

FAUST Cryptography Workshop Hash functions and MACs

April 27, 2024

Daniel Tenbrinck





Introduction

Compression and hash functions

Message authentication codes (MACs)

Workshop challenges

Introduction



The word **hash** is a little bit **ambiguous**...

What is a hash?



The word **hash** is a little bit **ambiguous**...





What is a hash?



The word **hash** is a little bit **ambiguous**...





This presentation is about cryptographic hash functions, e.g., *MD5, SHA256, ...*

What is a hash?



The word **hash** is a little bit **ambiguous**...





This presentation is about cryptographic hash functions, e.g., *MD5*, *SHA256*, ...

Example:

Hash("Your silly string could be here!") $\rightarrow 29c5963522fbf955f9...$

April 27, 2024

FAUST Cryptography Workshop

Hash functions are an important tool for various information security applications, e.g.,

Hash functions are an **important tool** for various information security applications, e.g.,

- data integrity validation
 - \rightarrow data fingerprinting to check for modifications
 - \rightarrow checksum to detect data corruption

Hash functions are an **important tool** for various information security applications, e.g.,

• data integrity validation

- \rightarrow data fingerprinting to check for modifications
- \rightarrow checksum to detect data corruption
- authenticity
 - \rightarrow digital signatures, message authentication codes (MACs)
 - \rightarrow secure password storage









• Alice wants to send a **plain text message** *m* to Bob:

m := "Your new bridge is beautiful!"





• Alice wants to send a **plain text message** *m* to Bob:

m := "Your new bridge is beautiful!"

• Hacker performs **MITM** attack and alters the message to:

m' := "Your new bridge is ugly!"



Compression and hash functions



- $\bullet~$ let Σ be a finite set of characters encoding our messages
 - ightarrow e.g., latin alphabet, hexadecimal encoding

 \rightarrow often we assume a binary encoding, i.e., $\Sigma=\{0,1\}$



let Σ be a finite set of characters encoding our messages

 → e.g., latin alphabet, hexadecimal encoding
 → often we assume a binary encoding, i.e., Σ = {0,1}

 we define a compression function c as a map:

$$c\colon \Sigma^n\to \Sigma^k, \qquad n>k.$$

 that means we compress the information of a word w ∈ Σⁿ by compressing it to a smaller word w' =: c(w) ∈ Σ^k



let Σ be a finite set of characters encoding our messages

 → e.g., latin alphabet, hexadecimal encoding
 → often we assume a binary encoding, i.e., Σ = {0,1}

 we define a compression function c as a map:

$$c: \Sigma^n \to \Sigma^k, \qquad n > k.$$

 that means we compress the information of a word w ∈ Σⁿ by compressing it to a smaller word w' =: c(w) ∈ Σ^k

Example: Binary checksum of words with length 4.

$$"0101"
ightarrow "0"$$
, " $1011"
ightarrow "1"$

April 27, 2024

FAUST Cryptography Workshop



• we define a **hash function** *h* as a map:

$$h\colon \Sigma^* \to \Sigma^k$$

 that means we map words w ∈ Σ* of variable size to a word w' =: h(w) ∈ Σ^k of fixed length

Example: Last byte of a word with variable length

"110101"
$$ightarrow$$
 "1", "100" $ightarrow$ "0"



Observation:

It becomes clear that both compression and hash functions are **not injective**, because they map a large set to a smaller set. This inevitably leads to **collisions**, i.e., different words being mapped to the same value.

Example: Binary checksum of words with length 4.

 $"1101" \rightarrow "1"$, "1000" \rightarrow "1"



To use compression or hash functions for cryptography they have to fulfill certain criteria:

- computing a hash value h(m) from a given message $m \in \Sigma^*$ is **efficient**
- finding collisions is numerically unfeasible

ightarrow computing $m,m'\in\Sigma^*$ with h(m)=h(m') impracticable

• generated hash values should be **pseudo-random**

 \rightarrow small changes should lead to completely different values





Idea:

• partition message $m \in \Sigma^*$ in $N \in \mathbb{N}$ words, each of size n:

 $m = m_1 | m_2 | \ldots | m_N$



Idea:

• partition message $m \in \Sigma^*$ in $N \in \mathbb{N}$ words, each of size n:

$$m = m_1 | m_2 | \dots | m_N + p$$

• add appropriate padding *p* at the end

ightarrow e.g., use zeros + binary encoding of message length |m|



Idea:

• partition message $m \in \Sigma^*$ in $N \in \mathbb{N}$ words, each of size n:

$$m = m_1 | m_2 | \ldots | m_N + p$$

• add appropriate padding *p* at the end

ightarrow e.g., use zeros + binary encoding of message length |m|

• now compression function c can be applied to every block





- choose initialization vector (IV), e.g., IV := 0^n
- successively apply c to message block $m_i \in \Sigma^n$ combined with last result $c_{i-1} := c(m_{i-1})$, e.g., $c_i = m_i \oplus c_{i-1}$



- choose initialization vector (IV), e.g., IV := 0^n
- successively apply c to message block $m_i \in \Sigma^n$ combined with last result $c_{i-1} := c(m_{i-1})$, e.g., $c_i = m_i \oplus c_{i-1}$





- choose initialization vector (IV), e.g., IV := 0^n
- successively apply c to message block $m_i \in \Sigma^n$ combined with last result $c_{i-1} := c(m_{i-1})$, e.g., $c_i = m_i \oplus c_{i-1}$





- choose initialization vector (IV), e.g., IV := 0^n
- successively apply c to message block $m_i \in \Sigma^n$ combined with last result $c_{i-1} := c(m_{i-1})$, e.g., $c_i = m_i \oplus c_{i-1}$





- choose initialization vector (IV), e.g., IV := 0^n
- successively apply c to message block $m_i \in \Sigma^n$ combined with last result $c_{i-1} := c(m_{i-1})$, e.g., $c_i = m_i \oplus c_{i-1}$
- result of last block c_N defines output of hash function for message m, i.e., h(m) = h_m := c_N







April 27, 2024

FAUST Cryptography Workshop

14 / 29



Alice sends a plain text message *m* together with its hash value h_m =: h(m) to Bob:

m := "Your new bridge is beautiful!", $h_m = e4689a1$





Alice sends a plain text message *m* together with its hash value h_m =: h(m) to Bob:

m := "Your new bridge is beautiful!", $h_m = e4689a1$

• Hacker performs **MITM attack** and alters the message to:

m' := "Your new bridge is ugly!"





• Bob receives the message m' and computes its hash value $h_{m'} =: h(m')$ as:

m' := "Your new bridge is ugly!", $h'_m = 54c8b30$





• Bob receives the message m' and **computes its hash value** $h_{m'} =: h(m')$ as:

m' := "Your new bridge is ugly!", $h'_m = 54c8b30$

• Bob realizes the message has been modified because:

 $h_m = e4689a1 \neq 54c8b30 = h_{m'}$





Question: Are Alice and Bob now safe from the hacker?


Answer: No, the hacker can modify the hash value as well.



Answer: No, the hacker can modify the hash value as well.





Answer: No, the hacker can modify the hash value as well.



Message authentication codes (MACs)

Question: How can Bob know that the message is really from Alice? **Question:** How can Bob know that the message is really from Alice?

Idea: We need to **add some secret** *s* to the hash function that only Alice and Bob know.

Question: How can Bob know that the message is really from Alice?

Idea: We need to **add some secret** *s* to the hash function that only Alice and Bob know.





Mathematical setting:

• we define a **parametrized hash function** *h^s* as a map:

$$h^{s}: S \times \Sigma^{*} \to \Sigma^{k}$$

• here S is a key space from which we can choose a secret key s



Mathematical setting:

• we define a **parametrized hash function** *h^s* as a map:

$$h^{s}: S \times \Sigma^{*} \to \Sigma^{k}$$

- here S is a key space from which we can choose a secret key s
- since the key s is unknown to externals h^s is called message authentication code (MAC)



Mathematical setting:

• we define a **parametrized hash function** *h^s* as a map:

$$h^{s} \colon S \times \Sigma^{*} \to \Sigma^{k}$$

• here S is a key space from which we can choose a secret key s

 since the key s is unknown to externals h^s is called message authentication code (MAC)

Example: Secret key $s \in S$ is prepended to the message $m \in \Sigma^*$ prior to computing a hash value via h, i.e.,

$$h^s(m) := h(s|m) = h^s_m$$









FAUST Cryptography Workshop



Alice sends a plain text message *m* together with its MAC using the secret *s* ∈ *S* as *h^s_m* =: *h^s(m)* to Bob:
 m := "Your new bridge is beautiful!", *h^s_m* = fa461b





Alice sends a plain text message *m* together with its MAC using the secret *s* ∈ *S* as *h^s_m* =: *h^s(m)* to Bob:

m := "Your new bridge is beautiful!", $h_m^s = fa461b$

- Hacker performs MITM attack and alters the message to:
 m' := "Your new bridge is ugly!"
- Hacker doesn't know the secret $s \in S$ and guesses $g \in S$ generating the MAC $h_{m'}^g = 40 a f de$





 Bob receives the message m' and computes its MAC using the secret s ∈ S as h^s_{m'} =: h^s(m'):

m' := "Your new bridge is ugly!", $h_{m'}^s = 34da47$





 Bob receives the message m' and computes its MAC using the secret s ∈ S as h^s_{m'} =: h^s(m'):

m' := "Your new bridge is ugly!", $h_{m'}^s = 34da47$

• Bob realizes the message was not sent from Alice because:

 $h_{m'}^s$ = 34da47 \neq 40afde = $h_{m'}^g$







Answer: Unfortunately not, if:

- 1. the hash function in the used MAC is based on the Merkle-Damgård construction
- 2. the secret is prepended to the message

Answer: Unfortunately not, if:

- 1. the hash function in the used MAC is based on the Merkle-Damgård construction
- 2. the secret is prepended to the message

Then, the hacker can perform a **length extension attack** and forge a message with valid MAC without knowing the secret.



Assumptions:

- h^s is a MAC that prepends the secret $s \in S$ and has a known Merkle-Damgård hash function and padding p
- $h_m^s := h(s|m|p)$ is MAC for original message m

Assumptions:

- h^s is a MAC that prepends the secret $s \in S$ and has a known Merkle-Damgård hash function and padding p
- $h_m^s := h(s|m|p)$ is MAC for original message m

Goal: Forge a valid MAC for an extended message $\overline{m} := m | e$

Assumptions:

- h^s is a MAC that prepends the secret $s \in S$ and has a known Merkle-Damgård hash function and padding p
- $h_m^s := h(s|m|p)$ is MAC for original message m

Goal: Forge a valid MAC for an extended message $\overline{m} := m | e$

Example:

m: amount=1000&receiver=bob

 $h_m^s = h(s|m|p) = 7b2f60$

\overline{m} : amount=1000&receiver=bobby





















- s is included in observed MAC $h_m^s \rightarrow$ use h_m^s as input for compression function c in Merkle-Damgård hash function
- $h_m^s = h(s|m|p)$, but we don't know length of s and p:

$$h_m^s = h(\mathbf{s}|m_1|m_2|\cdots|m_N|\mathbf{p})$$



- s is included in observed MAC $h_m^s \rightarrow$ use h_m^s as input for compression function c in Merkle-Damgård hash function
- $h_m^s = h(s|m|p)$, but we don't know length of s and p:

$$h_m^s = h(s|m_1|m_2|\cdots|m_N|p)$$

• use **brute-force** to guess needed padding \overline{p} so that $\overline{m} = m|\overline{p}|e$ generates a valid MAC $h_{\overline{m}}^{s}$







Idea: Combine secret *s* and message *m* via a hash function *h* in a more sophisticated way to compute a hash-based message authentication code (HMAC).

 $\mathsf{HMAC}(s,m) := h[s \oplus \mathsf{opad} | h(s \oplus \mathsf{ipad} | m)]$



Idea: Combine secret *s* and message *m* via a hash function *h* in a more sophisticated way to compute a hash-based message authentication code (HMAC).

$$HMAC(s, m) := h[s \oplus opad | h(s \oplus ipad | m)]$$

ipad and opad are paddings with two different byte constants,
 e.g., ipad = 0x5c...0x5c, opad = 0x36...0x36



Idea: Combine secret *s* and message *m* via a hash function *h* in a more sophisticated way to compute a hash-based message authentication code (HMAC).

$$\mathsf{HMAC}(s,m) := h[s \oplus \mathsf{opad} | h(s \oplus \mathsf{ipad} | m)]$$

- ipad and opad are paddings with two different byte constants,
 e.g., ipad = 0x5c...0x5c, opad = 0x36...0x36
- works with any cryptographic hash function h



Idea: Combine secret *s* and message *m* via a hash function *h* in a more sophisticated way to compute a hash-based message authentication code (HMAC).

$$\mathsf{HMAC}(s,m) := h[s \oplus \mathsf{opad} | h(s \oplus \mathsf{ipad} | m)]$$

- ipad and opad are paddings with two different byte constants,
 e.g., ipad = 0x5c...0x5c, opad = 0x36...0x36
- works with any cryptographic hash function h
- proposed in RFC2104



Observations:

• hash functions and MACs are not supposed to hide the content of plain text message *m* a-priori



Observations:

- hash functions and MACs are not supposed to hide the content of plain text message *m* a-priori
- different ways to combine MAC h^s with encrypted message e_m:



Observations:

- hash functions and MACs are not supposed to hide the content of plain text message *m* a-priori
- different ways to combine MAC h^s with encrypted message e_m:

Encrypt-and-MAC: $e(m) \mid h^{s}(m)$


- hash functions and MACs are not supposed to hide the content of plain text message *m* a-priori
- different ways to combine MAC h^s with encrypted message e_m:

Encrypt-and-MAC: $e(m) \mid h^s(m)$ MAC-then-Encrypt: $e[m \mid h^s(m)]$



- hash functions and MACs are not supposed to hide the content of plain text message *m* a-priori
- different ways to combine MAC h^s with encrypted message e_m:

Encrypt-and-MAC: $e(m) \mid h^s(m)$ MAC-then-Encrypt: $e[m \mid h^s(m)]$ Encrypt-then-MAC: $e(m) \mid h^s(e(m))$



- hash functions and MACs are not supposed to hide the content of plain text message m a-priori
- different ways to combine MAC h^s with encrypted message e_m :

MAC-then-Encrypt: $e[m \mid h^{s}(m)]$ Encrypt-then-MAC: $e(m) \mid h^{s}(e(m))$

 $e(m) \mid h^{s}(m)$

• only last composition is safe!



- hash functions and MACs are not supposed to hide the content of plain text message *m* a-priori
- different ways to combine MAC h^s with encrypted message e_m:

Encrypt-and-MAC: $e(m) \mid h^s(m)$ MAC-then-Encrypt: $e[m \mid h^s(m)]$ Encrypt-then-MAC: $e(m) \mid h^s(e(m))$

• only **last composition** is safe!

Example: message *m*, MAC h^s , ciphertexts $e_1(m)$, $e_2(m)$

- although $e_1(m) \neq e_2(m)$, the MAC $h^s(m)$ is equal!
- allows to correlate message content

Workshop challenges



Length extension attack

- authenticate as user Administrator to get the flag
- use length extension attack to forge a valid login token
- think about the padding!
- used hash function is SHA256



Length extension attack

- authenticate as user Administrator to get the flag
- use length extension attack to forge a valid login token
- think about the padding!
- used hash function is SHA256

Unhiding MAC

- all communication is encrypted in this service
- look at the source code!
- server computes HMAC of plaintext, then concatenates with ciphertext
- secret for HMAC is not known
- deduce information from the MACs sent by the server to win flag

April 27, 2024

FAUST Cryptography Workshop



Example for SHA256:

>>> import hashlib

>>> hashlib.sha256(b"Data as bytestring").hexdigest()
'0fffba14052435c8afed36243dd5b977dac140faaf3edf4c5c0b0ecf04895652'



Get started:

- Hash function challenges: https://workshop.faust.ninja/challenges
- Presentation slides:
 - https://www.studon.fau.de/crs5693797.html

If you are stuck: Ask us any time!

Links to useful websites with more information:

- Merkle-Damgard construction
- Information on SHA-2 hash functions
- Padding in cryptography
- Message authentication code
- HMACs
- Length extension attack
- Stack overflow discussion on MAC composition
- The Cryptographic Doom Principle