

Analysis and Improvement of a Lightweight Anonymous Authentication Protocol for Mobile Pay-TV Systems (Full text)

1st Saeed Banaeian Far*

Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering,
Science and Research Branch
Islamic Azad University
Tehran, Iran
Saeed.banaeian@srbiau.ac.ir

2nd Mahdi R. Alagheband

Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering,
Science and Research Branch
Islamic Azad University
Tehran, Iran
m.alagheband@srbiau.ac.ir

Abstract—For many years, the pay-TV system has attracted a lot of users. Users have recently expressed the desire to use mobile TV or mobile payment via anonymous protocols. The mobile users have also received their services over cellular communications networks. Each mobile device receives services from each head end systems. With increasing numbers of users and the expansion of Internet, user's privacy has become crucial important. When a device leaves the head end system's range, it must receive services from another head end system. In this paper, we review Chen *et al.*'s scheme and we highlight some weaknesses, including *privilege insider attack* and *user traceability attack*. Finally, we alleviate the scheme and analyze the alleviated scheme using both heuristic and formal methods.
Keyword: Authentication protocol, Formal model, Privacy preserving, User anonymity, User traceability

I. INTRODUCTION

After World War II, wireless communications were launched, and mobile services gradually became available. At that time, there was only one mobile operator that provided service to a few users. Then, the second generation of mobile communications was introduced as cellular networks under the GSM standard [1]. Mobile communications rapidly progressed. To date, communications have changed significantly four times. These changes and technological mutations were introduced as different generations of wireless communications technology so that today, the fourth generation of this method of communication is utilized. It is predicted that a new generation of mobile communications will be introduced in 2020 that will provide users with great speed and accuracy [1], [2], [3]. Pay-TV system has attracted many users for almost 30 years. In 1994, the number of people who used this technology reached 3.45 million in England. It doubled after 4 years [4]. Currently, numerous users use mobile devices to watch TV, and many communication systems have been provided for using the mobile-TV services [4], [5], [6], [7]. In these systems, the user can receive services after registration in a head end system (HES) network and store his/her information

in the database server (DBS) of the HES. At first, the HES only broadcasts one authentication message to all the users who request the same service [5]. Additionally, in [7], a user can access a television channel and play any video on his/her mobile phone.

Since smart card-based networks and mobile phone users are shifting to an ad hoc and completely mobile mode, HES cannot provide service to users everywhere. Therefore, when mobile users leave an area covered by a HES, they should receive services from another HES [8], [28], [9], [10]. First of all, they have to be authenticated again. In [8] the Mobi-Cash protocol based on elliptic curve cryptography (ECC) was proposed, and [28] used symmetric encryption functions. Constantin Popescu and Lo-yao Yeh's schemes are also based on bilinear pairing [9], [10].

Recently, user privacy has acquired special significance so that the demand for anonymous communication in networks has increased, and service providers have to authenticate users remotely and anonymously [11], [12], [13]. Bapana describes an anonymous authentication protocol suitable for distributed computer networks [14]. Yang *et al.* proposed a two-party secure roaming protocol based on identity based signatures (IBS) [12]. There are multiple servers, and each server manages a set of subscribers who are users of the network. Dedong *et al.* presented a model of two access modes: self-access and cross-domain access [13]. In self-access, the internet service providers (ISP) provide service to users directly, and cross-domain access is similar to that of a roaming network. Anonymous authentication schemes could meet these requirements. The validity and legality of a user's identity is approved in anonymous authentication schemes while divulging their true identity to no one. In some schemes, not only is the user's identity anonymous on public networks and channels, but users inside the network and attackers also cannot retrieve the user's ID [14], [16]. Even the server occasionally does not realize the user's ID [18]. In some schemes, there is no registration table for user authentication on the server [18], but the server can validate and authenticate the users anonymously.

The summary of this article has been submitted at <http://ist2018.itrc.ac.ir/>
*Corresponding author: Saeed Banaeianfar saeed_banaeian_far@yahoo.com

Our main contributions are listed follows:

- We present a great user anonymity. It means that we assume that an adversary has the server secret key and user password, but it cannot obtain the user's identity.
- We improve the Chen's scheme [16] against privilege insider attack. It means that the servers have no ability to obtain the users sensitive information.
- We improve the Chen's scheme [16] against user traceability attack.
- We analyze the alleviated scheme using both heuristic and formal methods.

In this paper, after discussing related work in section 2 and prerequisites for the scheme in section 3, we describe and analyze Chen *et al.*'s scheme [16] in section 4. It should be noted that Kim *et al.* have also promoted this scheme against stolen smart card-based attacks [19], but it is almost infeasible as long as the user chooses just strong password because it requires succeed brute force attack. In the following, we explain our alleviated scheme. Then, we analyze the alleviated scheme in heuristic and formal forms. Finally, we compare our scheme with recently proposed schemes.

II. RELATED WORK

In this section, we categorize pay-TV systems in 4 groups. At first, we describe signature-based pay-TV systems. Blind signature is practical way to verify user authentication by valid party, anonymously. Other categories are based on bilinear pairing, digital signature, encryption/decryption function, and hash function. Since hash function are light and secure, it is applied for lightweight schemes which are suitable for weak devices such as sensors and smart phones. We depict this section on the table I, in summary.

- *Pairing-based pay-TV systems*

Other researchers proposed heavy scheme based on bilinear pairing, such as Wang *et al.* proposed an authentication scheme for access control in mobile pay-TV systems, in 2012 [17]. Their protocol was resist against forgery, Man-in-the-Middle *MitM*, and replay attacks. Thus, an adversary can pass the verification phase successfully. Its performance is good, but as we said, it is based on bilinear pairing and that's not suitable for lightweight devices. In 2013, Liu used identity-based encryption in his scheme [5]. A number of schemes also used cryptographic functions and bilinear pairings (e.g., [6], [28], [9], [10]). Sabzinejad Farash made improvements [10] against impersonation attacks (User impersonation and *HES* impersonation) in [6]. Sabzinejad Farash's scheme [6] is also a robust and secure system which is the running time of protocol shorter than the previous schemes. However, his proposed scheme is designed with bilinear pairing. It is too heavy and unsuitable for the weak devices. In 2015, Heydari *et al.* proposed an authentication scheme resists against impersonation attack. They launched their attack on issue phase and generalized it on other phases [27].

Recently, Wu *et al.* proposed an authentication schemes for mobile pay-TV, but it does not support anonymity [28]. Anonymity is being supported through pairing transform in [29]. Also, in 2017, Wu *et al.* proved that the Sabzinejad protocol has some weaknesses [30]. For example, it does not support mutual authentication. But there is no modified scheme. Then, Biesmans *et al.* proposed pay-per-view and a pay-per-channel that protect users' privacy [40].

- *Signature-based pay-TV systems*

A user's connection with banks is another payment method that can be mentioned. Blind signature is another method for anonymization. In this method, a legitimate party signs the blinded message of users. After signing, other people can see the original message along with the valid signatures of the legal party. In 1996, Camenisch presented a communication scheme in an anonymous way in which a blind signature was used [20]. Subsequently, authors have tried to provide more efficient schemes for mobile-pay systems. Customers in this scheme have to open an anonymous account and there is no need for the bank to identify the customers. In 2009 Bakhtiari *et al.* presented the *MobiCash* scheme based on the blind signature and the customer's relationship with the bank [8]. Its blind signature is based on *ECDSA* crypto system. In 2016, Wu *et al.* proposed an efficient scheme [28]. Their scheme is a powerful scheme based on user signature. The user who wants to uses TV, must register as legal user via proposed scheme and creates session key to watch the TV. The user signs its message and sends it to server. Server verifies the received message with *open.algorithm* which is proposed in this scheme.

- *Encryption-based pay-TV systems*

Encryption-based schemes are most practical classification. This category neither heavy nor light. Thus, are not suitable for weak devices. For example, Yang J-H and Chang proposed *ID*-based scheme on *ECC* crypto system for remote user authentication [15]. It has some drawbacks such as vulnerability to insider and impersonation attacks [16]. In the hash-based pay-TV system (the next category), we describe Chen's scheme [16] and then analyse it in the section 4. In 2017 Arshad *et al.* proposed an efficient scheme [39] based on Wang's scheme [17]. But, there is no bilinear pairing functions and Arshad's scheme is easy to implement on *FPGA* boards.

- *Hash-based pay-TV systems*

In 2011, Chen modified the *ECC*-based scheme of Yang J-H and Chang [15]. The modified protocol is lightened and redesigned only with hash function but without *ECC* using [16]. Then in 2012, Kim *et al.* improved Chen's scheme [16] and made it robust against smart card-based attacks [19]. We will explain in section 4 that the improvement is not true.

In recent years, low energy consumption on smart cards has been motivated by an increase in the energy efficiency and productivity of schemes so that some of the designed

TABLE I
AN OVERVIEW ON THE SECTION 2

| Information → Schemes ↓ | Year | Base Article or improvement of. | Cryptographic functions | | | Contribution (in summery) |
|----------------------------|------|---|-------------------------|----------------|----------|--|
| | | | <i>BP</i> | <i>E/D/Sig</i> | <i>H</i> | |
| Camenicsh [20] | 1996 | Brickell 1995 [22] Stadler 1995 [23] | No | Yes | Yes | Proposed an anonymous electronic payment system |
| Bakhtiari [8] | 2009 | Abbasdasi 2004 [42] | No | Yes | Yes | Proposed a MobiCash system |
| Chen [16] | 2011 | Yang 2009 [15] | No | No | Yes | Improved Yang's scheme [15] against insider and impersonation attack |
| Kim [19] | 2012 | Chen 2011 [16] | No | No | Yes | Improved Chen's scheme [16] against smart card-based attacks. We explain in the section 4 that the improvement is not true |
| Wang [17] | 2012 | Sun 2009 [41] | Yes | Yes | Yes | Improved Sun's scheme [41] against MitM and impersonation attacks |
| Liu [5] | 2013 | Sun 2009 [41] | Yes | Yes | Yes | Privacy preserving Reduce the computation overhead |
| Tsai [24] | 2014 | Li 2012 [21] | No | No | Yes | Proposed a protocol based on chaotic map |
| Sabzinejad Farash [6] | 2014 | Yeh 2012 [10] | Yes | Yes | Yes | Improved Yeh's scheme [10] against head-end system impersonation attack Reduced the computation overhead |
| Heydari [27] | 2015 | Wang 2012 [17] | Yes | Yes | Yes | Improved Wang's scheme [17] against impersonation attack Reduced the computation overhead |
| Kou [26] | 2015 | Choi 2014 [38] | No | No | Yes | Improved Choi's scheme [38] against stolen smart card and impersonation attacks |
| Wu [28] | 2016 | He 2016 [29] | Yes | Yes | Yes | Added anonymity to He's scheme [29] |
| Wu [30] | 2017 | Sabzinejad Farash 2014 [6] | | | | Added mutual authentication to Sabzinejad Farash [6] |
| Arshad [39] | 2017 | Wang 2012 [17] | No | Yes | Yes | Made Wang's scheme [17] efficient, and implements it on <i>FPGA</i> boards |
| Biesmans [40] | 2018 | Attrapadung 2009 [43] | Yes | Yes | Yes | Privacy preserving |

Note:
BP: Bilinear Pairing *E/D/Sig*: Encryption/Decryption/Digital Signature *H*: Hash function

schemes for smart cards are hash-based and have high energy consumption efficiency (e.g., [21], [24], [26]). In 2014, Tsai proposed a light anonymous authentication protocol [24]. Then, in 2015, Kuo *et al.* also presented a lightweight scheme based on smart cards [26]. The lightweight schemes are popular, since light devices have been developed. So, we focus on this category of pay-TV systems.

In the section 5, we discuss the [6], [10], [16], [19] and our scheme, in the compare them with our improved scheme. We illustrate that our alleviated scheme is more secure than noted schemes.

III. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we explain preliminaries of our paper. These functions are used for lightweight protocols with low power consumption, so common encryption functions are not used. After presenting the required security features in anonymous authentication schemes, we briefly explain cellular communication. Finally, we explain the analysis of schemes through a formal method.

A. Parameters and Entities Description

a) **Describe the entities involved in this paper:** In Table II, the list of entities and parameters are depicted. Below, we explain the role of each of the entities [16].

- **HES:** A system sending broadcast TV service to receivers.
- **Receiver:** A mobile device with a *CAS* module used for access control.
- **SAS/SMS:** Subsystems responsible for subscriber authorization and management.
- **Encrypter/Decrypter:** Components for encrypting and decrypting CW, keys and sensitive information.
- **Multiplexer/Demultiplexer:** Components for multiplexing and demultiplexing A/V, data or IP to MPEG-2.
- **Scrambler/Desclamber:** Components for signal scrambling and the reverse engineering of Scrambler.
- **TX/RX:** Subsystems for signal transmission and receiving.
- **ECM/EMM:** Defined by *DVB* as two conditional access messages.

TABLE II
LIST OF NOTATIONS

| Entities | Description | Parameters | Description |
|--------------|---------------------------------|-------------|--|
| <i>HES</i> | Head End System | <i>S</i> | Server |
| <i>SAS</i> | Subscriber Authorization System | U_i | The <i>i</i> th user |
| <i>SMS</i> | Subscriber Management System | ID_i | <i>ID</i> of <i>i</i> th user |
| <i>CW</i> | Control Word | PW_i | Password of <i>i</i> th user |
| <i>CAS</i> | Conditional Access System | <i>b</i> | Random number |
| <i>ECM</i> | Entitlement Control Message | <i>N</i> | User registration number |
| <i>EMM</i> | Entitlement Management Message | <i>T</i> | Time stamp |
| <i>DBS</i> | Data Base Server | ΔT | $T_i - T_j$ |
| <i>MUX</i> | Multiplexer | \ominus | Token for issue phase |
| <i>DEMUX</i> | Demultiplexer | γ | Token for subscription phase |
| <i>TX</i> | Transmitter | γ_i | Token for hand-off phase |
| <i>RX</i> | Receiving module | $h(\cdot)$ | Secure one-way hash function |
| <i>MS</i> | Mobile device | \oplus | XOR operation |
| <i>DVB</i> | Digital Video Broadcast | \parallel | Concatenate operation |
| <i>A</i> | The Adversary | <i>y</i> | The secret key of the remote server |
| | | * | The stated parameters are generated by adversary |

B. Security Requirements

In this section, we mention the definitions of security requirements and the need for anonymous authentication protocols with multi-server service providers. Noted that the hash function have to be secure in standard model against relevant attacks. One-way hash functions with no collisions are functions with variant input and constant length output. From their characteristics, we can note that they do not have collisions and that they are one-way [32].

- **Privacy Preserving**

Privacy is a range of personal and private information of the user that the user wants to be protected and unavailable to \mathcal{A} s [33]. In this paper, user identity requires protection. Because users want to *log – in* anonymously and keeps his/her identity private.

- **User Anonymity**

User anonymity is a kind of privacy policy in networks. User anonymity means that user’s identities cannot be obtained and find a link to trace the users by any channel eavesdropping, stolen smart card, or access to the user database stored in server memory [31]. According to increasing user requests to join the networks and uses internet-based services, user’s privacy has become particularly important and identity anonymity is more considered.

- **User Traceability**

Traceability means that if a user *logs – in* to a server several times, or to multiple servers in several different points, \mathcal{A} or other users cannot determine whether is the same user that was previously *logged – in* to the server or not [35].

- **Resistance against privilege insider attack**

There are many *HESes* in the cellular network and users can get services from them. They authenticate users and then the users can use the services. To authenticate users, the *HESes* obtain the real users’ identity and then verify their *log – in* request. It is clearly that in this attack all *HESes* know the real users’ identity and if one of the

HESes is malicious, the users’ privacy is broken [36]. But, we want to the *HESes* learn no privacy information about the users’ identity.

- **Forward and Backward Security**

Forward security means that when the user is out of the network (or network service is revoked) and he is not a member of the network he must not retrieve encrypted messages after leaving or revocation. In fact, it means that the set of keys in the next sessions must be independent of the set of keys in the previous ones. Backward security means that if a user recently was a member of that network with a new key to server, this user would no longer retrieve previous session keys. This user cannot retrieve the previous encrypted information by having either the exchanged information in the past or the current key [34].

- **Mutual Authentication**

For secure communication, it is necessary that both parties persuade each other to confirm the identity. So, the user is known to the server, and the user is able to authenticate the server through the mutual authentication protocol [18].

C. Formal Security Analysis

Many proposed anonymous authentication protocols have been analyzed via ad hoc methods, but all of their drawbacks have not been discovered. Hence, there is no doubt that a formal method to discover the privacy and security drawbacks is required. \mathcal{A} ’s capabilities and threat models are classified in formal analysis. In this case, the adversary is capable of not only eavesdropping on the channel but also revealing secret data via data recovery through smart card power analysis attack [37].

A game-based model is applied to prove each attack. \mathcal{A} tries to success in the designed game. We illustrate that \mathcal{A} succeeds in designed game over Chen’s scheme [16]. However, it fails in designed games over our improved scheme. According to the protocol’s attributes, a formal analysis method has

TABLE III
CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN *MS* AND *HESes*

| U_i | | S |
|----------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Initialization phase | \Leftrightarrow | Secure channel |
| Issue phase | \Leftrightarrow | Public channel |
| Subscription phase | \Leftrightarrow | Public channel |
| Hand-off phase | \Leftrightarrow | Public channel |

three functions [37], [33]: (i) the experiment function, (ii) the success function, and (iii) the probability function. as follows:

- **Experiment function (EXP):** \mathcal{A} performs the process to get the required information.
- **Success function (Succ):** It specifies how successful \mathcal{A} is in gaining important data.
- **Probability function (Pr):** \mathcal{A} 's probability of success in the recovery of secret values.

If the probability of success is negligible (ϵ), the latter protocol is secure against assumed \mathcal{A} [33].

$$Succ_{\mathcal{A}}^{Protocol-name} = Pr[EX P_{\mathcal{A}}^{H.P.}] \leq \epsilon$$

D. Adversary abilities

In this section we describe \mathcal{A} abilities. We allow \mathcal{A} to achieve all parameters stored in smart card and database of servers, and it can eavesdrop the public channel, to show the security power of our alleviated scheme.

In the following we describe \mathcal{A} abilities [11], [36], briefly:

- \mathcal{A} can eavesdrop the public channel.
- \mathcal{A} can achieve to parameters stored in smart card.
- \mathcal{A} can achieve to verification table which is the servers has access to it.

In the section 4.3, we show our scheme is secure against all of smart card-based and stolen server attacks, as well as privacy drawbacks such as lack of anonymity and traceability. In the following, after explanation of Chen's scheme [16] and its weaknesses, we depart our modified scheme indetails.

IV. REVIEW OF THE CHEN ET AL. SCHEME

In this section, we investigate Chen's scheme [16]. This scheme has 4 phases: initialization, issue, subscription and hand-off. After briefly explaining the procedure of this protocol, we mention its weaknesses.

The Figure 1 shows the structure of general mobile pay-TV system. The Figure 2 and the Table III depict the the phases of Chen's scheme and correspondence between *MS* and *HESes*.

• Initialization phase

Users are registered in *DBS* of *HES* through *SAS/SMS*, and their *ID* is stored in *DBS* along with *N*. If *N* = 0, the user's identity and *N* = 1 is stored. These communications are carried out through a secure channel. To perform this process, the following steps are performed by U_i :

U_i chooses ID_i , PW_i , and generates b . Then it computes $PWB_i = h(PW_i \oplus b)$ and submits ID_i and PWB_i to S .

S checks ID_i is already in its database or not. Then it calculates:

$$K = h(ID_i \oplus PWB_i)$$

$$Q = h(UD\|x) \oplus PWB_i$$

$$R = h(PWB_i\|ID_i) \oplus h(y)$$

Here $UD = h(ID_i\|N)$. S issues the smart card containing $[K, R, Q]$ and sends it to U_i over secure channel.

U_i stores b on smart card. The smart card contains $[K, R, Q, b]$

• Issue phase

For each *log-in* and acquisition of service from each *HES* in the network, the user should send a *log-in* request and receives a Θ as a token. This token is used in the subscription phase. Kim *et al.* has attacked this phase [19]. The attack scenario is as follows:

\mathcal{A} listens to a user's session in the issue phase and steals the user's smart card. \mathcal{A} could obtain P from $C_i = h(P\|CID_i\|T_1\|n_i)$ by using the values of C_i , CID_i , T_1 , and n_i from the intercepted messages [19]. Due to the security of the secure one-way hash function, the probability of retrieving P from C_i is negligible (ϵ). As a result, \mathcal{A} cannot impersonate the user, and Chen's scheme is secure against stolen smart card attacks. In the following we describe the issue phase of Chen's scheme: U_i enters ID_i and PW_i and computes:

$$PWB_i = h(PW_i \oplus b)$$

$$K = h(ID_i \oplus PWB_i)$$

$$P = Q \oplus PWB_i$$

$$h(y) = h(PWB_i\|ID_i) \oplus R$$

Then it generates a random number n_i and calculates:

$$R_t = R_i \oplus h(y\|n_i)$$

$$CID_i = ID_i \oplus h(y\|T_1\|n_i)$$

$$C_i = h(P\|CID_i\|T_1\|n_i)$$

and sends $m = [R_i, C_i, CID_i, T_1, n_i]$ to *HES*.

HES receives m at T_2 and performs the following steps: Checks $T_2 - T_1 \leq \Delta T$ (acc/rej). Then it calculates:

$$ID_i = CID_i \oplus h(y\|T_1\|n_i)$$

and verifies ID_i if is a valid user identity. Else, it terminates the *log-in* request. Then calculates:

$$P' = h(UD\|x) = h(h(ID_i\|N)\|x)$$

$$C'_i = h(P'\|CID_i\|T_1\|n_i)$$

then it checks $C'_i = C_i$, if they are equal *HES* accepts the *log-in* request and calculates $R_t = R_i \oplus h(y\|n_i)$. Now, it chooses Θ_i , then calculates:

$$D_i = h(P'\|CID_i\|T_2\|n_i)$$




Fig. 1. The structure of CAS in a general mobile pay-TV system [16]




Fig. 2. The phases of the Chen's scheme [16]

$$E_i = \Theta_i \oplus h(P' \| T_2 \| n_i)$$

HES broadcasts the mutual authentication message $m_2 = [D_i, E_i, T_2]$.

U_i receives m_2 and checks the $T_3 - T_2 \leq \Delta T$ (acc/rej). Then it computes $D'_i = h(P \| CID_i \| T_2 \| n_i)$ and checks $D'_i = D_i$. Finally, it calculates certified token $\theta = E_i \oplus h(P \| T_2 \| n_i)$ as the session key to get Pay-TV service.

• **Subscription phase**

For communicating with HES using the obtained Θ communicated with HES and calculated γ . Then, it

communicated with HES and set the authentication key.

To calculate γ the following steps should be done:

U_i inputs its ID and PW and computes:

$$PW = h(PW_i \oplus b)$$

$$h(ID_i \oplus PWB_i)$$

$$K = h(ID_i \oplus PWB_i)$$

$$P = Q \oplus PWB_i$$

$$h(y) = h(PWB_i \| ID_i)$$

then it generates a random number n_i and calculates:

$$\begin{aligned} R_i &= \theta_i \oplus h(y\|n_i) \\ CID_i &= ID_i \oplus h(y\|T_1\|n_i) \\ C_i &= h(P\|CID_i\|T_1\|n_i) \end{aligned}$$

and sends $m = [R_i, C_i, CID_i, T_1, n_i]$ to *HES*. *HES* receives m at T_2 and checks $T_2 - T_1 \leq \Delta T$ (acc/rej). Then calculates $ID_i = CID_i \oplus h(y\|T_1\|n_i)$ and verifies if ID_i is valid user's identity and computes $P' = h(UD\|x) = h(h(ID_i\|N)\|x)$. Then it checks $C'_i = h(P'\|CID_i\|T_1\|n_i) = C_i$. If they are equal, *HES* accepts the *log-in* request and computes $\theta = R_i \oplus h(y\|n_i)$. *HES* chooses a random number γ_i for U_i and calculates:

$$\begin{aligned} D_i &= h(P'\|CID_i\|T_2\|n_i) \\ E_i &= \gamma_i \oplus h(P'\|T_2\|n_i) \end{aligned}$$

Finally, it broadcasts $m_2 = [D_i, E_i, T_2]$. After receiving M_2 in T_3 , U_i checks $T_3 - T_2 \leq \Delta T$ and if is valid checks $D'_i = h(P'\|CID_i\|T_2\|n_i) = D_i$. Then calculates the certified token $\gamma_i = E_i \oplus h(P'\|T_2\|n_i)$ to get Pay-TV service.

• Hand-off phase

In the hand-off phase for leaving the covered area of each *HES* and communicating with another *HES*, another γ should be calculated as γ_i and used for obtaining future services from *HES*. In fact, in this phase, the users are re-authenticated without *relog-in* and set a new authentication session key to obtain new *HES*. To calculate new authentication session key, U_i should be done the following steps:

It generates a new random number n_i and computes:

$$\begin{aligned} Z_i &= \theta_i \oplus h(y\|n_i) \\ CID_i &= ID_i \oplus h(y\|T_1\|n_i) \\ C_i &= h(P\|CID_i\|n_i) \end{aligned}$$

then it sends $m = [Z_i, C_i, CID_i, T_1, n_i]$ to *HES*. *HES* receives m at T_2 and checks $T_2 - T_1 \leq \Delta T$, then calculates:

$$\begin{aligned} ID_i &= CID_i \oplus h(y\|T_1\|n_i) \\ P' &= h(h(ID_i\|N)\|x) \end{aligned}$$

and checks $C'_i = h(P'\|CID_i\|T_1\|n_i) = C_i$ and if they are equal accepts the request. For verifying U_i 's request, it calculates $\theta_i = Z_i \oplus h(y\|n_i)$ and chooses γ as authentication session key and calculates:

$$\begin{aligned} D_i &= h(P'\|CID_i\|T_2\|n_i) \\ F_i &= \gamma_i \oplus h(P'\|T_2\|n_i) \end{aligned}$$

and broadcasts the mutual authentication message $m_2 = [D_i, F_i, T_2]$.

TABLE IV
THE PRIVILEGE INSIDER ATTACK

| Algorithm1 |
|---|
| Set up: |
| Input: CID_i, T_1 , & n_i received from public channel |
| Output: ID_i |
| Challenge: |
| 1. Receives CID_i, T_1 & n_i from public channel |
| 2. Computes $ID_i^* = CID_i \oplus h(y\ T_1\ n_i)$ |
| Guess: |
| 3. If $ID_i^* = ID_i$ then |
| Return 1 and accept ID_i^* as valid ID_i (user's ID) |
| else |
| return 0 |

U_i receives m_2 at T_3 and checks $T_3 - T_2 \leq \Delta T$ and $D'_i = h(P'\|CID_i\|T_2\|n_i) = D_i$ and if they are equal, it accepts *HES*'s request of mutual authentication. Finally U_i calculates $\gamma_i = F_i \oplus h(P'\|T_2\|n_i)$ as the authentication session key to obtain new *HES*'s service.

A. The Weaknesses of Chen et al. Scheme

In this section, we mention the weaknesses of Chen scheme, including privilege insider attack (subsequent breaking user privacy by the *HES*, means that the malicious *HES* can obtain the users' identity and traces them), and user traceability.

1) *Privilege insider attack*: According to the section 3.2 and 3.4, we assume that the *HESes* are malicious. In the issue phase of Chen protocol, all *HESes* have y , which is the particular key of the server, and therefore they can use it to calculate $R_i = R_i \oplus h(y\|n_i)$ and $ID_i = CID_i \oplus h(y\|T_1\|n_i)$. In fact, is clear, each *HESes* can calculate values such as R_i and ID_i through y . On the table IV (*algorithm1*), we describe this process in detail.

After obtain the real users' identity, Some users' privacy are broken as follows:

- **Breaking User Anonymity:** The ID_i is not directly located on the channel, users' IDs can be accessed by a simple relation using the information received from the public channel. To obtain the user's identity, it is enough to calculate the $ID_i = CID_i \oplus h(y\|T_1\|n_i)$ via the CID_i, n_i , and T_i received from the public channel and knowing y . In such a case, the user's ID can be retrieved. This procedure is described in Table IV (*Algorithm1*). According to the Table IV, We prove that malicious *HES* succeeds in the designed game. Therefore, \mathcal{A} can retrieve a real user ID simply with a probability of 1, so: $Succ_{\mathcal{A}}^{Chen} = 1$.
- **User Traceability:** According to the procedure demonstrated in Table IV, malicious *HES* is able to find the user's identity easily and grabs ID_i . Although, it can trace similarly the user with the *algorithm1*, cannot obtain that which user re-authenticates without re-login. But it can the user in the hand off phase is same user that has been in issue phase.

2) *User traceability*: According to definition of *user traceability* mentioned in the section 3.2, \mathcal{A} should not get any

TABLE V
THE USER TRACEABILITY

| Algorithm2 |
|---|
| Set up: |
| Input: CID_i, T_1 , & n_i eavesdropped from public channel |
| Output: 0 or 1 |
| Challenge: |
| 1. Eavesdrops CID_i, T_1 , & n_i from public channel |
| 2. Chooses randomly y^* |
| 3. Computes $ID_i^* = CID_i \oplus h(y^* T_1 n_i)$ |
| 4. Creates a set of ID_i^* s and stores it |
| Guess: |
| 5. Challenger has to calculate new ID_i^* like line 3 |
| If the new calculated ID_i^* is in the created set |
| return 1 (success), ID_i^* was <i>logged-in</i> on the server |
| else |
| return 0 (failure), ID_i^* never <i>logged-in</i> on the server |

information about users identity. It is clearly that \mathcal{A} has no information about y . with having y , \mathcal{A} can obtain ID_i . But, there is no need to obtain the real user identity. In this attack, \mathcal{A} wants to know the authenticated user is the same user that was previously *logged-in* to the server or not.

To achieves its goal, after eavesdropping each CID_i, T_1 , and n_i form public channel, \mathcal{A} chooses randomly unique y^* and calculates $ID_i^* = CID_i \oplus h(y^*||T_1||n_i)$ as pseudonym of all users send *log-in* request and stores all calculated ID_i^* s in its memory. After a while, \mathcal{A} eavesdrops the public channel and calculate ID_i^* and compares it with stored set of ID_i^* s. If new calculated ID_i^* is in stored set, the user is in the authentication phase, is the same user which \mathcal{A} calculated its pseudonym and stored its ID^* . Now, \mathcal{A} can guess this user was *logged-in* on the server or not with probability of 1. In fact it can classify all users in two groups. The first group: the group which has anonymous members, but \mathcal{A} knows the group members was *logged-in* on the server. The second group: it has the anonymous members, but \mathcal{A} knows the groups members never *logged-in* on the server. We describe this process on the Table V.

3) *Soundness*: In the issue phase, subscription phase and hand-off phase of Chen's scheme the following parameters are calculated by users:

$$R_i = R_t \oplus h(y||n_i)$$

$$CID_i = ID_i \oplus h(y||T_1||n_i)$$

$$R_i = \Theta_i \oplus h(y||n_i)$$

$$Z_i = \Theta_t \oplus h(y||n_i)$$

According to Chen's scheme, y is the secret key of the remote server stored in the hash function [16]. So, the users have no ability to calculate the mentioned parameters and they cannot use y .

B. Our Improved Scheme

In this section, we propose an improved issue of Chen scheme. Our improved scheme has 4 phases which we describe as below, and compare our changes with the original scheme.

We represent the protocol's procedure indetails in Tables VI to IX.

• Initialization Phase

Which is shown in Table VI, the server calculates R_i , and Q_i according to the Table VI after receiving ID_i , and PWB_i , and then stores R_i , Q_i and PWB_i in its database. In the following, we describe this process in details:

U₁: U_i generates b as random number and chooses PW_i . Then it computes $PWB = h(PW_i||b)$ and sends PWB_i and ID_i to the pay-TV server.

S: After receiving PWB_i and ID_i , S computes $Q_i = h(ID_i||x) \oplus PWB_i$ and $R_i = h(PWB_i||ID_i)$. Then it stores R_i , Q_i , and $Q_i \oplus PWB_i$ in its database and issues smart card containing $[R_i, Q_i]$. S send issued smart card to U_i .

U₁: U_i stores b on smart card memory and keeps it secure.

• Issue Phase

The mobile user generates n_i as random number and calculates R_i via the PW_i , ID_i , and R_i and being authenticated. Then, it calculates and sends a *log-in* request to HES . In the next step, after the time stamp and the user's ID verification, the server calculates E_i and D_i and broadcasts m_2 . The user also calculates Θ as the Authentication session key after checking ΔT and verifying its value. This session is shown in Table VII. The mentioned process is depicted in the following:

U₁: U_i inputs its ID , and PW and computes:

$$PWB_i = h(PW_i \oplus b)$$

$$R_i = h(PWB_i||ID_i)$$

Smart card checks R_i and verifies it. Then generates n_i and calculates:

$$Kn = Q_i \oplus PWB_i \oplus n_i$$

$$CID_i = Kn \oplus h(Kn||T_1||n_i)$$

$$C_i = h(Q_i||CID_i||T_1||n_i)$$

$$R_t = R_i \oplus Kn$$

Smart card sends $m_1 = [Kn, C_i, T_1, n_i]$ to S .

S: S receives m_1 at T_2 and checks $T_2 - T_1 \leq \Delta T$. Then it computes $Kn \oplus n_i = Q_i \oplus PWB_i$ and searches it in its database, then verifies it. Else, terminates this phase. S checks $C'_i = h(Q_i||Kn \oplus h(Kn||T_1||n_i)||T_1||n_i) = C_i$ and verifies it. Then it chooses the token Θ and stores it on DBS and computes:

$$D_i = h(R_i \oplus Kn||CID_i||T_2||n_i)$$

$$E_i = \Theta \oplus h(Q_i||T_2||n_i \oplus Q_i \oplus Kn)$$

and broadcasts $m_2 = [D_i, E_i, T_2]$.

U₁: U_i receives m_2 at T_3 and checks $T_3 - T_2 \leq \Delta T$. Then it checks $D'_i = h(R_i||CID_i||T_2||n_i) = D_i$ and calculates $\Theta = E_i \oplus h(Q_i||T_2||n_i \oplus PWB_i)$ as authentication session key.

TABLE VI
INITIALIZATION PHASE - OUR IMPROVED SCHEME

| U_i | S |
|--|---|
| Chooses b as random number and inputs ID_i, PW_i & b | |
| Computes $PWB_i = h(PW_i \oplus b)$ | $\xrightarrow{PWB_i, ID_i}$ Computes $Q_i = h(ID_i \ x) \oplus PWB_i$ $R_i = h(PWB_i \ ID_i)$ |
| Stores random number b on smart card and smart card contains $[R_i, Q_i \& b]$ | Stores $(Q_i, R_i \& Q_i \oplus PWB_i)$ in DBS Issues a smart card containing $[R_i, Q_i]$ |

TABLE VII
ISSUE PHASE - OUR IMPROVED SCHEME

| $U_i [R_i, Q_i \& b]$ | $S [Q_i, R_i, Q_i \oplus PWB_i]$ |
|---|---|
| Inputs ID_i & PW_i | |
| Computes $PWB_i = h(PW_i \oplus b)$ | |
| Verifies $R_i = h(PWB_i \ ID_i)$ (acc/rej) | |
| Generates n_i and computes $Kn = Q_i \oplus PWB_i \oplus n_i$ | |
| Computes $CID_i = Kn \oplus h(Kn \ T_1 \ n_i)$ | |
| $C_i = h(Q_i \ CID_i \ T_1 \ n_i)$ $R_i = R_i \oplus Kn$ | $\xrightarrow{m_1=[Kn, C_i, T_1, n_i]}$ Receives message at T_2 Checks $T_2 - T_1 \leq \Delta T$ Computes $Kn \oplus n_i = Q_i \oplus PWB_i$ Checks $Q_i \oplus PWB_i$ (acc/rej) $C'_i = h(Q_i \ Kn \oplus h(Kn \ T_1 \ n_i) \ T_1 \ n_i)$ (acc/rej) |
| Receives m_2 at T_3 & checks $T_3 - T_2 \leq \Delta T$ | $\xleftarrow{m_2=[D_i, E_i, T_2]}$ Chooses the token Θ & store in DBS Computes $D_i = h(R_i \oplus Kn \ CID_i \ T_2 \ n_i)$ $E_i = \Theta \oplus h(Q_i \ T_2 \ n_i \oplus Q_i \oplus Kn)$ |
| Computes $D'_i = h(R_i \ CID_i \ T_2 \ n_i)$ (acc/rej) | |
| Authentication session Key $\Theta = E_i \oplus h(Q_i \ T_2 \ n_i \oplus PWB_i)$ | |

• Subscription Phase

Which is shown in Table VIII. After Θ calculation and entering PW_i and ID_i , the user sends Kn^{new} , C_i and CID_i using the obtained Θ along with n_i^{new} and T_1 to HES . If HES authenticates the user's ID , it will broadcast $m_2 = [D_i, E_i, T_2]$ which contains γ . In the following, We describe the subscription phase of our alleviated scheme in details:

U_i : U_i inputs its ID , and PW and computes $PWB_i = h(PW_i \oplus b)$. Then verifies $R_i = h(PWB_i \| ID_i)$ and generates n_i^{new} and calculates following parameters:

$$Kn^{new} = Q_i \oplus PWB_i \oplus n_i^{new}$$

$$CID_i = Kn^{new} \oplus h(Kn^{new} \| T_1 \| n_i^{new})$$

$$C_i = h(Q_i \| CID_i \| T_1 \| n_i^{new})$$

$$R_i = \Theta \oplus Kn^{new}$$

U_i sends $m_1 = [Kn^{new}, C_i, T_1, n_i^{new}]$ to HES .

S : S receives m_1 at T_2 and checks $T_2 - T_1 \leq \Delta T$. Then computes $Kn^{new} \oplus n_i^{new} = Q_i \oplus PWB_i$ and checks $C'_i = h(Q_i \| CID_i \| T_1 \| n_i^{new}) = C_i$. S calculates $\Theta = R_i \oplus Kn^{new}$ and chooses γ as token for U_i . S computes:

$$D_i^{new} = h(R_i \| CID_i \| T_2 \| n_i^{new})$$

$$E_i^{new} = \gamma_i \oplus h(R_i \| T_2 \| n_i^{new} \oplus Q_i \oplus Kn^{new})$$

S broadcasts $m_2 = [D_i^{new}, E_i^{new}, T_2]$.

U_i : receives m_2 at T_3 and checks $T_3 - T_2 \leq \Delta T$. Then it checks $D'_i = h(R_i \| CID_i \| T_2 \| n_i^{new}) = D_i^{new}$ and computes $\gamma_i = E_i^{new} \oplus h(R_i \| T_2 \| n_i^{new} \oplus PWB_i)$ as authentication session key to get services.

• Hand-off Phase

Any user who wants to leave a HES region and $log-in$ to another HES region have to go through this step according to Table IX. Since the user is in the primary HES region, no $log-in$ is required. In fact, the user is re-authenticated without re-login. When this step is finished, the user obtains γ_i^{new} for communicating with the new HES . The hand-off phase of our alleviated scheme is shown on the Table IX.

According to the Table IX, S replaces $PWB_i \oplus Q_i \oplus h(y \| R_i)$ on $PWB_i \oplus Q_i$ stored in its database.

C. Security Analysis of Our Improved Scheme

This section is composed of three subsections. After explanation of the reason of our changes, analyze the improved scheme both heuristically and formally is analyzed.

Now, we analyze the main changes in our improved scheme compared with Chen's scheme. depicted in Tables VI to IX.

- **Removing N from DBS of HES :** By storing Q_i, R_i , and $PWB_i \oplus Q_i$, the server does not need to store N anymore in DBS of HES . Each user authenticates anonymously after sending the $log-in$ request for each HES in the authentication phase by HES with stored parameters in DBS of HES .
- **Removing $h(y)$ from R :** As in the Chen scheme, $h(y)$ is the public key of the server, and it is available to all users. Its presence or absence in R value does not guarantee any security.
- **Lack of using y in the generation phase:** We do not use y to prevent "user impersonation" and "user traceability" attacks. We used Q_i , and R_i instead. Q_i and R_i are joint

TABLE VIII
SUBSCRIPTION PHASE - OUR IMPROVED SCHEME

| $U_i [R_i, Q_i \& b]$ | $S [Q_i, R_i, Q_i \oplus PWB_i]$ |
|--|--|
| Inputs ID_i & PW_i Computes $PWB_i = h(PW_i \oplus b)$ Verifies $R_i = h(PWB_i \ ID_i)$ (acc/rej) Generates n_i^{new} and computes $Kn^{new} = Q_i \oplus PWB_i \oplus n_i^{new}$ Computes $CID_i = Kn^{new} \oplus h(Kn^{new} \ T_1 \ n_i^{new})$ $C_i = h(Q_i \ CID_i \ T_1 \ n_i^{new})$ $R_i = \Theta \oplus Kn^{new}$ | Receives message at T_2 $m_1 = [Kn^{new}, C_i, T_1, n_i^{new}]$ Checks $T_2 - T_1 \leq \Delta T$ Computes $Kn^{new} \oplus n_i^{new} = Q_i \oplus PWB_i$ Checks $Q_i \oplus PWB_i \oplus h(y \ R_i)$ (acc/rej) $C'_i = h(Q_i \ Kn^{new} \oplus h(Kn^{new} \ T_1 \ n_i^{new}) \ T_1 \ n_i^{new})$ (acc/rej) $\Theta = R_i \oplus Kn^{new}$ Chooses token γ for U_i Computes $D_i^{new} = h(R_i \ CID_i \ T_2 \ n_i^{new})$ $E_i^{new} = \gamma_i \oplus h(R_i \ T_2 \ n_i^{new} \oplus Q_i \oplus Kn^{new})$ |
| Receives m_2 at T_3 & checks $T_3 - T_2 \leq \Delta T$ Computes $D_i^{new} = h(R_i \ CID_i \ T_2 \ n_i^{new})$ (acc/rej) Computes $\gamma_i = E_i^{new} \oplus h(R_i \ T_2 \ n_i^{new} \oplus PWB_i)$ as Authentication key to get services | $m_2 = [D_i^{new}, E_i^{new}, T_2]$ $\Theta = R_i \oplus Kn^{new}$ Chooses token γ for U_i Computes $D_i^{new} = h(R_i \ CID_i \ T_2 \ n_i^{new})$ $E_i^{new} = \gamma_i \oplus h(R_i \ T_2 \ n_i^{new} \oplus Q_i \oplus Kn^{new})$ |

TABLE IX
HAND-OFF PHASE - OUR IMPROVED SCHEME

| $U_i [R_i, Q_i \& b]$ | $S [Q_i, R_i, Q_i \oplus PWB_i]$ |
|--|--|
| Re-authentication without re-login Generates n_i^{new} and computes $Kn^{new} = Q_i \oplus PWB_i \oplus n_i^{new}$ Computes $CID_i = Kn^{new} \oplus h(Kn^{new} \ T_1 \ n_i^{new})$ $C_i = h(Q_i \ CID_i \ T_1 \ n_i^{new})$ | Receives message at T_2 $m_1 = [C_i, T_1, n_i^{new}]$ Checks $T_2 - T_1 \leq \Delta T$ Computes $Kn^{new} \oplus n_i^{new} = Q_i \oplus PWB_i$ Checks $Q_i \oplus PWB_i \oplus h(y \ R_i)$ (acc/rej) Replaces $PWB_i \oplus Q_i \oplus h(y \ R_i)$ on $PWB_i \oplus Q_i$ $C'_i = h(Q_i \ Kn^{new} \oplus h(Kn^{new} \ T_1 \ n_i^{new}) \ T_1 \ n_i^{new})$ (acc/rej) Chooses the new authentication session key γ^{new} and |
| Receives m_2 at T_3 and checks $T_3 - T_2 \leq \Delta T$ (acc/rej) Computes $D_i^{new} = h(R_i \ CID_i \ T_2 \ n_i^{new})$ Computes $\gamma_i^{new} = F_i \oplus h(R_i \ T_2 \ n_i^{new} \oplus PWB_i)$ as new Authentication session key to obtain new HES | $m_2 = [D_i^{new}, F_i, T_2]$ computes $D_i^{new} = h(R_i \ CID_i \ T_2 \ n_i^{new})$ $F_i = \gamma_i^{new} \oplus h(R_i \ T_2 \ n_i^{new} \oplus Q_i \oplus Kn^{new})$ |

parameter between U_i and HES . R_i and Q_i are stored in the user memory and DBS of HES produced by the server.

1) *Heuristic Security Analysis*: In this section, we analyze the improved scheme in heuristic form and show that our scheme is resistant to all prevalent attacks. Imagine \mathcal{A} has possession of sensitive information stored on the card (with power attack [18]). we prove that the scheme resists a stolen smart card or stolen server. So, \mathcal{A} cannot evade the users' privacy or create any interference in communications.

• **Stolen server database attack and stolen verification table attack**: By stealing the information stored on the server, \mathcal{A} achieves $R_i = h(PWB_i \| ID_i)$, $Q_i = h(ID_i \| x) \oplus PWB_i$, $PWB_i = h(PW_i \oplus b)$. We prove that \mathcal{A} has no ability to obtain sensitive parameters:

- For x retrieval, \mathcal{A} needs to retrieve the hash function value, which is impossible given the secure *hash* function. Therefore, \mathcal{A} must again try to retrieve ID_i first. Then it can run brute force attack on x . So, its success probability is $(1/2)^{(Length-of-x) + (Length-of-ID_i)}$.
- For PW_i retrieval, \mathcal{A} needs to retrieve the hash function value, which is impossible given the secure *hash* function. Therefore, \mathcal{A} must again try to retrieve b first. Then, it can retrieve PW_i . So, its success probability is $(1/2)^{(Length-of-b) + (Length-of-PW_i)}$.

– The other parameter which \mathcal{A} wants to retrieve it, is ID_i stored in hash function. For retrieval it, \mathcal{A} has to run brute force attack with probability of $(1/2)^{Length-of-ID_i}$.

- **Stolen smart card attack**: By server stealing and after power analysis, \mathcal{A} achieves $Q_i = h(ID_i \| x) \oplus PWB_i$, $R_i = h(PWB_i \| ID_i)$, and random number b . b does not help \mathcal{A} to obtain the sensitive information of terms R_i and Q , \mathcal{A} also needs an *exponential-time*, to achieve them.
- **Replay attack**: There is the freshness of all sent flows on the channel and the new random number and time stamp, so there is no possibility for this attack. In fact, if \mathcal{A} intends to resend the previous messages, it needs to access the term R_i . As mentioned in the previous section, exponential time is needed to produce these parameters. It should be noted that \mathcal{A} could access R_i by possessing the server, but if \mathcal{A} is present at the highest level of attack (stolen server) and it possesses the database of server, there is no reason for the replay attack.
- **Impersonation attack**: For user impersonation, \mathcal{A} needs a pair of (ID_i, PW_i) or it should be able to produce Kn , C_i , and CID_i . As explained in the previous sections, in order to acquire or produce the desired parameters, \mathcal{A} needs exponential time and it cannot implement the attack in polynomial time.
- **Breaking user anonymity and user traceability at**

TABLE X
CHANNEL EAVESDROPPING

Algorithm3 $EXP_{ImpChen}^{Hash}$

Set up:
Input: Kn, C_i, T_1 , and n_i eavesdropped from public channel
Output: 1 (success) / 0 (failure)

Challenge:
1. Eavesdrops Kn, C_i, T_1 , and n_i from public channel eavesdropping
2. Computes $Q_i \oplus PW_{B_i} = Kn \oplus n_i$
where $Q_i = h(ID_i \| x) \oplus h(PW_i \oplus b)$ and $PW_{B_i} = h(PW_i \oplus b)$
3. Selects randomly ID_i^*, x^*, PW_i^* , and b^*
4. Computes $Kn^* \oplus n_i^* = h(ID_i^* \| x^*) \oplus h(PW_i^* \oplus b^*) \oplus h(PW_i^* \oplus b^*)$

Guess:
5. **If** $Kn^* \oplus n_i^* = Kn \oplus n_i$
Accepts selected ID_i^*, x^*, PW_i^* , and b^* as ID_i, x, PW_i , and b
Return 1 (success)
else
Return 0 (failure)

tacks: According to the Table VIII, it is clear that no user ID trace is placed directly on the channel. The only place that the user ID has been used is $CID_i = Kn \oplus h(Kn \| T_1 \| n_i) = Q_i \oplus PW_{B_i} \oplus n_i \oplus h(Q_i \oplus PW_{B_i} \oplus n_i \| T_1 \| n_i) = h(ID_i \| x) \oplus h(PW_i \oplus b) \oplus h(PW_i \oplus b) \oplus n_i \oplus h(h(ID_i \| x) \oplus h(PW_i \oplus b) \oplus h(PW_i \oplus b) \oplus n_i \| T_1 \| n_i)$ that \mathcal{A} is faced with this phrase with the possibility of $(1/2)^{Length-of-hash}$ to retrieve the user ID . If \mathcal{A} possesses the database of a server, it can access the user's ID , but having the user ID without any adverse information is not sufficiently useful. Card stealing and the card data retrieval do not help \mathcal{A} to achieve user's IDs . Regarding to protection of user ID , the user is untraceable. \mathcal{A} cannot calculate the user ID , so it cannot trace the user in the hand-off phase.

- **Channel eavesdropping attack:** According to the description in previous sections, \mathcal{A} cannot actively attack by channel avoidance and having the transmitted information on the channel. Also \mathcal{A} cannot able to obtain user's ID via passive attack.

2) *Formal Security Analysis:* In this section, we analyze our scheme in the formal model [37], [33], which is shown in Tables X to XIII (*Algorithms3* to *Algorithms6*). In the *algorithms*, we show that our alleviated scheme is resistant against "channel eavesdrop" and "stolen card attack" and in random oracle model. By regarding the one-way hash function (Note that the parameters represented by * are generated by \mathcal{A}).

- **Channel eavesdropping**

\mathcal{A} obtains Kn, C_i, T_1 , and n_i with interception. To recover the sensitive information about U_i , there must be a process in accordance with the *Algorithm3* that shown on the Table X.

In the designed game noted on the Table X, \mathcal{A} eavesdrops Kn, C_i, T_1 , and n_i from public channel and tries to guess sensitive information. To pass the game successfully, it has to guess ID_i, x, PW_i , and b correctly. Since the maximum probability of success is $(1/2)^{inpuets-length}$. So, \mathcal{A} is not able to guess sensitive information correctly

TABLE XI
STOLEN SMART CARD

Algorithm4 $EXP_{ImpChen}^{Hash}$

Set up:
Input: R_i , and b recovered from smart card memory by power attack
Output: 1 (success) / 0 (failure)

Challenge:
1. Recovers R_i , and b from smart card by power analysis attack
2. Selects randomly PW_i^* and ID_i^* as user's private key and ID
3. Computes $R_i^* = h(h(PW_i^* \oplus b) \| ID_i^*)$

Guess:
4. **If** $R_i^* = R_i$ then
Accepts PW_i^* and ID_i^* as user's private key and ID
Return 1 (success)
else
Return 0 (failure)

in polynomial time.

$$Succ_{\mathcal{A}-ID_i}^{Imp-Chen} = Pr[EXP_{\mathcal{A}}^{hash}] \leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{ID_i-length}$$

$$Succ_{\mathcal{A}-x}^{Imp-Chen} = Pr[EXP_{\mathcal{A}}^{hash}] \leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{x-length}$$

$$Succ_{\mathcal{A}-PW_i}^{Imp-Chen} = Pr[EXP_{\mathcal{A}}^{hash}] \leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{PW_i-length}$$

$$Succ_{\mathcal{A}-b}^{Imp-Chen} = Pr[EXP_{\mathcal{A}}^{hash}] \leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{b-length}$$

$$Succ_{\mathcal{A}}^{Imp-Chen} = Pr[EXP_{\mathcal{A}}^{hash}] \leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{(ID_i \| x \| PW_i \| b)-length} \leq \epsilon$$

So, it can not guess mentioned parameters correctly.

- **Stolen smart card attack**

If the smart card is stolen and corrupted by power analysis attack, \mathcal{A} acquires stored data and tries to impersonate the user or deceive the server. \mathcal{A} this process according to Tables XI and XII (*algorithms 4* and *5*). In this section, the invader tries to recover 4 parameters. To indicate that our improved scheme is secure against this attack, we design two games shown in the Tables XI and XII. In the games, \mathcal{A} obtains R_i, Q_i , and b from smart card memory by power attack and runs the games mentioned in the *algorithm 4* and *5*.

- After recovering R_i , and b , \mathcal{A} tries to obtain the user's private key and ID which are described in Table XI indetails.

According to the Table XI, \mathcal{A} has no chance to obtain a user's private key and ID , so:

$$Succ_{\mathcal{A}-PW_i}^{Imp-Chen} = Pr[EXP_{\mathcal{A}}^{hash}] \leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{PW_i-length}$$

$$Succ_{\mathcal{A}-ID_i}^{Imp-Chen} = Pr[EXP_{\mathcal{A}}^{hash}] \leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{ID_i-length}$$

$$Succ_{\mathcal{A}}^{Imp-Chen} = Pr[EXP_{\mathcal{A}}^{hash}] \leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{(ID_i \| PW_i)-length} \leq \epsilon$$

- According to the recovering the server's private key which is described in Table X, if an output of the *algorithm3* is 1 (but, we prove formally, its

TABLE XII
STOLEN SMART CARD

Algorithm5 $EXP_{ImpChen}^{Hash}$

Set up:
Input: Q_i and b recovered from smart card memory by power attack, correct x , and PW_i which are guess successfully from Table X
Output: 1 (success) / 0 (failure)

Challenge:
1. Recovers Q_i from smart card by power attack
2. Assumes that x^* , and PW_i^* are correct and $Pr[x^* = x \cap PW_i^* = PW_i] = 1$
3. Selects randomly ID_i^*
4. Computes $Q_i^* = h(ID_i^* || x) || h(PW_i \oplus b)$

Guess:
If $Q_i^* = Q_i$ then
Return 1 and accept ID_i^* as user ID
else
return 0

probability is negligible). It means we assume that \mathcal{A} obtains the x , and PW_i successfully and tries to guess the ID_i . To proof formally that \mathcal{A} has no ability to obtain the user ID and breaks the user privacy, we design a game and depict it on the Table XII.

In the *algorithm5* we assume that $Pr[x^* = x \cap PW_i^* = PW_i] = 1$. However, \mathcal{A} can obtain the user ID with negligible probability. We note that:

$$Succ_A^{Imp-Chen} = Pr[EXP_A^{Hash} | Pr[x^* = x \cap PW_i^* = PW_i] = 1] \leq \epsilon$$

We know that $Pr[x^* = x \cap PW_i^* = PW_i] \leq \epsilon$. So, \mathcal{A} has no chance to guess ID_i successfully. It is great anonymity level (\mathcal{A} has the server's secret and user's password, but it cannot break the user privacy and obtain user's ID).

- **Stolen server attack**

According our alleviated scheme, R_i , and Q_i are parameters stored in user memory and server database. So, the designed games in this item are similar to previous item (stolen smart card attack) and there is no need to repeat the formal analysis for this item.

- **Privilege insider attack**

According to the section 3.2 and the definition of privilege insider attack, we assume that the servers are malicious and we want that they have no information about user identity. To prove that our alleviated scheme is resists to privilege insider attack, we design a game and show it on the Table XIII.

We assumed that, we have secure one-way hash function and the success probability of obtain the hash argument is negligible. So, we note for this item:

$$Succ_A^{Imp-Chen} = Pr[EXP_A^{Hash}] \leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{ID_i-length}$$

V. COMPARISON

In this section, we compare our improved scheme with other schemes in both security features and performance cost.

TABLE XIII
PRIVILEGE INSIDER ATTACK

Algorithm6 $EXP_{ImpChen}^{Hash}$

Set up:
Input: Kn , C_i , T_1 , and n_i received form public channel
Output: 1 (success) / 0 (failure)

Challenge:
1. Receives Kn , C_i , T_1 , and n_i form public channel
2. Computes $Kn \oplus n_i = Q_i \oplus PWB_i$
3. Searches $Q_i \oplus PWB_i$ and find Q_i , and R_i
4. Computes $PWB_i = Q_i \oplus PWB_i \oplus Q_i$
(Now, the challenger has Kn , C_i , T_1 , n_i , Q_i , R_i , and PWB_i)
Note: Challenger wants to obtain ID_i and it uses the parameters contain user ID

Result: Challenger uses R_i , and Q_i to recover ID_i

5. Selects randomly ID_i^*
6. Computes $Q_i^* = h(ID_i^* || x) \oplus PWB_i$ and $R_i^* = h(PWB_i || ID_i^*)$

Guess:
If $Q_i^* = Q_i$, or $R_i^* = R_i$
Return 1 and accepts ID_i^* as user ID
else
return 0

- **Security features**

Chen *et al* proposed a scheme for mobile pay-TV [16], and then Kim *et al* improved it in 2012 against the *stolen card attacks* [19]. However, we mentioned in the previous sections, the improvement seems to be wrong. It has weaknesses such as *breaking user privacy*, user traceability and some forms of computing like Chen's scheme. In this section, we showed in the Table XIV, the benefits of our alleviated scheme compare with that of Chen *et al*.

According to Table XIV, our improved scheme has even more security features than Sabzinejad Farash's scheme [6] and our alleviated scheme much more lighter the Farash's scheme. Also, our scheme is more secure than both Chen's scheme [16] and its improvement proposed in 2012 [19]. Our scheme is secure against stolen/lost smart card, impersonation, and stolen verifier attacks, but \mathcal{A} can impersonate users in Yeh L's scheme [10].

- **Performance cost**

In recent years, many anonymous authentication schemes for mobil pay-TV are proposed. Some of them only use of hash function and suitable for light device. According to [39], we assume the execution time of the hash function is $0.13\mu s$ and the execution time of pairing function is $17500.354\mu s$. It is clearly that the pairing-based schemes are much heavier and slower than the schemes use only hash function (for example, the execution time of our improved scheme in issue phase is $1.3\mu s$ and the execution time of issue phase in Wu *et al* [28] is about $2777.357\mu s$). We depict in the Table XV performance comparison of our improved scheme with other light schemes.

TABLE XIV
SECURITY FEATURES COMPARISON

| Scheme \ Security Feature | S1 | S2 | S3 | S4 | S5 | S6 | S7 |
|-------------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Chen <i>et al</i> [16] (2011) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✗ | ✗ | ✓ | ✗ |
| Kim <i>et al</i> [19] (2012) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✗ | ✗ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Yeh L [10] (2012) | ✗ | ✗ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Sabzinejad Farash [6] (2016) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✗ | ✓ |
| Our Improved Scheme | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |

Note:
S1: Resistance against stolen/lost smart card attack and user impersonation attack
S2: Resistance against stolen verifier or stolen verification table and server impersonation attack
S3: Resistance against DoA attack
S4: Secure against privacy preserving (compromise user's ID for other server, which is not server that submitted user)
S5: Secure against user traceability
S6: Provide mutual authentication
S7: Resistance against privilege insider attack

TABLE XV
PERFORMANCE COMPARISON

| Scheme \ Feature | P1 | P2 | P3 | P4 | P5 | P6 | P7 | P8 |
|------------------|----|------|----|------|----|------|----|----|
| Chen [16] | 6 | 0.78 | 7 | 0.91 | 7 | 0.91 | 4 | 5 |
| Kim [19] | 7 | 0.91 | 20 | 1.3 | 7 | 0.91 | 4 | 5 |
| Li [21] | 5 | 0.65 | 9 | 1.17 | 20 | 2.6 | 6 | 4 |
| Our scheme | 3 | 0.39 | 6 | 0.78 | 4 | 0.52 | 3 | 4 |

Note:
P1: The number of hash function in registration phase
P2: The execution time of registration phase (μs)
P3: The number of hash function in issue phase - user side
P4: The execution time of issue phase - user side (μs)
P5: The number of hash function in issue phase - server side
P6: The execution time of issue phase - server side (μs)
P7: The number of parameters stored in the smart card
P8: The number of parameters send on public channel in issue phase

VI. CONCLUSION

To save energy, lightweight devices have become customary. Light protocols should help them to develop. However, we have to respect to their security and privacy policies. one important aspect of privacy is an anonymity fulfilled by anonymous authentication protocols. Recently, a lot of anonymous authentication protocols have been proposed which is based on secure hash function or bilinear pairing transform. Hash-based protocols are lightweight and quick to run. Our alleviated protocol is more secure and lighter than mentioned protocols. Since the light devices such as sensors, smart cards, and smart phones are increasing, we predict lightweight protocols and hash-based protocols will be more popular to be paid.

REFERENCES

- [1] Rayan, Nirmal Lourdh, and Chaitanya Krishna. "A survey on mobile wireless networks." *International Journal of Scientific and Engineering Research* (2014).
- [2] Bhalla, Mudit Ratana, and Anand Vardhan Bhalla. "Generations of mobile wireless technology: A survey." *International Journal of Computer Applications* 5.4 (2010).
- [3] B.KiranKumar. Latest Trends in Wireless Mobile Communication. *International Journal of Computer Science and Information Technologies* 2012.
- [4] Armstrong, Mark. "Competition in the pay-TV market." *Journal of the Japanese and International Economies* 13.4 (1999): 257-280.
- [5] Liu, Xuefeng, and Yuqing Zhang. "A privacy-preserving acceleration authentication protocol for mobile pay-TV systems." *Security and Communication Networks* 6.3 (2013): 361-372.
- [6] Farash, Mohammad Sabzinejad, and Mahmoud Ahmadian Attari. "A provably secure and efficient authentication scheme for access control in mobile pay-TV systems." *Multimedia Tools and Applications* 75.1 (2016): 405-424.
- [7] Bria, Aurelian, Patrik Karrberg, and Per Andersson. "TV in the mobile or TV for the mobile: challenges and changing value chains." *Personal, Indoor and Mobile Radio Communications, 2007. PIMRC 2007. IEEE 18th International Symposium on*. IEEE, 2007.
- [8] Bakhtiari, Shaghayegh, Ahmad Baraani, and Mohammad-Reza Khayyambashi. "Mobicash: A new anonymous mobile payment system implemented by elliptic curve cryptography." *Computer Science and Information Engineering, 2009 WRI World Congress on*. Vol. 3. IEEE, 2009.
- [9] Popescu, Constantin. "An anonymous mobile payment system based on bilinear pairings." *Informatica* 20.4 (2009): 579-590.
- [10] Yeh, Lo-Yao, and Woei-Jiunn Tsaur. "A secure and efficient authentication scheme for access control in mobile pay-TV systems." *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia* 14.6 (2012): 1690-1693.
- [11] Banaeian Far, Saeed, and Mahdi R. Alagheband. "Provable analysis and improvement of smart card-based anonymous authentication protocols." *International Journal of Communication Systems*: e3542.
- [12] Yang, Guomin, et al. "Universal authentication protocols for anonymous wireless communications." *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications* 9.1 (2010).
- [13] ZHANG, De-dong, Xin-xin NIU, and Yong Peng. "Anonymous authentication scheme of trusted mobile terminal under mobile Internet." *The Journal of China Universities of Posts and Telecommunications* 20.1 (2013): 58-65.
- [14] Bapana, Surekha, K. Lakshmi Narayana, and Chandra Sekhar Vorugunti. "An energy efficient remote user authentication scheme preserving user anonymity." *Contemporary Computing and Informatics (IC3I), 2014 International Conference on*. IEEE, 2014.
- [15] Yang J-H and Chang C-C. "An ID-based remote mutual authentication with key agreement scheme for mobile devices on elliptic curve cryptosystem." *ComputSecur.* 2009; 28:138-43.
- [16] Chen, Tien-Ho, et al. "An efficient anonymous authentication protocol for mobile pay-TV." *Journal of Network and Computer Applications* 34.4 (2011): 1131-1137.
- [17] Wang, Huaqun, and Bo Qin. "Improved one-to-many authentication scheme for access control in pay-TV systems." *IET information Security* 6.4 (2012): 281-290.
- [18] Chen, Chi-Tung, and Cheng-Chi Lee. "A two-factor authentication scheme with anonymity for multi-server environments." *Security and Communication Networks* 8.8 (2015): 1608-1625.
- [19] Kim, Hyunsung, and Sung Woon Lee. "Anonymous authentication protocol for mobile pay-TV system." *Computer Applications for Security, Control and System Engineering* (2012): 471-478.
- [20] Camenisch, Jan, Jean-Marc Piveteau, and Markus Stadler. "An efficient

- fair payment system." *Proceedings of the 3rd ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. ACM, 1996.
- [21] Li, Xiong, et al. "An efficient and security dynamic identity based authentication protocol for multi-server architecture using smart cards." *Journal of Network and Computer Applications* 35.2 (2012): 763-769.
- [22] Brickell, Ernest F., Peter Gemmell, and David W. Kravitz. "Trustee-based Tracing Extensions to Anonymous Cash and the Making of Anonymous Change." *SODA*. Vol. 95. 1995.
- [23] Stadler, Markus, Jean-Marc Piveteau, and Jan Camenisch. "Fair blind signatures." *International Conference on the Theory and Applications of Cryptographic Techniques*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1995.
- [24] Tsai, Jia-Lun, and Nai-Wei Lo. "A chaotic map-based anonymous multi-server authenticated key agreement protocol using smart card." *International Journal of Communication Systems* 28.13 (2015): 1955-1963.
- [25] Abbasdasari, Ranjit, Ravi Mukkamala, and V. Valli Kumari. "Mobicoin: digital cash for m-commerce." *International conference on distributed computing and internet technology*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2004.
- [26] Kuo, Wen-Chung, et al. "An enhanced secure anonymous authentication scheme based on smart cards and biometrics for multi-server environments." *Information Security (AsiaJCIS), 2015 10th Asia Joint Conference on*. IEEE, 2015.
- [27] Heydari, Mohammad, et al. "An improved one-to-many authentication scheme based on bilinear pairings with provable security for mobile pay-TV systems." *Multimedia Tools and Applications* 76.12 (2017): 14225-14245.
- [28] Wu, Hsiao-Ling, Chin-Chen Chang, and Chin-Yu Sun. "A secure authentication scheme with provable correctness for pay-TV systems." *Security and Communication Networks* 9.11 (2016): 1577-1588.
- [29] He, Debiao, et al. "One-to-many authentication for access control in mobile pay-TV systems." *Science China Information Sciences* 59.5 (2016): 052108.
- [30] Wu, Hsiao-Ling, and Chin-Chen Chang. "Attacks on a provably secure and efficient authentication scheme for access control in mobile pay-TV systems." *Multimedia Tools and Applications* (2017): 1-11.
- [31] Sureshkumar, Venkatasamy, et al. "A lightweight two-gateway based payment protocol ensuring accountability and unlinkable anonymity with dynamic identity." *Computers & Electrical Engineering* 57 (2017): 223-240.
- [32] Lumini, Alessandra, and Loris Nanni. "An improved biohashing for human authentication." *Pattern recognition* 40.3 (2007): 1057-1065.
- [33] Lindell, Andrew. "Anonymous Authentication" Black Hat. 2007.
- [34] Djellali, Benchaa, et al. "User authentication scheme preserving anonymity for ubiquitous devices." *Security and Communication Networks* 8.17 (2015): 3131-3141.
- [35] Anderson, Ross. *Two remarks on public key cryptology*. No. UCAM-CL-TR-549. University of Cambridge, Computer Laboratory, 2002.
- [36] Madhusudhan, R. "A secure and lightweight authentication scheme for roaming service in global mobile networks." *Journal of Information Security and Applications* 38 (2018): 96-110.
- [37] Messerges, Thomas S., Ezzy A. Dabbish, and Robert H. Sloan. "Investigations of Power Analysis Attacks on Smartcards." *Smartcard* 99 (1999): 151-161.
- [38] Y. Choi, J. Nam, D. Lee, J. Kim, J. Jung and D. Won "Security enhanced anonymous multi server authenticated key agreement scheme using smart card and biometrics." *The Scientific World Journal*, Vol. 2014, Article 281305 , 2014.
- [39] Arshad, Hamed, et al. "Design and FPGA implementation of an efficient security mechanism for mobile pay-TV systems." *International Journal of Communication Systems* 30.15 (2017).
- [40] Biesmans, Wouter, et al. "Private Mobile Pay-TV From Priced Oblivious Transfer." *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security* 13.2 (2018): 280-291.
- [41] Sun, Hung-Min, and Muh-Chyi Leu. "An efficient authentication scheme for access control in mobile pay-TV systems." *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia* 11.5 (2009): 947-959.
- [42] Abbasdasari, Ranjit, Ravi Mukkamala, and V. Valli Kumari. "Mobicoin: digital cash for m-commerce." *International conference on distributed computing and internet technology*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2004.
- [43] N. Attrapadung and H. Imai, "Conjunctive broadcast and attribute-based encryption," in *Pairing-Based Cryptography-Pairing 2009*. Springer, 2009, pp. 248-265.