An Active Attack Against HB$^+$ - A Provably Secure Lightweight Authentication Protocol

Henri Gilbert[1], Matthew Robshaw[1], and Hervé Sibert[2]

[1] France Télécom, R&D Division
38–40, rue du Général Leclerc
92794 Issy les Moulineaux, Cedex 9, France
[2] France Télécom, R&D Division
42, rue des Coutures, BP 6243, 14066 Caen, Cedex 4, France
{henri.gilbert,matt.robshaw,herve.sibert}@francetelecom.com

Abstract Much research has focused on providing RFID tags with lightweight cryptographic functionality. The HB$^+$ authentication protocol was recently proposed [1] and claimed to be secure against both passive and active attacks. In this note we propose a linear-time active attack against HB$^+$.

Keywords: RFID, privacy, low-cost cryptography, authentication.

1 Introduction

Much research has focused on providing RFID tags with lightweight cryptographic functionality. Particular interest has been paid to the issue of authentication, in order to both prevent counterfeiting and enhance privacy. In this note, we focus on an authentication protocol by A. Juels and S. Weis [1] which is to be presented at Crypto'05. This protocol, called HB$^+$, provides a symmetric authentication scheme that is claimed to be well-suited to low-cost devices such as RFID tags. In [1], HB$^+$ is presented as an enhanced variant of a protocol due to N. Hopper and M. Blum [2] (and known as the HB protocol). While HB was proven secure against passive attacks under the "Learning Parity with Noise" (LPN) hardness assumption, HB$^+$ is claimed to be secure against both passive and active attacks and a security proof is provided [1]. In this note, we show that HB$^+$ is vulnerable to an efficient active attack with linear computational and communication complexity. The rest of this note is structured as follows. First we provide an outline of the LPN problem and the HB and HB$^+$ protocols. In the following section we describe the attack and assess its cost. Finally, we consider the implications of our observations.

2 The LPN problem and the HB and HB$^+$ protocols

In this section we quickly review the HB and HB$^+$ protocols. It is interesting to note that they have much in common with a scheme first presented in [3]. Roughly speaking, the LPN problem requires an adversary to recover a k-bit secret x after being given several equations of the form $b_i = a_i \cdot x \oplus \nu_i$, with unknowns x and the

ν_i's. Here ν_i is a (noise) bit equal to 1 with a probability $\eta \in [0, \frac{1}{2}[$. Throughout we denote the Hamming Weight of a vector x by $|x|$.

Definition 1. *The LPN problem with security parameters q, k, η, with $\eta \in [0, \frac{1}{2}[$ is defined as follows: given a random $q \times k$ binary matrix A, a random k-bit vector x, a vector ν such that $|\nu| \leq \eta q$, and the product $z = A \cdot x \oplus \nu$, find a k-bit vector x' such that $|A \cdot x' \oplus z| \leq \eta q$.*

The HB scheme is a symmetric-key authentication protocol that is directly related to the LPN problem. The round described in Figure 1 is repeated r times. The tag is authenticated if the checking procedure fails at most ηr times.

<div style="text-align:center">

Tag (secret x)   **Reader (secret x)**

$\nu \in \{0, 1 | \mathrm{Prob}(\nu = 1) = \eta\}$

$\xleftarrow{\quad a \quad}$ Choose challenge $a \in_R \{0, 1\}^k$

Compute $z = a \cdot x \oplus \nu$ $\xrightarrow{\quad z \quad}$ Check $a \cdot x = z$

</div>

Figure 1. One round of the HB protocol.

Note that the HB scheme is not secure against active attacks. Since ν is strictly less than $\frac{1}{2}$, by challenging the tag with some chosen a several times the value $a \cdot x$ will be revealed. Gaussian elimination will therefore give x once k equations with linearly independent a's have been retrieved. The HB$^+$ protocol is an augmented version of the basic HB scheme. The aim of the HB$^+$ protocol [1] is to prevent the extraction of tag secrets by corrupt readers using such chosen challenges. The symmetric key now consists of two k-bit vectors x and y, and a blinding vector is first sent by the tag. The HB$^+$ round described in Figure 2 is repeated r times and the tag successfully authenticated if the check fails at most ηr times[1]

<div style="text-align:center">

Tag (secret x, y)   **Reader (secret x, y)**

$\nu \in \{0, 1 | \mathrm{Prob}(\nu = 1) = \eta\}$

Choose blinding vector $b \in_R \{0, 1\}^k$ $\xrightarrow{\quad b \quad}$

$\xleftarrow{\quad a \quad}$ Choose challenge $a \in_R \{0, 1\}^k$

Compute $z = a \cdot x \oplus b \cdot y \oplus \nu$ $\xrightarrow{\quad z \quad}$ Check $a \cdot x \oplus b \cdot y = z$

</div>

Figure 2. One round of the HB$^+$ protocol.

---

[1] A straightforward generalization of HB$^+$ consists in replacing the authentication acceptance threshold ηr by $\eta' r$, where η' is a constant which may differ from η. It is easy to see that the attack described in this note is also applicable to this slight variant of HB$^+$.

3 An active attack against HB$^+$

Here we show a simple active attack against the HB$^+$ protocol. The attack requires that the adversary is capable of manipulating challenges sent by a legitimate reader to a legitimate tag during the authentication exchanges, and to check whether this manipulation results (or not) in an authentication failure. In detail, the attack consists of choosing a constant k-bit vector δ and using it to perturb the challenges sent by a legitimate reader to the tag: δ is xor'ed to each authentication challenge for each of the r rounds of authentication. If the authentication process is successful, then we must have that $\delta \cdot x = 0$ with overwhelming probability. If authentication doesn't succeed then $\delta \cdot x = 1$ with overwhelming probability.

Tag (secret x, y)   **Reader (secret x, y)**
$\nu \in \{0, 1 | \text{Prob}(\nu = 1) = \eta\}$

Choose blinding vector $b \in_R \{0, 1\}^k$ $\xrightarrow{\quad b \quad}$

$\xleftarrow{\quad a' = a \oplus \delta \quad} \cdots \xleftarrow{\quad a \quad}$ Choose challenge $a \in_R \{0, 1\}^k$

Compute $z' = a' \cdot x \oplus b \cdot y \oplus \nu$ $\xrightarrow{\quad z' \quad}$ Check $a \cdot x \oplus b \cdot y = z'$

Figure 3. The attack on one round of the HB$^+$ protocol.

The attack is illustrated in Figure 3 for one round of the HB$^+$ protocol. We use the same δ in all r rounds of the protocol. Acceptance or rejection by the reader would thereby reveal one bit of secret information. To retrieve the k-bit secret x, it is enough to repeat the full protocol k times for linearly independent δ's, and to solve the resulting system. Conveniently, one can choose δ's with a single non-zero bit. Once x has been derived, the attacker can either immediately impersonate the tag using commitment values $b = 0$, or the attacker can then derive[2] the k-bit secret y using linearly independent linear combinations $b \cdot y$. Another side effect of the disclosure of x is that the privacy of the tag's identity is also compromised.

4 Discussion

We have described an active attack against the HB$^+$ protocol [1] that has a complexity linear in the length of the keys and number of rounds. It is interesting to consider how such an attack evades the proof of security that accompanies the HB$^+$ protocol [1]. The main problem is that the security model in [1] does not take account of the potential leak of information by a legitimate verifier as well as a legitimate

---

[2] These can be obtained by using, for instance, a false tag that sends a chosen blinding factor b to a legitimate reader during a complete execution of the protocol, and returns $a \cdot x$ to each authentication challenge a. If the authentication is successful then $b \cdot y = 0$ with overwhelming probability. If authentication doesn't succeed then $b \cdot y = 1$ with overwhelming probability.

prover. In the attack, each "accept" or "reject" outcome from a legitimate verifier provides one bit of information about the shared secret key x. Moreover, an attacker is not restricted to attacking the tag only, and then the reader only, as the proof of security demands. Instead the adversary interacts with both at the same time to gain an advantage.

From a practical point of view, the most obvious way to mount the attack is to use a false reader to communicate with the legitimate tag and a false tag to communicate with the legitimate reader. Note that the false reader and tag need not be in the same physical place, they need only communicate with each other. However, such a man-in-the-middle configuration is not really required. Instead an adversary need only cause controlled perturbations to the challenges sent from the reader to the tag.

It is worth noting that while the attacker interacts with both the tag and the reader, this is done in an unintrusive manner. From the point of view of the reader, either authentication with a legitimate tag has been successful or it has been unsuccessful (due, for instance, to a noisy transmission). In both cases the attacker gains information and the reader is unlikely to be aware that an attack has taken place.

5 Conclusion

While protocols with a proof of security are to be welcomed, caution demands that the security model be sufficiently robust. Given the practical nature of the attack outlined here, it is fair to conclude that the security model considered in [1] is too restrictive and that the HB^+ protocol is vulnerable to a realistic active attack.

References

1. A. Juels and S. A. Weis. Authenticating pervasive devices with human protocols. In V. Shoup, editor, *Advances in Cryptology - Crypto 05*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer-Verlag, to appear 2005. Also available via http://www.rsasecurity.com/rsalabs/.
2. N. J. Hopper and M. Blum. Secure Human Identification Protocols. In C. Boyd, editor, *Advances in Cryptology - Asiacrypt '01*, volume 2248 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 52–66. Springer-Verlag, 2001.
3. H. Gilbert. Techniques for Low Cost Authentication and Message Authentication. In J.J. Quisquater, editor, *Smart Card Research and Applications, Proceedings of CARDIS '98, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium, September, 14-16, 1998*, volume 1820 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 183–192. Springer-Verlag, 2000.