Midsem Exam : 25 points

1. (5 points) Let  $f: \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}^n$  be any function. The Feistel transform of f is the function  $FSTL_f: \{0,1\}^{2n} \to \{0,1\}^{2n}$  defined by

$$FSTL_f(L||R) = R||f(R) \oplus L$$

where L and R both belong to  $\{0,1\}^n$ ,  $\oplus$  denotes the bitwise XOR operator, and  $\parallel$  denotes the string concatenation operator.

Let  $F: \{0,1\}^n \times \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}^n$  be a length-preserving pseudorandom function. Define  $F': \{0,1\}^n \times \{0,1\}^n \times \{0,1\}^{2n} \to \{0,1\}^{2n}$  as

$$F'(k_1, k_2, L \| R) = FSTL_{F_{k_2}} \left( FSTL_{F_{k_1}}(L \| R) \right)$$

If  $k_1, k_2$  are chosen independently and uniformly from  $\{0, 1\}^n$ , prove that  $F'(k_1, k_2, \cdot) : \{0, 1\}^{2n} \to \{0, 1\}^{2n}$  is **not** a pseudorandom permutation. Note that the distinguisher knows the structure of F' but does not have access to the keys  $k_1, k_2$ .

Note:  $F'(k_1, k_2, \cdot)$  is a pseudorandom permutation if for every PPT distinguisher D, there is a negligible function negl such that:

$$\left|\Pr\left[D^{F'(k_1,k_2,\cdot)}(1^n)=1\right]-\Pr\left[D^{g(\cdot)}(1^n)=1\right]\right|\leq \texttt{negl}(n),$$

where the first probability is taken over uniform choice of  $k_1, k_2 \in \{0, 1\}^n$  and the randomness of D, and the second probability is taken over uniform choice of  $g \in \operatorname{Perm}_{2n}$  and the randomness of D. The set  $\operatorname{Perm}_{2n}$  is the set of all bijections with domain equal to  $\{0, 1\}^{2n}$  and range equal to  $\{0, 1\}^{2n}$ . By  $D^{F'(k_1, k_2, \cdot)}(1^n)$  and  $D^{g(\cdot)}(1^n)$ , we mean distinguishers D who have oracle access to  $F'(k_1, k_2, \cdot)$  and g respectively.

- 2. (a)  $(2\frac{1}{2} \text{ points})$  Let  $\Pi = (\text{Gen, Enc, Dec})$  be a private-key encryption scheme with message space  $\mathcal{M} = \{0, 1\}^n$  where *n* is the security parameter. Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be the ciphertext space of  $\Pi$ . Define  $\Pi' = (\text{Gen}', \text{Enc}', \text{Dec}')$  to be another private-key encryption scheme with message space  $\mathcal{M}' = \{0, 1\}^{2n}$  as follows:
  - Gen' is the same algorithm as Gen. Both algorithms output a key k from a keyspace  $\mathcal{K}$ .
  - For key k and message  $m = m_1 || m_2 \in \{0,1\}^{2n}$  where  $m_1 \in \{0,1\}^n$  and  $m_2 \in \{0,1\}^n$ , the ciphertext output by  $\operatorname{Enc}'$  is  $(c_1, c_2) \in \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C}$  where  $c_1 \leftarrow \operatorname{Enc}_k(m_1)$  and  $c_2 \leftarrow \operatorname{Enc}_k(m_2)$ .
  - For key k and ciphertext  $(c_1, c_2) \in \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C}$ , the message output by Dec' is  $m_1 || m_2$  where  $m_1 = \text{Dec}_k(c_1)$  and  $m_2 = \text{Dec}_k(c_2)$ .

Prove that  $\Pi'$  is **not** CCA-secure, even if  $\Pi$  is CCA-secure.

- (b)  $(2\frac{1}{2} \text{ points})$  Let  $\Pi_1 = (\text{Gen}_1, \text{Enc}_1, \text{Dec}_1)$  and Let  $\Pi_2 = (\text{Gen}_2, \text{Enc}_2, \text{Dec}_2)$  be two privatekey encryption schemes with the same message space  $\mathcal{M}$  and ciphertext space  $\mathcal{C}$ . Define  $\Pi' = (\text{Gen}', \text{Enc}', \text{Dec}')$  to be another private-key encryption scheme with message space  $\mathcal{M}$  and ciphertext space  $\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C}$  as follows:
  - The key generated by Gen' is  $(k_1, k_2)$  where  $k_1 \leftarrow \text{Gen}_1(1^n)$  and  $k_2 \leftarrow \text{Gen}_2(1^n)$ .
  - For key  $(k_1, k_2)$  and message  $m \in \mathcal{M}$ , the ciphertext output by Enc' is  $(c_1, c_2) \in \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C}$ where  $c_1 \leftarrow \text{Enc}_{1,k_1}(m)$  and  $c_2 \leftarrow \text{Enc}_{2,k_2}(m)$ .
  - For key  $(k_1, k_2)$  and ciphertext  $(c_1, c_2) \in C \times C$ , the decryption algorithm Dec' first computes  $m_1 = \text{Dec}_{1,k_1}(c_1)$  and  $m_2 = \text{Dec}_{2,k_2}(c_2)$ . If  $m_1 \neq m_2$ , Dec' outputs  $\perp$  to indicate decryption failure. If  $m_1 = m_2$ , Dec' outputs  $m_1$ .

Prove that  $\Pi'$  is **not** CCA-secure, even if  $\Pi_1$  and  $\Pi_2$  are CCA-secure.

Note 1: The CCA indistinguishability experiment  $\operatorname{PrivK}_{4\Pi}^{ca}(n)$  where  $\Pi = (\operatorname{Gen}, \operatorname{Enc}, \operatorname{Dec})$  is described below.

- 1. A key k is generated by running  $Gen(1^n)$ .
- 2. The adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  is given  $1^n$  and oracle access to  $\text{Enc}_k(\cdot)$  and  $\text{Dec}_k(\cdot)$ . It outputs a pair of messages  $m_0, m_1 \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $|m_0| = |m_1|$ .
- 3. A uniform bit  $b \in \{0,1\}$  is chosen. Ciphertext  $c \leftarrow \text{Enc}_k(m_b)$  is computed and given to  $\mathcal{A}$ . c is called the *challenge ciphertext*.
- 4. The adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  continues to have oracle access to  $\operatorname{Enc}_k(\cdot)$  and  $\operatorname{Dec}_k(\cdot)$ , but is not allowed to query the latter on the challenge ciphertext itself. Eventually,  $\mathcal{A}$  outputs a bit b'.
- 5. The output of the experiment is defined to be 1 if b' = b, and 0 otherwise. If output is 1, we say that A succeeds.

Note 2: A private-key encryption scheme  $\Pi = (Gen, Enc, Dec)$  has indistinguishable encryptions under a chosenciphertext attack, or is CCA-secure, if for all probabilistic polynomial-time adversaries  $\mathcal{A}$  there is a negligible function negl such that, for all n,

$$\Pr\left[\operatorname{PrivK}_{\mathcal{A},\Pi}^{\operatorname{cca}}(n) = 1\right] \leq \frac{1}{2} + \operatorname{negl}(n).$$

- 3. (a)  $(2\frac{1}{2} \text{ points})$  Show that the CBC block cipher mode encryption scheme is not CCA-secure.
  - (b)  $(2\frac{1}{2})$  points) Show that the CTR block cipher mode encryption scheme is not CCA-secure.

Note 1: Cipher Block Chaining (CBC) mode works as follows:

- Let  $m = m_1, m_2, \dots, m_l$  where  $m_i \in \{0, 1\}^n$ .
- Let F be a length-preserving pseudorandom permutation with block length n.
- A uniform initialization vector (IV) of length n is first chosen.
- Set  $c_0 = IV$ . For  $i = 1, \ldots, l$ , set  $c_i := F_k(c_{i-1} \oplus m_i)$ . The ciphertext is  $(c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_l)$ .
- For  $i = 1, 2, ..., l, m_i \coloneqq F_k^{-1}(c_i) \oplus c_{i-1}$ .

Note 2: Counter (CTR) mode works as follows:

- Let  $m = m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_l$  where  $m_i \in \{0, 1\}^n$ .
- Let F be a length-preserving pseudorandom function with block length n.
- A uniform value  $\mathtt{ctr}$  of length n is first chosen.
- Set  $c_0 = \mathsf{ctr.}$  For  $i = 1, \ldots, l$ , set  $c_i \coloneqq F_k(\mathsf{ctr} + i) \oplus m_i$ . The ciphertext is  $(c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_l)$ .
- For  $i = 1, 2, \ldots, l, m_i \coloneqq F_k(\mathtt{ctr} + i) \oplus c_i$ .
- 4. Recall that the PKCS #5 padding scheme is used to pad a message x having length some integral number of bytes into a *encoded data* m having length jL bytes where L is the block length in bytes. The number of bytes which are appended to x to get m is b where  $1 \le b \le L$ . Each of these padding bytes is equal to the byte representation of the integer b. Assume that L < 256.

Suppose the encoded data m has length 2L bytes, i.e.  $m = (m_1, m_2)$  where  $|m_i| = L$  bytes for i = 1, 2. Recall that the encoded data m is obtained by padding the message x. Let F be a length-preserving pseudorandom permutation where  $F_k : \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, 1\}^n$  where n = 8L. (Note: 8L bits = L bytes) Now suppose the encoded data is encrypted using CBC mode as described below.

- The ciphertext corresponding to  $m = (m_1, m_2)$  is given by  $c = (c_0, c_1, c_2)$  where
  - $-c_0$  is uniformly chosen from  $\{0,1\}^n$ .
  - $-c_i = F_k(m_i \oplus c_{i-1})$  for i = 1, 2.

Suppose an adversary has access to a padding oracle. On input some ciphertext block c' of the form  $(c'_0, c'_1, c'_2)$  or  $(c'_0, c'_1)$ , the padding oracle only returns a message from the set {ok, padding\_error}. The ok is returned when there is no padding error in the encoded data m' obtained from c'. If there is a padding error, then padding\_error is returned.

- (a) (2 points) Describe a procedure by which the adversary can recover the **length** *b* of the padding in the encoded data *m*. Be specific about the inputs sent to the padding oracle and the decisions made by your procedure on receiving the oracle's responses.
- (b) (3 points) Describe a procedure by which the adversary can recover all the message bytes in the encoded data m. The adversary is allowed to send ciphertext blocks of the form  $c' = (c'_0, c'_1)$  or of the form  $c' = (c'_0, c'_1, c'_2)$ .
- 5. (5 points) Recall the construction of a CBC-MAC using a length-preserving pseudorandom function F with key/input/output length equal to n bits. Let  $m \in \{0,1\}^{dn}$  be a message for a fixed integer d > 1.
  - Gen: Choose key k uniformly from  $\{0, 1\}^n$ .
  - Mac: Parse the message m into d blocks  $m_1, \ldots, m_d$  of length n bits each. Set  $t_0 = 0^n$ . For  $i = 1, \ldots, d$ , set  $t_i = F_k(t_{i-1} \oplus m_i)$ . Output  $t_d$  as the tag.
  - Vrfy: For a message-tag pair (m, t) output 0, if the message is not of length dn. Otherwise, output 1 if and only if  $t = \text{Mac}_k(m)$ .

Consider the following variation of the CBC-MAC. Prove that this variation (Gen, Mac', Vrfy') is an insecure MAC.

- Mac': Parse the message m in to d blocks m<sub>1</sub>,..., m<sub>d</sub> of length n bits each. Choose an initialization vector IV uniformly from {0,1}<sup>n</sup>. Set t<sub>0</sub> = IV. For i = 1,..., d, set t<sub>i</sub> = F<sub>k</sub>(t<sub>i-1</sub> ⊕ m<sub>i</sub>). Output (IV, t<sub>d</sub>) as the tag.
- Vrfy': For a message-tag pair (m, (IV, t)) output 0, if the message is not of length dn. Parse the message m into d blocks m<sub>1</sub>,..., m<sub>d</sub> of length n bits each. Set t<sub>0</sub> = IV. For i = 1,..., d, set t<sub>i</sub> = F<sub>k</sub>(t<sub>i-1</sub> ⊕ m<sub>i</sub>).

Output 1 if and only if  $t = t_d$ .

Note: A message authentication code  $\Pi = (Gen, Mac, Vrfy)$  is existentially unforgeable under an adaptive chosenmessage attack, or just secure, if for all PPT adversaries  $\mathcal{A}$ , there is a negligible function negl such that:

$$\Pr\left[\texttt{Mac-forge}_{\mathcal{A},\Pi}(n) = 1\right] \leq \texttt{negl}(n).$$

The message authentication experiment  $\texttt{Mac-forge}_{\mathcal{A},\Pi}(n)$  is defined as follows:

- 1. A key k is generated by running  $Gen(1^n)$ .
- 2. The adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  is given input  $1^n$  and oracle access to  $\operatorname{Mac}_k(\cdot)$ . The adversary eventually outputs (m, t). Let  $\mathcal{Q}$  denote the set of all queries that  $\mathcal{A}$  asked its oracle.
- 3.  $\mathcal{A}$  succeeds if and only if (1)  $\operatorname{Vrfy}_k(m,t) = 1$  and (2)  $m \notin \mathcal{Q}$ . If  $\mathcal{A}$  succeeds, the output of the experiment is 1. Otherwise, the output is 0.