

Subject: OFFICIAL COMMENT: Cheetah

From: "Danilo Gligoroski" <danilo.gligoroski@gmail.com>

Date: Fri, 12 Dec 2008 22:39:51 +0100

To: <hash-function@nist.gov>

CC: <hash-forum@nist.gov>

Cheetah hash function is not resistant against length-extension attack.

The mechanism in Cheetah to protect against length-extension attack is the permutation of the chaining value before the last invocation of the compression function. However, the initial chaining value of Cheetah is a zero vector of 256 or 512 bits. That means that every hashing of short messages that have length less than 959 bits will suffer from the trivial length-extension attack because the permutation of the initial zero vector is known to the attacker.

Best regards,
Danilo Gligoroski

Subject: OFFICIAL COMMENT: Cheetah

From: Dmitry Khovratovich <khovratovich@gmail.com>

Date: Fri, 6 Feb 2009 17:30:07 +0100

To: hash-function@nist.gov

CC: hash-forum@nist.gov

Hi all,

we would like to make some clarification on the status of Cheetah. Gligoroski's observation showed that the IV is one of a few fixed points of the permutation which should prevent length-extension attacks. A simple change of the IV would make a length-extension attack on even short messages impossible. Therefore, we do not consider this observation as a break.

Another option, which however does not affect neither speed nor the security of compression function, would be to add to the last-round permutation a non-zero constant, which would remove any fixed points and completely avoid length-extension attacks.

So it would be good if editors of the following web-sites which currently list Cheetah as "broken" take note:

- skein-hash.info
- wikipedia
- etc.

Note also that Cheetah, though being AES-based hash functions, runs at remarkably high speed. Our recent implementation of Cheetah-256 runs at a speed of 9.3 cpb, while Cheetah-512 runs at 13.6 cpb.

--

Best regards,
Dmitry, Alex, Ivica

University of Luxembourg,
Laboratory of Algorithmics, Cryptography and Security,

Subject: Re: OFFICIAL COMMENT: Cheetah

From: David Bauer <astgtciv2009@gatech.edu>

Date: Fri, 6 Feb 2009 13:27:15 -0500

To: Multiple recipients of list <hash-forum@nist.gov>

Note also that Cheetah, though being AES-based hash functions, runs at remarkably high speed. Our recent implementation of Cheetah-256 runs at a speed of 9.3 cpb, while Cheetah-512 runs at 13.6 cpb.

Is this code available someplace?

David Bauer

Subject: Re: OFFICIAL COMMENT: Cheetah
From: Dmitry Khovratovich <khovratovich@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, 6 Feb 2009 14:08:43 -0500
To: Multiple recipients of list <hash-forum@nist.gov>

Not yet, but we will publish it soon.

On Fri, Feb 6, 2009 at 7:26 PM, David Bauer <astgtciv2009@gatech.edu> wrote:

> Note also that Cheetah, though being AES-based hash functions, runs at
> remarkably high speed. Our recent implementation of Cheetah-256 runs
> at a speed of 9.3 cpb, while Cheetah-512 runs at 13.6 cpb.

Is this code available someplace?

David Bauer

--

Best regards,
Dmitry Khovratovich

University of Luxembourg,
Laboratory of Algorithmics, Cryptography and Security,
+ 352 46 66 44 5478

Subject: OFFICIAL COMMENT: Cheetah

From: Dmitry Khovratovich <khovratovich@gmail.com>

Date: Fri, 20 Feb 2009 18:48:53 +0300

To: hash-function@nist.gov

CC: Multiple recipients of list <hash-forum@nist.gov>

Hi all,

Cheetah now has its own webpage: <http://cryptolux.org/cheetah> , where the specification, updates, slides and code will host.

A new 64-bit assembler implementation (9.3 / 13.6 cpb for 256/512 bit digest, resp.) is also available there.

Comments are welcome.

--

Best regards,
Dmitry Khovratovich

University of Luxembourg,
Laboratory of Algorithmics, Cryptography and Security,
+ 352 46 66 44 5478

Subject: Re: OFFICIAL COMMENT: Cheetah

From: Dmitry Khovratovich <khovratovich@gmail.com>

Date: Fri, 20 Feb 2009 11:59:58 -0500

To: Multiple recipients of list <hash-forum@nist.gov>

UPD.: the certificate of our web-server is self-signed so you probably get a security warning (we will resolve it soon). Please just choose the option "accept the certificate" when open the web-site.

On Fri, Feb 20, 2009 at 7:01 PM, Dmitry Khovratovich <khovratovich@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi all,

Cheetah now has its own webpage: <http://cryptolux.org/cheetah> , where the specification, updates, slides and code will host.

A new 64-bit assembler implementation (9.3 / 13.6 cpb for 256/512 bit digest, resp.) is also available there.

Comments are welcome.

--

Best regards,
Dmitry Khovratovich

University of Luxembourg,
Laboratory of Algorithmics, Cryptography and Security,
+ 352 46 66 44 5478

--

Best regards,
Dmitry Khovratovich

University of Luxembourg,
Laboratory of Algorithmics, Cryptography and Security,
+ 352 46 66 44 5478

Subject: OFFICIAL COMMENT: Cheetah

From: "Danilo Gligoroski" <danilo.gligoroski@gmail.com>

Date: Tue, 21 Apr 2009 08:53:15 +0200

To: <hash-function@nist.gov>

CC: <hash-forum@nist.gov>

Hi,

I think I have second preimage attack on un-salted Cheetah with complexity of $O(2^{(n/2)})$ computations and negligible memory.

Cheetah uses a sort of Rijndael block cipher in Davies-Meyer mode and HAIFA framework.

Let us call the used Rijndael-like block cipher as RijndaelCheetah.

More precisely RijndaelCheetah(Key, PlainText) is a block cipher

where Key = (Message_Block_of_1024_bits || Block_Counter).

Similarly, let us call Inverse_RijndaelCheetah(Key, CipherText) the inverse block cipher.

We are going to define two-block second preimage attack on Cheetah (meet-in-the-middle attack).

Let Cheetah(Unknown_Message) = H1.

The goal is to find a second preimage message $M=(M_0, M_1)$ consisting of two blocks, such that Cheetah(M) = H1.

Note that both blocks M_0 and M_1 are 1024 bits long.

Step 1. Fix the last 88 bits of M_1 , according to the definition of the padding of a message long $2048 - 88 = 1960$ bits.

Step 2. Fix also the last 88 bits of M_0 to the same padding constant value as in M_1 .

Step 3. (Forward step) Generate $2^{(n/2)}$ different messages $\{M_{0_i} \mid i=1, \dots, 2^{(n/2)}\}$ (with the fixed last 88 bits as defined in Step 2.) and compute $H_{0_i} = \text{LastBlockPermutation}(\text{RijndaelCheetah}(M_{0_i}, \text{Block_Counter}_0, \text{IV}) \text{ XOR IV})$, $i=1, \dots, 2^{(n/2)}$,

where $\text{Block_Counter}_0=0$, and IV is any IV defined by the designers of Cheetah.

In the current documentation $\text{IV}=0$, but in one OFFICIAL COMMENT the designers mentioned possibility to use a different IV. This attack works well no matter what IV was chosen.

Step 4. (Backward step) Generate $2^{(n/2)}$ different messages $\{M_{1_i} \mid i=1, \dots, 2^{(n/2)}\}$ (with the fixed last 88 bits as defined in Step 1.) and compute

$H_{1_i} = \text{Inverse_RijndaelCheetah}(M_{1_i}, \text{Block_Counter}_1, H_1)$, $i=1, \dots, 2^{(n/2)}$,

where $\text{Block_Counter}_1=1$.

Step 5. With high probability, there is a matching pair (M_{0_i}, M_{1_j}) such that the corresponding

$H_{0_i} = H_{1_j}$ i.e. Cheetah(M) = H1 where $M = (M_{0_i}, M_{1_j})$.

Remark: Since the domain for message blocks M_{0_i} and M_{1_i} is the same, we can launch a memoryless

version of this attack described in memoryless birthday attack of van Oorschot and Wiener paper [1],

and the total complexity of this attack is $O(2^{(n/2)})$ computations and negligible memory.

[1] Paul C. Van Oorschot and Michael J. Wiener. Parallel collision search with cryptanalytic applications.
Journal of Cryptology, 12:1-28, 1999.

Regards,
Danilo Gligoroski

Subject: RE: OFFICIAL COMMENT: Cheetah
From: "Danilo Gligoroski" <danilo.gligoroski@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, 21 Apr 2009 06:43:25 -0400
To: Multiple recipients of list <hash-forum@nist.gov>

Clarification:

The described attack was based on the Figure 1 in the official Cheetah documentation where there is no last feed-forward. If there is a feed-forward, the attack as described is not possible.

Regards,
 Danilo!

From: hash-forum@nist.gov [mailto:hash-forum@nist.gov] **On Behalf Of** Danilo Gligoroski
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2009 9:04 AM
To: Multiple recipients of list
Subject: OFFICIAL COMMENT: Cheetah

Hi,

I think I have second preimage attack on un-salted Cheetah with complexity of $O(2^{n/2})$ computations and negligible memory.

Cheetah uses a sort of Rijndael block cipher in Davies-Meyer mode and HAIFA framework.

Let us call the used Rijndael-like block cipher as RijndaelCheetah.
 More precisely RijndaelCheetah(Key, PlainText) is a block cipher
 where Key = (Message_Block_of_1024_bits || Block_Counter).

Similarly, let us call Inverse_RijndaelCheetah(Key, CipherText) the inverse
 block cipher.

We are going to define two-block second preimage attack on Cheetah
 (meet-in-the-middle attack).

Let Cheetah(Unknown_Message) = H1.

The goal is to find a second preimage message $M=(M_0, M_1)$ consisting
 of two blocks, such that Cheetah(M) = H1.
 Note that both blocks M_0 and M_1 are 1024 bits long.

Step 1. Fix the last 88 bits of M_1 , according to the definition of the
 padding of a message long $2048 - 88 = 1960$ bits.

Step 2. Fix also the last 88 bits of M_0 to the same padding constant value as in M_1 .

Step 3. (Forward step) Generate $2^{n/2}$ different messages $\{M_{0_i} \mid i=1, \dots, 2^{n/2}\}$
 (with the fixed last 88 bits as defined in Step 2.) and compute
 $H_{0_i} = \text{LastBlockPermutation}(\text{RijndaelCheetah}(M_{0_i}, \text{Block_Counter}_0, \text{IV}) \text{ XOR IV }), i=1, \dots,$
 $2^{n/2}$,
 where $\text{Block_Counter}_0=0$, and IV is any IV defined by the designers of Cheetah.
 In the current documentation $\text{IV}=0$, but in one OFFICIAL COMMENT the designers mentioned
 possibility to use a different IV. This attack works well no matter what IV was chosen.

Step 4. (Backward step) Generate $2^{n/2}$ different messages $\{M_{1_i} \mid i=1, \dots, 2^{n/2}\}$
 (with the fixed last 88 bits as defined in Step 1.) and compute
 $H_{1_i} = \text{Inverse_RijndaelCheetah}(M_{1_i}, \text{Block_Counter}_1, H_1), i=1, \dots, 2^{n/2}$,

Subject: Re: OFFICIAL COMMENT: Cheetah
From: Dmitry Khovratovich <khovratovich@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, 21 Apr 2009 10:41:01 -0400
To: Multiple recipients of list <hash-forum@nist.gov>

Hi,
you are right, Figure 1 is incorrect.

There is a feed-forward, of course. See, e.g., the reference code, the conference slides, or the pseudocode (page 2).

On Tue, Apr 21, 2009 at 3:42 AM, Danilo Gligoroski <danilo.gligoroski@gmail.com> wrote:

Clarification:

The described attack was based on the Figure 1 in the official Cheetah documentation where

there is no last feed-forward. If there is a feed-forward, the attack as described is not possible.

Regards,

Danilo!

From: hash-forum@nist.gov [<mailto:hash-forum@nist.gov>] On Behalf Of Danilo Gligoroski
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2009 9:04 AM
To: Multiple recipients of list
Subject: OFFICIAL COMMENT: Cheetah

Hi,

I think I have second preimage attack on un-salted Cheetah with complexity of

$O(2^{(n/2)})$ computations and negligible memory.

Cheetah uses a sort of Rijndael block cipher in Davies-Meyer mode and HAIFA framework.

Let us call the used Rijndael-like block cipher as RijndaelCheetah.

More precisely $\text{RijndaelCheetah}(\text{Key}, \text{PlainText})$ is a block cipher

where $\text{Key} = (\text{Message_Block_of_1024_bits} \parallel \text{Block_Counter})$.

Similarly, let us call $\text{Inverse_RijndaelCheetah}(\text{Key}, \text{CipherText})$ the inverse block cipher.