

## Chapter 5

# Modification Check Values

- ❑ Cryptographic hash functions
- ❑ MDC, MAC
- ❑ MD5, SHA-1
- ❑ H-MAC, CBC-MAC


## Cryptographic Hash Functions



- ❑ Definition: *hash function*
  - ❑ A *hash function* is a function  $h$  which has the following two properties:
    - *Compression*:  $h$  maps an input  $x$  of arbitrary finite bit length, to an output  $h(x)$  of fixed bit length  $n$
    - *Ease of computation*: Given  $h$  and  $x$  it is *easy* to compute  $h(x)$
- ❑ Definition: *cryptographic hash function*
  - ❑ A *cryptographic hash function*  $h$  needs to satisfy the following properties:
    - *Pre-image resistance*: for essentially all pre-specified outputs  $y$ , it is computationally infeasible to find an  $x$  such that  $h(x) = y$
    - *2<sup>nd</sup> pre-image resistance*: given  $x$  it is computationally infeasible to find any second input  $x'$  with  $x \neq x'$  such that  $h(x) = h(x')$
    - *Collision resistance*: it is computationally infeasible to find any pair  $(x, x')$  with  $x \neq x'$  such that  $h(x) = h(x')$
  - ❑ *Cryptographic hash functions* are used to compute *modification detection codes (MDC)*

- ❑ It is common practice in data communications to compute some kind of *error detection code* over messages, that enables the receiver to check if a message was **accidentally altered** during transmission
  - ❑ Examples: Parity, Bit-Interleaved Parity, Cyclic Redundancy Check (CRC)
- ❑ This leads to the wish of having a similar value that allows to check, if a message has been **intentionally modified** during transmission
  - ❑ If somebody wants to intentionally modify a message which is protected with a CRC value he can re-compute the CRC value after modification or modify the message in a way that it leads to the same CRC value
  - ❑ Therefore, a *modification check value* will have to fulfill additional properties that will make it impossible for attackers to forge it
- ❑ Two main categories of modification check values:
  - ❑ **Modification Detection Code (MDC)**
  - ❑ **Message Authentication Code (MAC)**

## Message Authentication Codes (MAC)



- ❑ Definition: *message authentication code*
  - ❑ A *message authentication code algorithm* is a family of functions  $h_k$  parameterized by a secret key  $k$  with the following properties:
    - *Compression*:  $h_k$  maps an input  $x$  of arbitrary finite bitlength to an output  $h_k(x)$  of fixed bitlength, called the MAC
    - *Ease of computation*: given  $k$ ,  $x$  and a known function family  $h_k$  the value  $h_k(x)$  is easy to compute
    - *Computation-resistance*: for every fixed, allowed, but unknown value of  $k$ , given zero or more text-MAC pairs  $(x_i, h_k(x_i))$  it is computationally infeasible to compute a text-MAC pair  $(x, h_k(x))$  for any new input  $x \neq x_i$
  - ❑ Please note that *computation-resistance* implies the property of *key non-recovery*, that is  $k$  can not be recovered from pairs  $(x_i, h_k(x_i))$ , but computation resistance can not be deduced from key non-recovery, as the key  $k$  need not always to be recovered to forge new MACs



- For illustrative purposes, consider the following MAC definition:
  - Input: message  $m = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$  with  $x_i$  being 64-bit values, and key  $k$
  - Compute  $\Delta(m) := x_1 \oplus x_2 \oplus \dots \oplus x_n$  with  $\oplus$  denoting bitwise exclusive-or
  - Output: MAC  $C_k(m) := E_k(\Delta(m))$  with  $E_k(x)$  denoting DES encryption
  - The key length is 56 bit and the MAC length is 64 bit, so we would expect an effort of about  $2^{55}$  operations to obtain the key  $k$  and break the MAC (i.e., being able to forge messages).
- Unfortunately the MAC definition is insecure:
  - Assume an attacker Eve who wants to forge messages exchanged between Alice and Bob obtains a message  $(m, C_k(m))$  which has been “protected” by Alice using the secret key  $k$  shared with Bob
  - Eve can construct a message  $m'$  that yields the same MAC:
    - Let  $y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{n-1}$  be arbitrary 64-bit values
    - Define  $y_n := y_1 \oplus y_2 \oplus \dots \oplus y_{n-1} \oplus \Delta(m)$ , and  $m' := (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n)$
    - When Bob receives  $(m', C_k(m))$  from Eve pretending to be Alice he will accept it as being originated by Alice as  $C_k(m)$  is a valid MAC for  $m'$

## Attacks Based on the Birthday Phenomenon




- The Birthday Phenomenon:
  - How many people need to be in a room such that the possibility that there are at least two people with the same birthday is greater than 0.5?
  - For simplicity, we don't care about February, 29, and assume that each birthday is equally likely
- Define  $P(n, k) := \text{Pr}[\text{at least one duplicate in } k \text{ items, with each item able to take one of } n \text{ equally likely values between 1 and } n]$
- Define  $Q(n, k) := \text{Pr}[\text{no duplicate in } k \text{ items, each between 1 and } n]$ 
  - We are able to choose the first item from  $n$  possible values, the second item from  $n - 1$  possible values, etc.
  - Hence, the number of different ways to choose  $k$  items out of  $n$  values with no duplicates is:  $N = n \times (n - 1) \times \dots \times (n - k + 1) = n! / (n - k)!$
  - The number of different ways to choose  $k$  items out of  $n$  values, with or without duplicates is:  $n^k$
  - So,  $Q(n, k) = N / n^k = n! / ((n - k)! \times n^k)$



- Principal application which led original design: **message integrity**
  - An MDC represents a *digital fingerprint*, which can be signed with a private key, e.g. using the RSA or ElGamal algorithm, and it is not possible to construct two messages with the same fingerprint so that a given signed fingerprint can not be re-used by an attacker
  - A MAC over a message  $m$  directly certifies that the sender of the message possesses the secret key  $k$  and the message could not have been modified without knowledge of that key
- Other applications, which require some caution:
  - Confirmation of knowledge
  - Key derivation
  - Pseudo-random number generation

## Attacks Based on the Birthday Phenomenon



- We have:
 
$$P(n, k) = 1 - Q(n, k) = 1 - \frac{n!}{(n - k)! \times n^k}$$

$$= 1 - \frac{n \times (n - 1) \times \dots \times (n - k + 1)}{n^k}$$

$$= 1 - \left[ \frac{n - 1}{n} \times \frac{n - 2}{n} \times \dots \times \frac{n - k + 1}{n} \right]$$

$$= 1 - \left[ \left( 1 - \frac{1}{n} \right) \times \left( 1 - \frac{2}{n} \right) \times \dots \times \left( 1 - \frac{k - 1}{n} \right) \right]$$
- We will use the following inequality:  $(1 - x) \leq e^{-x}$  for all  $x \geq 0$
- So:
 
$$P(n, k) > 1 - \left[ \left( e^{-1/n} \right) \times \left( e^{-2/n} \right) \times \dots \times \left( e^{-(k-1)/n} \right) \right]$$

$$= 1 - e^{-\left[ \frac{1}{n} + \frac{2}{n} + \dots + \frac{k-1}{n} \right]}$$

$$= 1 - e^{-\frac{k \times (k-1)}{2n}}$$
- In the last step, we used the equality:  $1 + 2 + \dots + (k - 1) = (k^2 - k) / 2$ 
  - Exercise: proof the above equality by induction



- Let's go back to our original question: how many people  $k$  have to be in one room such that there are at least two people with the same birthday (out of  $n = 365$  possible) with probability  $\geq 0,5$ ?

- So, we want to solve:

$$\frac{1}{2} = 1 - e^{-k \times (k-1) / 2n}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow 2 = e^{k \times (k-1) / 2n}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \ln(2) = \frac{k \times (k-1)}{2n}$$

- For large  $k$  we can approximate  $k \times (k-1)$  by  $k^2$ , and we get:

$$k = \sqrt{2 \ln(2)n} \approx 1.18\sqrt{n}$$

- For  $n = 365$ , we get  $k = 22.54$  which is quite close to the correct answer 23



- As we learned from the birthday phenomenon, she will just have to produce about  $\sqrt{2^r} = 2^{r/2}$  variations of each of the two messages such that the probability that she obtains two messages  $m1'$  and  $m2'$  with the same MDC is at least 0.5
- As she has to store the messages together with their MDCs in order to find a match, the memory requirement of her attack is on the order of  $2^{r/2}$  and its computation time requirement is on the same order
- After she has found  $m1'$  and  $m2'$  with  $MDC1(m1') = MDC1(m2')$  she asks Alice to sign  $m2'$ . Eve can then take this signature and claim that Alice signed  $m1'$ .
- Attacks following this method are called *birthday attacks*
- Consider now, that Alice uses RSA with keys of length 2048 bit and a cryptographic hash function which produces MDCs of length 96 bit.
  - Eve's average effort to produce two messages  $m1'$  and  $m2'$  as described above is on the order of  $2^{48}$ , which is feasible today. Breaking RSA keys of length 2048 bit is far out of reach with today's algorithms and technology.



- What does this have to do with MDCs?
- We have shown, that if there are  $n$  possible different values, the number  $k$  of values one needs to randomly choose in order to obtain at least one pair of identical values, is in the order of  $\sqrt{n}$
- Now, consider the following attack [Yuv79a]:
  - Eve wants Alice to sign a message  $m1$ , Alice normally never would sign. Eve knows that Alice uses the function  $MDC1(m)$  to compute an MDC of  $m$  which has length  $r$  bit before she signs this MDC with her private key yielding her digital signature.
  - First, Eve produces her message  $m1$ . If she would now compute  $MDC1(m1)$  and then try to find a second harmless message  $m2$  which leads to the same MDC her search effort in the average case would be on the order of  $2^{(r-1)}$ .
  - Instead she takes any harmless message  $m2$  and starts producing variations  $m1'$  and  $m2'$  of the two messages, e.g. by adding `<space>` `<backspace>` combinations or varying with semantically identical words.




- Cryptographic Hash Functions for creating MDCs:
  - Message Digest 5 (MD5):
    - Invented by R. Rivest
    - Successor to MD4
  - Secure Hash Algorithm 1 (SHA-1):
    - Invented by the National Security Agency (NSA)
    - The design was inspired by MD4
- Message Authentication Codes:
  - DES-CBC-MAC:
    - Uses the Data Encryption Standard in Cipher Block Chaining mode
    - In general, the CBC-MAC construction can be used with any block cipher
  - MACs constructed from MDCs:
    - This very common approach raises some cryptographic concern as it makes some implicit but unverified assumptions about the properties of the MDC



- Like most of today's block ciphers follow the general structure of a Feistel network, most cryptographic hash functions in use today follow a common structure:

- Let  $y$  be an arbitrary message. Usually, the length of the message is appended to the message and it is padded to a multiple of some block size  $b$ . Let  $(y_0, y_1, \dots, y_{L-1})$  denote the resulting message consisting of  $L$  blocks of size  $b$
- The general structure is as depicted below:



- $CV$  is a chaining value, with  $CV_0 := IV$  and  $MDC(y) := CV_L$
- $f$  is a specific compression function which compresses  $(n + b)$  bit to  $n$  bit

## The Message Digest 5



- MD5 follows the common structure outlined before [Riv92a]:
  - The message  $y$  is padded by a "1" followed by 0 to 511 "0" bits such that the length of the resulting message is congruent 448 modulo 512
  - The length of the original message is added as a 64-bit value resulting in a message that has length which is an integer multiple of 512 bit
  - This new message is divided into blocks of length  $b = 512$  bit
  - The length of the chaining value is  $n = 128$  bit
    - The chaining value is "structured" as four 32-bit registers A, B, C, D
    - Initialization:  $A := 0x\ 01\ 23\ 45\ 67$      $B := 0x\ 89\ AB\ CD\ EF$   
 $C := 0x\ FE\ DC\ BA\ 98$      $D := 0x\ 76\ 54\ 32\ 10$
    - This initialization vector is in little-endian format
  - Each block of the message  $y_i$  is processed with the chaining value  $CV_i$  with the function  $f$  which is internally realized by 4 rounds of 16 steps each
    - Each round uses a similar structure and makes use of a table  $T$  containing 64 constant values of 32-bit each,
    - Each of the four rounds uses a specific logical function  $g$




- The hash function  $H$  can be summarized as follows:

- $CV_0 = IV =$  initial  $n$ -bit value
- $CV_i = f(CV_{i-1}, y_{i-1}) \quad 1 \leq i \leq L$
- $H(y) = CV_L$

- It has been shown [Mer89a] that if the compression function  $f$  is collision resistant, then the resulting iterated hash function  $H$  is also collision resistant.
- Cryptanalysis of cryptographic hash functions thus concentrates on the internal structure of the function  $f$  and finding efficient techniques to produce collisions for a single execution of  $f$
- Primarily motivated by birthday attacks, a common minimum suggestion for  $n$ , the bit length of the hash value, is 160 bit, as this implies an effort of order  $2^{80}$  to attack which is considered infeasible today

## The Message Digest 5 – Structure of One Step




- The function  $g$  is one of four different logical functions
- $y_i[k]$  denotes the  $k^{\text{th}}$  32-bit word of message block  $i$
- $T[j]$  is the  $j^{\text{th}}$  entry of table  $t$  with  $j$  incremented modulo 64 every step
- $CLS_s$  denotes cyclical left shift by  $s$  bits with  $s$  following some schedule




- ❑ The MD5-MDC over a message is the content of the chaining value CV after processing the final message block
- ❑ Security of MD5:
  - ❑ Every bit of the 128-bit hash code is a function of every input bit
  - ❑ Between 1992 and 1996 significant progress in cryptanalyzing MD5 has been published:
    - In 1996 H. Dobbertin published an attack that allows to generate a collision for the function  $f$  (realized by the 64 steps described above).
    - While this attack has not yet been extended to a full collision for MD5 with its initialization vector, it raises nevertheless serious concern.
  - ❑ In reaction to this RSA Laboratories publish in 1996 [Rob96a]:
    - *“Existing signatures formed using MD5 are not at risk and while MD5 is still suitable for a variety of applications (namely those which rely on the one-way property of MD5 and on the random appearance of the output) as a precaution it should not be used for future applications that require the hash function to be collision-resistant.”*

## The Secure Hash Algorithm SHA-1 – One Step




- ❑  $t \in \{0, \dots, 15\} \Rightarrow W_t := y_i[t]$
- ❑  $t \in \{16, \dots, 79\} \Rightarrow W_t := \text{CLS}_1(W_{t-16} \oplus W_{t-14} \oplus W_{t-8} \oplus W_{t-3})$
- ❑ After step 79 each register A, B, C, D, E is added modulo  $2^{32}$  with the value of the corresponding register before step 0 to compute  $CV_{i+1}$



- ❑ Also SHA-1 follows the common structure as described above:
  - ❑ SHA-1 works on 512-bit blocks and produces a 160-bit hash value
  - ❑ As its design was also inspired by the MD4 algorithm, its initialization is basically the same like that of MD5:
    - The data is padded, a length field is added and the resulting message is processed as blocks of length 512 bit
    - The chaining value is structured as five 32-bit registers A, B, C, D, E
    - Initialization:  $A = 0x\ 67\ 45\ 23\ 01$       $B = 0x\ EF\ CD\ AB\ 89$   
 $C = 0x\ 98\ BA\ DC\ FE$       $D = 0x\ 10\ 32\ 54\ 76$   
 $E = 0x\ C3\ D2\ E1\ F0$
    - The values are stored in big-endian format
  - ❑ Each block  $y_i$  of the message is processed together with  $CV_i$  in a module realizing the compression function  $f$  in four rounds of 20 steps each.
    - The rounds have a similar structure but each round uses a different primitive logical function  $f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4$
    - Each step makes use of a fixed additive constant  $K_t$ , which remains unchanged during one round

## The Secure Hash Algorithm SHA-1



- ❑ The SHA-1-MDC over a message is the content of the chaining value CV after processing the final message block
- ❑ Security of SHA-1:
  - ❑ As SHA-1 produces MDCs of length 160 bit, it offers better security against brute-force and birthday attacks than MD5
  - ❑ Up to now, no cryptanalytic results against the compression function of SHA-1 have been published
    - However, it has to be stated, that the design criteria of SHA-1 are not known, which makes cryptanalysis more difficult
- ❑ Further comparison between SHA-1 and MD5:
  - ❑ Speed: SHA-1 is about 25% slower than MD5 (CV is about 25% bigger)
  - ❑ Simplicity and compactness: both algorithms are simple to describe and implement and do not require large programs or substitution tables
  - ❑ Little-endian vs. big-endian architecture: no advantage of either approach
  - ❑ RSA Laboratories (who invented MD5) recommend SHA-1 or RipeMD-160 for applications that require collision resistance [Rob96a]

## Constructing a MAC from a MDC



- Reasons for constructing MACs from MDCs:
  - Cryptographic hash functions generally execute faster than symmetric block ciphers
  - There were no export restrictions to cryptographic hash functions
- Basic idea: “mix” a secret key  $K$  with the input and compute an MDC
  - The assumption that an attacker needs to know  $K$  to produce a valid MAC nevertheless raises some cryptographic concern:
    - The construction  $H(K, m)$  is not secure (see note 9.64 in [Men97a])
    - The construction  $H(m, K)$  is not secure (see note 9.65 in [Men97a])
    - The construction  $H(K, p, m, K)$  with  $p$  denoting an additional padding field does not offer sufficient security (see note 9.66 in [Men97a])
  - The most used construction is:  $H(K, p_1, H(K, p_2, m))$ 
    - Two different padding patterns  $p_1$  and  $p_2$  are used to fill up the key to one input block of the cryptographic hash function
    - This scheme seems to be secure (see note 9.67 in [Men97a])
    - It has been standardized in RFC 2104 [Kra97a] and is called *HMAC*

## Cipher Block Chaining Message Authentication Codes




- Security of CBC-MAC:
  - As an attacker does not know  $K$ , a birthday attack is much more difficult to launch (if not impossible)
  - Attacking a CBC-MAC requires known (message, MAC) pairs
  - This allows for shorter MACs
  - A CBC-MAC can optionally be strengthened by agreeing upon a second key  $K' \neq K$  and performing a triple encryption on the *last* block:
$$\text{MAC} = E(K, D(K', E(K, C_{n-1})))$$
    - This doubles the key space while adding only little computing effort
- There have also been some proposals to create MDCs from symmetric block ciphers with setting the key to a fixed (known) value:
  - Because of the relatively small block size of 64 bit of most common block ciphers, these schemes offer insufficient security against birthday attacks
  - As symmetric block ciphers require more computing effort than dedicated cryptographic hash functions, these schemes are relatively slow

## Cipher Block Chaining Message Authentication Codes



- A CBC-MAC is computed by encrypting a message in CBC Mode and taking the last ciphertext block or a part of it as the MAC:



- This MAC needs not to be signed any further, as it has already been produced using a shared secret  $K$ 
  - However, it is not possible to say who exactly has created a MAC, as everybody (sender, receiver) who knows the secret key  $K$  can do so
- This scheme works with any block cipher (DES, IDEA, ...)

## Summary (what do I need to know)



- Principles of cryptographic hash functions
  - Modification detection code (MDC)
  - Message authentication code (MAC)
- MD5
  - Operation principles
  - Security
- MAC
  - H-MAC – using a cryptographic hash function
  - CBC-MAC – using a symmetric block cipher in CBC mode

## Additional References

---



- [Men97a] A. J. Menezes, P. C. Van Oorschot, S. A. Vanstone. *Handbook of Applied Cryptography*. CRC Press Series on Discrete Mathematics and Its Applications. CRC Press, 1997.
- [Kra97a] H. Krawczyk, M. Bellare, R. Canetti. *HMAC: Keyed-Hashing for Message Authentication*. Internet RFC 2104, February 1997.
- [Mer89a] R. Merkle. *One Way Hash Functions and DES*. Proceedings of Crypto '89, Springer, 1989.
- [Riv92a] R. L. Rivest. *The MD5 Message Digest Algorithm*. Internet RFC 1321, April 1992.
- [Rob96a] M. Robshaw. *On Recent Results for MD2, MD4 and MD5*. RSA Laboratories' Bulletin, No. 4, November 1996.
- [Yuv79a] G. Yuval. *How to Swindle Rabin*. Cryptologia, July 1979.