow \lceil |M|/n \rceil$
21 $S \leftarrow E_K(\mathcal{N}) \,\|\, E_K(\mathcal{N}{+}1) \,\|\, \cdots \,\|\, E_K(\mathcal{N}{+}m{-}1)$
22 $C \leftarrow M \,\oplus\, S$ [first $|M|$ bits]
23 **return** $C$

**Algorithm** $\mathrm{pad}\,(M;\ B, P)$

30 **if** $|M| \in \{n, 2n, 3n, \ldots\}$
31 **then return** $M \,\oplus\!\!\!\rightarrow\, B$,
32 **else return** $(M \,\|\, 10^{n-1-(|M| \bmod n)}) \,\oplus\!\!\!\rightarrow\, P$

**Algorithm** $\mathrm{OMAC}_K\ (M)$

40 $L \leftarrow E_K(0^n);\quad B \leftarrow 2L;\quad P \leftarrow 4L$
41 **return** $\mathrm{CBC}_K(\mathrm{pad}\,(M;\ B, P))$

**Algorithm** $\mathrm{OMAC}_K^t\ (M)$

50 **return** $\mathrm{OMAC}_K([t]_n \,\|\, M)$

Figure 1: Basic building blocks. The block cipher $E\colon \mathsf{Key} \times \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}^n$ is fixed and $K \in \mathsf{Key}$. For CBC, $M \in (\{0,1\}^n)^+$. For CTR, $M \in \{0,1\}^*$ and $\mathcal{N} \in \{0,1\}^n$. For pad, $M \in \{0,1\}^*$ and $B, P \in \{0,1\}^n$ and $\oplus\!\!\!\rightarrow$ xors the shorter string into the end of longer one. For OMAC, $M \in \{0,1\}^*$ and $t \in [0..2^n - 1]$ and the multiplication of a number by a string $L$ is done in $\mathrm{GF}(2^n)$.

$X \,\oplus\!\!\!\rightarrow\, P$ (the *xor-at-the-end* operator) denote the string of length $\ell = \max\{|X|, |P|\}$ bits that is obtained by prepending $\big||X| - |P|\big|$ zero-bits to the shorter string and then xoring this with the other string. (In other words, xor the shorter string into the *end* of the longer string.) A *block cipher* is a function $E\colon \mathsf{Key} \times \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}^n$ where $\mathsf{Key}$ is a finite, nonempty set and $n \geq 1$ is a number and $E_K(\cdot) = E(K, \cdot)$ is a permutation on $\{0,1\}^n$. The number $n$ is called the *block length.* Throughout this note we fix such a block cipher $E$.

Building blocks. In Figure 1 we define the algorithms CBC, CTR, pad, OMAC (no superscript), and $\mathrm{OMAC}^\bullet$ (with superscript). The algorithms CBC (the CBC MAC) and CTR (counter-mode encryption) are standard. Algorithm pad is used only to define OMAC. Algorithm OMAC [10] is a pseudorandom function (PRF) that is a one-key variant of the algorithm XCBC [8]. Algorithm $\mathrm{OMAC}^\bullet$ is like OMAC but takes an extra argument, the integer $t$. This algorithm is a "tweakable" PRF [15], tweaked in the most simple way possible.

We explain the notation used in the definition of OMAC. The value of $iL$ (line 40: $i$ an integer in $\{2, 4\}$ and $L \in \{0,1\}^n$) is the $n$-bit string that is obtained by multiplying $L$ by the $n$-bit string that represents the number $i$. The multiplication is done in the finite field $\mathrm{GF}(2^n)$ using a canonical polynomial to represent field points. The canonical polynomial we select is the lexicographically first polynomial among the irreducible polynomials of degree $n$ that have a minimum number of nonzero coefficients. For $n = 128$ the indicated polynomial is $\mathsf{x}^{128} + \mathsf{x}^7 + \mathsf{x}^2 + \mathsf{x} + 1$. In that case, $2L = L{\ll}1$ if the first bit of $L$ is 0 and $2L = (L{\ll}1) \oplus 0^{120}10000111$ otherwise, where $L{\ll}1$ means the left shift of $L$ by one position (the first bit vanishing and a zero entering into the last bit). The value of $4L$ is simply $2(2L)$. We warn that to avoid side-channel attacks one must implement the doubling operation in a constant-time manner.

We have made a small modification to the OMAC algorithm as it was originally presented, changing one of its two constants. Specifically, the constant 4 at line 40 was the constant 1/2 (the multiplicative inverse of 2) in the original definition of OMAC [10]. The OMAC authors indicate

**Algorithm** $\text{EAX.Encrypt}_K^{N\,H}(M)$

10 $\mathcal{N} \leftarrow \text{OMAC}_K^0(N)$
11 $\mathcal{H} \leftarrow \text{OMAC}_K^1(H)$
12 $C \leftarrow \text{CTR}_K^{\mathcal{N}}(M)$
13 $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow \text{OMAC}_K^2(C)$
14 $Tag \leftarrow \mathcal{N} \oplus \mathcal{C} \oplus \mathcal{H}$
15 $T \leftarrow Tag$ [first $\tau$ bits]
16 **return** $CT \leftarrow C \,\|\, T$

**Algorithm** $\text{EAX.Decrypt}_K^{N\,H}(CT)$

20 **if** $|CT| < \tau$ **then return** INVALID
21 Let $C \,\|\, T \leftarrow CT$ where $|T| = \tau$
22 $\mathcal{N} \leftarrow \text{OMAC}_K^0(N)$
23 $\mathcal{H} \leftarrow \text{OMAC}_K^1(H)$
24 $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow \text{OMAC}_K^2(C)$
25 $Tag' \leftarrow \mathcal{N} \oplus \mathcal{C} \oplus \mathcal{H}$
26 $T' \leftarrow Tag'$ [first $\tau$ bits]
27 **if** $T \neq T'$ **then return** INVALID
28 $M \leftarrow \text{CTR}_K^{\mathcal{N}}(C)$
29 **return** $M$

Figure 2: Encryption and decryption under EAX mode. The plaintext is $M$, the ciphertext is $CT$, the key is $K$, the nonce is $N$, and the header is $H$. The mode depends on a block cipher $E$ (that CTR and OMAC implicitly use) and a tag length $\tau$.




Figure 3: Encryption under EAX mode. The message is $M$, the key is $K$, and the header is $H$. The ciphertext is $C \,\|\, T$.

that they will promulgate this modification [11], which slightly simplifies implementations.

EAX. Fix a block cipher $E\colon \mathsf{Key} \times \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}^n$ and a tag length $\tau \in [0..n]$. These parameters should be fixed at the beginning of a particular session that will use EAX mode. Typically, the parameters would be agreed to in an authenticated manner between the sender and the receiver, or they would be fixed for all time for some particular application. Given these parameters, EAX provides a nonce-based AEAD scheme $\mathrm{EAX}[E,\tau]$ whose encryption algorithm has signature $\mathsf{Key} \times \mathsf{Nonce} \times \mathsf{Header} \times \mathsf{Plaintext} \to \mathsf{Ciphertext}$ and whose decryption algorithm has signature $\mathsf{Key} \times \mathsf{Nonce} \times \mathsf{Header} \times \mathsf{Ciphertext} \to \mathsf{Plaintext} \cup \{\textsc{Invalid}\}$ where Nonce, Header, Plaintext, and Ciphertext are all $\{0,1\}^*$. The EAX algorithm is specified in Figure 2 and a picture illustrating EAX encryption is given in Figure 3.

# 3 Discussion of EAX

We discuss various features of our algorithm and choices underlying the design.

No encodings. We have avoided any nontrivial encoding of multiple strings into a single one.[3] Some other approaches that we considered required a PRF to be applied to what was logically a tuple, like $(N,H,C)$. Doing this raises encoding issues we did not want to deal with because, ultimately, there is no efficient, compelling, on-line way to encode multiple strings into a single one. Alternatively, one could avoid encodings and consider a new kind of primitive, a multi-argument PRF. But this would be a non-standard tool and we didn't want to use any non-standard tools. All in all, it seemed best to find a way to sidestep the need to do encodings, which is what we have done.

Why not generic composition? Why have we specified a block-cipher based (BC-based) AEAD scheme instead of following the generic-composition approach of combining a (privacy-only) encryption method and a message authentication code? There are reasonable arguments in favor of generic composition, based on aesthetic or architectural sensibilities. One can argue that generic composition better separates conceptually independent elements (privacy and authenticity) and, correspondingly, allows greater implementation flexibility [6, 14]. Correctness becomes much simpler and clearer as well. The argument does have validity. Still, BC-based AEAD modes have some important advantages. BC-based AEAD makes it easier to use a cryptosystem correctly and interoperably—for example, presenting a more directly useful API for developers. BC-based AEAD reduces the risk that implementors will choose insecure parameters. It makes it easier for implementors to use a scheme without knowing a lot of cryptography. It saves on key bits and key-setup time, as generic-composition methods invariably require a pair of separate keys.

All of that said, EAX can be viewed as having been derived from a generic-composition scheme we call EAX2, described in Section 5. Specifically, one instantiates the generic-composition scheme EAX2 with CTR mode (counter mode) and OMAC, and then collapses the two keys into one. If one does favor generic composition, EAX2 is a nice algorithm for it.

On-line. Here, we say that an algorithm is *on-line* if it is able to process a stream of data as it arrives, with constant memory, not knowing in advance when the stream will end. Observe then that on-line methods should not require knowledge of the length of a message until the message is finished. A failure to be on-line has been regarded as a significant defect for an encryption scheme

[3] One could view the prefixing of $[t]_n$ to $M$ in the definition of $\mathrm{OMAC}^t_K(M)$ as an encoding, but $[t]_n$ is a constant, fixed-length string, and the aim here is just to "tweak" the PRF. That is very different from needing to encode an arbitrary-length message $M$ and an arbitrary-length header $H$ into a single string, for example.

| | **CCM** | **EAX** |
|---|---|---|
| **Functionality** | Authenticated Encryption with AD | Authenticated Encryption with AD |
| **Built from** | Block cipher $E$ with 128-bit blocksize | Block cipher $E$ with $n$-bit blocksize |
| **Parameters** | Block cipher $E$<br>Tag length $\boldsymbol{\tau} \in \{4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16\}$<br>Length of msg length field $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in [2..8]$ | Block cipher $E$<br>Tag length $\tau \in [0..n]$ |
| **Message space** | Parameterized: 7 choices: $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in [2..8]$. Each possible message space a subset of $\text{BYTE}^*$, from $\text{BYTE}^{2^{16}-1}$ to $\text{BYTE}^{<2^{64}-1}$ | $\{0,1\}^*$ |
| **Nonce space** | Parameterized, with a value of $15 - \boldsymbol{\lambda}$ bytes. From 56 bits to 104 bits | $\{0,1\}^*$ |
| **Key space** | One block-cipher key | One block-cipher key |
| **Ciphertext expansion** | $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ bytes | $\tau$ bits |
| **Block-cipher calls** | $2\left\lceil\frac{\lvert M\rvert}{128}\right\rceil + \left\lceil\frac{\lvert H\rvert}{128}\right\rceil + 2 + \delta$, for $\delta \in \{0,1\}$ | $2\left\lceil\frac{\lvert M\rvert}{n}\right\rceil + \left\lceil\frac{\lvert H\rvert}{n}\right\rceil + \left\lceil\frac{\lvert N\rvert}{n}\right\rceil$ |
| **Block-cipher calls with static header** | $2\left\lceil\frac{\lvert M\rvert}{128}\right\rceil + \left\lceil\frac{\lvert H\rvert}{128}\right\rceil + 2 + \delta$, for $\delta \in \{0,1\}$ | $2\left\lceil\frac{\lvert M\rvert}{n}\right\rceil + \left\lceil\frac{\lvert N\rvert}{n}\right\rceil$ |
| **Key setup** | Block cipher subkeys | Block cipher subkeys<br>3 block-cipher calls |
| **IV requirements** | Non-repeating nonce | Non-repeating nonce |
| **Parallelizable?** | No | No |
| **On-line?** | No | Yes |
| **Preprocessing (/msg)** | Limited (key stream only) | Limited (key stream and header only) |
| **Memory rqmts** | Small constant | Small constant |
| **Provable security?** | Yes: reduction from block-cipher's PRP security, bound of $\Theta(\sigma^2/2^{128})$ | Yes: reduction from block-cipher's PRP security, bound of $\Theta(\sigma^2/2^n)$ |
| **Patent-encumbered?** | No | No |

Figure 4: A comparison of basic characteristics of CCM and EAX. The count on block-cipher calls for EAX ignores key-setup costs. By the set BYTE we mean $\{0,1\}^8$.

or a MAC. EAX is on-line.

Now it is true that in many contexts where one would be encrypting a string one *does* know the length of the string in advance. For example, many protocols will already have "packaged up" the string length at a lower level. In effect, such strings have been represented in the computing system as sequence of bytes and a count of those bytes. But there are also contexts where one does *not* know the length of a message in advance of getting an indication that it is over. For examples, a printable string is often represented in computer systems as a sequence of non-zero bytes followed by a terminal zero-byte. Certainly one should be able to efficiently encrypt a string which has been represented in this way.

Ability to process a static AD. In many scenarios the associated data $H$ will be static over the course of a communications session. For example, the associated data may including information such as the IP address of the sender, the receiver, and fixed cryptographic parameters associated to this session. In such a case one would like that the amount of time to compute $\text{Encrypt}_K^{N\ H}(M)$ and $\text{Decrypt}_K^{N\ H}(C)$ should be independent of $|H|$, disregarding the work done in a preprocessing step. (The significance of this goal was already explained in [16].) EAX achieves this goal.

Fast verification. Invalid messages can be rejected at half the cost of decryption. This is one of the benefits of following what is basically an encrypt-then-authenticate approach as opposed to a authenticate-then-encrypt approach.

Surfacing a MAC. One can obtain a MAC as efficient as the PRF underlying EAX via $\text{MAC}_K(H) = \text{Encrypt}_K^{0^n\ H}(\varepsilon)$.

Comparison with CCM. Figure 4 compares EAX and CCM along various dimensions. We elaborate on some of these points here.

While EAX is on-line, CCM is not. One needs to know the length of both the plaintext and the associated data before one can proceed with encryption.

While EAX allows pre-processing of static associated data, CCM does not, because it encodes the nonce $N$ and the message length $\|M\|_n$ before $H$ rather than after it.

CCM has a more complex parameterization than does EAX due to the introduction of a message-length parameter.

CCM's nonce length is restricted in an undesirable way. For parameter choices that allow encrypting long messages with CCM, the nonce length is so limited that CCM with these parameters might not provide adequate security when nonces are chosen randomly. EAX does not have this problem.

CCM disrupts word alignment in the associated data. (CCM prepends 18 or 22 bytes of meta-data to the header $H$ before processing it, which is not a multiple of most machine's word length.) As a result, CCM implementations could suffer a performance hit when processing long associated data strings, a problem that EAX avoids.

For more information on the limitations of CCM, see [18].

## 4 Intellectual Property Statement

The authors neither have, nor are of aware of, any patents or pending patents relevant to EAX. We do not intend to apply for any patents covering this technology. Our work for this note is hereby placed in the public domain. As far as we know, EAX is free and unencumbered for all uses.

**Algorithm** $\text{EAX2.Encrypt}^{N\,H}_{K1,K2}(M)$

10 $\mathcal{N} \leftarrow F^0_{K1}(N)$
11 $\mathcal{H} \leftarrow F^1_{K1}(H)$
12 $C \leftarrow \mathcal{E}^{\mathcal{N}}_{K2}(M)$
13 $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow F^2_{K1}(C)$
14 $\mathit{Tag} \leftarrow \mathcal{N} \oplus \mathcal{C} \oplus \mathcal{H}$
15 $T \leftarrow \mathit{Tag}$ [first $\tau$ bits]
16 **return** $CT \leftarrow C \,\|\, T$

**Algorithm** $\text{EAX2.Decrypt}^{N\,H}_{K1,K2}(CT)$

20 **if** $|CT| < \tau$ **then return** INVALID
21 Let $C \,\|\, T \leftarrow CT$ where $|T| = \tau$
22 $\mathcal{N} \leftarrow F^0_{K1}(N)$
23 $\mathcal{H} \leftarrow F^1_{K1}(H)$
24 $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow F^2_{K1}(C)$
25 $\mathit{Tag}' \leftarrow \mathcal{N} \oplus \mathcal{C} \oplus \mathcal{H}$
26 $T' \leftarrow \mathit{Tag}'$ [first $\tau$ bits]
27 **if** $T \neq T'$ **then return** INVALID
28 $M \leftarrow \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{N}}_{K2}(C)$
29 **return** $M$

Figure 5: The generic composition scheme $\text{EAX2}[\Pi, F, \tau]$. The scheme is built from a PRF $F$: $\text{Key1} \times \{0,1\}^* \to \{0,1\}^n$ and an IV-based encryption scheme $\Pi = (\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{D})$ having key space Key2 and message space $\{0,1\}^*$.




Figure 6: Encrypting under EAX2. The plaintext is $M$ and the key is $(K1, K2)$ and the header is $H$. The ciphertext is $C \,\|\, T$. By $F^i_K$ we mean the function where $F^i_K(M) = F_K([i]_n \,\|\, M)$.

# 5 EAX2 Algorithm

This section is not necessary to understand or implement EAX, but it is necessary for understanding the proof of security of EAX as well as the general approach taken for its design. That approach has been to first design a generic-composition scheme, EAX2, and then "collapse" to a single key for the particular case of CTR encryption and OMAC authentication.

EAX2 COMPOSITION. Let $F\colon \mathsf{Key1} \times \{0,1\}^* \to \{0,1\}^n$ be a PRF, where $n \geq 2$. Let $\Pi = (\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{D})$ be an IV-based encryption scheme having key space Key2 and IV space $\{0,1\}^n$. This means that $\mathcal{E}\colon \mathsf{Key2} \times \{0,1\}^n \times \{0,1\}^* \to \{0,1\}^*$ and $\mathcal{D}\colon \mathsf{Key2} \times \{0,1\}^n \times \{0,1\}^* \to \{0,1\}^*$ and Key2 is a set of keys and for every $K \in \mathsf{Key2}$ and $\mathcal{N} \in \{0,1\}^n$ and $M \in \{0,1\}^*$, if $C = \mathcal{E}_K^{\mathcal{N}}(M)$ then $\mathcal{D}_K^{\mathcal{N}}(C) = M$. Let $\tau \leq n$ be a number. Now given $F$ and $\Pi$ and $\tau$ we define an AEAD scheme $\mathrm{EAX2}[\Pi, F, \tau] = (\mathrm{EAX2.Encrypt}, \mathrm{EAX2.Decrypt})$ as follows. Set $F_K^t(M) = F_K([t]_n \,\|\, M)$. Set $\mathsf{Key} = \mathsf{Key1} \times \mathsf{Key2}$. Then the encryption algorithm $\mathrm{EAX2.Encrypt}\colon \mathsf{Key} \times \{0,1\}^* \times \{0,1\}^* \to \{0,1\}^*$ and the decryption algorithm $\mathrm{EAX2.Decrypt}\colon \mathsf{Key} \times \{0,1\}^* \times \{0,1\}^* \to \{0,1\}^* \cup \{\textsc{Invalid}\}$ are defined in Figure 5 and the former is illustrated in Figure 6. $\mathrm{EAX2}[\Pi, F, \tau]$ is provably secure under natural assumptions about $\Pi$ and $F$. See Section 7.

EAX1 COMPOSITION. Let EAX1 be the single-key variant of EAX2 where one insists that $\mathsf{Key1} = \mathsf{Key2}$ and where one keys $F$, $\mathcal{E}$, and $\mathcal{D}$ with a single key $K \in \mathsf{Key} = \mathsf{Key1} = \mathsf{Key2}$. That is, one associates to $F$ and $\Pi$, as above, the scheme $\mathrm{EAX1}[\Pi, F, \tau]$ that is defined as with EAX2 but where the key space is $\mathsf{Key} = \mathsf{Key1} = \mathsf{Key2}$ and the one key $K$ keys everything. Notice that $\mathrm{EAX}[E, \tau] = \mathrm{EAX1}[\mathrm{CTR}[E], \mathrm{OMAC}[E], \tau]$. This is a useful way to look at EAX.

# 6 Definitions

The security results we state and prove later rely on the definitions here.

AEAD SCHEMES. A *set of keys* is a nonempty set having a distribution (the uniform distribution when the set is finite). A (nonce-based) *authenticated-encryption with associated-data* (AEAD) scheme is a pair of algorithms $\mathbf{\Pi} = (\mathbf{E}, \mathbf{D})$ where $\mathbf{E}$ is a deterministic *encryption* algorithm $\mathbf{E}\colon \mathsf{Key} \times \mathsf{Nonce} \times \mathsf{Header} \times \mathsf{Plaintext} \to \mathsf{Ciphertext}$ and a $\mathbf{D}$ is a deterministic *decryption* algorithm $\mathbf{D}\colon \mathsf{Key} \times \mathsf{Nonce} \times \mathsf{Header} \times \mathsf{Ciphertext} \to \mathsf{Plaintext} \cup \{\textsc{Invalid}\}$. The *key space* Key is a set of keys while the *nonce space* Nonce and the *header space* Header (also called the space of *associated data*) are nonempty sets of strings. We write $\mathbf{E}_K^{N\,H}(M)$ for $\mathbf{E}(K, N, H, M)$ and $\mathbf{D}_K^{N\,H}(CT)$ for $\mathbf{D}(K, N, H, CT)$. We require that $\mathbf{D}_K^{N\,H}(\mathbf{E}_K^{N\,H}(M)) = M$ for all $K \in \mathsf{Key}$ and $N \in \mathsf{Nonce}$ and $H \in \mathsf{Header}$ and $M \in \mathsf{Plaintext}$. In this note we assume, for notational simplicity, that Nonce, Header, Plaintext, and Ciphertext are all $\{0,1\}^*$ and that $|\mathbf{E}_K^{N\,H}(M)| = |M|$. An adversary is a program with access to one or more oracles.

NONCE-RESPECTING. Suppose $A$ is an adversary with access to an *encryption oracle* $\mathbf{E}_K^{\cdot\,\cdot}(\cdot)$. This oracle, on input $(N, H, M)$, returns $\mathbf{E}_K^{N\,H}(M)$. Let $(N_1, H_1, M_1), \ldots, (N_q, H_q, M_q)$ denote its oracle queries. The adversary is said to be *nonce-respecting* if $N_1, \ldots, N_q$ are always distinct, regardless of oracle responses and regardless of $A$'s internal coins.

PRIVACY OF AEAD SCHEMES. We consider adversaries with access to an encryption oracle $\mathbf{E}_K^{\cdot\,\cdot}(\cdot)$. We assume that any privacy-attacking adversary is nonce-respecting. The advantage of such an adversary $A$ in violating the privacy of AEAD scheme $\mathbf{\Pi} = (\mathbf{E}, \mathbf{D})$ having key space Key is

$$\mathbf{Adv}_{\mathbf{\Pi}}^{\mathbf{priv}}(A) \;=\; \Pr\left[K \xleftarrow{\$} \mathsf{Key} :\; A^{\mathbf{E}_K^{\cdot\,\cdot}(\cdot)} = 1\right] - \Pr\left[K \xleftarrow{\$} \mathsf{Key} :\; A^{\$^{\cdot\,\cdot}(\cdot)} = 1\right]$$

where $\$^{\cdot}_{\cdot}(\cdot)$ denotes the oracle that on input $(N, H, M)$ returns a random string of length $|M|$.

AUTHENTICITY OF AEAD SCHEMES. This time we provide the adversary with two oracles, an encryption oracle $\mathbf{E}^{\cdot}_{K}(\cdot)$ as above and also a *verification oracle* $\widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{\cdot}_{K}(\cdot)$. The latter oracle takes input $(N, H, CT)$ and returns 1 if $\mathbf{D}^{N\,H}_{K}(CT) \in \mathsf{Plaintext}$ and returns 0 if $\mathbf{D}^{N\,H}_{K}(CT) = \textsc{Invalid}$. The adversary is assumed to satisfy three conditions, and these must hold regardless of the responses to its oracle queries and regardless of $A$'s internal coins:

- $A$ must be nonce-respecting. (The condition is understood to apply only to the adversary's encryption oracle. Thus a nonce used in an encryption-oracle query may be used in a verification-oracle query).
- $A$ must call its verification-oracle exactly once and not call its encryption oracle after it has made its verification oracle query. (That is, it makes a sequence of encryption-oracle queries, then a verification-oracle query, and halts.)
- $A$ must never make a verification-oracle query $(N, H, CT)$ such that the encryption oracle had previously returned $CT$ in response to a query $(N, H, M)$.

We say that such an $A$ *forges* if its verification oracle returns 1 in response to the single query made to it. The advantage of such an adversary $A$ in violating the authenticity of AEAD scheme $\mathbf{\Pi} = (\mathbf{E}, \mathbf{D})$ having key space $\mathsf{Key}$ is

$$\mathbf{Adv}^{\mathbf{auth}}_{\mathbf{\Pi}}(A) \;=\; \Pr\left[K \xleftarrow{\$} \mathsf{Key} :\; A^{\mathbf{E}^{\cdot}_{K}(\cdot),\,\widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{\cdot}_{K}(\cdot)} \text{ forges}\right] .$$

IV-BASED ENCRYPTION. An *IV-based encryption scheme* (an IVE scheme) is a pair of algorithms $\Pi = (\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{D})$ where $\mathcal{E} \colon \mathsf{Key} \times \mathsf{IV} \times \mathsf{Plaintext} \to \mathsf{Ciphertext}$ is a deterministic *encryption* algorithm and $\mathcal{D} \colon \mathsf{Key} \times \mathsf{IV} \times \mathsf{Ciphertext} \to \mathsf{Plaintext} \cup \{\textsc{Invalid}\}$ is a deterministic *decryption* algorithm. The *key space* $\mathsf{Key}$ is a set of keys and the *plaintext space* $\mathsf{Plaintext}$ and *ciphertext space* $\mathsf{Ciphertext}$ and *IV space* $\mathsf{IV}$ are all nonempty sets of strings. We write $\mathcal{E}^{R}_{K}(M)$ for $\mathcal{E}(K, R, M)$ and $\mathcal{D}^{R}_{K}(C)$ for $\mathcal{D}(K, R, C)$. We require that $\mathcal{D}^{R}_{K}(\mathcal{E}^{R}_{K}(M)) = M$ for all $K \in \mathsf{Key}$ and $R \in \mathsf{IV}$ and $M \in \mathsf{Plaintext}$. We assume, as before, that $\mathsf{Plaintext} = \mathsf{Ciphertext} = \{0,1\}^*$ and that $|\mathcal{E}^{R}_{K}(M)| = |M|$. We also assume that $\mathsf{IV} = \{0,1\}^n$ for some $n \geq 1$ called the *IV length*.

PRIVACY OF IVE SCHEMES WITH RANDOM IVS. Let $\Pi = (\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{D})$ be an IVE scheme with key space $\mathsf{Key}$ and IV space $\mathsf{IV} = \{0,1\}^n$. Let $\mathcal{E}^{\$}$ be the probabilistic algorithm defined from $\mathcal{E}$ that, on input $K$ and $M$, chooses an IV $R$ at random from $\{0,1\}^n$, computes $C \leftarrow \mathcal{E}^{R}_{K}(M)$, and then returns $C$ along with the chosen IV:

| **Algorithm** $\mathcal{E}^{\$}_{K}(M)$ // The probabilistic encryption scheme built from IVE scheme $\mathcal{E}$ |
|---|
| $R \xleftarrow{\$} \{0,1\}^n$ ; $C \leftarrow \mathcal{E}^{R}_{K}(M)$ ; **return** $R \,\|\, C$ |

Then we define the advantage of an adversary $A$ in violating the privacy of $\Pi$ (as an encryption scheme using random IV) by

$$\mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{priv}}_{\Pi}(A) \;=\; \Pr\left[K \xleftarrow{\$} \mathsf{Key} :\; A^{\mathcal{E}^{\$}_{K}(\cdot)} = 1\right] - \Pr\left[K \xleftarrow{\$} \mathsf{Key} :\; A^{\$(\cdot)} = 1\right]$$

where $\$(\cdot)$ denotes the oracle that on input $M$ returns a random string of length $n + |M|$. This is just the ind\$-privacy of the randomized symmetric encryption scheme associated to $\Pi$. We again require the adversary $A$ to be nonce-respecting, which now means that, whatever the adversary's oracle does, the adversary may make no $(N, M)$ query that follows an earlier $(N, M')$ query. We comment that we have used a superscript of "priv" for an IVE scheme and "**priv**" (bold font) for an AEAD scheme.

PSEUDORANDOM FUNCTIONS. A *family of functions*, or a *pseudorandom function* (PRF), is a map $F\colon \mathsf{Key} \times D \to \{0,1\}^n$ where $\mathsf{Key}$ is a set of keys and $D$ is a nonempty set of strings. We call $n$ the *output length* of $F$. We write $F_K$ for the function $F(K,\cdot)$ and we write $f \xleftarrow{\$} F$ to mean $K \xleftarrow{\$} \mathsf{Key}\,;\ f \leftarrow F_K$. We denote by $\mathcal{R}_n^*$ the set of all functions with domain $\{0,1\}^*$ and range $\{0,1\}^n$; by $\mathcal{R}_n^n$ the set of all functions with domain $\{0,1\}^n$ and range $\{0,1\}^n$; and by $\mathcal{R}_n^I$ the set of all functions with domain $I$ and range $\{0,1\}^n$. We identify a function with its key, making $\mathcal{R}_n^n$, $\mathcal{R}_n^*$ and $\mathcal{R}_n^I$ pseudorandom functions. The advantage of adversary $A$ in violating the pseudorandomness of the family of functions $F\colon \mathsf{Key} \times \{0,1\}^* \to \{0,1\}^n$ is

$$\mathbf{Adv}_F^{\mathrm{prf}}(A) \;=\; \Pr\left[K \xleftarrow{\$} \mathsf{Key} :\ A^{F_K(\cdot)} = 1\right] - \Pr\left[\rho \xleftarrow{\$} \mathcal{R}_n^* :\ A^{\rho(\cdot)} = 1\right]$$

A family of functions $E\colon \mathsf{Key} \times D \to \{0,1\}^n$ is a *block cipher* if $D = \{0,1\}^n$ and each $E_K$ is a permutation. We let $\mathcal{P}_n$ denote all the permutations on $\{0,1\}^n$ and define

$$\mathbf{Adv}_E^{\mathrm{prp}}(A) \;=\; \Pr\left[K \xleftarrow{\$} \mathsf{Key} :\ A^{E_K(\cdot)} = 1\right] - \Pr\left[\pi \xleftarrow{\$} \mathcal{P}_n :\ A^{\pi(\cdot)} = 1\right]$$

RESOURCES. If xxx is an advantage notion for which $\mathbf{Adv}_{\Pi}^{\mathrm{xxx}}(A)$ has been defined we write $\mathbf{Adv}_{\Pi}^{\mathrm{xxx}}(R)$ for the maximal value of $\mathbf{Adv}_{\Pi}^{\mathrm{xxx}}(A)$ over all adversaries $A$ that use resources at most $R$. When counting the resource usage of an adversary, one maximizes over all possible oracle responses, including those that could not be returned by any experiment we have specified for adversarial advantage. Resources of interest are: $t$—the running time; $q$—the total number of oracle queries; $q_{\mathrm{e}}$—the number of oracle queries to the adversary's first oracle; and $\sigma$—the data complexity. The running time $t$ of an algorithm is its actual running time (relative to some fixed RAM model of computation) plus its description size (relative to some standard encoding of algorithms). The data complexity $\sigma$ is defined as the sum of the lengths of all strings encoded in the adversary's oracle queries, plus the number of these strings (but only if more than one).[4] In this paper the length of strings is measured in $n$-bit blocks, for some understood value $n$. The number of blocks in a string $M$ is defined as $\|M\|_n = \max\{1, \lceil |M|/n \rceil\}$, so that the empty string counts as one block. As an example, an adversary that asks queries $(N_1, H_1, M_1), (N_2, H_2, M_2)$ to its first oracle and query $(N, H, M)$ to its second oracle has data complexity $\|N_1\|_n + \|H_1\|_n + \|M_1\|_n + \|N_2\|_n + \|H_2\|_n + \|M_2\|_n + \|N\|_n + \|H\|_n + \|M\|_n + 9$. We always assume that $\sigma \geq n$. The name of a resource measure ($t$, $t'$, $q$, etc.) will be enough to make clear what resource it refers to.

We write $\widetilde{O}(f(x))$ for $O(f(x)\lg(f(x))$ and the constant hidden inside the notation is understood to be an absolute constant. When $F$ is a function we write $\mathrm{Time}_F(\sigma))$ for the maximal amount of time to compute the function $F$ over inputs of total length $\sigma$. When $\Pi = (\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{D})$ is an AEAD scheme or an IVE scheme with key space $\mathsf{Key}$ we write $\mathrm{Time}_{\mathcal{E}}(\sigma)$ for the time to compute a random element $K \xleftarrow{\$} \mathsf{Key}$ plus the maximal amount of time to compute the function $\mathcal{E}_K$ on arguments of total length $\sigma$.

# 7 Security Results

We first obtain results about the security of EAX2 and then prove a result about the security of a tweakable-OMAC extension. These results are applied to derive results about the security of EAX. The notation and security measures referred to below are defined in Section 6.

SECURITY OF EAX2. We begin by considering the EAX2$[\Pi, F, \tau]$ scheme with $F$ being equal to $\mathcal{R}_n^n$, the set of all functions with domain $\{0,1\}^n$ and range $\{0,1\}^n$. In other words, we are considering

[4] There is a certain amount of arbitrariness in this convention, but it is reasonable and simplifies subsequent accounting.

the case where $F_{K1}$ is a random function with domain $\{0,1\}^n$ and range $\{0,1\}^n$. First we show that EAX2$[\Pi, \mathcal{R}_n^n, \tau]$ inherits the privacy of the underlying IVE scheme $\Pi$.

**Lemma 1 [Privacy of EAX2 with a random PRF]** Let $\Pi$ be an IVE scheme with IV space $\{0,1\}^n$ and let $\tau \in [0..n]$. Then

$$\mathbf{Adv}^{\mathbf{priv}}_{\mathrm{EAX2}[\Pi,\mathcal{R}_n^n,\tau]}(t,q,\sigma) \quad \leq \quad \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{priv}}_{\Pi}(t',q,\sigma)$$

where $t' = t + \widetilde{O}(\sigma)$. □

The proof of the above lemma is in Appendix A. We now turn to the authenticity of EAX2$[\Pi, \mathcal{R}_n^n, \tau]$. The following shows that EAX2$[\Pi, \mathcal{R}_n^n, \tau]$ provides authenticity under the assumption that the underlying IVE scheme $\Pi$ provides privacy.

**Lemma 2 [Authenticity of EAX2 with a random PRF]** Let $\Pi$ be an IVE scheme with IV space $\{0,1\}^n$ and let $\tau \in [0..n]$. Then

$$\mathbf{Adv}^{\mathbf{auth}}_{\mathrm{EAX2}[\Pi,\mathcal{R}_n^n,\tau]}(t,q,\sigma) \quad \leq \quad 2^{-\tau} + \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{priv}}_{\Pi}(t',q,\sigma)$$

where $t' = t + \widetilde{O}(\sigma)$. □

The proof of the above lemma is in Appendix A. The results above allow us to obtain results about the security of the general EAX2$[\Pi, F, \tau]$ scheme based on assumptions about the security of the component schemes.

**Theorem 3 [Security of EAX2]** Let $F\colon \mathsf{Key1} \times \{0,1\}^* \to \{0,1\}^n$ be a family of functions, let $\Pi = (\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{D})$ be an IVE scheme with IV space $\{0,1\}^n$ and let $\tau \in [0..n]$. Then

$$\mathbf{Adv}^{\mathbf{auth}}_{\mathrm{EAX2}[\Pi,F,\tau]}(t,q,\sigma) \quad \leq \quad 2^{-\tau} + \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{priv}}_{\Pi}(t_2,\ q,\ \sigma) + \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{prf}}_{F}(t_1,\ 3q+3,\ \sigma) \tag{1}$$

$$\mathbf{Adv}^{\mathbf{priv}}_{\mathrm{EAX2}[\Pi,F,\tau]}(t,q,\sigma) \quad \leq \quad \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{priv}}_{\Pi}(t_2,\ q,\ \sigma) + \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{prf}}_{F}(t_3,\ 3q,\ \sigma) \tag{2}$$

where $t_1 = t + \mathrm{Time}_{\mathcal{E}}(\sigma) + \widetilde{O}(\sigma)$ and $t_2 = t + \widetilde{O}(\sigma + nq)$ and $t_3 = t + \mathrm{Time}_{\mathcal{E}}(\sigma) + \widetilde{O}(\sigma)$. □

The proof of the above theorem is in Appendix A.

Security of a Tweakable-OMAC Extension. This section develops the core result underlying why key-reuse "works" across OMAC and CTR modes. To do this, we consider the following extension of the tweakable-OMAC construction. Fix $n \geq 1$ and let $t \in \{0,1,2\}$ and $\rho \in \mathcal{R}_n^n$ and $M \in \{0,1\}^*$ and $s \in \mathbb{N}$. Then define

**Algorithm** $\mathbb{OMAC}[\rho]\ (t, M, s)$

10 $R \leftarrow \mathrm{OMAC}^t_\rho(M)$
11 **for** $j \leftarrow 0$ **to** $s-1$ **do** $S_j \leftarrow \rho(R+j)$
12 **return** $R\, S_0 S_1 \cdots S_{s-1}$

In other words, an $\mathbb{OMAC}[\rho]$ oracle, when asked $(t, M, s)$, returns not only $R = \mathrm{OMAC}[\rho]^t(M)$ but also a key stream $S_0 S_1 \ldots S_s$ formed using CTR-mode and start-index $R$. We emphasize that the key stream is formed using the *same* function $\rho$ (that is, the same key) that underlies the OMAC computation. Note too that we have limited the tweak $t$ to a small set, $\{0,1,2\}$.

We imagine providing an adversary $A$ with one of two kinds of oracles. The first is an oracle $\mathrm{OMAC}_\rho(\cdot,\cdot,\cdot)$ for a randomly chosen $\rho \in \mathcal{R}_n^n$. The second is an oracle $\$_n(\cdot,\cdot,\cdot)$ that, on input $(t, M, s)$, returns $n(s+1)$ random bits. Either way, we assume that the adversary is *length-respecting*: if the adversary asks a query $(t, M, s)$ it does not ask any subsequent query $(t, M, s')$ for $s' \neq s$. As the adversary runs, it asks some sequence of queries $(t_1, M_1, s_1), \ldots, (t_q, M_q, s_q)$. The resources of interest to us are the sum of the block lengths of the messages being MACed, $\sigma_1 = \sum \|M_i\|_n$, and the total number $\sigma_2 = \sum s_i$ of key-stream blocks that the adversary requests. We claim that a reasonable adversary will have little advantage in telling apart the two oracles, and we bound its distinguishing probability in terms of the resources $\sigma_1$ and $\sigma_2$ that it expends. Recall that for oracles $X$ and $Y$ and an adversary $A$ we measure $A$'s ability to distinguish between oracles $X$ and $Y$ by the number $\mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{dist}}_{X,Y}(A) = \Pr[A^X = 1] - \Pr[A^Y = 1]$.

**Lemma 4 [Pseudorandomness of $\mathbb{OMAC}$]** Fix $n \geq 2$. Then, for length-respecting adversaries,

$$\mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{dist}}_{\mathbb{OMAC}[\mathcal{R}_n^n],\$_n}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \quad \leq \quad \frac{(\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 + 3)^2}{2^n} \qquad \square$$

The proof of the above lemma is in Appendix B.

Security of EAX. We are now ready to prove the security of EAX.

**Theorem 5 [Security of EAX]** Let $n \geq 2$ and $\tau \in [0..n]$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathbf{priv}}_{\mathrm{EAX}[\mathcal{R}_n^n,\tau]}(\sigma) &\leq \frac{9\,\sigma^2}{2^n} \\ \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathbf{auth}}_{\mathrm{EAX}[\mathcal{R}_n^n,\tau]}(\sigma) &\leq \frac{10.5\,\sigma^2}{2^n} + \frac{1}{2^\tau} \end{aligned} \qquad \square$$

The proof of the above is in Appendix C. Finally, we may, in the customary way, pass to the corresponding complexity-theoretic result where we start with an arbitrary block cipher $E$.

**Corollary 6 [Security of EAX]** Let $n \geq 2$ and $E\colon \mathsf{Key} \times \{0,1\}^n \times \{0,1\}^n$ be a block cipher and let $\tau \in [0..n]$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathbf{priv}}_{\mathrm{EAX}[E,\tau]}(t, \sigma) &\leq \frac{9.5\,\sigma^2}{2^n} + \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{prp}}_E(t', \sigma) \\ \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathbf{auth}}_{\mathrm{EAX}[E,\tau]}(t, \sigma) &\leq \frac{11\,\sigma^2}{2^n} + \frac{1}{2^\tau} + \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{prp}}_E(t', \sigma) \end{aligned}$$

where $t' = t + O(\sigma)$. $\square$

We omit the proof, which is completely standard.

# 8 Acknowledgments

We received comments from Niels Ferguson, Jack Lloyd, David McGrew, Jesse Walker, and Doug Whiting. Jack provided an initial set of test vectors for us.

Mihir Bellare's work was funded by NSF grants CCR-0098123 and ANR-0129617, and by an IBM Faculty Partnership Development Award. Phil Rogaway's work was funded by NSF CCR-0208842 and a gift from CISCO Systems. David Wagner's work was funded by NSF CCR-0113941.

## References


[1] M. Bellare, A. Desai, E. Jokipii, and P. Rogaway. A concrete security treatment of symmetric encryption: Analysis of the DES modes of operation. *Proceedings of the 38th Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, IEEE, 1997. Available as `http://www-cse.ucsd.edu/users/mihir/papers/sym-enc.html`.

[2] M. Bellare, R. Guérin, and P. Rogaway. XOR MACs: New methods for message authentication using finite pseudorandom functions. *Advances in Cryptology – CRYPTO '95*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science Vol. 963, D. Coppersmith ed., Springer-Verlag, 1995. Available as and `http://www-cse.ucsd.edu/users/mihir/papers/xormacs.html`

[3] M. Bellare, O. Goldreich, and H. Krawczyk. Stateless evaluation of pseudorandom functions: Security beyond the birthday barrier. *Advances in Cryptology – CRYPTO '96*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science Vol. 1109, N. Koblitz ed., Springer-Verlag, 1996. Available as `http://www-cse.ucsd.edu/users/mihir/papers/otp.html`.

[4] M. Bellare, J. Kilian, and P. Rogaway. The security of the cipher block chaining message authentication code. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences* (JCSS), vol. 61, no. 3, pp. 362–399, Dec 2000. Available as `http://www-cse.ucsd.edu/users/mihir/papers/cbc.html`.

[5] M. Bellare, T. Kohno, and C. Namprempre. Authenticated encryption in SSH: provably fixing the SSH binary packet protocol. *Proceedings of the 9th Annual Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, ACM, 2002. Available as `http://www-cse.ucsd.edu/users/mihir/papers/ssh.html`

[6] M. Bellare and C. Namprempre. Authenticated encryption: Relations among notions and analysis of the generic composition paradigm. *Advances in Cryptology – ASIACRYPT '00*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science Vol. 1976, T. Okamoto ed., Springer-Verlag, 2000. Available as `http://www-cse.ucsd.edu/users/mihir/papers/oem.html`

[7] M. Bellare and P. Rogaway. Encode-then-encipher encryption: How to exploit nonces or redundancy in plaintexts for efficient encryption. *Advances in Cryptology – ASIACRYPT '00*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science Vol. 1976, T. Okamoto ed., Springer-Verlag, 2000. Available as `http://www-cse.ucsd.edu/users/mihir/papers/ee.html`

[8] J. Black and P. Rogaway. CBC MACs for arbitrary-length messages: The three-key constructions. *Advances in Cryptology – CRYPTO '00*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science Vol. 1880, M. Bellare ed., Springer-Verlag, 2000. Available as `http://www.cs.ucdavis.edu/~rogaway/papers/3k.html`

[9] V. Gligor and P. Donescu. Fast encryption and authentication: XCBC encryption and XECB authentication modes. Presented at the 2nd NIST Workshop on AES Modes of Operation, Santa Barbara, CA, August 24, 2001. `http://www.glue.umd.edu/afs/glue.umd.edu/home/enee/faculty/gligor/pub/NIST-submissionRev.ps`.

[10] T. Iwata and K. Kurosawa. OMAC: One-key CBC MAC. *Fast Software Encryption '03*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science Vol. ?? , T. Johansson ed., Springer-Verlag, 2003. Also Cryptology ePrint archive Report 2002/180, `http://eprint.iacr.org/2002/180`

[11] T. Iwata and K. Kurosawa. Personal communications, January 2002.

[12] C. Jutla. Encryption modes with almost free message integrity. *Advances in Cryptology – EUROCRYPT '01*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science Vol. 2045 , B. Pfitzmann ed., Springer-Verlag, 2001. Also Cryptology ePrint archive Report 2000/039, `http://eprint.iacr.org/2000/039/`

[13] J. Katz and M. Yung. Unforgeable encryption and adaptively secure modes of operation. *Fast Software Encryption '00*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science Vol. 1978, B. Schneier ed., Springer-Verlag, 2000.

Adversary $P^{e(\cdot)}$

Initially, $f$ is everywhere undefined
Run $A$
When $A$ makes oracle query $(N, H, M)$ answer the query as follows:
$\mathcal{N} \| C \xleftarrow{\$} e(M)$ // where $|\mathcal{N}| = n$
$f([0]_n \| N) \leftarrow \mathcal{N}$
**if** $f([1]_n \| H)$ is undefined **then** $f([1]_n \| H) \xleftarrow{\$} \{0,1\}^n$
$\mathcal{H} \leftarrow f([1]_n \| H)$
**if** $f([2]_n \| C)$ is undefined **then** $f([2]_n \| C) \xleftarrow{\$} \{0,1\}^n$
$\mathcal{C} \leftarrow f([2]_n \| C)$
Let $T$ be the first $\tau$ bits of $\mathcal{N} \oplus \mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{C}$
Return $CT \leftarrow C \| T$ as the oracle response
When $A$ outputs a bit, $d$, **return** $d$

Figure 7: Adversary $P$ attacking the privacy of IVE scheme $\Pi$ using as subroutine adversary $A$ attacking the privacy of $\mathbf{\Pi} = \text{EAX2}[\Pi, \mathcal{R}_n^n, \tau]$.


[14] H. Krawczyk. The order of encryption and authentication for protecting communications (or: how Secure is SSL?). *Advances in Cryptology – CRYPTO '01*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science Vol. 2139, J. Kilian ed., Springer-Verlag, 2001. Also Cryptology ePrint archive Report 2001/045, `http://eprint.iacr.org/2001/045`

[15] M. Liskov, R. Rivest, and D. Wagner. Advances in Cryptology – CRYPTO '02, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 2442, pp. 31–46. Springer-Verlag, 2002. See `www.cs.berkeley.edu/~daw`

[16] P. Rogaway. Authenticated-encryption with associated-data. *Proceedings of the 9th Annual Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, ACM, 2002. Available as `http://www.cs.ucdavis.edu/~rogaway/papers/ad.html`

[17] P. Rogaway, M. Bellare, J. Black, and T. Krovetz. OCB: A block-cipher mode of operation for efficient authenticated encryption. *Proceedings of the 8th Annual Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, ACM, 2001. Available as `http://www.cs.ucdavis.edu/~rogaway/papers/ocb.htm`

[18] P. Rogaway and D. Wagner. A critique of CCM. Manuscript, February 2003. `http://www.cs.ucdavis.edu/~rogaway/papers/ccm.html`.

[19] D. Whiting, R. Housley, and N. Ferguson. Counter with CBC-MAC (CCM). June 2002. Available at `http://csrc.nist.gov/encryption/modes/proposedmodes/`


# A Proofs of security of EAX2

**Proof of Lemma 1:** Let Key2 be the key space of the IVE scheme $\Pi = (\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{D})$. Let $A$ be an adversary attacking the privacy of the AEAD scheme $\mathbf{\Pi} = (\mathbf{E}, \mathbf{D})$ where $\mathbf{\Pi} = \text{EAX2}[\Pi, \mathcal{R}_n^n, \tau]$. Assume that $A$ makes at most $q$ oracle queries, has data complexity at most $\sigma$, and running time at most $t$. Using $A$, we construct an adversary $P$, defined in Figure 7, for attacking the privacy of $\Pi$. Observe that $P$ makes at most $q$ oracle queries, has data complexity $\sigma$, and running time at most $t'$. Regarding the design of $P$, our first claim is that its assignment of a value to $f([0]_n \| N)$, made

in answering an oracle query of $A$, is legitimate because $f([0]_n \,\|\, N)$ was not previously defined. This is true because $A$ is nonce-respecting. Now we claim that

$$\Pr\left[K2 \xleftarrow{\$} \mathsf{Key2}:\ P^{\mathcal{E}^{\$}_{K2}(\cdot)} = 1\right] \;=\; \Pr\left[f \xleftarrow{\$} \mathcal{R}^n_n;\ K2 \xleftarrow{\$} \mathsf{Key2}:\ A^{\mathbf{E}^{\cdot,\cdot}_{f,K2}(\cdot)} = 1\right] \tag{3}$$

$$\Pr\left[K2 \xleftarrow{\$} \mathsf{Key2}:\ P^{\$(\cdot)} = 1\right] \;=\; \Pr\left[f \xleftarrow{\$} \mathcal{R}^n_n;\ K2 \xleftarrow{\$} \mathsf{Key2}:\ A^{\$^{\cdot,\cdot}(\cdot)} = 1\right]. \tag{4}$$

Subtracting, we get

$$\mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{priv}}_{\Pi}(B) \;=\; \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathbf{priv}}_{\mathbf{\Pi}}(A)$$

which concludes the proof. We now justify the two equations above. The first is clear from the definitions. With regarding Equation (4), we need to check that when $P$'s oracle is $\$(\cdot)$, the oracle-responses returned to $A$ are uniformly and independently distributed. Such a response has the form $C \,\|\, T$. We know that $C$ is random because it is chosen by $P$'s oracle. The reason $T$ is also random is that it is the xor of some quantities with $\mathcal{N}$ and the latter, being returned by $P$'s oracle, is random. ▮

Towards the proof of Lemma 2 we consider a new game and a lemma about it. The game is parameterized by integers $m, \tau \geq 1$. Let $I$ denote the set of all strings of length at most $m$ and let $f\colon I \to \{0,1\}^\tau$. We consider an adversary with access to two oracles, $\mathrm{XTag}^f(\cdot)$ and $\mathrm{XVf}^f(\cdot,\cdot)$. The *xor-tag* oracle $\mathrm{XTag}^f(\cdot)$ takes input a set $S \subseteq I$ and returns $\sum_{x\in S} f(x)$, the sum here being modulo two, ie. XOR. The *xor-verify* oracle $\mathrm{XVf}^f(\cdot,\cdot)$ takes input a set $S \subseteq I$ and a string $T$. It returns 1 if $T = \sum_{x\in S} f(x)$ and 0 otherwise. We require that $A$ make exactly one query to its xor-verify oracle and that this be its last oracle query. (That is, it makes a sequence of queries to its xor-tag oracle, then a query to its xor-verify oracle, and then halts.) We say that $A$ *forges* if its query to its xor-verify oracle results in the oracle returning 1. We let

$$\mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{xtag}}_{m,\tau}(A) \;=\; \Pr\left[f \xleftarrow{\$} \mathcal{R}^I_\tau:\ A^{\mathrm{XTag}^f(\cdot),\,\mathrm{XVf}^f(\cdot,\cdot)} \text{ forges}\right].$$

Towards stating the lemma we need about this advantage, we need some notation. Let $c = |I|$ and let $x_1, \ldots, x_c$ denote a lexicographic ordering of $I$. If $S \subseteq I$ we let $\mathrm{ChV}(S)$ denote its $c$-bit characteristic vector, meaning $\mathrm{ChV}(S)[j] = 1$ if $x_j \in S$ and 0 otherwise ($1 \leq j \leq c$). Suppose adversary $A$ makes xor-tag queries $S_1, \ldots, S_q$ and finally a xor-verify query $(S, T)$. We say that $A$ is *rank respecting* if $\mathrm{ChV}(S)$ is not a linear combination of $\mathrm{ChV}(S_1), \ldots, \mathrm{ChV}(S_q)$. (This must be true regardless of oracle responses and regardless of $A$'s internal coins.) In considering linear combinations we are working over the field of two elements.

**Lemma 7** Let $m, \tau \geq 1$ be integers and let $A$ be a rank-respecting adversary. Then

$$\mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{xtag}}_{m,\tau}(A) \;\leq\; 2^{-\tau}. \qquad \square$$

**Proof of Lemma 7:** This lemma is pretty much implicit in [2, 3], but for completeness we provide a proof here. First, some notation. Let $I$ be the set of all strings of length at most $m$ and let $c = |I|$. When we write a sum of vectors, we mean the vectors are being added componentwise modulo 2. When we write a sum of $\tau$-bit strings, we mean the bitwise XOR.

We begin by considering the adversary $B$ depicted in Figure 8. It has the following features:

- $\mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{xtag}}_{m,\tau}(B) = \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{xtag}}_{m,\tau}(A)$.
- $B$ makes exactly $c - 1$ xor-tag oracle queries.

Adversary $B^{\mathrm{XTag}^f(\cdot),\,\mathrm{XVf}^f(\cdot,\cdot)}$
  $i \leftarrow 0$;
  Run $A$
    When $A$ makes an xor-tag query $S$
      **if** $\mathrm{ChV}(S)$ is linearly dependent on $\mathrm{ChV}(S_1), \ldots, \mathrm{ChV}(S_i)$
        **then** Let $L \subseteq \{1, \ldots, i\}$ be such that $\mathrm{ChV}(S) = \sum_{l \in L} \mathrm{ChV}(S_l)$; $A_i \leftarrow \sum_{l \in L} A_l$
        **else** $i \leftarrow i + 1$; $S_i \leftarrow S$; $A_i \leftarrow \mathrm{XTag}^f(S_i)$
      Return $A_i$ to $A$ as the oracle response
    When $A$ makes an xor-verify query $(S, T)$
      **for** $j = i + 1, \ldots, c - 1$ **do**
        Pick some $S_j \subseteq I$ such that $\mathrm{ChV}(S), \mathrm{ChV}(S_1), \ldots, \mathrm{ChV}(S_j)$ are linearly independent
        $A_j \leftarrow \mathrm{XTag}^f(S_j)$
      Return $\mathrm{XVf}^f(S, T)$ to $A$ as the oracle response

Figure 8: Adversary for the proof of Lemma 7.

- $B$ makes exactly one xor-verify query and this is the last oracle query it makes.
- Let $S_1, \ldots, S_{c-1}$ be the xor-tag oracle queries made by $B$, and let $S_c$ be the first component of the pair that constitutes the xor-verify oracle query made by $B$. Then $\mathrm{ChV}(S_1), \ldots, \mathrm{ChV}(S_c)$ are linearly independent.

To complete the proof we will show that $\mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{xtag}}_{m,\tau}(B) \leq 2^{-\tau}$.

Let $f\colon I \to \{0,1\}^\tau$ denote the function chosen at random in the game. Let $\mathbf{S}_i$ be the random variable taking value the $i$-th xor-tag oracle query made by $B$ ($1 \leq i \leq c-1$), and let $\mathbf{S}_c$ denote the random variable taking value the first component of the pair that constitutes the xor-verify oracle query made by $B$. For $1 \leq i \leq c$ let $\mathbf{A}_i$ be the random variable taking value the response returned by the game to xor-tag oracle query $\mathbf{S}_i$. (Query $\mathbf{S_c}$ is not made to the xor-tag oracle by $B$, but we define the random variable whose value is its response anyway). That is:

$$\mathbf{A}_i \;=\; \sum_{x \in \mathbf{S}_i} f(x) \qquad (1 \leq i \leq c)\,.$$

Let $S_1, \ldots, S_{c-1}$ be any sequence of xor-tag queries made by $B$, and let $A_1, \ldots, A_{c-1}$ be responses returned to them. Let $S_c$ be the first component of the pair constituting a following xor-verify query made by $B$. Let $A_c$ be *any* $\tau$-bit strings. We claim that

$$\Pr\left[\, \mathbf{A}_c = A_c \;\middle|\; (\mathbf{S}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{S}_c, \mathbf{A}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{A}_{c-1}) = (S_1, \ldots, S_c, A_1, \ldots, A_{c-1}) \,\right] \;=\; 2^{-\tau}\,, \tag{5}$$

the probability being over the choice of the function $f$ alone. This implies that $\mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{xtag}}_{m,\tau}(B) = 2^{-\tau}$, which completes the proof. It remains to justify Equation (5).

Let $M$ be the $c-1$ by $c$ matrix whose $i$-th row is $\mathrm{ChV}(S_i)$ ($1 \leq i \leq c-1$) and let $\overline{M}$ be the $c$ by $c$ matrix whose $i$-th row is $\mathrm{ChV}(S_i)$ ($1 \leq i \leq c$). Since $\mathrm{ChV}(S_1), \ldots, \mathrm{ChV}(S_c)$ are linearly independent, $\overline{M}$ is non-singular. Let $x_1, \ldots, x_c$ denote a lexicographic ordering of $I$. We identify $f$ with the (column) vector $f = (f(x_1), \ldots, f(x_c))$. Below we use "$\cdot$" to denote matrix-vector

multiplication. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Pr[\,\mathbf{A}_c = A_c \mid (\mathbf{S}_1,\ldots,\mathbf{S}_c,\mathbf{A}_1,\ldots,\mathbf{A}_{c-1}) = (S_1,\ldots,S_c,A_1,\ldots,A_{c-1})\,] \\
&= \frac{|\{\, f \in \mathcal{R}_\tau^I \,:\, \overline{M}\cdot f = (A_1,\ldots,A_c)\,\}|}{|\{\, f \in \mathcal{R}_\tau^I \,:\, M\cdot f = (A_1,\ldots,A_{c-1})\,\}|} \\
&= \frac{|\{\, f \in \mathcal{R}_\tau^I \,:\, \overline{M}\cdot f = (A_1,\ldots,A_c)\,\}|}{\sum_{A\in\{0,1\}^\tau}|\{\, f \in \mathcal{R}_\tau^I \,:\, \overline{M}\cdot f = (A_1,\ldots,A_{c-1},A)\,\}|} \\
&= \frac{1}{\sum_{A\in\{0,1\}^\tau} 1} \qquad (6) \\
&= \frac{1}{2^\tau}\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Above, Equation (6) is true because $\overline{M}$ is non-singular. ▌

We will now use Lemma 7 to prove Lemma 2.

**Proof of Lemma 2:** Let $B$ be an adversary attacking the authenticity of $\mathrm{EAX2}[\Pi,\mathcal{R}_n^n,\tau]$. Assume it makes at most $q_{\mathrm{e}}$ encryption oracle queries, has data complexity at most $\sigma$, and running time at most $t$. Let $m$ be large enough that no string in an oracle query of $B$ has length exceeding $m$, regardless of oracle responses and regardless of $A$'s internal coins. Let $I$ be the set of all strings of length at most $m$. For any $f\colon I\to\{0,1\}^n$ we define:

| **Algorithm** $\mathbf{EE}_f^{N\,H}(M)$ | **Algorithm** $\widehat{\mathbf{DD}}_f^{N\,H}(CT)$ |
|---|---|
| $\mathcal{N}\leftarrow f([0]_n \,\|\, N)$ | **if** $\|CT\|<\tau$ **then return** INVALID |
| $\mathcal{H}\leftarrow f([1]_n \,\|\, H)$ | Let $C \,\|\, T \leftarrow CT$ where $\|T\|=\tau$ |
| $C \xleftarrow{\$} \{0,1\}^{\|M\|}$ | $\mathcal{N}\leftarrow f([0]_n \,\|\, N)$ |
| $\mathcal{C}\leftarrow f([2]_n \,\|\, C)$ | $\mathcal{H}\leftarrow f([1]_n \,\|\, H)$ |
| $\mathit{Tag}\leftarrow \mathcal{N}\oplus\mathcal{C}\oplus\mathcal{H}$ | $\mathcal{C}\leftarrow f([2]_n \,\|\, C)$ |
| $T\leftarrow \mathit{Tag}$ [first $\tau$ bits] | $\mathit{Tag}'\leftarrow \mathcal{N}\oplus\mathcal{C}\oplus\mathcal{H}$ |
| **return** $CT\leftarrow C \,\|\, T$ | $T'\leftarrow \mathit{Tag}'$ [first $\tau$ bits] |
| | **if** $T\neq T'$ **then return** INVALID **else return** 1 |

We let

$$\mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{rauth}}(B) \;=\; \Pr\left[f \xleftarrow{\$} \mathcal{R}_n^I :\; B^{\mathbf{EE}_f(\cdot),\widehat{\mathbf{DD}}_f(\cdot)} \text{ forges}\right]\,.$$

We will construct a rank-respecting adversary $A$ such that

$$\mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{rauth}}(B) \;\le\; \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{xtag}}_{m,\tau}(A)\,. \qquad (7)$$

We will also construct an adversary $P$, using resources $t', q, \sigma$ and attacking the privacy of $\Pi$, such that

$$\mathbf{Adv}^{\mathbf{auth}}_{\mathrm{EAX2}[\Pi,\mathcal{R}_n^n,\tau]}(B) - \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{rauth}}(B) \;\le\; \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{priv}}_{\Pi}(P)\,. \qquad (8)$$

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{Adv}^{\mathbf{auth}}_{\mathrm{EAX2}[\Pi,\mathcal{R}_n^n,\tau]}(B) &= \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{rauth}}(B) + \left(\mathbf{Adv}^{\mathbf{auth}}_{\mathrm{EAX2}[\Pi,\mathcal{R}_n^n,\tau]}(B) - \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{rauth}}(B)\right) \\
&\le \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{xtag}}_{m,\tau}(A) + \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{priv}}_{\Pi}(P) \\
&\le 2^{-\tau} + \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{priv}}_{\Pi}(t',q,\sigma)\,,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality uses Lemma 7. This completes the proof of the lemma. It remains to construct the adversaries $A$ and $P$ indicated above.

Adversary $A^{\mathrm{XTag}^f(\cdot),\,\mathrm{XVf}^f(\cdot,\cdot)}$ defines the following subroutines:

**Subroutine** $\mathrm{SimE}^{N\,H}\ (M)$

$C \xleftarrow{\$} \{0,1\}^{|M|}$
$S \leftarrow \{\,[0]_n \,\|\, N,\ [1]_n \,\|\, H,\ [2]_n \,\|\, C\,\}$
$T \leftarrow \mathrm{XTag}^f(S)$
**return** $CT \leftarrow C \,\|\, T$

**Subroutine** $\mathrm{SimD}^{N\,H}\ (CT)$

**if** $|CT| < \tau$ **then return** INVALID
Let $C \,\|\, T \leftarrow CT$ where $|T| = \tau$
$S \leftarrow \{\,[0]_n \,\|\, N,\ [1]_n \,\|\, H,\ [2]_n \,\|\, C\,\}$
**if** $\mathrm{XVf}^f(S,T) = 0$ **then return** INVALID
**else return** 1

Adversary $A$ then runs $B^{\mathrm{SimE}^{\cdot\,\cdot}(\cdot),\,\mathrm{SimD}^{\cdot\,\cdot}(\cdot)}$. Equation (7) is true because for any choice of the underlying function $f$ we have $\mathrm{SimE}^{\cdot\,\cdot}(\cdot) = \mathbf{EE}_f^{\cdot\,\cdot}(\cdot)$ and $\mathrm{SimD}^{\cdot\,\cdot}(\cdot) = \widehat{\mathbf{DD}}_f^{\cdot\,\cdot}(\cdot)$. It remains to show that $A$ is rank-respecting. Let $c = |I|$ and let $x_1, \ldots, x_c$ denote a lexicographic ordering of $I$. For $1 \le i \le q$ let $(N_i, H_i, M_i)$ be the $i$-th encryption-oracle query made by $B$, leading to $A$ making xor-tag query $S_i$, and let $(N, H, CT)$ denote the verification query made by $B$, leading to $A$ making xor-verify query $(S,T)$. Let $CT = C \,\|\, T$ where $|T| = \tau$. Imagine a matrix whose $i$-th row is $\mathrm{ChV}(S_i)$ $(1 \le i \le q)$ and whose $(q+1)$-th row is $\mathrm{ChV}(S)$. Column $j$ is called a $l$-column if $x_j$ is prefixed by $[l]_n$ $(0 \le l \le 2$ and $1 \le j \le c)$. Since $A$ is nonce-respecting there exists a set $D$ of $q$ 0-columns such that the submatrix formed by the first $q$ rows of the matrix and the columns in $D$ is a $q$ by $q$ identity matrix. Since $\mathrm{ChV}(S)$ has exactly one 1 in a 0-column, the only way that $\mathrm{ChV}(S)$ could be a linear combination of $\mathrm{ChV}(S_1), \ldots, \mathrm{ChV}(S_q)$ is that it equals $\mathrm{ChV}(S_i)$ for some $i$ $(1 \le i \le q)$. This means that $N = N_i$, $H = H_i$ and the response to $B$'s $i$-th oracle query was $CT$. But this contradicts the condition we imposed on $B$ that disallowed a verification-oracle query $(N, H, CT)$ such that $CT$ had been obtained in response to an encryption-oracle query $(N, H, M)$. (It is important here that we required the condition to hold regardless of the responses to oracle queries and the coin tosses of $B$.) So $\mathrm{ChV}(S)$ cannot equal $\mathrm{ChV}(S_i)$. This completes the proof that $A$ is rank-respecting.

We now turn to the design of adversary $P$. It is depicted in Figure 9. It is an extension of the adversary constructed in the proof of Lemma 1 that also handles verification-oracle queries. A crucial feature of EAX2 we have exploited in order to be able to respond to verification-oracle queries is that the validity of a ciphertext can be verified without decrypting under the IVE scheme. Regarding the design of $P$, our first claim is that its assignment of a value to $f([0]_n \,\|\, N)$, made in answering an encryption-oracle query of $B$, is legitimate because $f([0]_n \,\|\, N)$ was not previously defined. This is true for two reasons. The first is that $B$ is nonce-respecting. The second is that $B$ does not make any encryption-oracle queries after it has made its verification-oracle query. (The verification-oracle query might define $f([0]_n \,\|\, N)$, but since no encryption-oracle queries follow we do not have to be concerned about $f([0]_n \,\|\, N)$ being defined at the time of answering one of them.) Now we turn to the analysis. Let $\mathsf{Key2}$ be the key-space of $\Pi$. It is easy to see that

$$\Pr\left[K2 \xleftarrow{\$} \mathsf{Key2} :\ P^{\mathcal{E}^{\$}_{K2}(\cdot)} = 1\right] \;=\; \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathbf{auth}}_{\mathrm{EAX2}[\Pi,\mathcal{R}^n_n,\tau]}(B) \tag{9}$$

$$\Pr\left[K2 \xleftarrow{\$} \mathsf{Key2} :\ P^{\$(\cdot)} = 1\right] \;=\; \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{rauth}}(B)\ . \tag{10}$$

Subtracting, we get Equation (8), and this concludes the proof. ∎

**Proof of Theorem 3:** Let $A$ be an adversary using resources at most $(t, q, \sigma)$ that attacks the authenticity of $\mathbf{\Pi} = (\mathbf{E}, \mathbf{D}) = \mathrm{EAX2}[\Pi, F, \tau]$. Using $A$, we construct an adversary $B$ for

Adversary $P^{e(\cdot)}$

Initially, $f$ is everywhere undefined
Run $B$
When $B$ makes encryption-oracle query $(N, H, M)$:
$\mathcal{N} \,\|\, C \xleftarrow{\$} e(M)$ // where $|\mathcal{N}| = n$
$f([0]_n \,\|\, N) \leftarrow \mathcal{N}$
**if** $f([1]_n \,\|\, H)$ is undefined **then** $\mathcal{H} \leftarrow f([1]_n \,\|\, H) \xleftarrow{\$} \{0,1\}^n$
**if** $f([2]_n \,\|\, C)$ is undefined **then** $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow f([2]_n \,\|\, C) \xleftarrow{\$} \{0,1\}^n$
Let $T$ be the first $\tau$ bits of $\mathcal{N} \oplus \mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{C}$
Return $CT \leftarrow C \,\|\, T$ to $B$ as the oracle response
When $B$ makes verification-oracle query $(N, H, CT)$:
**if** $|CT| < \tau$ **then return** INVALID to $B$ as the oracle response
Let $C \,\|\, T \leftarrow CT$ where $|T| = \tau$
**if** $f([0]_n \,\|\, N)$ is undefined **then** $f([0]_n \,\|\, N) \xleftarrow{\$} \{0,1\}^n$
$\mathcal{N} \leftarrow f([0]_n \,\|\, N)$
**if** $f([1]_n \,\|\, H)$ is undefined **then** $f([1]_n \,\|\, H) \xleftarrow{\$} \{0,1\}^n$
$\mathcal{H} \leftarrow f([1]_n \,\|\, H)$
**if** $f([2]_n \,\|\, C)$ is undefined **then** $f([2]_n \,\|\, C) \xleftarrow{\$} \{0,1\}^n$
$\mathcal{C} \leftarrow f([2]_n \,\|\, C)$
Let $T'$ be the first $\tau$ bits of $\mathcal{N} \oplus \mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{C}$
**if** $T = T'$ **then** $d \leftarrow 1$ **else** $d \leftarrow 0$
**if** $d = 0$
**then return** INVALID to $B$ as the oracle response
**else return** 1 to $B$ as the oracle response
**return** $d$

Figure 9: Adversary $P$ attacking the privacy of IVE scheme $\Pi$ in the proof of Lemma 2.

distinguishing $f \xleftarrow{\$} F$ from $f \xleftarrow{\$} \mathcal{R}_n^n$. Adversary $B$, which has oracle $f$, works as follows. At the beginning of $B$'s execution it chooses $K2 \xleftarrow{\$} \mathsf{Key2}$ where $\mathsf{Key2}$ is the key space of $\Pi$. Then $B$ runs $A$. When $A$ makes an oracle query $(N_i, H_i, M_i)$ adversary $B$ computes $\mathcal{N}_i \leftarrow f([0]_n \,\|\, N_i)$ and $C_i \leftarrow \mathcal{E}_{K2}^{\mathcal{N}_i}(M_i)$ and $\mathcal{H}_i \leftarrow f([1]_n \,\|\, H_i)$ and $\mathcal{C}_i \leftarrow f([2]_n \,\|\, C_i)$ and $T_i \leftarrow (\mathcal{N}_i \oplus \mathcal{C}_i \oplus \mathcal{H}_i)$ [first $\tau$ bits] and $CT_i \leftarrow C_i \| T_i$ and then $B$ returns to $A$ the string $CT_i$. When $A$ halts, outputting an attempted forgery $(N, H, C \,\|\, T)$, adversary $B$ checks if this is a valid forgery: (1) it checks if $(N, H, C \,\|\, T)$ is distinct from every $(N_i, H_i, C_i \,\|\, T_i)$ that has been computed; (2) it computes $\mathcal{N} \leftarrow f([0]_n \,\|\, N)$ and $\mathcal{H} \leftarrow f([1]_n \,\|\, H)$ and $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow f([2]_n \,\|\, C)$ and sees if $T = (\mathcal{N} \oplus \mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{C})$ [first $\tau$ bits]. If both conditions hold then $B$ returns the bit 1 (it guesses that $f = F_{K1}$ for a random $K1$) and otherwise it outputs the bit 0 (it guesses that $f$ is a random function from $\mathcal{R}_n^n$).

Note that $B$ makes a total of $3q + 3$ oracle calls. The total length of those queries is $\sigma$. (Recall our convention that we include in $\sigma$ the output length and the number of components in each vector that is queried.) The running time of $B$ is $t_1 = t + \mathrm{Time}_{\mathcal{E}}(\sigma) + \widetilde{O}(\sigma)$. Finally, adversary $B$

provides $A$ a perfect simulation of $\mathrm{EAX2}[\Pi, F, \tau]$ if $f$ is selected by $f \xleftarrow{\$} F$ while $B$ provides $A$ a perfect simulation of $\mathrm{EAX2}[\Pi, \mathcal{R}_n^n, \tau]$ if $f \xleftarrow{\$} \mathcal{R}_n^n$. Thus using Lemma 2 we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{Adv}^{\mathbf{auth}}_{\mathrm{EAX2}[\Pi,F,\tau]}(A) \\
&= \Big(\mathbf{Adv}^{\mathbf{auth}}_{\mathrm{EAX2}[\Pi,F,\tau]}(A) - \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathbf{auth}}_{\mathrm{EAX2}[\Pi,\mathcal{R}_n^n,\tau]}(A)\Big) + \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathbf{auth}}_{\mathrm{EAX2}[\Pi,\mathcal{R}_n^n,\tau]}(A) \\
&\le \Big(\Pr[f \xleftarrow{\$} F:\ B^f = 1] - \Pr[f \xleftarrow{\$} \mathcal{R}_n^n:\ B^f = 1]\Big) + 2^{-\tau} + \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{priv}}_{\Pi}(t_2, q, \sigma) \\
&= \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{prf}}_{F}(B) + \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{priv}}_{\Pi}(t_2, q, \sigma) + 2^{-\tau} \\
&\le \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{prf}}_{F}(t_1,\ 3q+3,\ \sigma) + \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{priv}}_{\Pi}(t_2, q, \sigma) + 2^{-\tau}\ .
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Equation (1).

Reusing the name, let $A$ be an adversary that attacks the privacy of $\mathbf{\Pi} = (\mathbf{E}, \mathbf{D})$ and uses resources at most $(t, q, \sigma)$. Reusing the name, we construct an adversary $B$ for attacking the pseudorandomness of $F$.

Adversary $B$, which has an oracle for $f$, is constructed as follows. At the beginning of $B$'s execution it chooses $K2 \xleftarrow{\$} \mathsf{Key2}$ where $\mathsf{Key2}$ is the key space of $\Pi$. Then $B$ runs $A$. When $A$ makes an oracle call $(N_i, H_i, M_i)$ adversary $B$ computes $\mathcal{N}_i \leftarrow f([0]_n \,\|\, N_i)$ and $C_i \leftarrow \mathcal{E}_{K2}^{\mathcal{N}_i}(M_i)$ and $\mathcal{H}_i \leftarrow f([1]_n \,\|\, H_i)$ and $\mathcal{C}_i \leftarrow f([2]_n \,\|\, C_i)$ and $T_i \leftarrow (\mathcal{N}_i \oplus \mathcal{C}_i \oplus \mathcal{H}_i)$ [first $\tau$ bits] and $CT_i \leftarrow C_i \,\|\, T_i$ and then $B$ returns to $A$ the string $CT_i$. When $A$ halts, outputting a bit $b$, adversary $B$ outputs the same bit $b$.

The total number of oracle queries made by $B$ is $3q$. The total length of these queries is at most $\sigma$. The running time of $B$ is $t_3 = t + \mathrm{Time}_{\mathcal{E}}(\sigma) + \widetilde{O}(\sigma)$. Finally, adversary $B$ provides $A$ a perfect simulation of $\mathrm{EAX2}[\Pi, F, \tau]$ if $f$ is selected by $f \xleftarrow{\$} F$ while $B$ provides $A$ a perfect simulation of $\mathrm{EAX2}[\Pi, \mathcal{R}_n^n, \tau]$ if $f \xleftarrow{\$} \mathcal{R}_n^n$. Now using Lemma 1 we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{Adv}^{\mathbf{priv}}_{\mathrm{EAX2}[\Pi,F,\tau]}(A) &= \Big(\mathbf{Adv}^{\mathbf{priv}}_{\mathrm{EAX2}[\Pi,F,\tau]}(A) - \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathbf{priv}}_{\mathrm{EAX2}[\Pi,\mathcal{R}_n^n,\tau]}(A)\Big) + \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathbf{priv}}_{\mathrm{EAX2}[\Pi,\mathcal{R}_n^n,\tau]}(A) \\
&\le \Big(\Pr[f \xleftarrow{\$} F:\ B^f = 1] - \Pr[f \xleftarrow{\$} \mathcal{R}_n^n:\ B^f = 1]\Big) + \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{priv}}_{\Pi}(t_2, q, \sigma) \\
&= \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{prf}}_{\Pi}(B) + \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{priv}}_{\Pi}(t_2, q, \sigma) \\
&\le \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{prf}}_{\Pi}(t_3, 3q, \sigma) + \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{priv}}_{\Pi}(t_2, q, \sigma)
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Equation (2). ∎

# B Proof of Security of the Tweakable-OMAC Extension

**Proof of Lemma 4:** Let $A$ be a length-respecting adversary for distinguishing $\mathbb{OMAC}[\mathcal{R}_n^n]$ from a random function. Assume that $A$ uses resources $(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)$. Without loss of generality we assume that $A$ is deterministic and makes no repeated queries. We simulate the behavior of an $\mathbb{OMAC}[\mathcal{R}_n^n]$ oracle as show in Figure 10. That figure depicts a mechanism, game **Q1**, that coincides with the definition of $\mathbb{OMAC}[\mathcal{R}_n^n]$. As before, we use the notation $\widetilde{X}$ for the padded version of the string $X$, namely $\widetilde{X} = X10^{n-|X|-1}$.

Game **Q1** is not the most obvious simulation of an $\mathbb{OMAC}[\mathcal{R}_n^n]$ oracle. In particular, the game distinguishes among the following cases: one-block messages that are a full $n$ bits (line 10); one-block messages that fall short of $n$ bits (line 11); messages with two or more blocks where the final

**Initialization**

00 $\rho \xleftarrow{\$} \mathcal{R}_n^n$
01 $L_0 \leftarrow \rho([0]_n)$ ; $L_1 \leftarrow \rho([1]_n)$ ; $L_2 \leftarrow \rho([2]_n)$

**On query** $(t, M, s)$**, where** $t \in \{0,1,2\}$ **and** $M = M_1 \cdots M_m$ **and** $s \in \mathbb{N}$

10 **if** $|M| = n$ **then** $T \leftarrow \rho(M_1 \oplus L_t \oplus 2L_0)$
20 **elseif** $|M| < n$ **then** $T \leftarrow \rho(\widetilde{M_1} \oplus L_t \oplus 4L_0)$
30 **else if** $Y[t, M_1]$ is undefined **then** $Y[t, M_1] \leftarrow \rho(M_1 \oplus L_t)$
31 $u \leftarrow$ the largest number in $[1 \,..\, m-1]$ s.t. $Y[t, M_{1..u}]$ is defined
32 **for** $j \leftarrow u+1$ **to** $m-1$ **do** $Y[t, M_{1..j}] \leftarrow \rho(Y[t, M_{1..j-1}] \oplus M_j)$
33 **if** $|M_m| = n$ **then** $T \leftarrow \rho(Y[t, M_{1..m-1}] \oplus M_m \oplus 2L_0)$
34 **if** $|M_m| < n$ **then** $T \leftarrow \rho(Y[t, M_{1..m-1}] \oplus \widetilde{M_m} \oplus 4L_0)$
40 **for** $j \leftarrow 0$ **to** $s-1$ **do** $S_j \leftarrow \rho(T+j-1)$
50 **return** $T \,\|\, S_0 \cdots S_{s-1}$

Figure 10: Game **Q1**, which perfectly simulates an $\mathrm{OMAC}_\rho^t$ oracle for $t \in \{0,1,2\}$ and $\rho$ a random function from $\mathcal{R}_n^n$.

block is a full block (line 33); and messages with two or more blocks where the final block is a short block (line 34). In addition to breaking into these cases, we implement memoization by way of the array $Y$. In particular, when a query $M_1 \ldots M_m$ is asked we record (memoize) the intermediate values that we get as we CBC our way down $M_1 \cdots M_{m-1}$. If any of prefixes $M_1, M_{1..2}, \ldots, M_{1..m-1}$ should arise again with the same tweak we will not re-compute the values needed as we chain down the message, looking up the answer in the array $Y$ instead. Notice that memoization stops one block short of the final block $M_m$ and that the memoization is tweak-dependent.

To help us understand the behavior of game **Q1** we make some changes to it, yielding game **Q2**, defined in Figure 11. As is standard, game **Q2** avoids choosing $\rho \xleftarrow{\$} \mathcal{R}_n^n$ at the beginning and instead fills in values incrementally. Any time we need a $\rho(X)$ value, if it is not yet defined then we choose a value at random from $\{0,1\}^n$ and make this to be $\rho(X)$. Any time we need a value for $\rho(X)$ that has been defined already, we use that old value. In the latter case we also set a flag *bad*. The flag *bad* effects nothing visible to the adversary, but it is central to our subsequent analysis. It is easy to verify that games **Q1** and **Q2** provide identical views to any adversary that interacts with them, so $\Pr[A^{\mathbf{Q1}} = 1] = \Pr[A^{\mathbf{Q2}} = 1]$.

Also defined in Figure 11 is game **R1**. This game is obtained by dropping the highlighted statements from game **Q1**. We only omit statements that immediately follow the setting of the flag *bad*. The game **R1** is easily seen to return $n(s-1)$ random bits in response to any query $(t, M, s)$. Thus $\mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{dist}}_{\mathbf{Q2},\mathbf{R1}}(A) = |\Pr[A^{\mathbf{Q2}} = 1\} - |\Pr[A^{\mathbf{R1}} = 1\}| \le \Pr[A^{\mathbf{R1}}$ sets *bad*$]$. This is the standard setup for analyses within the game-playing paradigm.

To more easily understand game **R1** we rewrite it a bit, resulting in the game **R2** shown in Figure 12. To understand the change from game **R1** to game **R2** notice that, having eliminated the seven highlighted statements of game **Q2**, the $\rho(X)$-values are no longer actually used in game **R1**: all that one needs to keep track of is whether or not a point $X$ has already been placed into the the domain of $\rho$. Thus game **R2** ceases to keep track of $\rho$-values; instead, we record in the variable $\Re$ what would be the domain of $\rho$ at this point in time. So $\Re$ starts off as $\{[0]_n, [1]_n, [2]_n\}$

**Initialization**

00 $L_0 \xleftarrow{\$} \{0,1\}^n$ ; $L_1 \xleftarrow{\$} \{0,1\}^n$ ; $L_2 \xleftarrow{\$} \{0,1\}^n$
01 $\rho([0]_n) \leftarrow L_0$ ; $\rho([1]_n) \leftarrow L_1$ ; $\rho([2]_n) \leftarrow L_2$
02 $bad \leftarrow \texttt{false}$

**On query** $(t,\, M,\, s)$**, where** $t \in \{0,1,2\}$ **and** $M = M_1 \cdots M_m$ **and** $s \in \mathbb{N}$

05 $T \xleftarrow{\$} \{0,1\}^n$
10 **if** $|M| = n$ **then**
11 $X_1 \leftarrow M_1 \oplus L_t \oplus 2L_0$ ; **if** $X_1 \in \mathrm{Domain}(\rho)$ **then** $bad \leftarrow \texttt{true}$ , $T \leftarrow \rho(X_1)$
12 $\rho(X_1) \leftarrow T$
20 **elseif** $|M| < n$ **then**
21 $X_1 \leftarrow \widetilde{M_1} \oplus L_t \oplus 4L_0$ ; **if** $X_1 \in \mathrm{Domain}(\rho)$ **then** $bad \leftarrow \texttt{true}$ , $T \leftarrow \rho(X_1)$
22 $\rho(X_1) \leftarrow T$
30 **else if** $Y[t,\, M_1]$ is undefined **then**
31 $X_1 \leftarrow M_1 \oplus L_t$ ; $Y[t,\, M_1] \xleftarrow{\$} \{0,1\}^n$
32 **if** $X_1 \in \mathrm{Domain}(\rho)$ **then** $bad \leftarrow \texttt{true}$ , $Y[t,\, M_1] \leftarrow \rho(X_1)$
33 $\rho(X_1) \leftarrow Y[t,\, M_1]$
40 $u \leftarrow$ the largest number in $[1\,..\,m-1]$ s.t. $Y[t,\, M_{1..u}]$ is defined
41 **for** $j \leftarrow u+1$ **to** $m-1$ **do**
42 $X_j \leftarrow Y[t,\, M_{1..j-1}] \oplus M_j$ ; $Y[t,\, M_{1..j}] \xleftarrow{\$} \{0,1\}^n$
43 **if** $\rho(X_j)$ is defined **then** $bad \leftarrow \texttt{true}$ , $Y[t,\, M_{1..j}] \leftarrow \rho(X_j)$
44 $\rho(X_m) \leftarrow Y[t,\, M_{1..j}]$
50 **if** $|M_m| = n$ **then**
51 $X_m \leftarrow Y[t,\, M_{1..m-1}] \oplus M_m \oplus 2L_0$
52 **if** $X_m \in \mathrm{Domain}(\rho)$ **then** $bad \leftarrow \texttt{true}$ , $T \leftarrow \rho(X_m)$
53 $\rho(X_m) \leftarrow T$
60 **if** $|M_m| < n$ **then**
61 $X_m \leftarrow Y[t,\, M_{1..m-1}] \oplus \widetilde{M_m} \oplus 4L_0$
62 **if** $X_m \in \mathrm{Domain}(\rho)$ **then** $bad \leftarrow \texttt{true}$ , $T \leftarrow \rho(X_m)$
63 $\rho(X_m) \leftarrow T$
70 **for** $j \leftarrow 0$ **to** $s-1$ **do**
71 $S_j \xleftarrow{\$} \{0,1\}^n$
72 **if** $T+j-1 \in \mathrm{Domain}(\rho)$ **then** $bad \leftarrow \texttt{true}$ , $S_j \leftarrow \rho(T+j-1)$
73 $\rho(T+j-1) \leftarrow S_j$
80 **return** $T \,\|\, S_0 \cdots S_{s-1}$

Figure 11: Game **Q2**, which is equivalent to game **Q1**. Game **R1** is obtained by omitting the highlighted statements.

(corresponding to the fact that $\rho([0]_n)$, $\rho([1]_n)$, and $\rho([2]_n)$ are defined in game **R1**) and then, whenever a point $X$ would have been placed into the domain of $\rho$, with some value being assigned to $\rho(X)$, we simply add $X$ to the set $\mathcal{R}$, not bothering with anything else. Instead of testing if a given point is in the domain of $\rho$ we test if it is in $\mathcal{R}$. At this point we notice that the random value $T$ is not used until the final lines of the game, so, for added clarity, we move down in the program the choosing of the random value $T$. We have that $\Pr[A^{\mathbf{R1}} \text{ sets } bad] = \Pr[A^{\mathbf{R2}} \text{ sets } bad]$. Given what we have said so far, $\mathbf{Adv}^{\text{prf}}_{\mathbb{OMAC}[\mathcal{R}^n_n]}(A) = \mathbf{Adv}^{\text{dist}}_{\mathbf{Q1},\mathbf{R2}}(A) \leq \Pr[A^{\mathbf{R2}} \text{ sets } bad]$. Our job has been reduced to understanding the adversary's chance of setting *bad* in game **R2**.

Let us dispense right away with the the chance that *bad* is set at line 73. The value $T$ is chosen at random at line 70 and then we see if any of the $s$ points $T, T+1, \ldots, T+s-1$ are in the set $\mathcal{R}$. Now $|\mathcal{R}| \leq \sigma_1 + \sigma_2 + 3$ throughout the execution of game **R2** and we are testing for the presence of at most $\sigma_2$ points in $\mathcal{R}$, and so

$$\Pr[bad \text{ gets set at line 73 of game } \mathbf{R2}] \quad \leq \quad \frac{\sigma_2(\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 + 3)}{2^n} \tag{11}$$

Let game **R3** coincide with game **R2** except for eliminating line 73. The probability that *bad* gets set in game **R2** is at most the probability that *bad* gets set in line 73 of game **R2** plus the probability that *bad* gets set in a line other than line 73 of game **R2**. So by equation (11) we have that

$$\Pr[bad \text{ gets set in game } \mathbf{R2}] \quad \leq \quad \Pr[bad \text{ gets set in game } \mathbf{R3}] + \frac{\sigma_2(\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 + 3)}{2^n} \tag{12}$$

We proceed with the analysis of game **R3**.

The values $S_j$ returned to the adversary in game **R3** have no impact on any internal variable maintained by the game (these values are chosen, returned to the adversary, and never used again). The only significance of the $q$ $T$-values returned to the adversary is to define some $\sigma_2$ $\mathcal{R}$-values—values that the adversary does not control[5]. Thus we will only be giving the adversary *more* power if we allow it to select an initial set of $\sigma_2 + 3$ values for $\mathcal{R}$ (the "+3" reflecting the three values that were assigned to $\mathcal{R}$ at line 01) and have it interact no further with the game, since everything is at that point determined. In other words, the game is made noninteractive, but we maximize over all possible choices $\{\mathsf{R}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{R}_{\sigma_2+3}\}$ of initial values for $\mathcal{R}$. The adversary's corresponding queries are now fixed. The modified game is shown in Figure 13. We regard all of $\mathtt{q}$ and $\mathtt{t}^1, \ldots, \mathtt{t}^{\mathtt{q}} \in \{0,1,2\}$ and strings $\mathtt{M}^1, \ldots, \mathtt{M}^{\mathtt{q}}$ having block lengths $\mathtt{m}^1, \ldots, \mathtt{m}^{\mathtt{q}}$ and strings $\mathsf{R}_1, \cdots, \mathsf{R}_{\sigma_2+3} \in \{0,1\}^n$ as fixed constants associated to the game. We must bound the probability that *bad* gets set to `true` in game **S**. We do that with a case analysis.

If the flag *bad* gets set in game **S** it is because a point $X^s_j$ gets computed in one of lines 11, 21, 31, 41, 51, 61 (six possibilities), but that point was *already* placed in $\mathcal{R}$ by an earlier execution of one of lines 01, 12, 22, 33, 43, 53, 63 (seven possibilities). This gives a total of $6 \times 7 = 42$ cases. We refer to the "current" point as $X^s_j$ and the "earlier" point as $X^r_i$. The current point must follow the earlier point under the natural ordering. The current point $X^s_j$ and the earlier point $X^r_i$ can be set as any of the following:

[5]Strictly speaking, the attacker can control $s$ for each invocation. However, it is still true that we are only giving the adversary more power if we allow the adversary to select $\sigma_2 + 3$ values in advance rather than observing the $S$- and $T$-values as we go.

**Initialization**

00 $L_0 \xleftarrow{\$} \{0,1\}^n$ ; $L_1 \xleftarrow{\$} \{0,1\}^n$ ; $L_2 \xleftarrow{\$} \{0,1\}^n$
01 $\mathcal{R} \leftarrow \{[0]_n, [1]_n, [2]_n\}$
02 $bad \leftarrow \texttt{false}$

**On query** $(t,\, M,\, s)$**, where** $t \in \{0,1,2\}$ **and** $M = M_1 \cdots M_m$ **and** $s \in \mathbb{N}$

10 **if** $|M| = n$ **then**
11 $X_1 \leftarrow M_1 \oplus L_t \oplus 2L_0$ ; **if** $X_1 \in \mathcal{R}$ **then** $bad \leftarrow \texttt{true}$
12 $\mathcal{R} \leftarrow \mathcal{R} \cup \{X_1\}$
20 **elseif** $|M| < n$ **then**
21 $X_1 \leftarrow \widetilde{M_1} \oplus L_t \oplus 4L_0$ ; **if** $X_1 \in \mathcal{R}$ **then** $bad \leftarrow \texttt{true}$
22 $\mathcal{R} \leftarrow \mathcal{R} \cup \{X_1\}$
30 **else if** $Y[t,\, M_1]$ is undefined **then**
31 $X_1 \leftarrow M_1 \oplus L_t$ ; $Y[t,\, M_1] \xleftarrow{\$} \{0,1\}^n$
32 **if** $X_1 \in \mathcal{R}$ **then** $bad \leftarrow \texttt{true}$
33 $\mathcal{R} \leftarrow \mathcal{R} \cup \{X_1\}$
40 $u \leftarrow$ the largest number in $[1\,..\,m-1]$ s.t. $Y[t,\, M_{1..u}]$ is defined
41 **for** $j \leftarrow u+1$ **to** $m-1$ **do**
42 $X_j \leftarrow Y[t,\, M_{1..j-1}] \oplus M_j$ ; $Y[t,\, M_{1..j}] \xleftarrow{\$} \{0,1\}^n$
43 **if** $X_j \in \mathcal{R}$ **then** $bad \leftarrow \texttt{true}$
44 $\mathcal{R} \leftarrow \mathcal{R} \cup \{X_j\}$
50 **if** $|M_m| = n$ **then**
51 $X_m \leftarrow Y[t,\, M_{1..m-1}] \oplus M_m \oplus 2L_0$
52 **if** $X_m \in \mathcal{R}$ **then** $bad \leftarrow \texttt{true}$
53 $\mathcal{R} \leftarrow \mathcal{R} \cup \{X_m\}$
60 **if** $|M_m| < n$ **then**
61 $X_m \leftarrow Y[t,\, M_{1..m-1}] \oplus \widetilde{M_m} \oplus 4L_0$
62 **if** $X_m \in \mathcal{R}$ **then** $bad \leftarrow \texttt{true}$
63 $\mathcal{R} \leftarrow \mathcal{R} \cup \{X_m\}$

70 $T \xleftarrow{\$} \{0,1\}^n$
71 **for** $j \leftarrow 0$ **to** $s-1$ **do**
72 $S_j \xleftarrow{\$} \{0,1\}^n$
73 **if** $T+j-1 \in \mathcal{R}$ **then** $bad \leftarrow \texttt{true}$
74 $\mathcal{R} \leftarrow \mathcal{R} \cup \{T,\, T+1,\, \ldots,\, T+s-1\}$
80 **return** $T \,\|\, S_0 \cdots S_{s-1}$

Figure 12: Game **R2**, which is equivalent to **R1** but no longer maintains the function $\rho$.

```
00  L_0 <-$ {0,1}^n ; L_1 <-$ {0,1}^n ; L_2 <-$ {0,1}^n
01  R <- {R_1, ..., R_{σ_2+3}}
02  bad <- false

05  for s <- 1 to q do

10      if |M^s| = n then
11          X^s_1 <- M^s_1 ⊕ L_{t^s} ⊕ 2L_0 ; if X^s_1 ∈ R then bad <- true
12          R <- R ∪ {X^s_1}
20      elseif |M^s| < n then
21          X^s_1 <- M̃^s_1 ⊕ L_{t^s} ⊕ 4L_0 ; if X^s_1 ∈ R then bad <- true
22          R <- R ∪ {X^s_1}
30      else  if Y[t^s, M^s_1] is undefined then
31                X^s_1 <- M^s_1 ⊕ L_{t^s} ; Y[t^s, M^s_1] <-$ {0,1}^n
32                if X^s_1 ∈ R then bad <- true
33                R <- R ∪ {X^s_1}
35          u <- the largest number in [1 .. m^s - 1] s.t. Y[t^s, M^s_{1..u}] is defined
40          for j <- u + 1 to m^s - 1 do
41                X^s_j <- Y[t^s, M^s_{1..j-1}] ⊕ M^s_j ; Y[t^s, M^s_{1..j}] <-$ {0,1}^n
42                if X^s_j ∈ R then bad <- true
43                R <- R ∪ {X^s_j}
50          if |M^s_{m^s}| = n then
51                X^s_{m^s} <- Y[t^s, M^s_{1..m^s-1}] ⊕ M^s_{m^s} ⊕ 2L_0
52                if X^s_{m^s} ∈ R then bad <- true
53                R <- R ∪ {X^s_{m^s}}
60          if |M^s_{m^s}| < n then
61                X^s_{m^s} <- Y[t^s, M^s_{1..m^s-1}] ⊕ M̃^s_{m^s} ⊕ 4L_0
62                if X^s_{m^s} ∈ R then bad <- true
63                R <- R ∪ {X^s_{m^s}}
```

Figure 13: Game **S**, the noninteractive game that the analysis focuses on.

| case | earlier point $X_i^r$ | current point $X_j^s$ | $\Pr[X_i^r = X_j^s]$ | explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | $\mathsf{R}_\ell$ | $\mathtt{M}_1^s \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^s} \oplus 2L_0$ | $2^{-n}$ | randomness of $L_0$ |
| 2 | $\mathtt{M}_1^r \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^r} \oplus 2L_0$ | $\mathtt{M}_1^s \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^s} \oplus 2L_0$ | 0 or $2^{-n}$ | no repeated queries / randomness of $L_{\mathtt{t}^s}$ |
| 3 | $\widetilde{\mathtt{M}_1^r} \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^r} \oplus 4L_0$ | $\mathtt{M}_1^s \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^s} \oplus 2L_0$ | $2^{-n}$ | randomness of $L_0$ |
| 4 | $\mathtt{M}_1^r \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^r}$ | $\mathtt{M}_1^s \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^s} \oplus 2L_0$ | $2^{-n}$ | randomness of $L_0$ |
| 5 | $Y[\mathtt{t}^r, \mathtt{M}_{1..i-1}^r] \oplus \mathtt{M}_i^r$ | $\mathtt{M}_1^s \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^s} \oplus 2L_0$ | $2^{-n}$ | randomness of $L_0$ |
| 6 | $Y[\mathtt{t}^r, \mathtt{M}_{1..\mathtt{m}^r-1}^r] \oplus \mathtt{M}_i^r \oplus 2L_0$ | $\mathtt{M}_1^s \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^s} \oplus 2L_0$ | $2^{-n}$ | randomness of $Y[\mathtt{t}^r, \mathtt{M}_{1..\mathtt{m}^r-1}^r]$ |
| 7 | $Y[\mathtt{t}^r, \mathtt{M}_{1..\mathtt{m}^r-1}^s] \oplus \widetilde{\mathtt{M}_i^r} \oplus 4L_0$ | $\mathtt{M}_1^s \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^s} \oplus 2L_0$ | $2^{-n}$ | randomness of $Y[\mathtt{t}^r, \mathtt{M}_{1..\mathtt{m}^r-1}^r]$ |
| 8 | $\mathsf{R}_\ell$ | $\widetilde{\mathtt{M}_1^s} \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^s} \oplus 4L_0$ | $2^{-n}$ | randomness of $L_0$ |
| 9 | $\mathtt{M}_1^r \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^r} \oplus 2L_0$ | $\widetilde{\mathtt{M}_1^s} \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^s} \oplus 4L_0$ | $2^{-n}$ | randomness of $L_0$ |
| 10 | $\widetilde{\mathtt{M}_1^r} \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^r} \oplus 4L_0$ | $\widetilde{\mathtt{M}_1^s} \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^s} \oplus 4L_0$ | 0 or $2^{-n}$ | no repeated queries / randomness of $L_{\mathtt{t}^s}$ |
| 11 | $\mathtt{M}_1^r \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^r}$ | $\widetilde{\mathtt{M}_1^s} \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^s} \oplus 4L_0$ | $2^{-n}$ | randomness of $L_0$ |
| 12 | $Y[\mathtt{t}^r, \mathtt{M}_{1..i-1}^r] \oplus \mathtt{M}_i^r$ | $\widetilde{\mathtt{M}_1^s} \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^s} \oplus 4L_0$ | $2^{-n}$ | randomness of $L_0$ |
| 13 | $Y[\mathtt{t}^r, \mathtt{M}_{1..\mathtt{m}^r-1}^r] \oplus \mathtt{M}_i^r \oplus 2L_0$ | $\widetilde{\mathtt{M}_1^s} \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^s} \oplus 4L_0$ | $2^{-n}$ | randomness of $Y[\mathtt{t}^r, \mathtt{M}_{1..\mathtt{m}^r-1}^r]$ |
| 14 | $Y[\mathtt{t}^r, \mathtt{M}_{1..\mathtt{m}^r-1}^s] \oplus \widetilde{\mathtt{M}_i^r} \oplus 4L_0$ | $\widetilde{\mathtt{M}_1^s} \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^s} \oplus 4L_0$ | $2^{-n}$ | randomness of $Y[\mathtt{t}^r, \mathtt{M}_{1..\mathtt{m}^r-1}^r]$ |
| 15 | $\mathsf{R}_\ell$ | $\mathtt{M}_1^s \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^s}$ | $2^{-n}$ | randomness of $L_{\mathtt{t}^s}$ |
| 16 | $\mathtt{M}_1^r \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^r} \oplus 2L_0$ | $\mathtt{M}_1^s \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^s}$ | $2^{-n}$ | randomness of $L_0$ |
| 17 | $\widetilde{\mathtt{M}_1^r} \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^r} \oplus 4L_0$ | $\mathtt{M}_1^s \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^s}$ | $2^{-n}$ | randomness of $L_0$ |
| 18 | $\mathtt{M}_1^r \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^r}$ | $\mathtt{M}_1^s \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^s}$ | 0 or $2^{-n}$ | memoization / randomness of $L_{\mathtt{t}^s}$ |
| 19 | $Y[\mathtt{t}^r, \mathtt{M}_{1..i-1}^r] \oplus \mathtt{M}_i^r$ | $\mathtt{M}_1^s \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^s}$ | $2^{-n}$ | randomness of $L_{\mathtt{t}^s}$ |
| 20 | $Y[\mathtt{t}^r, \mathtt{M}_{1..\mathtt{m}^r-1}^r] \oplus \mathtt{M}_i^r \oplus 2L_0$ | $\mathtt{M}_1^s \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^s}$ | $2^{-n}$ | randomness of $Y[\mathtt{t}^r, \mathtt{M}_{1..\mathtt{m}^r-1}^r]$ |
| 21 | $Y[\mathtt{t}^r, \mathtt{M}_{1..\mathtt{m}^r-1}^s] \oplus \widetilde{\mathtt{M}_i^r} \oplus 4L_0$ | $\mathtt{M}_1^s \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^s}$ | $2^{-n}$ | randomness of $Y[\mathtt{t}^r, \mathtt{M}_{1..\mathtt{m}^r-1}^r]$ |
| 22 | $\mathsf{R}_\ell$ | $Y[\mathtt{t}^s, \mathtt{M}_{1..j-1}^s] \oplus \mathtt{M}_j^s$ | $2^{-n}$ | randomness of $Y[\mathtt{t}^s, \mathtt{M}_{1..j-1}^s]$ |
| 23 | $\mathtt{M}_1^r \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^r} \oplus 2L_0$ | $Y[\mathtt{t}^s, \mathtt{M}_{1..j-1}^s] \oplus \mathtt{M}_j^s$ | $2^{-n}$ | randomness of $Y[\mathtt{t}^s, \mathtt{M}_{1..j-1}^s]$ |
| 24 | $\widetilde{\mathtt{M}_1^r} \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^r} \oplus 4L_0$ | $Y[\mathtt{t}^s, \mathtt{M}_{1..j-1}^s] \oplus \mathtt{M}_j^s$ | $2^{-n}$ | randomness of $Y[\mathtt{t}^s, \mathtt{M}_{1..j-1}^s]$ |
| 25 | $\mathtt{M}_1^r \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^r}$ | $Y[\mathtt{t}^s, \mathtt{M}_{1..j-1}^s] \oplus \mathtt{M}_j^s$ | $2^{-n}$ | randomness of $Y[\mathtt{t}^s, \mathtt{M}_{1..j-1}^s]$ |
| 26 | $Y[\mathtt{t}^r, \mathtt{M}_{1..i-1}^r] \oplus \mathtt{M}_i^r$ | $Y[\mathtt{t}^s, \mathtt{M}_{1..j-1}^s] \oplus \mathtt{M}_j^s$ | 0 or $2^{-n}$ | memoization / randomness of $L_{\mathtt{t}^s}$ |
| 27 | $Y[\mathtt{t}^r, \mathtt{M}_{1..\mathtt{m}^r-1}^r] \oplus \mathtt{M}_i^r \oplus 2L_0$ | $Y[\mathtt{t}^s, \mathtt{M}_{1..j-1}^s] \oplus \mathtt{M}_j^s$ | $2^{-n}$ | randomness of $L_0$ |
| 28 | $Y[\mathtt{t}^r, \mathtt{M}_{1..\mathtt{m}^r-1}^s] \oplus \widetilde{\mathtt{M}_i^r} \oplus 4L_0$ | $Y[\mathtt{t}^s, \mathtt{M}_{1..j-1}^s] \oplus \mathtt{M}_j^s$ | $2^{-n}$ | randomness of $L_0$ |
| 29 | $\mathsf{R}_\ell$ | $Y[\mathtt{t}^s, \mathtt{M}_{1..\mathtt{m}^s-1}^s] \oplus \mathtt{M}_j^s \oplus 2L_0$ | $2^{-n}$ | randomness of $Y[\mathtt{t}^s, \mathtt{M}_{1..\mathtt{m}^s-1}^s]$ |
| 30 | $\mathtt{M}_1^r \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^r} \oplus 2L_0$ | $Y[\mathtt{t}^s, \mathtt{M}_{1..\mathtt{m}^s-1}^s] \oplus \mathtt{M}_j^s \oplus 2L_0$ | $2^{-n}$ | randomness of $Y[\mathtt{t}^s, \mathtt{M}_{1..\mathtt{m}^s-1}^s]$ |
| 31 | $\widetilde{\mathtt{M}_1^r} \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^r} \oplus 4L_0$ | $Y[\mathtt{t}^s, \mathtt{M}_{1..\mathtt{m}^s-1}^s] \oplus \mathtt{M}_j^s \oplus 2L_0$ | $2^{-n}$ | randomness of $Y[\mathtt{t}^s, \mathtt{M}_{1..\mathtt{m}^s-1}^s]$ |
| 32 | $\mathtt{M}_1^r \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^r}$ | $Y[\mathtt{t}^s, \mathtt{M}_{1..\mathtt{m}^s-1}^s] \oplus \mathtt{M}_j^s \oplus 2L_0$ | $2^{-n}$ | randomness of $Y[\mathtt{t}^s, \mathtt{M}_{1..\mathtt{m}^s-1}^s]$ |
| 33 | $Y[\mathtt{t}^r, \mathtt{M}_{1..i-1}^r] \oplus \mathtt{M}_i^r$ | $Y[\mathtt{t}^s, \mathtt{M}_{1..\mathtt{m}^s-1}^s] \oplus \mathtt{M}_j^s \oplus 2L_0$ | $2^{-n}$ | randomness of $L_0$ |
| 34 | $Y[\mathtt{t}^r, \mathtt{M}_{1..\mathtt{m}^r-1}^r] \oplus \mathtt{M}_i^r \oplus 2L_0$ | $Y[\mathtt{t}^s, \mathtt{M}_{1..\mathtt{m}^s-1}^s] \oplus \mathtt{M}_j^s \oplus 2L_0$ | 0 or $2^{-n}$ | no repeated queries / randomness of $Y[\mathtt{t}^s, \mathtt{M}_{1..\mathtt{m}^s-1}^s]$ |
| 35 | $Y[\mathtt{t}^r, \mathtt{M}_{1..\mathtt{m}^r-1}^s] \oplus \widetilde{\mathtt{M}_i^r} \oplus 4L_0$ | $Y[\mathtt{t}^s, \mathtt{M}_{1..\mathtt{m}^s-1}^s] \oplus \mathtt{M}_j^s \oplus 2L_0$ | $2^{-n}$ | randomness of $L_0$ |
| 36 | $\mathsf{R}_\ell$ | $Y[\mathtt{t}^s, \mathtt{M}_{1..\mathtt{m}^s-1}^s] \oplus \widetilde{\mathtt{M}_j^s} \oplus 4L_0$ | $2^{-n}$ | randomness of $Y[\mathtt{t}^s, \mathtt{M}_{1..\mathtt{m}^s-1}^s]$ |
| 37 | $\mathtt{M}_1^r \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^r} \oplus 2L_0$ | $Y[\mathtt{t}^s, \mathtt{M}_{1..\mathtt{m}^s-1}^s] \oplus \widetilde{\mathtt{M}_j^s} \oplus 4L_0$ | $2^{-n}$ | randomness of $Y[\mathtt{t}^s, \mathtt{M}_{1..\mathtt{m}^s-1}^s]$ |
| 38 | $\widetilde{\mathtt{M}_1^r} \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^r} \oplus 4L_0$ | $Y[\mathtt{t}^s, \mathtt{M}_{1..\mathtt{m}^s-1}^s] \oplus \widetilde{\mathtt{M}_j^s} \oplus 4L_0$ | $2^{-n}$ | randomness of $Y[\mathtt{t}^s, \mathtt{M}_{1..\mathtt{m}^s-1}^s]$ |
| 39 | $\mathtt{M}_1^r \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^r}$ | $Y[\mathtt{t}^s, \mathtt{M}_{1..\mathtt{m}^s-1}^s] \oplus \widetilde{\mathtt{M}_j^s} \oplus 4L_0$ | $2^{-n}$ | randomness of $Y[\mathtt{t}^s, \mathtt{M}_{1..\mathtt{m}^s-1}^s]$ |
| 40 | $Y[\mathtt{t}^r, \mathtt{M}_{1..i-1}^r] \oplus \mathtt{M}_i^r$ | $Y[\mathtt{t}^s, \mathtt{M}_{1..\mathtt{m}^s-1}^s] \oplus \widetilde{\mathtt{M}_j^s} \oplus 4L_0$ | $2^{-n}$ | randomness of $L_0$ |
| 41 | $Y[\mathtt{t}^r, \mathtt{M}_{1..\mathtt{m}^r-1}^r] \oplus \mathtt{M}_i^r \oplus 2L_0$ | $Y[\mathtt{t}^s, \mathtt{M}_{1..\mathtt{m}^s-1}^s] \oplus \widetilde{\mathtt{M}_j^s} \oplus 4L_0$ | $2^{-n}$ | randomness of $L_0$ |
| 42 | $Y[\mathtt{t}^r, \mathtt{M}_{1..\mathtt{m}^r-1}^s] \oplus \widetilde{\mathtt{M}_i^r} \oplus 4L_0$ | $Y[\mathtt{t}^s, \mathtt{M}_{1..\mathtt{m}^s-1}^s] \oplus \widetilde{\mathtt{M}_j^s} \oplus 4L_0$ | 0 or $2^{-n}$ | no repeated queries / randomness of $Y[\mathtt{t}^s, \mathtt{M}_{1..\mathtt{m}^s-1}^s]$ |

Figure 14: Case analysis for the proof of $\mathbb{OMAC}$

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| line 01 | $X^0_\ell$ | $\mathsf{R}_\ell$ |
| line 12 | $X^r_1$ | $\mathtt{M}^r_1 \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^r} \oplus 2L_0$ |
| line 22 | $X^r_1$ | $\widetilde{\mathtt{M}^r_1} \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^r} \oplus 4L_0$ |
| line 33 | $X^r_1$ | $\mathtt{M}^r_1 \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^r}$ |
| line 44 | $X^r_i$ | $Y[\mathtt{t}^r, \mathtt{M}^r_{1..i-1}] \oplus \mathtt{M}^r_i$ |
| line 53 | $X^r_{m^r}$ | $Y[\mathtt{t}^r, \mathtt{M}^r_{1..\mathtt{m}^r-1}] \oplus \mathtt{M}^r_i \oplus 2L_0$ |
| line 63 | $X^r_{m^r}$ | $Y[\mathtt{t}^r, \mathtt{M}^r_{1..\mathtt{m}^r-1}] \oplus \widetilde{\mathtt{M}^r_i} \oplus 4L_0$ |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| line 11 | $X^s_1$ | $\mathtt{M}^s_1 \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^s} \oplus 2L_0$ |
| line 21 | $X^s_1$ | $\widetilde{\mathtt{M}^s_1} \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^s} \oplus 4L_0$ |
| line 31 | $X^s_1$ | $\mathtt{M}^s_1 \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^s}$ |
| line 41 | $X^s_j$ | $Y[\mathtt{t}^s, \mathtt{M}^s_{1..j-1}] \oplus \mathtt{M}^s_j$ |
| line 51 | $X^s_{m^s}$ | $Y[\mathtt{t}^s, \mathtt{M}^s_{1..\mathtt{m}^s-1}] \oplus \mathtt{M}^s_j \oplus 2L_0$ |
| line 61 | $X^s_{m^s}$ | $Y[\mathtt{t}^s, \mathtt{M}^s_{1..\mathtt{m}^s-1}] \oplus \widetilde{\mathtt{M}^s_j} \oplus 4L_0$ |

Each current point $X^s_j$ that gets considered during game **S** has a "type" which is one of the six possibilities above. Each earlier point $X^r_i$ likewise has a "type" which is one of the seven possibilities above. The type of a point does not depend on random choices made during the execution of the game **S**; the type of a point is determined once the constants associated to the game are fixed. If we look at a pair of earlier/current points $(X^r_i, X^s_j)$ each point will have some one particular type—there are 42 pairs of types in all.

We now claim that for any current point $X^s_j$ and any earlier point $X^r_i$, the probability that the values assigned to these two points are the same is at most $2^{-n}$. This is verified by a case analysis, going over all 42 possibilities for the type of $X^r_i$ and $X^s_i$. The case analysis is outlined in Figure 14. We add justification to three representative examples:

- *Case 2.* We are trying to bound $\Pr[\mathtt{M}^r_1 \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^r} \oplus 2L_0 = \mathtt{M}^s_1 \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^s} \oplus 2L_0] = \Pr[\mathtt{M}^r_1 \oplus \mathtt{M}^s_1 = L_{\mathtt{t}^r} \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^s}]$ where $r < s$. Here $|M^r| < n$ and $|M^s| < n$. Subcase 2A: if $\mathtt{t}^r = \mathtt{t}^s$ then $M^r \neq M^s$ because of the constraint that adversary $A$ was allowed to make no $(t, M, s)$ query following an earlier $(t, M, r)$ query, and so the indicated probability is 0. Subcase 2B: if $\mathtt{t}^r \neq \mathtt{t}^s$ then $L_{\mathtt{t}^r}$ and $L_{\mathtt{t}^s}$ are random and independent, and so $\Pr[\mathtt{M}^r_1 \oplus \mathtt{M}^s_1 = L_{\mathtt{t}^r} \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^s}] = 2^{-n}$.
- *Case 9.* We are bounding $\Pr[\mathtt{M}^r_1 \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^r} \oplus 2L_0 = \widetilde{\mathtt{M}^s_1} \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^s} \oplus 4L_0] = \Pr[\mathtt{M}^r_1 \oplus \widetilde{\mathtt{M}^s_1} = L_{\mathtt{t}^r} \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^s} \oplus 6L_0]$. If $\mathtt{t}^r = \mathtt{t}^s$ then this is $\Pr[\mathtt{M}^r_1 \oplus \widetilde{\mathtt{M}^s_1} = 6L_0] = 2^{-n}$ because $L_0$ is random and independent of the left-hand side. If $\mathtt{t}^r = 0$ and $\mathtt{t}^s \neq 0$ then this is $\Pr[\mathtt{M}^r_1 \oplus \widetilde{\mathtt{M}^s_1} \oplus L_{\mathtt{t}^s} = 7L_0] = 2^{-n}$ because $L_0$ is random and independent of the left-hand side. The case for $\mathtt{t}^r \neq 0$ and $\mathtt{t}^s = 0$ is the same way, as is the case for $\mathtt{t}^r \neq 0$ and $\mathtt{t}^s \neq 0$ and $\mathtt{t}^r \neq \mathtt{t}^s$.
- *Case 34.* This case arises for messages $\mathtt{M}^r$ and $\mathtt{M}^s$ having two or more blocks and both messages having a full final block. We want to bound $\Pr[Y[\mathtt{t}^r, \mathtt{M}^r_{1..\mathtt{m}^r-1}] \oplus \mathtt{M}^r_i \oplus 2L_0 = Y[\mathtt{t}^s, \mathtt{M}^s_{1..\mathtt{m}^s-1}] \oplus \mathtt{M}^s_j \oplus 2L_0]$ which is $\Pr[\mathtt{M}^r_i \oplus \mathtt{M}^s_j = Y[\mathtt{t}^r, \mathtt{M}^r_{1..\mathtt{m}^r-1}] \oplus Y[\mathtt{t}^s, \mathtt{M}^s_{1..\mathtt{m}^s-1}]]$. Observe that $Y[\mathtt{t}^r, \mathtt{M}^r_{1..\mathtt{m}^r-1}]$ and $Y[\mathtt{t}^s, \mathtt{M}^s_{1..\mathtt{m}^s-1}]$ are random from $\{0,1\}^n$, being chosen from this set in an earlier execution of line 41 or line 31. If they are the identical random variable, that is, $\mathtt{t}^r = \mathtt{t}^s$ and $\mathtt{M}^r$ less its final block is identical to $\mathtt{M}^s$ less its final block, then $\Pr[\mathtt{M}^r_i \oplus \mathtt{M}^s_j = 0] = 0$ because there are no repeated queries. If they are different random variables then they are independent and $\Pr[\mathtt{M}^r_i \oplus \mathtt{M}^s_j = Y[\mathtt{t}^r, \mathtt{M}^r_{1..\mathtt{m}^r-1}] \oplus Y[\mathtt{t}^s, \mathtt{M}^s_{1..\mathtt{m}^s-1}]] = 2^{-n}$.

The justifications for the remaining 39 cases are analogous. We leave the reader to check the table, which is the technical heart of the proof.

We are now ready to conclude the proof. As the $\sigma_1$ current points $X^s_j$ are considered the probability that the $k$th current point $X^s_j$ collides with a given earlier one of the $k-1+\sigma_2+3$ earlier points $X^r_i$ is at most $1/2^n$. Thus the probability that the $k$th current point coincides with some earlier point is at most $(k+\sigma_2+2)/2^n$. So the probability that some current point coincides with some earlier one is at most $\sum_{k=1}^{\sigma_1}(k+\sigma_2+2)/2^n = \sigma_1(\sigma_2+3)/2^n + \sum_{k=1}^{\sigma_1}(k-1)/2^n \leq (\sigma_1\sigma_2 + 3\sigma_1 + 0.5\sigma_1^2)/2^n$.

Combining with Equation (12) and the prior arguments we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{dist}}_{\mathbb{OMAC}[\mathcal{R}^n_n],\$_n}(\sigma_1,\sigma_2) &\le \frac{\sigma_1\sigma_2+3\sigma_1+0.5\sigma_1^2}{2^n}+\frac{\sigma_2(\sigma_1+\sigma_2+3)}{2^n}\\ &= \frac{0.5\sigma_1^2+2\sigma_1\sigma_2+\sigma_2^2+3\sigma_1+3\sigma_2}{2^n}\\ &\le \frac{(\sigma_1+\sigma_2+3)^2}{2^n}\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. ∎

# C Proofs of security of EAX

**Proof of Theorem 5:** We begin with the privacy claim. Let $A$ be an adversary using resources $(q,\sigma)$ that is trying to distinguish $\mathrm{EAX}[\mathcal{R}^n_n,\tau]$ from a source of random bits. We construct an adversary $B$ that distinguishes $\mathbb{OMAC}[\mathcal{R}^n_n]$ from a source of random bits. Adversary $B$ has an oracle $g$ that responds to queries $(t,M,s)\in\{0,1,2\}\times\{0,1\}^*\times\mathbb{N}$ with a string $R\,S_0S_1\cdots S_{s-1}$, each named component an $n$-bit string. Adversary $B$ works as follows:

**Algorithm** $B^g$
Run $A$
  When $A$ makes an oracle call $(N_i,\ H_i,\ M_i)$, do the following:
    $s\leftarrow\lceil|M_i|/n\rceil$
    $\mathcal{N}_i\,S_0\ldots S_{s-1}\leftarrow g(0,\ N_i,\ s)$
    $C_i\leftarrow M_i\ \oplus\ (S_0\cdots S_{s-1}$ [first $|M_i|$ bits])
    $\mathcal{H}_i\leftarrow g(1,\ H_i,\ 0)$
    $\mathcal{C}_i\leftarrow g(2,\ C_i,\ 0)$
    $T_i\leftarrow\mathcal{N}_i\oplus\mathcal{C}_i\oplus\mathcal{H}_i$ [first $\tau$ bits]
    Return, in response to $A$'s query, $C_i\,\|\,T_i$
  When $A$ halts, outputting a bit $b$, **return** $b$

We may assume that adversary $A$ makes $q>1$ queries since, otherwise, the result follows immediately. Then, under our conventions for the data complexity, adversary $B$ uses resources at most $(2\sigma-3,\sigma)$. Observe that $\Pr[A^{\mathrm{EAX}[\mathcal{R}^n_n,\tau]}=1]=\Pr[B^{\mathbb{OMAC}[\mathcal{R}^n_n]}=1]$. Also, since $A$ is nonce respecting, $B$ is length-respecting and $\Pr[A^{\$}=1]=\Pr[B^{\$_n}=1]$. Using Lemma 4 we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{Adv}^{\mathbf{priv}}_{\mathrm{EAX}[\mathcal{R}^n_n,\tau]}(A) &= \Pr[A^{\mathrm{EAX}[\mathcal{R}^n_n,\tau]}=1]-\Pr[A^{\$}=1]\\ &= \Pr[B^{\mathbb{OMAC}[\mathcal{R}^n_n]}=1]-\Pr[B^{\$_n}=1]\\ &\le \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{dist}}_{\mathbb{OMAC}[\mathcal{R}^n_n,\$_n]}(2\sigma-3,\ \sigma)\\ &\le \frac{(3\sigma)^2}{2^n}\\ &\le \frac{9\sigma^2}{2^n}\end{aligned}$$

This completes the privacy claim.

Moving on to authenticity and reusing the name, let $A$ be an adversary for attacking the authenticity of $\mathrm{EAX}[\mathcal{R}_n^n, \tau]$ that uses resources at most $\sigma$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_1 &= \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathbf{auth}}_{\mathrm{EAX}[\mathcal{R}_n^n,\tau]}(A) \\ \alpha_2 &= \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathbf{auth}}_{\mathrm{EAX2}[\mathrm{CTR}[\mathcal{R}_n^n],\mathcal{R}_n^*,\tau]}(A) \\ \delta &= \alpha_1 - \alpha_2 \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2 and known results about the privacy of CTR (cf. [1]) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_2 &\leq \frac{1}{2^\tau} + \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{priv}}_{\mathrm{CTR}[\mathcal{R}_n^n]}(\sigma) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2^\tau} + \frac{\sigma^2}{2^n}\ . \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\alpha_1 \ = \ \alpha_2 + \delta \ \leq \ \delta + \frac{\sigma^2}{2^n} + \frac{1}{2^\tau}\ .$$

We now turn to bounding $\delta$. To do this, reusing the name, we construct from $A$ (the authenticity-attacking adversary) an adversary $B$ (with an oracle for $g$ and intended for distinguishing $\mathbb{OMAC}[\mathcal{R}_n^n]$ from a source of random bits):

**Algorithm** $B^g$

Run $A$

When $A$ makes an oracle call $(N_i,\ H_i,\ M_i)$, do the following:

$s \leftarrow \lceil |M_i|/n \rceil$

$\mathcal{N}_i\, S_0 \ldots S_{s-1} \leftarrow g(0,\ N_i, s)$

$C_i \leftarrow M_i \ \oplus\ (S_0 \cdots S_{m-1}$ [first $|M_i|$ bits])

$\mathcal{H}_i \leftarrow g(1,\ H_i,\ 0)$

$\mathcal{C}_i \leftarrow g(2,\ C_i,\ 0)$

$T_i \leftarrow \mathcal{N}_i \oplus \mathcal{C}_i \oplus \mathcal{H}_i$

In response to $A$'s query, return $C_i \,\|\, T_i$

When $A$ outputs a forgery attempt $(N,\ H,\ C \,\|\, T)$ and halts:

$c \leftarrow \lceil |C|/n \rceil$

$\mathcal{N} \leftarrow g(0,\ N,\ 0)$

$\mathcal{H} \leftarrow g(1,\ H,\ 0)$

$\mathcal{C} \leftarrow g(2,\ C,\ 0)$

$T' \leftarrow \mathcal{N} \oplus \mathcal{C} \oplus \mathcal{H}$ [first $\tau$ bits]

**if** $T = T'$ **and** $(N, H, C \,\|\, T) \neq (N_i, H_i, C_i \,\|\, T_i)$ for all $i$

**then return** 1 **else return** 0

As before, one may assume that $A$ makes $q > 1$ queries and, according to our conventions, the complexity of $B$ will then be at most $(2\sigma - 3, \sigma)$. Also, $\alpha_1 = \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathbf{auth}}_{\mathrm{EAX}[\mathcal{R}_n^n,\tau]}(A) = \Pr[B^{\mathbb{OMAC}[\mathcal{R}_n^n]} = 1]$. Next, define the function $E[\rho, f] : \{0,1,2\} \times \{0,1\}^* \times \mathbb{N} \to \{0,1\}^*$ by

**Algorithm** $E[\rho, f]\ (t, M, s)$

$R \leftarrow f([t]_n || M)$

**for** $j \leftarrow 0$ **to** $s - 1$ **do** $S_j \leftarrow \rho(R + j)$

**return** $R\, S_0 S_1 \cdots S_{s-1}$

Note that

$$\alpha_2 = \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathbf{auth}}_{\mathrm{EAX2}[\mathrm{CTR}[\mathcal{R}_n^n],\mathcal{R}_n^*,\tau]}(A) = \Pr[B^{E[\mathcal{R}_n^n,\mathcal{R}_n^*]} = 1].$$

Moreover,

$$\mathbf{Adv}^{\mathrm{dist}}_{\$_n,E[\mathcal{R}_n^n,\mathcal{R}_n^*]} \leq \frac{\sigma_2^2}{2^{n+1}}$$

for all adversaries that request a total of $\sigma_2$ keystreams, since $E[\mathcal{R}_n^n, \mathcal{R}_n^*]$ can only be distinguished from $\$_n$ if there is a collision in the inputs to $\rho$, and there are $\sigma_2$ inputs to $\rho$. As a trivial consequence,

$$\Pr[B^{E[\mathcal{R}_n^n,\mathcal{R}_n^*]} = 1] \geq \Pr[B^{\$_n} = 1] - \frac{\sigma^2}{2^{n+1}}$$

and thus

$$\alpha_2 = \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathbf{auth}}_{\mathrm{EAX2}[\mathrm{CTR}[\mathcal{R}_n^n],\mathcal{R}_n^*,\tau]}(A) \geq \Pr[B^{\$_n} = 1] - \frac{\sigma^2}{2^{n+1}}.$$

Also, $B$ is length-respecting, since $A$ is nonce-respecting (we use here the fact that the last three queries $B$ makes all take the form $g(\cdot,\cdot,0)$, so those last three queries cannot violate the length-respecting condition). So, using Lemma 4, we conclude that

$$\delta \;=\; \alpha_1 - \alpha_2 \;\leq\; \frac{(3\sigma)^2}{2^n} + \frac{\sigma^2}{2^{n+1}} \;\leq\; \frac{9.5\sigma^2}{2^n}$$

This completes the authenticity claim and the proof. ▌

# D Recommended API

Some important features of EAX can only be utilized if one accesses EAX functionality through an appropriate user interface. In this section we therefore put forward an API that permits (a) incremental encryption, (b) incremental decryption, (c) authenticity verification without ciphertext recovery, and (d) static headers with negligible per-message cost. Providing of these features results in an API that is a bit more elaborate than some programmers may want or need, so we also include some simpler, "all-in-one" calls.

```
/*
 * We provide two interfaces:
 * 1. A simple interface that does not support streaming data.
 * 2. An incremental interface that supports streaming data.
 * See below for documentation on both.
 */

/*****************************************************************
 * -- How to encrypt, the simplified interface --
 * First, call
 *     eax_init()
 * to setup the key and set the parameters.
 * Then, for each packet, call
 *    eax_encrypt()
 * When all done, call
 *   eax_zeroize()
 *****************************************************************
 * -- How to decrypt, the simplified interface --
```

```
 * First, call
 *   eax_init()
 * to setup the key and set the parameters.
 * Then, for each packet:
 *   eax_decrypt()
 * When all done, call
 *   eax_zeroize()
 * It is the caller's responsibility to check tag validity
 * by examining the return value of eax_decrypt().
 ************************************************************************/


/************************************************************************
 * -- How to encrypt, incrementally --
 * First, call
 *     eax_init()
 * to setup the key and set the parameters.
 * Then, for each packet, call
 *    eax_provide_nonce()
 *    {eax_provide_header(), eax_compute_ciphertext()}*
 *    eax_compute_tag()
 * Here {x,y} means x or y, and z* means any number of iterations of z.
 * When all done, call
 *   eax_zeroize()
 *
 * Note that encryption can be done on the fly, and header and message data
 * may be provided in any order and in arbitrary chunks.
 ************************************************************************
 * -- How to decrypt, incrementally --
 * First, call
 *   eax_init()
 * to setup the key and set the parameters.
 * Then, for each packet:
 *   eax_provide_nonce()
 *   {eax_provide_header(), eax_provide_ciphertext()}*
 *   eax_check_tag()
 *   eax_compute_plaintext()    // only do this if tag was valid
 * When all done, call
 *   eax_zeroize()
 * Note that decryption may be done on the fly, and header and message data
 * may be provided in any order and in arbitrary chunks.
 * It is the caller's responsibility to check tag validity
 * by examining the return value of eax_check_tag().
 ************************************************************************/

typedef enum {AES128,AES192,AES256} block_cipher; /* "standard" ciphers */
typedef unsigned char byte;
typedef void eax_state;                      /* EAX context; opaque */


/************************************************************************
 *   Calls common to incremental and non-incremental API
 ************************************************************************/
```

```
/*
 * eax_init
 *
 * Key and parameter setup to init a EAX context data structure.
 * If you don't know what to pass for t,E, use t=16, E=AES128.
 */
eax_state *
eax_init(
  byte* Key,       // The key, as a string.
  unsigned int t,  // The tag length, in bytes.
  block_cipher E   // Enumerated that indicates what cipher to use.
);

/*
 * eax_provide_header
 *
 * Supply a message header.  The header "grows" with each call
 * until a eax_provide_header() call is made that follows a
 * eax_encrypt(), eax_decrypt(), eax_provide_plaintext(),
 * eax_provide_ciphertext() or eax_compute_plaintext() call.
 * That starts reinitializes the header.
 */
int
eax_provide_header(
  eax_state *K,     // The EAX context.
  byte *H,          // The header (associated data) (possibly more to come)
  unsigned int h    // having h bytes
);

/*
 * eax_zeroize
 *
 * Session is over; destroy all key material and cleanup!
 */
void
eax_zeroize(
    eax_state *K       // The EAX context to remove
);


/*****************************************************************
 *  All-in-one, non-incremental interface
 *****************************************************************/

/*
 * eax_encrypt
 *
 * Encrypt the given message with the given key, nonce and header.
 * Specify the header (if nonempty) with eax_provide_header().
 */
int
eax_encrypt(
  eax_state *K,       // The caller provides the EAX context,
  byte* N,            // the nonce and
```

```
  unsigned int n,     // its length (in bytes), and
  byte* M,            // the plaintext and
  unsigned int m,     // its length (in bytes).
  byte* C,            // The m-byte ciphertext
  byte* T             // and the tag T are returned.
);


/*
 * eax_decrypt()
 *
 * Decrypt the given ciphertext with the given key, nonce and header.
 * Specify the header (if nonempty) with eax_provide_header().
 * Returns 1 for a valid ciphertext, 0 for an invalid ciphertext.
 */
int
eax_decrypt(
  eax_state *K,       // The caller provides the EAX context,
  byte* N,            // the nonce and
  unsigned int n,     // its length (in bytes), and
  byte* C,            // the ciphertext and
  unsigned int c,     // its length (in bytes), and the
  byte* T,            // tag.
  byte* P             // If valid, return the c-byte plaintext.
);


/*********************************************************************
 *      Incremental interface
 *********************************************************************/

/*
 * eax_provide_nonce
 *
 * Provide a nonce.  For encryption, do this before calling
 * eax_compute_ciphertext() and eax_compute_tag();
 * for decryption, do this before calling
 * eax_provide_ciphertext(), eax_check_tag, or eax_compute_plaintext().
 */
int
eax_provide_nonce(
  eax_state *K,    // The EAX context,
  byte* N,         // the nonce, and
  unsigned int n   // the length of the nonce (in bytes).
);


/*
 * eax_compute_ciphertext
 *
 * Encrypt a message or a part of a message.
 * The nonce needs already to have been
 * specified by a call to eax_provide_nonce().
 */
```

```
int
eax_compute_ciphertext(  // Encrypt (part of) a message
  eax_state *K,    // Given a EAX context K
  byte *M,         // and a message M  (possibly more to come)
  unsigned int m,  // having m bytes.
  byte *C          // Return a ciphertext body C also having m bytes.
);


/*
 * eax_compute_tag
 *
 * Message and header finished: compute the authentication tag that is a part
 * of the complete ciphertext.
 */
int
eax_compute_tag(
  eax_state *K,       // Given a EAX context
  byte *T             // compute the tag T for it.
);


/*
 * eax_provide_ciphertext
 *
 * Supply the ciphertext, or the next piece of ciphertext.
 * This is used to check for the subsequent authenticity check eax_check_tag().
 */
int
eax_provide_ciphertext(
  eax_state *K,       // Given a EAX context
  byte *C,            // and a ciphertext C (possibly more to come)
  unsigned int c      // having c bytes.
);


/*
 * eax_check_tag
 *
 * The nonce, ciphertext and header have all been fully provided; check if
 * they are valid for the given tag.
 * Returns 1 for a valid ciphertext, 0 for an invalid ciphertext
 * (in which case plaintext/ciphertext might be zeroized as well).
 */
int
eax_check_tag(
  eax_state *K,       // Given a EAX context and
  byte *T             // the tag that accompanied the ciphertext.
);


/*
 * eax_compute_plaintext
 *
```

```
 * Recover the plaintext from the provided ciphertext.
 * A call to eax_provide_nonce() needs to precede this call.
 * The caller is responsible for separately checking if the ciphertext is valid.
 * Normally this would be done before computing the plaintext with
 * eax_compute_plaintext().
 */
int
eax_compute_plaintext(
    eax_state *K,   // Given a EAX context
    byte *C,        // and a ciphertext C (possibly more to come)
    unsigned int c, // having c bytes,
    byte *M         // return the corresponding c bytes of plaintext.
);
```

# E Test Vectors

The following EAX-AES128 test vectors have been graciously provided by Jack Lloyd. We have not yet verified these values. If you do, please send us email. If you provide code, we will hapilly make it available on the web.

```
MSG:
KEY:      233952DEE4D5ED5F9B9C6D6FF80FF478
NONCE:    62EC67F9C3A4A407FCB2A8C49031A8B3
HEADER:   6BFB914FD07EAE6B
CIPHER:   E037830E8389F27B025A2D6527E79D01

MSG:      F7FB
KEY:      91945D3F4DCBEE0BF45EF52255F095A4
NONCE:    BECAF043B0A23D843194BA972C66DEBD
HEADER:   FA3BFD4806EB53FA
CIPHER:   19DD5C4C9331049D0BDAB0277408F67967E5

MSG:      1A47CB4933
KEY:      01F74AD64077F2E704C0F60ADA3DD523
NONCE:    70C3DB4F0D26368400A10ED05D2BFF5E
HEADER:   234A3463C1264AC6
CIPHER:   D851D5BAE03A59F238A23E39199DC9266626C40F80

MSG:      481C9E39B1
KEY:      D07CF6CBB7F313BDDE66B727AFD3C5E8
NONCE:    8408DFFF3C1A2B1292DC199E46B7D617
HEADER:   33CCE2EABFF5A79D
CIPHER:   632A9D131AD4C168A4225D8E1FF755939974A7BEDE

MSG:      40D0C07DA5E4
KEY:      35B6D0580005BBC12B0587124557D2C2
NONCE:    FDB6B06676EEDC5C61D74276E1F8E816
HEADER:   AEB96EAEBE2970E9
CIPHER:   071DFE16C675CB0677E536F73AFE6A14B74EE49844DD

MSG:      4DE3B35C3FC039245BD1FB7D
KEY:      BD8E6E11475E60B268784C38C62FEB22
NONCE:    6EAC5C93072D8E8513F750935E46DA1B
HEADER:   D4482D1CA78DCE0F
CIPHER:   835BB4F15D743E350E728414ABB8644FD6CCB86947C5E10590210A4F
```

```
MSG:      8B0A79306C9CE7ED99DAE4F87F8DD61636
KEY:      7C77D6E813BED5AC98BAA417477A2E7D
NONCE:    1A8C98DCD73D38393B2BF1569DEEFC19
HEADER:   65D2017990D62528
CIPHER:   02083E3979DA014812F59F11D52630DA30137327D10649B0AA6E1C181DB617D7F2

MSG:      1BDA122BCE8A8DBAF1877D962B8592DD2D56
KEY:      5FFF20CAFAB119CA2FC73549E20F5B0D
NONCE:    DDE59B97D722156D4D9AFF2BC7559826
HEADER:   54B9F04E6A09189A
CIPHER:   2EC47B2C4954A489AFC7BA4897EDCDAE8CC33B60450599BD02C96382902AEF7F832A

MSG:      6CF36720872B8513F6EAB1A8A44438D5EF11
KEY:      A4A4782BCFFD3EC5E7EF6D8C34A56123
NONCE:    B781FCF2F75FA5A8DE97A9CA48E522EC
HEADER:   899A175897561D7E
CIPHER:   0DE18FD0FDD91E7AF19F1D8EE8733938B1E8E7F6D2231618102FDB7FE55FF1991700

MSG:      CA40D7446E545FFAED3BD12A740A659FFBBB3CEAB7
KEY:      8395FCF1E95BEBD697BD010BC766AAC3
NONCE:    22E7ADD93CFC6393C57EC0B3C17D6B44
HEADER:   126735FCC320D25A
CIPHER:   CB8920F87A6C75CFF39627B56E3ED197C552D295A7CFC46AFC253B4652B1AF3795B124AB6E
```