

Wired Equivalent Privacy Protocol

Author(s):

Summary: The Wired Equivalent Privacy (WEP) protocol, described in [80299], is used to protect data during wireless transmission.

Protocol specification (in common syntax)

```
A, B : principal
Kab : symkey
RC4 : message, symkey -> message
C : message -> message

1. A -> B : v, ((M,C(M)) xor RC4(v,Kab))
```

Description of the protocol rules

To encrypt the message M , A applies the operator `xor` to $RC4(v, Kab)$ and $(M, C(M))$ where $C(M)$ is the *integrity checksum* of the message M and $RC4$ is a function modeling the RC4 algorithm which is used to generate a *keystream* (*i.e.* a long sequence of pseudo-random bytes) from the initial vector v and the secret key Kab shared between A and B . To decrypt the received message, B computes $RC4(v, Kab)$ and after applying exclusive or, he obtains $(M, C(M))$ and can verify that the checksum is correct.

The properties of exclusive or are:

$$x \text{ xor } (y \text{ xor } z) = (x \text{ xor } y) \text{ xor } z \text{ (E1)}$$

$$x \text{ xor } y = y \text{ xor } x \text{ (E2)}$$

$$x \text{ xor } 0 = x \text{ (E3)}$$

$$x \text{ xor } x = 0 \text{ (E4)}$$

References

[80299]

Claimed attacks

We present below attacks given in [BGW01] that require the following properties:

$$C(x \text{ xor } y) = C(x) \text{ xor } C(Y) \quad (\text{E5})$$

$$(x1,y1) \text{ xor } (x2,y2) = (x1 \text{ xor } x2,y1 \text{ xor } y2) \quad (\text{E6})$$

According to [BGW01], (E5) is a general property of CRC checksum.

The first attack uses the fact that encrypting two messages P1 and P2 with the same initial vector v and with the same key k can reveal information. Indeed, we have the following equalities between the ciphers C1 and C2 and their associated plain text P1 and P2:

$$\begin{aligned} C1 \text{ xor } C2 &= ((P1,C(P1)) \text{ xor } RC4(v,k)) \text{ xor } ((P2,C(P2)) \text{ xor } RC4(v,k)) \\ &= ((P1,C(P1)) \text{ xor } (P2,C(P2))) \text{ xor } (RC4(v,k) \text{ xor } RC4(v,k)) && (\text{E1})(\text{E2}) \\ &= (P1,C(P1)) \text{ xor } (P2,C(P2)) && (\text{E3})(\text{E4}) \end{aligned}$$

This allows an intruder who knows a plain text P1 and its cipher C1 to decrypt any cipher C2. Indeed, thanks to this equality, the intruder can easily get (P2,C(P2)) and obtain the plaintext P2.

The second attack allows the intruder controlled modifications to a cipher text without disrupting the checksum. Assume that the intruder has intercepted $(M,C(M)) \text{ xor } RC4(v,Kab)$ and knows D. He can now obtain the cipher text associated to the message $M \text{ xor } D$ by computing:

$$\begin{aligned} ((M,C(M)) \text{ xor } RC4(v,Kab)) \text{ xor } (D,C(D)) &= RC4(v,Kab) \text{ xor } ((M,C(M)) \text{ xor } (D,C(D))) \\ &= RC4(v,Kab) \text{ xor } (M \text{ xor } D, C(M) \text{ xor } C(D)) \\ &= RC4(v,Kab) \text{ xor } (M \text{ xor } D, C(M \text{ xor } D)) \end{aligned}$$

Notice that this attack can be applied without full knowledge of M. For example, to flip the first bit of M, the attacker can set $D = 100\dots0$. Now, if the intruder knows the plaintext M (and its associated cipher) he can generate the ciphertext associated to any message he wants.

Citations

- [80299] IEEE 802.11 Local and Metropolitan Area Networks: Wireless LAN Medium Access Control (MAC) and Physical (PHY) Specifications, 1999.
- [BGW01] N. Borisov, I. Goldberg, and D. Wagner. Intercepting mobile communications: The insecurity of 802.11. In *Proc. 7th Annual International Conference on Mobile Computing and Networking (MOBICOM'01)*, pages 180–188, Rome (Italy), 2001. ACM Press.