Hash Functions (ctd.) Lecture 15

Hash Functions

RECALL

Pland

Main syntactic feature: Variable input length to fixed length output
Primary requirement: collision-resistance

If for all PPT A, Pr[x≠y and h(x)=h(y)] is negligible in the following experiment:

• $A \rightarrow (x,y)$; $h \leftarrow \mathcal{U}$: Combinatorial Hash Functions

• $A \rightarrow x$; $h \leftarrow \mathcal{U}$; $A(h) \rightarrow y$: Universal One-Way Hash Functions

• $h \leftarrow \mathfrak{A}$; $A(h) \rightarrow (x,y)$: Collision-Resistant Hash Functions

• $h \leftarrow \mathcal{H}; A^h \rightarrow (x,y)$: Weak Collision-Resistant Hash Functions

h←ૠ; x←X; A(h,h(x))→y: One-Way Hash Functions (x=y OK)

h←\$\mathcal{H}; x←X; A(h,x)→y : SPR Hash Functions
 Also often required: "unpredictability"
 Already saw: a 2-UHF (chop(ax+b) over a field)

Today: UOWHF and CRHF constructions. Domain Extension.

UOWHF

• Universal One-Way HF: $A \rightarrow x$; $h \leftarrow \mathcal{U}$; $A(h) \rightarrow y$. h(x)=h(y) w.n.p

Since the hash function is compressing, then there will be collisions. So a computationally unbounded adversary can win this game!

Need to rely on computational hardness

OWHF can be constructed from OWF

• Much easier to see $OWP \Rightarrow UOWHF$

Or, if not unique, can uniformly sample a <u>so</u>lution for h

UOWHF from OWP

• $F_h(x) = h(f(x))$, where <u>f is a OWP</u> and <u>h from a 2-UHF</u> family

s.t. h is a 2−to−1 map, and

If all z, z', w, can efficiently solve for h s.t. h(z) = h(z') = w

Is a UOWHF: can choose h to force UOWHF adversary to invert f

BreakOWP(z) { Get $x \leftarrow A$; Sample random w; Solve h s.t. h(z) = h(f(x)) = w; Give h to A; Get $y \leftarrow A$ and output y; }

• Only collision ($y \neq x$ s.t. $F_h(x) = F_h(y)$) is $y=f^{-1}(z)$



Or, if not unique, can uniformly sample a solution for h

UOWHF from OWP

• $F_h(x) = h(f(x))$, where <u>f is a OWP</u> and <u>h from a 2-UHF</u> family

s.t. h is a 2−to−1 map, and

If all z, z', w, can efficiently solve for h s.t. h(z) = h(z') = w

Is a UOWHF: can choose h to force UOWHF adversary to invert f

BreakOWP(z) { Get $x \leftarrow A$; Sample random w; Solve h s.t. h(z) = h(f(x)) = w; Give h to A; Get $y \leftarrow A$ and output y; }

• Only collision ($y \neq x$ s.t. $F_h(x) = F_h(y)$) is $y=f^{-1}(z)$

- The BreakOWP is efficient as h can be efficiently solved \checkmark
- BreakOWP has same advantage as A has against UOWHF? Yes, if h is uniform (independent of x) [Why?]
 - In the second second

CRHF

- Collision-Resistant HF: h←\$\$; A(h)→(x,y). h(x)=h(y) w.n.p
 Not known to be possible from OWF/OWP alone

 "Impossibility" (blackbox-separation) known

 Possible from "claw-free pair of permutations"
 In turn from hardness of discrete-log, factoring, and from lattice-based assumptions
- Also from "homomorphic one-way permutations", and from homomorphic encryptions
 - All candidates use mathematical operations that are considered computationally expensive

CRHF

CRHF from discrete log assumption:

- Suppose G a group of prime order q, where DL is considered hard (e.g. QR_p^* for p=2q+1 a safe prime)
- → $h_{g1,g2}(x_1,x_2) = g_1^{x1}g_2^{x2}$ (in G) where $g_1, g_2 \neq 1$ (hence generators)
- A collision: $(x_1, x_2) \neq (y_1, y_2)$ s.t. $h_{g1,g2}(x_1, x_2) = h_{g1,g2}(y_1, y_2)$
 - Collision $\Rightarrow x_1 \neq y_1 \text{ and } x_2 \neq y_2 \text{ [Why?]}$
 - Then $g_2 = g_1^{(x1-y1)/(x2-y2)}$ (exponents in \mathbb{Z}_q^*)

i.e., w.r.t. a random base g₁, can compute DL of a random element g₂. Breaks DL!

Hash halves the size of the input

Domain Extension

h_t

h_{t-1}

h_{t-2}

 h_1

Full-domain hash: hash arbitrarily long strings to a single hash value

So far, UOWHF/CRHF which have a fixed domain
First, simpler goal: extend to a larger, fixed domain

Assume we are given a hash function from two blocks to one block (a block being, say, k bits)

What if we can compress by only one bit (e.g., our UOWHF construction)?

Can just apply repeatedly to compress by t bits

Domain Extension

- Can compose hash functions more efficiently, using a "<u>Merkle tree</u>"
 - Uses a basic hash from {0,1}^{2k} to {0,1}^k
 - Example: A hash function from {0,1}^{8k} to {0,1}^k using a tree of depth 3
 - Any tree can be used, with consistent I/O sizes
- Independent hashes or same hash?
 - Depends!

Domain Extension for CRHF

- For CRHF, same basic hash used through out the Merkle tree. Hash description same as for a single basic hash
- If a collision ((x₁...x_n), (y₁...y_n)) over all, then some collision (x',y') for basic hash
 - Consider moving a "frontline" from bottom to top. Look for equality on this front.
 - Collision at some step (different values on ith front, same on i+1st); gives a collision for basic hash

Same for x & y

Different for x & y

A*(h): run A(h) to get (x₁...x_n), (y₁...y_n). Move frontline to find (x',y')

Domain Extension for UOWHF

h₃

h₂

 h_1

h₁

h₂

h₁

h₁

For UOWHF, can't use same basic hash throughout!

A* has to output an x' on getting (x₁...x_n) from A, before getting h

Can guess a random node (i.e., random pair of frontlines) where collision occurs, but if not a leaf, can't compute x' until h is fixed!

- Solution: a different h for each level of the tree (i.e., no ancestor/successor has same h)
 - To compute x': Get (x₁...x_n) from A. Then pick | | | | | a random node (say at level i), pick h_j for levels below i, and compute input to the node; let this be x'.

On getting h, plug it in as h_i, pick h_j for remaining levels; give h's to A and get (y₁...y_n); compute y' and output it.

UOWHF vs. CRHF

OWHF has a weaker guarantee than CRHF

OWHF can be built based on OWF (we saw based on OWP), where as CRHF "needs stronger assumptions"

But "usual" OWF candidates suffice for CRHF too (we saw construction based on discrete-log)

Domain extension of CRHF is simpler, with no blow-up in the description size. For UOWHF description increases logarithmically in the input size

OWHF theoretically important (based on simpler assumptions, good if paranoid), but CRHF can substitute for it

 Current practice: much less paranoid; faith on efficient, ad hoc (and unkeyed) constructions

Domain Extension

Full-domain hash: hash arbitrarily long strings to a single hash value

Merkle-Tree construction extends the domain to any fixed input length

Hash the message length (number of blocks) along with the original hash

Collision in the new hash function gives either collision at the top level, or if not, collision in the original Merkle tree and for the same message length

Hash Functions in Practice

A single function, not a family (e.g. SHA-3, SHA-256, MD4, MD5)

- Often from a fixed input-length compression function
- Merkle-Damgård iterated hash function, MD^f:



Collision resistance even with variable input-length.

Note: Unlike MACs, here "length-extension" is OK, as long as it results in a different hash value

If f is not keyed, but "concretely" collision resistant, so is MD^f

If f collision resistant then so is MD^f (for any IV)

If f modelled as a Random Oracle, MD^f is a "public-use RO." If f modelled as an "Ideal Cipher," MD^f is "pre-image aware."