CHALMERS — GÖTEBORGS UNIVERSITET

EXAM IN CRYPTOGRAPHY

TDA352 (Chalmers) - DIT250 (GU)

18 January 2019, 08:30 - 12.30

Tillåtna hjälpmedel: Typgodkänd räknare. Annan minnestömd räknare får användas efter godkännande av kursansvarig vid dennes besök i skrivsalen. No extra material is allowed during the exam except of pens and a simple calculator (with cleared memory). No smartphones or other electronic devices are allowed. Answers must be given in *English* and should be clearly justified.

Teacher/Examiner: Katerina Mitrokotsa **Questions during exam:** Katerina Mitrokotsa, phone 031 772 1040

The exam is divided in four main topics and the total number of points is 50 (plus 6 *bonus points*).

The grades are:

CTH Grades: $22-30 \rightarrow 3$ $31-39 \rightarrow 4$ $40-50 \rightarrow 5$ GU Grades: $22-39 \rightarrow G$ $40-50 \rightarrow VG$

Good luck!

1 Symmetric Ciphers (16 p)

(a) Let us consider the following symmetric cipher:

 $E(k,m_0) = E(k,m_{00}||m_{01}) = m_{00}||E(k \oplus m_{01})|$

where m_{00} and m_{01} denote the first and second bit of a message m_0 . Prove that this symmetric cipher is not semantically secure. (4 p)

Hint: Use a security game and describe a successful strategy of the attacker.

- (b) Let us consider that $\mathcal{G} : \mathcal{K} \to \{0,1\}^n$ is a predictable PRG. Describe an attack that can be performed against a stream cipher that uses the predictable PRG \mathcal{G} . (2 p)
- (c) Consider that the OTP is used to encrypt two different messages m_1 and m_2 and the corresponding cipher texts are c_1 and c_2 correspondingly. The same key k is used to encrypt both messages. Describe an attack (two time pad) that could be performed in order to recover the plaintexts m_1 and m_2 .

Hint: Consider that the messages m_1 and m_2 represent messages (in binary form) in a language (*e.g.*, using ASCII code of each character). Give a concrete example explaining how the attack could be successful. (2 p).

- (d) Describe how encryption and decryption works in CBC (Cipher Block Chaining) mode with IV for block ciphers. (1 p)
- (e) Bonus points: Give the definition of chosen-plaintext attacks (IND-CPA) for secret key encryption using a security game. (3 p)
- (f) Show that CBC (Cipher Block Chaining) mode for block ciphers is not secure against Chosen Plaintext attacks (CPA) when the IV is predictable. (4 p)

Hint: Use in your description a security game and a successful strategy of the attacker in the case he is able to predict the IV).

2 Public Key Encryption (12 p)

(a) Describe how the textbook RSA encryption works (1 p)

Hint: Describe the algorithms with their corresponding input and output.

- (b) Consider an RSA system with modulus N = pq, public key *e* and private key *d*. Show that if an adversary finds out $\Phi(N) = (p-1)(q-1)$, she can easily factorise N and thus break the encryption. (3 p)
- (c) Define the IND-CCA security game (indistinguishability chosen ciphertext attacks) and show that the textbook RSA encryption scheme is not secure under IND-CCA. (5 p)
- (d) We consider double RSA encryption using a common modulus N and two public keys e_1 and e_2 with corresponding private keys. Thus, a message m is encrypted first using RSA encryption with the key e_1 ; the result is encrypted again using key e_2 . Explain why this approach does not increase security. (3 p)

3 Data Integrity (15 p)

- (a) Bonus points: How do we define a secure MAC (message authentication code)? (3 p). Hint: Give the security game and formal definition.
- (b) Describe how raw CBC-MAC works. (2 p).
- (c) Show that raw CBC-MAC is insecure. (5 p).

Hint: Describe an existential forgery. Use a security game and a successful strategy of the attacker. Consider that in the challenge phase, a message with length two blocks is used.

- (d) How may we avoid the security problem in raw CBC-MAC? Describe a solution. (2 p).
- (e) Give three advantages of digital signatures in comparison to MACs. (3 p)

4 Cryptographic Protocols (13 p)

1. Let p,q two large prime numbers such that $N = p \cdot q$. Let $s \in \mathbb{Z}_N$ such that gcd(s,N) = 1 and it holds $v = s^2 \pmod{N}$. Peggy (the prover) and Victor (the verifier) run the following zero-knowledge protocol:

Verifier (Victor) \mathcal{V}		Prover (Peggy) \mathcal{P}
(N, v)		(N, s, v) s secret key
		pick a random
		$r \in \{1, 2, \dots, N-1\}$
pick a random	<i>←</i>	$w = r^2 \pmod{N}$
$c\in\{0,1\}$	\xrightarrow{c}	compute
check	$\leftarrow z$	$z = rs^c \pmod{N}$
$z^2 = wv^c \pmod{N}$		

- (a) What is the probability that a fake Peggy (not having the secret *s*) to be identified correctly. Justify your answer and explain how we may decrease the success probability of a fake Peggy. (1 p).
- (b) Can Victor transfer his knowledge, that indeed Peggy has the secret *x*, to someone else? Explain why. (2 p).
- (c) Consider that an attacker (who does not have access to the secret key) can always predict Victor's challenge. Describe how the attacker may always successfully pass the protocol. (3 p).

2. Consider that we have three parties P_1 , P_2 , P_3 and each of them has a secret value a = 1, b = 2 and c = 3 correspondingly. We are using the secure multi party computation (SMPC) protocol for addition (that we have seen in the lectures) based on Shamir's Secret Sharing Scheme with t = 1.

(a) Show how P_1, P_2 and P_3 can compute the sum $\sigma = a + b + c$, without disclosing the values *a*, *b* and *c*. (4 p)

Hint: Describe how P_1 , P_2 and P_3 create their shares and distribute them and how finally the sum is computed.

(b) Consider that P_3 decides not to collaborate with P_1 and P_2 . Can P_1 and P_2 still compute the sum σ ? If yes, justify why and show how. (3 p)