### NTNU | Norwegian University of Science and Technology

# **PADDING ORACLES: CBC AND SHA**

TTM4205 – Lecture 11

Tjerand Silde

15.10.2024

### Contents

### **Padding Oracles**

The CBC mode

**More CBC Problems** 

**Length Extension Attack** 

**Order of Enc and Auth** 



### Contents

### **Padding Oracles**

The CBC mode

**More CBC Problems** 

Length Extension Attack

**Order of Enc and Auth** 



# **Reference Material**

These slides are based on:

- The referred papers in the slides
- ▶ JPA: parts of chapter 4, 6 and 7
- DW: parts of chapter 2 to 4

### **Padding Oracles**

By this we mean, on a high level, an API that allows an adversary to learn if some input is correctly formed.

We limit ourselves to inputs with a particular padding.



# **Padding Oracles**

We will look at symmetric and asymmetric padding schemes:

- in depth on the CBC block cipher mode (today)
- extension attack against hashing (today)
- padding attacks against the RSA scheme (next)

Several of which are relevant to the weekly problems.

We will also look at some mitigations to these issues.



### Contents

**Padding Oracles** 

### The CBC mode

**More CBC Problems** 

**Length Extension Attack** 

**Order of Enc and Auth** 





The CBC mode without authentication works as following:

Cipher mode for symmetric ciphers (e.g. DES, AES)



- Cipher mode for symmetric ciphers (e.g. DES, AES)
- Proposed in 1976, proven CPA-secure in 1997, broken 2002



- Cipher mode for symmetric ciphers (e.g. DES, AES)
- Proposed in 1976, proven CPA-secure in 1997, broken 2002
- Secure against Chosen Plaintext Attacks (CPA, theory)



- Cipher mode for symmetric ciphers (e.g. DES, AES)
- Proposed in 1976, proven CPA-secure in 1997, broken 2002
- Secure against Chosen Plaintext Attacks (CPA, theory)



- Cipher mode for symmetric ciphers (e.g. DES, AES)
- Proposed in 1976, proven CPA-secure in 1997, broken 2002
- Secure against Chosen Plaintext Attacks (CPA, theory)
- Not secure against Chosen Ciphertext Attacks (CCA, practice)
- > A variety of padding oracle attacks and patches in practice



- Cipher mode for symmetric ciphers (e.g. DES, AES)
- Proposed in 1976, proven CPA-secure in 1997, broken 2002
- Secure against Chosen Plaintext Attacks (CPA, theory)
- Not secure against Chosen Ciphertext Attacks (CCA, practice)
- > A variety of padding oracle attacks and patches in practice
- Revoked from some applications (e.g. TLS) in 2018



Cipher Block Chaining (CBC) mode encryption



- Each block must be of exactly 128 bits
- Shorter message leads to padding at the end
- Add one byte ends with 01, two with 02, etc. ...
- An API outputs errors when wrong padding

### Question: What might an attacker do in this setting?





### Let *C*<sub>2</sub> be an encryption of *X* that you want to decrypt



- Let *C*<sub>2</sub> be an encryption of *X* that you want to decrypt
- Choose random  $C_1$  and ask for  $C_1|C_2$  to be decrypted



- Let *C*<sub>2</sub> be an encryption of *X* that you want to decrypt
- Choose random  $C_1$  and ask for  $C_1|C_2$  to be decrypted
- Successful decryption if  $C_1 \oplus X$  has valid padding



- Let *C*<sub>2</sub> be an encryption of *X* that you want to decrypt
- Choose random  $C_1$  and ask for  $C_1|C_2$  to be decrypted
- Successful decryption if  $C_1 \oplus X$  has valid padding
- ▶ Vary last byte of *C*<sup>1</sup> until correct to find last byte of *X*



- ▶ Let *C*<sup>2</sup> be an encryption of *X* that you want to decrypt
- Choose random  $C_1$  and ask for  $C_1|C_2$  to be decrypted
- Successful decryption if  $C_1 \oplus X$  has valid padding
- ▶ Vary last byte of *C*<sup>1</sup> until correct to find last byte of *X*
- Find next byte by  $C_1[15] = X[15] \oplus 02$  and vary  $C_1[14]$

- ▶ Let *C*<sup>2</sup> be an encryption of *X* that you want to decrypt
- Choose random  $C_1$  and ask for  $C_1|C_2$  to be decrypted
- Successful decryption if  $C_1 \oplus X$  has valid padding
- ▶ Vary last byte of *C*<sup>1</sup> until correct to find last byte of *X*
- Find next byte by  $C_1[15] = X[15] \oplus 02$  and vary  $C_1[14]$
- ► Continue until you have all bytes of *X*, max 128 · 16 trials



- ▶ Let *C*<sup>2</sup> be an encryption of *X* that you want to decrypt
- Choose random  $C_1$  and ask for  $C_1|C_2$  to be decrypted
- Successful decryption if  $C_1 \oplus X$  has valid padding
- ▶ Vary last byte of *C*<sup>1</sup> until correct to find last byte of *X*
- Find next byte by  $C_1[15] = X[15] \oplus 02$  and vary  $C_1[14]$
- ► Continue until you have all bytes of *X*, max 128 · 16 trials
- Continue until you have the whole message, block by block

#### Security Flaws Induced by CBC Padding Applications to SSL, IPSEC, WTLS...

Serge Vaudenay

Swiss Federal Institute of Technology (EPFL) Serge.Vaudenay@epfl.ch

Abstract. In many standards, e.g. SSL/TLS, IPSEC, WTLS, messages are first pre-formatted, then encrypted in CBC mode with a block cipher. Decryption needs to check if the format is valid. Validity of the format is easily leaked from communication protocols in a chosen ciphertext attack since the receiver usually sends an acknowledgment or an error message. This is a side channel.

In this paper we show various ways to perform an efficient side channel attack. We discuss potential applications, extensions to other padding schemes and various ways to fix the problem.

Figure: https://www.iacr.org/cryptodb/archive/2002/EUROCRYPT/2850/2850.pdf

NTNU | Norwegian University of Science and Technology

### Cryptopals: Exploiting CBC Padding Oracles

This is a write-up of the classic padding oracle attack on CBC-mode block ciphers. If you've done the <u>Cryptopals</u> cryptography challenges, you'll remember it as <u>challenge 17</u>. This is a famous and elegant attack. With it, we will see how even a small data leak (in this case, the presence of a "padding oracle" – defined below) can lead to full plaintext recovery.

Like the Cryptopals challenges, this post is written to be accessible to anyone with an interest in cryptography – no graduate degree required. All you need is patience, focus, and some basic familiarity with the concepts in the following section.

**Figure:** https://research.nccgroup.com/2021/02/17/cryptopals-exploiting-cbc-p adding-oracles





Matthew Green in attacks 🛛 🛇 October 23, 2011 🛛 😇 2,314 Words

# Attack of the week: XML Encryption

Figure: https:

//blog.cryptographyengineering.com/2011/10/23/attack-of-week-xml-encryption



### Contents

**Padding Oracles** 

The CBC mode

### **More CBC Problems**

Length Extension Attack

**Order of Enc and Auth** 



### **Authenticated CBC Mode**

If we check that the CBC encryption was correctly computed, then we do not need to worry about the padding oracle.

### Question: What are possible mitigations for CBC?



# **Possible Mitigations**

- ► Compute a MAC on ptx (X) or ctx (✓)
- Randomized padding scheme
- Fixed size padding scheme
- Additional randomized delay
- No specific error message

Question: What might go wrong in these cases?





Figure 2. Distribution of timing values (outliers removed) for distinguishing attack on OpenSSL TLS, showing faster processing time in the case of  $M_0$  (in red) compared to  $M_1$  (in blue).

Figure: https://www.ieee-security.org/TC/SP2013/papers/4977a526.pdf
Norwegian University of
Science and Technology

## **General Solutions**

- Always use authenticated encryption
- Avoid CBC mode if possible (use GCM)
- Constant time padding check
- No specific error messages



2013 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy

### Lucky Thirteen: Breaking the TLS and DTLS Record Protocols

Nadhem J. AlFardan and Kenneth G. Paterson Information Security Group, Royal Holloway, University of London Egham, Surrey TW20 0EX, UK Email: {nadhem.alfardan.2009, kenny.paterson}@rhul.ac.uk

Figure: https://www.ieee-security.org/TC/SP2013/papers/4977a526.pdf



### Contents

**Padding Oracles** 

The CBC mode

**More CBC Problems** 

**Length Extension Attack** 

**Order of Enc and Auth** 



# Hashing as MAC

Assume that we are in the following setting:

- Let sk be a fixed size secret
- Let *m* be a known message
- Let H be a the SHA2 hash function
- Let MAC be h = H(sk||m)

### Question 1: Do you remember how SHA2 works?

#### SHA-2 Process Overview





# Hashing as MAC

Assume that we are in the following setting:

- Let sk be a fixed size secret
- Let *m* be a known message
- Let H be a the SHA2 hash function
- Let MAC be h = H(sk||m)

Question 2: How can we forge h' = H(sk||m')?



The issue is that SHA2 apply a compression function on blocks of the message using length padding in the end.

If you know the length of the secret and the message, then you also know the padding, and you can append a message at the end to get a valid hash without knowing the secret.



### Hashing as MAC

### This attack applies to SHA2, but not to SHA3. SHA3 has a different structure.

Does not apply to HMAC, since it hashes twice to make everything fixed length.









### Length extension attack



🖑 12 🛛 Q 1



#### What is length extension?

When a <u>Merkle-Damgård</u> based hash is misused as a message authentication code with construction H(secret | message), and message and the length of secret is known, a length extension attack allows anyone to include extra information at the end of the message and produce a valid hash without knowing the secret. Quick sidebar, before you freak out:

Since HMAC does not use this construction, HMAC hashes are not prone to length extension attacks.

#### Figure: https://deeprnd.medium.com/length-extension-attack-bff5b1ad2f70

NTNU | Norwegian University of Science and Technology

### Contents

**Padding Oracles** 

The CBC mode

**More CBC Problems** 

**Length Extension Attack** 

**Order of Enc and Auth** 



## **Order of Enc and Auth**

CPA secure symmetric crypto with input message *m*:

▶ SSH: 
$$c = Enc_{sk_E}(m)$$
,  $a = Auth_{sk_A}(m)$ , send  $(a, c)$ 

# **Order of Enc and Auth**

We refer to these methods as:

- SSL/TLS: authenticate-then-encrypt (AtE)
- IPSec: encrypt-then-authenticate (EtA)
- SSH: encrypt-and-authenticate (E&A)

# **Order of Enc and Auth**

We refer to these methods as:

- SSL/TLS: authenticate-then-encrypt (AtE) (can be secure...)
- ► IPSec: encrypt-then-authenticate (EtA) (proven secure, ✓)
- SSH: encrypt-and-authenticate (E&A) (shown broken, X)

Interestingly, AtE is proven secure when using CBC mode.



# The Order of Encryption and Authentication for Protecting Communications (Or: How Secure is SSL?)\*

Hugo Krawczyk\*\*

Figure: https://iacr.org/archive/crypto2001/21390309.pdf



# **Questions?**

