

# Applied Cryptography

## Symmetric Cryptography, Assignment 3, Monday, March 4, 2024

### Remarks:

- Hand in your answers through Brightspace.
- Hand in format: PDF. Either hand-written and scanned in PDF, or typeset and converted to PDF. Please, **do not** submit photos, Word files, LaTeX source files, or similar. Also submit code used for your assignments (as separate files).
- Assure that the name of **each** group member is **in** the document (not just in the file name).

**Deadline:** Sunday, March 17, 23.59

**Goals:** After completing these exercises you should have understanding in arguing security of hash functions, and in the usage of sponge and duplex functions.

1. **(10 points)** On 23 February 2017, researchers from CWI Amsterdam and Google Researchers broke SHA-1 in practice. In this exercise, you will generate your own SHA-1 collision. There is no need to dive into the technical details of SHA-1, the only important thing to know is that SHA-1 is a Merkle-Damgård design (see slide 10). In more detail, SHA-1 operates on a state of 160 bits, and compresses message blocks of 512 bits at a time.

The attackers of SHA-1 derived two different messages  $M$  and  $M'$  of size 1024 bits that, if preceded by a common prefix  $S$  of size 1536 bits, resulted in  $\text{SHA-1}(S\|M) = \text{SHA-1}(S\|M')$ . The messages  $S, M, M'$  are given at <https://www.cs.ru.nl/~bmennink/sha1attack/>, alongside a SHA-1 digest computation tool.

- (a) Compute  $\text{SHA-1}(S\|M)$  and  $\text{SHA-1}(S\|M')$ .
- (b) Consider the following message  $M''$ :

```
8B AD F0 OD 8B AD F0 OD 8B AD F0 OD 8B AD F0 OD
8B AD F0 OD 8B AD F0 OD 8B AD F0 OD 8B AD F0 OD
8B AD F0 OD 8B AD F0 OD 8B AD F0 OD 8B AD F0 OD
8B AD F0 OD 8B AD F0 OD 8B AD F0 OD 8B AD F0 OD
```

Compute  $\text{SHA-1}(S\|M\|M'')$  and  $\text{SHA-1}(S\|M'\|M'')$ .

- (c) Consider a 1024-bit message block  $M_a$  defined as:

```
C0 FF EE C0 FF EE C0 FF EE C0 FF EE C0 FF EE C0 FF EE C0
FF EE C0 FF EE C0 FF EE C0 FF EE C0 FF EE C0 FF EE C0 FF
EE C0 FF EE C0 FF EE C0 FF EE C0 FF EE C0 FF EE C0 FF EE
C0 FF EE C0 FF EE C0 FF EE C0 FF EE C0 FF EE C0 FF EE C0
FF EE C0 FF EE C0 FF EE C0 FF EE C0 FF EE C0 FF EE C0 FF
EE C0 FF EE C0 FF EE C0 FF EE C0 FF EE C0 FF EE C0 FF EE
C0 FF EE C0 FF EE C0 FF EE C0 FF EE C0 FF EE C0 FF EE C0
FF EE C0 FF EE C0 FF EE C0 FF EE C0 FF EE C0 FF EE C0 FF
```

Find a prefix  $P$  for  $M_a$  and a second message  $M_b$  such that  $\text{SHA-1}(P\|M_a) = \text{SHA-1}(M_b)$ , where  $P\|M_a$  and  $M_b$  are distinct and of equal size. Hint: use  $S, M, M'$ .

- (d) Compute the corresponding SHA-1 hash digest for your message of question 1c.
2. **(10 points)** In this exercise you build your own sponge-based hash function, assuming you already have a permutation  $p$  on  $b = 400$ .

Using the KECCAK- $f$  permutation that you can find in `permutation.py`, build the full KECCAK hash function. Here, you can assume a 10-padding, which appends the message with a single 1 and a sufficient number of 0s so that the padded message is of length a multiple of  $r$  bits. (Note that the KECCAK- $f$  permutation operates on bytes, but still the padding is in bits.) Make sure you can control the capacity  $c$  and the rate  $r$  (with  $c + r = b$ ), as you will use that feature in exercise 3.

You can verify your implementation against the server using

```
nc appliedcrypto.cs.ru.nl 4143
```

(Note that this is only possible from within the Radboud network, or via a VPN connection.)

3. **(20 points)** In this exercise, we look at some of the indistinguishability-based bounds for sponge constructions that were stated in the lecture slides, and show that these bounds are tight: is it possible to “break” these constructions in this number of queries? Use your implementation from exercise 2 for exercises 3b and 3d with parameters  $b = 400$ ,  $c = 40$ ,  $r = 360$ , and  $n = 720$ .
  - (a) Sketch the generic approach to find a collision for sponge-based hash functions, and argue what the computational complexity is.
  - (b) Use your implementation from exercise 2 to find an actual collision, i.e., provide two messages  $M, M'$  with  $M \neq M'$  with the same hash  $h(M) = h(M')$ .
  - (c) For the general case, e.g., if  $c$ ,  $b$ ,  $r$  and  $n$  are variables, what is actually the proven minimal complexity to find a collision against a sponge construction? Relate this bound to your attack.
  - (d) Use your implementation from exercise 2 to find a second preimage for your name, i.e., if the encoding of your name (run ‘python encoding.py your\_name’) is the message  $M$ , find another  $M' \neq M$  such that  $h(M) = h(M')$ .
  - (e) For the general case, e.g., if  $c$ ,  $b$ ,  $r$  and  $n$  are variables, what is actually the proven minimal complexity to find a second preimage against a sponge construction? Relate this bound to your attack.
4. **(10 points)** Consider SpongeWrap from lecture 5 slide 10. This construction is only a secure authenticated encryption scheme if the distinguisher cannot repeat nonces for encryption queries (it may repeat nonces for decryption queries, though).
  - (a) Suppose above condition is violated and the distinguisher can repeat nonces for encryption queries. Describe an attacker that breaks the confidentiality of SpongeWrap in a constant number of queries.
  - (b) Suppose we *omit* the domain separating bits 1/0 from SpongeWrap, and associated data and message are both padded with simple 10\*-padding (i.e., the last, incomplete, block of both  $A$  and  $M$  is padded with a 1 and a sufficient number of 0s to get an  $r$ -bit block). Describe an attacker that breaks the authenticity of SpongeWrap in a constant number of queries. (Note: the distinguisher is *not* allowed to repeat nonces for encryption queries.)