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   - Real-time and efficient detection of malware.
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Finding relevant files resembles ...
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… or is it solved for suspect files?
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Definition and Avalanche Effect

1. A hash function $h$ is a function with two properties:
   - **Compression**: $h : \{0, 1\}^* \to \{0, 1\}^n$.
   - **Ease of computation**: Computation of $h(m)$ is 'fast' in practice.

2. **Notation**:
   - $m$ is a 'document' (e.g. a file, a volume, a device).
   - $h(m)$ its hash value or digest.

3. Cryptographic hash functions follow the avalanche effect:
   - If $m$ is replaced by $m'$, $h(m')$ behaves pseudo randomly.
   - No control over the output, if the input is changed.
   - If only one bit in $m$ is changed to get $m'$, the two outputs $h(m)$ and $h(m')$ look 'very' different.
Foundations of Hash Functions

Sample Cryptographic Hash Functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>MD5</th>
<th>SHA-1</th>
<th>SHA-256</th>
<th>SHA-512</th>
<th>RIPEMD-160</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

```
watson $ sha1sum vortrag_hash-in-forensics.pdf
83393d77d6f03de998c5ee1c2c9a2ad08f0901d2 vortrag_hash-in-forensics.pdf

watson $ sha1sum /dev/hda1
fba81604531ff5a26f1b2ab3a4674ab1d9dbf113 /dev/hda1

watson $ sha256sum /dev/hda
80ba7ddb431798591c1a6254de059e5734e5e4ab03e8a5185749fce6fde2de41 /dev/hda
```
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Use Cases

1. Ensure **authenticity** and **integrity** during data acquisition.
   - Relevant for both dead and live analysis.
   - Hash values must be protected:
     - Written down by hand in investigation notebook.
     - Compute a digital signature over it.

2. Automatically identify known files:
   - Whitelisting: Known to be **good** files.
   - Blacklisting: Known to be **bad** files.

**Relevant security property of the hash function:**

*Second-preimage resistance.*
Use Cases of Hash Functions

Whitelisting

1. Underlying Idea:
   - Generate a database $G$ of known to be good files and their corresponding hash values.
   - Identify automatically an unsuspicious file on base of its hash value, which matches a fingerprint of a file in $G$.
   - Exclude a known to be good file from further investigation.
   - Significant reduction of irrelevant data.

2. Examples of unsuspicious files:
   - System files of operating systems.
   - Well-known benign applications like browsers, editors, ...

3. Widespread database:
   - Reference Data Set (RDS) of the National Software Reference Library (NSRL), maintained by NIST
## NSRL-RDS: Sample Entries

```
watson $ less NSRLFile.txt

"SHA-1","MD5","CRC32","FileName","FileSize","ProductCode","OpSystemCode","SpecialCode"
"000000206738748EDD92C4E3D2E823896700F849","392126E756571EBF112CB1C1CEDDF926","EBD105A0","I05002T2.PFB",98
"0000004DA6391F7F5D2F7FCCF36CEBDA60C6EA02","0E53C14A3E48D94FF596A2824307B492","AA6A7B16","00br2026.gif",22
"00000A9E47BD385A0A3685AA12C2DB6FD727A20","176308F27DD52890F013A3FD80F92E51","D749B562","femvo523.wav",42
"0000142988AFA836117B1B572FAE4713F200567","9B3702B0E788C6D62996392FE3C9786A","05E566DF","J0180794.JPG",32
"0000142988AFA836117B1B572FAE4713F200567","9B3702B0E788C6D62996392FE3C9786A","05E566DF","J0180794.JPG",32
"0000142988AFA836117B1B572FAE4713F200567","9B3702B0E788C6D62996392FE3C9786A","05E566DF","J0180794.JPG",32
"0000142988AFA836117B1B572FAE4713F200567","9B3702B0E788C6D62996392FE3C9786A","05E566DF","J0180794.JPG",32
"0000142988AFA836117B1B572FAE4713F200567","9B3702B0E788C6D62996392FE3C9786A","05E566DF","J0180794.JPG",32
"0000142988AFA836117B1B572FAE4713F200567","9B3702B0E788C6D62996392FE3C9786A","05E566DF","J0180794.JPG",32
```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHA-1</th>
<th>MD5</th>
<th>CRC32</th>
<th>FileName</th>
<th>FileSize</th>
<th>ProductCode</th>
<th>OpSystemCode</th>
<th>SpecialCode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>000000206738748EDD92C4E3D2E823896700F849</td>
<td>392126E756571EBF112CB1C1CEDDF926</td>
<td>EBD105A0</td>
<td>I05002T2.PFB</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0000004DA6391F7F5D2F7FCCF36CEBDA60C6EA02</td>
<td>0E53C14A3E48D94FF596A2824307B492</td>
<td>AA6A7B16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00000A9E47BD385A0A3685AA12C2DB6FD727A20</td>
<td>176308F27DD52890F013A3FD80F92E51</td>
<td>D749B562</td>
<td>femvo523.wav</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0000142988AFA836117B1B572FAE4713F200567</td>
<td>9B3702B0E788C6D62996392FE3C9786A</td>
<td>05E566DF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Harald Baier
Hash Functions in Forensics / Fhg-SIT, 2011-04-12
13/25
Whitelisting: Assessment

1. General assessment:
   ▶ Well-known and established process in computer forensics.
   ▶ If database is trusted, no false positives (positive = benign).

2. Possible bottleneck: Size of database.
   ▶ Size of database is increasing.
   ▶ Currently RDS is about 6 gigabyte.
Blacklisting

1. Underlying idea:
   ▶ Generate a database of known to be bad files and their corresponding hash values.
   ▶ Let $B$ denote this set.
   ▶ Find automatically a suspicious file on base of its fingerprint, which matches a fingerprint of a file in $B$.

2. Sample suspect files:
   ▶ Malware.
   ▶ Encryption or steganographic software.
   ▶ Corporate secrets.
   ▶ IPR protected files.
   ▶ Child pornography.
Blacklisting: Evaluation

1. Anti-detection approach:
   - Let a suspicious file \( b \in B \) be given.
   - Change some (irrelevant) bit of \( b \) to get \( b' \).
   - Consequence:
     - \( h(b') \) is very different from \( h(b) \).
     - \( b' \) is not detected automatically.

2. Core problem:
   - Cryptographic requirements of a hash function and forensic goals are complementary.
   - A suspicious file similar to an element of \( B \) is not detected.

3. Fragments of elements of \( B \) are not identified, too.
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Goals

1. Overcome drawbacks of cryptographic hash functions in the context of computer forensics.

2. Main drawbacks are:
   ▶ Data acquisition: Integrity of copy is destroyed, if some bits change.
   ▶ White-/Blacklisting:
     ▶ Suspect files similar to known to be bad files are not detected.
     ▶ Fragments are not detected (due to deletion, fragmentation).

3. Currently known approaches:
   ▶ Segment hashes (also called block hashes).
   ▶ Context-triggered piecewise hashes.
### Segment Hashes

1. **Underlying idea:**
   - Split input data (volume, file) in blocks of **fixed length**.
   - Compute for each segment its cryptographic hash.
   - Lookup in hash database for matches.

![Diagram of input file m with segments m₁, m₂, m₃, ..., mₜ and their hashes h(m₁), h(m₂), h(m₃), ..., h(mₜ).]

2. **Original aim:** Improve integrity of storage media.
Segment Hashes: Evaluation

1. Anti-Blacklisting is very easy:
   ▶ Introduce / Delete an irrelevant byte in the first sector.
   ▶ All segment hashes differ from the stored segment hashes.
   ▶ Modified suspect file is not detected.

2. A good technique for whitelisting (see NIST results).

3. Size of segment hash database is large:
   ▶ 4096 byte block size, SHA-1.
   ▶ \[
   \frac{\text{size of hash database}}{\text{size of raw data}} = \frac{20}{4096} = 0.00488
   \]
   \[\implies 1 \text{ terabyte of raw data yields a 5 gigabyte hash database.}\]

4. Hash database depends on the hashwindow size.
1. Originally proposed for spam detection (*spamsum* by Andrew Tridgell, 2002)

2. Ported to forensics by Jesse Kornblum, 2006: *ssdeep*.
CTPH: A sample tool

1. ssdeep (based on spamsum).

2. CTPH is a sequence of printable characters:
   ▶ Only the least significant 6 bits (LS6B) of a segment hash are considered.
   ▶ LS6B are encoded base64.

```
1 watson $ ssdeep -l vortrag_hash-in-forensics_sit-110412.pdf
2
3 ssdeep,1.0--blocksize:hash:hash,filename
4 12288:UweC9h947a4LMqsMS0/6tzDEPU6P80hu7B9N9Fi:HD9/0MjI6aPU6kk69i,"vortrag_hash-in-forensics_sit-110412.pdf"
```

3. A good tool in absence of an active adversary.

4. FTK implements CTPH.
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Central Challenges

1. In the short term:
   ▶ Determine a 'compression' ratio for whitelisting.
   ▶ How successful is block hashing?
   ▶ Process model of using CTPH and semantic layer similarity tools.

2. In the long term: Find a similarity preserving hash function.
   ▶ Fuzzy hash function, denoted by $f$.
   ▶ $m$ and $m'$ are 'similar' $\implies f(m)$ and $f(m')$ are 'similar', too.
   ▶ $m$ shall be of any type: txt, doc, odt, jpg, bmp, devices, ...
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Thank you for your attention!

1. Harald Baier

2. E-Mail:
   - harald.baier@h-da.de
   - harald.baier@cased.de

“Sorry about the odor. I have all my passwords tattooed between my toes.”