

# Properties of cryptographic hash functions Preimage Resistance (One-way) *h* is preimage resistant if given a hash value *y*, it is computationally infeasible to find an *x* such that h(x) = y. 2nd Preimage Resistance (Weak Collision Resistance) *h* is 2nd preimage resistant if given a value $x_1$ and its hash $h(x_1)$ , it is computationally infeasible to find another $x_2$ such that $h(x_2) = h(x_1)$ . (Strong) Collision Resistance *h* is collision resistant if it is computationally infeasible to find *any* two inputs $x_1$ and $x_2$ such that $h(x_1) = h(x_2)$ .

## Hash function Classification [HAC]



### **Modification Detection Codes**

- The main application of hash functions is as Modification Detection Codes to provide data integrity.
- A hash h(x) provides a short message digest, a "fingerprint" of some possibly large data x. If the data is altered, the digest should become invalid.
  - This allows the data (but not the hash!) to be stored in an unsecured place.
  - ► If x is altered to x', we hope  $h(x) \neq h(x')$ , so it can be detected.
- This is useful especially where *malicious* alteration is a concern, e.g., software distribution.
- Ordinary hash functions such as CRC-checkers produce checksums which are not 2nd preimage resistant: an attacker could produce a hacked version of a software product and ensure the checksum remained the same.

### Varieties of MDCs

- A one-way hash function (OWHF) is a hash function that satisfies preimage resistance and 2nd-preimage resistance.
- A collision resistant hash function (CRHF) is a hash function that satisfies 2nd-preimage resistance and collision resistance.
- In practice, CRHF usually satisfies preimage resistance.
- CRHFs are harder to construct than OWHFs and have longer length hash values.
- Choice between OWHF and CRHF depends on application:
  - If attacker can control input, CRHF required.
  - Otherwise OWHF suffices
- **Ex**: which is needed for password file security?

### Message Authentication Codes

- Message Authentication Codes are keyed hash functions, indexed with a secret key.
  - As well as data integrity, they provide data-origin authentication, because it is assumed that apart from the recipient, only the sender knows the secret key necessary to compute the MAC.
- A MAC is a key-indexed family of hash functions,  $\{h_k | k \in \mathcal{K}\}$ . MACs must satisfy a *computation resistance* property.

#### **Computation Resistance**

Given a set of pairs  $(x_i, h_k(x_i))$  it is computationally infeasible to find any other text-MAC pair  $(x, k_k(x))$  for a new input  $x \neq x_i$ .

### Relationships between properties

- Collision resistance implies 2nd-preimage resistance.
- Sketch proof [HAC]:
  - Let *h* be CR, but suppose it is not 2nd PI.
  - ► Fix some input *x*; compute *h*(*x*).
  - Since not 2nd PI, we can find an  $x' \neq x$  with h(x') = h(x).
  - But now (x, x') is a collision, so h cannot be CR.
- This and similar arguments (e.g., see Smart) can be made precise using the Random Oracle Model.
- Collision resistance does not imply preimage resistance
- Contrived counterexample:

 $h(x) = \begin{cases} 1 \mid \mid x & \text{if } x \text{ has length } n \\ 0 \mid \mid g(x) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$ 

### Collision Resistance and Birthday Attacks

- To satisfy (strong) collision resistance, a hash function must be large enough to withstand a birthday attack. (or square root attack).
- Drawing random elements with replacement from a set of k elements, a repeat is likely after about  $\sqrt{k}$  selections.
- Mallory has two contracts, one for £1000, the other £100,000, to be signed with a 64-bit hash. He makes 2<sup>32</sup> minor variations in each (e.g spaces/control chars), and finds a pair with the same hash. Later claims second document was signed, not first.
- An *n*-bit unkeyed hash function has **ideal security** if producing a preimage or 2nd-preimage each requires 2<sup>n</sup> operations, and producing a collision requires 2<sup>n/2</sup> operations.

## From one-way functions to MDCs

#### Multiplication of large primes is a OWF

- for appropriate choices of p and q, f(p, q) = pq is a one-way function since integer factorization [FACTORING] is difficult.
- Not feasible to turn into an MD function, though. (Ex: why?)
- Exponentiation in finite fields is a OWF
  - for appropriate primes p and numbers α,
     f(x) = α<sup>x</sup> mod p is a one-way function, since the discrete logarithm problem [DLP] is difficult.
  - Main problem with turning this into a realistic MD function is that it's too slow to calculate.

### OWFs from block ciphers

- A block cipher is an encryption scheme which works on fixed length blocks of input text.
- We can construct a OWF from a block cipher such as DES, which is treated essentially as a random function:

#### $h(x) = E_k(x) \oplus x$

for fixed key k. This *can* be turned into a MD function, by iteration...



## SHA-1 (160)

- Secure Hash Algorithm (rev 1) is a NIST standard [FIPS 180] also based on MD4. Five 32-bit blocks are chained; output is 160 bits. Message blocks 512 bits. Padding like MD5.
  - Main loop has four rounds of 20 operations, chaining 5 variables a, b, c, d, e, f. Five IVs and four constants are used:

$4 = 0 \times 67452301$	K 0.45 A027000
$B = 0 \times EFCDAB89$	$K_0 = 0000000000000000000000000000000000$
$C = 0 \times 98 BADCEE$	$K_1 = 0 \times 6 ED9 EBA1$
$D = 0 \times 10325476$	$K_2 = 0 \times 8 F1 BBCDC$
$S = 0 \times 10525470$	$K_3 = 0 \times CA62C1D6$
E = 0 X C S D Z E I F 0	

The message block undergoes an expansion transformation from 16\*32-bit words x<sub>i</sub> to 80\*32-bit words, w<sub>i</sub> by:

```
 \begin{array}{ll} w_i &=& x_i, & \mbox{for } 0 \leq i \leq 15. \\ w_i &=& (w_{i-3} \oplus w_{i-8} \oplus \\ & & w_{i-14} \oplus w_{i-16}) <<<1, & \mbox{for } 16 \leq i \leq 79. \end{array}
```

## SHA-1 (160) continued

80 steps in main loop, changing Ks and Fs 4 times
 Where *i* = *i*/20:

```
for(i = 0; i < 80; i++) {

tmp = (a < < 5) + F_j(b, c, d) + e + w_i + K_j;

e = d;

c = b < << 30;

b = a;

a = tmp;
```

}

Each F<sub>j</sub> combines three of the five variables:

$$F_0(X,Y,Z) = (X \wedge Y) \vee (\neg X \wedge Z)$$

$$_{1}(X,Y,Z) = X \oplus Y \oplus Z$$

$$F_2(X, Y, Z) = (X \land Y) \lor (X \land Z) \lor (Y$$

 $\wedge Z$ )

- $F_3(X,Y,Z) = X \oplus Y \oplus Z$
- Finally a, b, c, d, e are added to tmp (all addition is modulo 2<sup>32</sup>).
- Exercise: implement SHA-1 in your favourite language following this. Test against sha1sum.

### Current Status

- Hash functions are versatile and powerful primitive.
- However, difficult to construct and less researched than encryption schemes.
  - ideal hash function is a "random mapping" where knowledge of previous results doesn't give knowledge of another.
  - practical fast iterative hash constructions fail this!
  - MD4 (1998), MD5 (1993/2005), SHA-1 (2005) are now all considered broken.
- The US National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) has since developed a set of newer hash functions.
  - Formerly called SHA-2, they are denoted by their output size: SHA-256, SHA-384, SHA-512.
  - However, since they are based upon the same SHA construction, they are not long-term solutions
  - NIST is currently running a SHA-3 competition to determine the successor.

### References

- A. J. Menezes, P. C. Van Oorschot, S. A. Vanstone, eds. Handbook of Applied Cryptography.
   CRC Press, 1997. Online: http://www.cacr.math.uwaterloo.ca/hac.
- Neils Ferguson and Bruce Schneier. Practical Cryptography. John Wiley & Sons, 2003.
- Douglas R Stinson. Cryptography Theory and Practice. CRC Press, second edition edition, 2002.
- Nigel Smart. Cryptography: An Introduction. McGraw-Hill, 2003. Third edition online: http://www.cs.bris.ac.uk/~nigel/Crypto\_Book/

### Recommended Reading

One of: Ch 9 of HAC (9.1–9.2); Ch. 10 of Smart 3rd Ed; 11.1–11.3 of Gollmann.