Relaxing IND-CCA: Indistinguishability Against Chosen Ciphertext Verification Attack

Sumit Kumar Pandey, Santanu Sarkar and Mahavir Prasad Jhanwar

CR Rao AIMSCS Hyderabad

November 2, 2012

イロト 不得下 イヨト イヨト 二日

SUMIT KUMAR PANDEY, SANTANU SARKAR AND MAHAVIR PRA



◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆ □▶ ◆ □▶ ● □ ● ○ ○ ○

Definitions

- Encryption Scheme
- IND-CPA
- IND-CCA
- IND-CCVA
- **2** Bleichenbacher's attack on PKCS#1
- Generic Constructions

Definition: Encryption Scheme

- KG(1^λ): A probabilistic polynomial time algorithm which takes security parameter 1^λ as input and outputs a public-private key pair (*PK*, *SK*).
- **ENC**(*m*, *PK*): A probabilistic polynomial time algorithm which takes a message *m* and public key *PK* as input and returns ciphertext *C*.
- DEC(C, SK, PK): A deterministic polynomial time algorithm which takes ciphertext C, secret key SK and public key PK as input and returns a message m if C is a valid ciphertext else ⊥.

(日) (同) (目) (日) (日) (0) (0)

Definition: Encryption Scheme

- KG(1^λ): A probabilistic polynomial time algorithm which takes security parameter 1^λ as input and outputs a public-private key pair (*PK*, *SK*).
- **ENC**(*m*, *PK*): A probabilistic polynomial time algorithm which takes a message *m* and public key *PK* as input and returns ciphertext *C*.
- DEC(C, SK, PK): A deterministic polynomial time algorithm which takes ciphertext C, secret key SK and public key PK as input and returns a message m if C is a valid ciphertext else ⊥.

For consistency, it is required that for all $(PK, SK) \leftarrow KG(1^{\lambda})$ and all messages m, m = DEC(ENC(m, PK), SK, PK).

Definition: IND-CPA

An encryption scheme S_{ENC} is said to be **IND-CPA** (indistinguishable against chosen plaintext attack) secure if no probabilistic polynomial time algorithm $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2)$ has a non-negligible advantage in the following game:

(日本本語を本語を本語を、目、2000)

Definition: IND-CPA

An encryption scheme S_{ENC} is said to be **IND-CPA** (indistinguishable against chosen plaintext attack) secure if no probabilistic polynomial time algorithm $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2)$ has a non-negligible advantage in the following game: $\underline{Game}_{S_{ENC}, \mathcal{A}}^{IND-CPA}$

- $(PK, SK) \leftarrow \mathsf{KG}(1^{\lambda})$
- $(m_0, m_1, st) \leftarrow \mathcal{A}_1(PK)$
- $b \stackrel{R}{\leftarrow} \{0,1\}$
- $y \leftarrow ENC(m_b, PK)$
- $b' \leftarrow \mathcal{A}_2(y, PK, st)$

The advantage of \mathcal{A} is defined as $\mathcal{A}dv(\mathcal{A}) = |\Pr(b = b') - \frac{1}{2}|$

Definition: IND-CCA

An encryption scheme S_{ENC} is said to be **IND-CCA** (indistinguishable against chosen ciphertext attack) secure if no probabilistic polynomial time algorithm $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2)$ has a non-negligible advantage in the following game:

(日本本語を本語を本語を、目、2000)

Definition: IND-CCA

An encryption scheme S_{ENC} is said to be **IND-CCA** (indistinguishable against chosen ciphertext attack) secure if no probabilistic polynomial time algorithm $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2)$ has a non-negligible advantage in the following game:

- DecryptionOracle(𝔅): Given a ciphertext 𝔅, except the challenge ciphertext, the oracle returns m ← DEC(𝔅, SK, PK).
 Game^{IND-CCA}_{SENC,A}
 - $(PK, SK) \leftarrow \mathsf{KG}(1^{\lambda})$
 - $(m_0, m_1, st) \leftarrow \mathcal{A}_1^\mathcal{O}(\mathsf{PK})$
 - $b \stackrel{R}{\leftarrow} \{0,1\}$
 - $y \leftarrow \text{ENC}(m_b, PK)$
 - $b' \leftarrow \mathcal{A}_2^{\mathcal{O}}(y, PK, st)$

The advantage of \mathcal{A} is defined as $\mathcal{A}dv(\mathcal{A}) = |\Pr(b = b') - \frac{1}{2}|$

Definition: IND-CCVA

(ロ) (国) (E) (E) (E) (O)(0)

An encryption scheme S_{ENC} is said to be **IND-CCVA** (indistinguishable against chosen ciphertext verification attack) secure if no probabilistic polynomial time algorithm $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2)$ has a non-negligible advantage in the following game:

Definition: IND-CCVA

An encryption scheme S_{ENC} is said to be **IND-CCVA** (indistinguishable against chosen ciphertext verification attack) secure if no probabilistic polynomial time algorithm $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2)$ has a non-negligible advantage in the following game:

• ChosenCiphertextVerificationOracle(\mathcal{O}): Given a ciphertext \mathcal{C} , the oracle returns 1 if \mathcal{C} is valid else returns 0.

 $\textbf{Game}^{\textit{IND-CCVA}}_{S_{\textit{ENC}},\mathcal{A}}$

- $(PK, SK) \leftarrow \mathsf{KG}(1^{\lambda})$
- $(m_0, m_1, st) \leftarrow \mathcal{A}_1^\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{PK})$
- $b \stackrel{R}{\leftarrow} \{0,1\}$
- $y \leftarrow \mathsf{ENC}(m_b, PK)$
- $b' \leftarrow \mathcal{A}_2^{\mathcal{O}}(y, PK, st)$

The advantage of \mathcal{A} is defined as $\mathcal{A}dv(\mathcal{A}) = |\Pr(b = b') - \frac{1}{2}|$

Trivial Conclusions

- IND-CCVA secure encryption schemes are IND-CPA secure also. $IND-CCVA \rightarrow IND-CPA$
- IND-CCA secure encryption schemes are IND-CCVA secure also.

 $IND-CCA \rightarrow IND-CCVA$

Does CCVA make sense?

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへで

SUMIT KUMAR PANDEY, SANTANU SARKAR AND MAHAVIR PRAN

PKCS#1

- **KG**(1^{λ}): Choose primes p, q (4k bit each) and compute n = pq (n is k byte number). Choose e, d, such that $ed \equiv 1 \pmod{\phi(n)}$. The public key, PK, is (n, e) and the secret key, SK, is (p, q, d).
- **ENC**(*m*, *PK*): A data block *D*, consisting of |D| bytes, is encrypted as follows:
 - First, a padding string *PS*, consisting of k 3 |D| nonzero bytes, is generated pseudo-randomly (the byte length of *PS* is atleast 8).
 - Now, the encryption block EB = 00||02||PS||00||D is formed, is converted into an integer x, and is encrypted with RSA, giving the ciphertext c = x^e (mod n).



• **DEC**(*c*, *SK*, *PK*) A Ciphertext *c* is decrypted as follows:

- Compute $x' = c^d \pmod{n}$.
- Converts x' into an encryption block EB'.
- Check, if the encryption block is PKCS conforming (An encryption block *EB* consisting of *k* bytes,
 EB = *EB*₁||...||*EB*_k, is called PKCS conforming, if it satisfies the following conditions: *EB*₁ = 00, *EB*₂ = 02, *EB*₃ through *EB*₁₀ are nonzero and at least one of the bytes *EB*₁₁ through *EB*_k is 00).
- If the encryption block is PKCS conforming, then output the data block; otherwise an error sign.

Bleichenbacher's Attack on PKCS#1

Bleichenbacher's attack assumes that the adversary has access to an oracle that, for every ciphertext, returns whether the corresponding plaintext is PKCS conforming. If the plaintext is not PKCS conforming, the oracle outputs an error sign. Given just these error signs, because of specific properties of PKCS #1, Bleichenbacher showed how a very clever program can decrypt a target ciphertext (the oracle answer will reveal the first two bytes of the corresponding plaintext of the chosen ciphertext).

・ロト ・雪 ・ ・ ヨ ・ ・ ヨ ・

Bleichenbacher's Attack on PKCS#1

Bleichenbacher's attack assumes that the adversary has access to an oracle that, for every ciphertext, returns whether the corresponding plaintext is PKCS conforming. If the plaintext is not PKCS conforming, the oracle outputs an error sign. Given just these error signs, because of specific properties of PKCS #1, Bleichenbacher showed how a very clever program can decrypt a target ciphertext (the oracle answer will reveal the first two bytes of the corresponding plaintext of the chosen ciphertext).

D. Bleichenbacher. Chosen Ciphertext Attacks Against Protocols Based on the RSA Encryption Standard PKCS #1. In Proc. Crypto'98, pages 1-12, 1998.

• CCVA makes sense.

◆□ → < 個 → < 目 → < 目 → ○ < ○ </p>

• CCVA makes sense.

Questions

- Ooes there exist any encryption scheme which is IND-CCVA secure but not IND-CCA secure?
- Ooes there exist any encryption scheme which is IND-CPA secure but not IND-CCVA secure?

Generic Constructions

・ロト ・ 四ト ・ ヨト ・ ヨト … ヨ

SUMIT KUMAR PANDEY, SANTANU SARKAR AND MAHAVIR PRAN

Let \prod be a public key encryption scheme with \mathcal{K} as key space, \mathcal{M} as message space, and \mathcal{C} as ciphertext space. In general, we have

 $\cup_{k\in\mathcal{K}}\mathsf{Enc}(\mathcal{M})\subseteq\mathcal{C}.$

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲三▶ ▲三▶ 三日 - ∽000

Let \prod be a public key encryption scheme with \mathcal{K} as key space, \mathcal{M} as message space, and \mathcal{C} as ciphertext space. In general, we have

$$\cup_{k\in\mathcal{K}}\mathsf{Enc}(\mathcal{M})\subseteq\mathcal{C}.$$

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト 二日

lf

- \prod is IND-CPA secure but not IND-CCA secure, and
- $\cup_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \mathsf{Enc}(\mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{C}$

Let \prod be a public key encryption scheme with \mathcal{K} as key space, \mathcal{M} as message space, and \mathcal{C} as ciphertext space. In general, we have

$$\cup_{k\in\mathcal{K}}\mathsf{Enc}(\mathcal{M})\subseteq\mathcal{C}.$$

lf

• \prod is IND-CPA secure but not IND-CCA secure, and

•
$$\cup_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \mathsf{Enc}(\mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{C}$$

then,

• There exists an IND-CCVA secure encryption scheme but not IND-CCA secure.

イロト 不得下 イヨト イヨト 二日

Let

• \prod is IND-CPA secure but not IND-CCA secure, and

•
$$\cup_{k\in\mathcal{K}}\mathsf{Enc}(\mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{C}$$

Let

- \prod is IND-CPA secure but not IND-CCA secure, and
- $\cup_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \mathsf{Enc}(\mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{C}$
- $\hat{\mathcal{E}} = (\mathit{KeyGen}_{\hat{\mathcal{E}}}, \mathit{ENC}_{\hat{\mathcal{E}}}, \mathit{DEC}_{\hat{\mathcal{E}}})$ based on \prod
 - KeyGen_Ê: Same as KeyGen.
 - ENC_Ê: Encryption of a message *m* under a public key *PK* is given as

$$\hat{c} = 1 || c$$
, where $c = ENC(m, PK)$.

・ロト ・雪 ・ ・ ヨ ・ ・ ヨ ・

•
$$DEC_{\hat{\mathcal{E}}}$$
:
 $DEC_{\hat{\mathcal{E}}}(\hat{c}, SK, PK) = DEC(c, SK, PK)$ if $\hat{c} = 1 ||c|$, otherwise
return \perp .

Let

- \prod is IND-CPA secure but not IND-CCA secure, and
- $\cup_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \mathsf{Enc}(\mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{C}$
- $\hat{\mathcal{E}} = (\mathit{KeyGen}_{\hat{\mathcal{E}}}, \mathit{ENC}_{\hat{\mathcal{E}}}, \mathit{DEC}_{\hat{\mathcal{E}}})$ based on \prod
 - KeyGen_Ê: Same as KeyGen.
 - ENC_Ê: Encryption of a message *m* under a public key *PK* is given as

$$\hat{c} = 1 || c$$
, where $c = ENC(m, PK)$.

(日本本語を本語を本語を、目、2000)

•
$$DEC_{\hat{\mathcal{E}}}$$
:
 $DEC_{\hat{\mathcal{E}}}(\hat{c}, SK, PK) = DEC(c, SK, PK)$ if $\hat{c} = 1 ||c|$, otherwise
return \perp .

- $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$ is IND-CPA secure but not IND-CCA secure, and
- $\cup_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \mathsf{Enc}(\mathcal{M}) \neq \mathcal{C}$

It is easy to check that $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$ is IND-CPA secure but not IND-CCA secure with the added property that every ciphertext need not be valid. Since it is trivial to distinguish valid ciphertexts from invalid ciphertexts (by just looking at the most significant bit), CCVA oracle does not give any extra advantage to the adversary and thus $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$ is IND-CCVA secure.

Let \mathcal{E}_{CPA} be a public key encryption scheme described by the key generation algorithm $KeyGen_{CPA}$, encryption algorithm ENC_{CPA} and decryption algorithm DEC_{CPA} . Now define a new public key encryption \mathcal{E} as follows

Let \mathcal{E}_{CPA} be a public key encryption scheme described by the key generation algorithm $KeyGen_{CPA}$, encryption algorithm ENC_{CPA} and decryption algorithm DEC_{CPA} . Now define a new public key encryption \mathcal{E} as follows

- KeyGen: Same as KeyGen_{CPA}.
- Enc: Encryption of a message *m* under a public key *PK* is given as

$$c = c_1 || c_2 = ENC_{CPA}(m, PK) || ENC_{CPA}(m, PK)$$

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト 二日

イロト 不得下 イヨト イヨト 二日

- Dec: Decryption of a ciphertext $c = c_1 || c_2$ with the corresponding secret key *SK* will proceed as follows:
 - $m'_1 \leftarrow DEC_{CPA}(c_1, SK, PK)$
 - $m'_2 \leftarrow DEC_{CPA}(c_2, SK, PK)$
 - If $m'_1 = m'_2$, return m'_1 , else
 - return \perp

Attack

$$b \stackrel{\mathcal{R}}{\rightarrow} \{0,1\}$$

 $\mathcal{C}_b = c_1^b || c_2^b = ENC_{CPA}(m_b, PK) || ENC_{CPA}(m_b, PK)$

Attack

$$\begin{split} b &\stackrel{\mathcal{R}}{\rightarrow} \{0,1\}\\ \mathcal{C}_{b} = c_{1}^{b} || c_{2}^{b} = ENC_{CPA}(m_{b}, PK) || ENC_{CPA}(m_{b}, PK)\\ \downarrow\\ b' &\stackrel{\mathcal{R}}{\rightarrow} \{0,1\}\\ \mathcal{C}_{b'} = c_{1}^{b} || c_{2}^{b'} = ENC_{CPA}(m_{b}, PK) || ENC_{CPA}(m_{b'}, PK) \end{split}$$

SUMIT KUMAR PANDEY, SANTANU SARKAR AND MAHAVIR PRAS

Attack

$$\begin{split} b \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}} \{0,1\} \\ \mathcal{C}_{b} &= c_{1}^{b} || c_{2}^{b} = ENC_{CPA}(m_{b}, PK) || ENC_{CPA}(m_{b}, PK) \\ &\downarrow \\ b' \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}} \{0,1\} \\ \mathcal{C}_{b'} &= c_{1}^{b} || c_{2}^{b'} = ENC_{CPA}(m_{b}, PK) || ENC_{CPA}(m_{b'}, PK) \\ &\downarrow \end{split}$$

if chosen ciphertext verification oracle returns 1, b = b', else $b \neq b'$

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲豆▶ ▲豆▶ □ □ のへで

Let \mathcal{E}_{CCA1} be a public key encryption scheme described by the key generation algorithm $KeyGen_{CCA1}$, encryption algorithm ENC_{CCA1} and decryption algorithm DEC_{CCA1} . Now define a new public key encryption \mathcal{E} as follows

- KeyGen: Same as *KeyGen_{CCA1}*.
- Enc: Encryption of a message *m* under a public key *PK* is given as

 $c = c_1 || c_2 = ENC_{CCA1}(m, PK) || ENC_{CCA1}(m, PK)$

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲三▶ ▲三▶ 三日 - ∽000

イロト 不得下 イヨト イヨト 二日

- Dec: Decryption of a ciphertext $c = c_1 || c_2$ with the corresponding secret key *SK* will proceed as follows:
 - $m'_1 \leftarrow DEC_{CCA1}(c_1, SK, PK)$
 - $m'_2 \leftarrow DEC_{CCA1}(c_2, SK, PK)$
 - If $m_1' = m_2'$, return m_1' , else
 - return \perp

Attack

$$b \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}} \{0,1\}$$

$$\mathcal{C}_{b} = c_{1}^{b} || c_{2}^{b} = ENC_{CCA1}(m_{b}, PK) || ENC_{CCA1}(m_{b}, PK)$$

◆□ > ◆□ > ◆三 > ◆三 > ● ● ●

SUMIT KUMAR PANDEY, SANTANU SARKAR AND MAHAVIR PRAS

Attack

$$\begin{aligned} b \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}} \{0,1\} \\ \mathcal{C}_{b} &= c_{1}^{b} || c_{2}^{b} = ENC_{CCA1}(m_{b}, PK) || ENC_{CCA1}(m_{b}, PK) \\ &\downarrow \\ b' \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}} \{0,1\} \\ \mathcal{C}_{b'} &= c_{1}^{b} || c_{2}^{b'} = ENC_{CCA1}(m_{b}, PK) || ENC_{CCA1}(m_{b'}, PK) \end{aligned}$$

SUMIT KUMAR PANDEY, SANTANU SARKAR AND MAHAVIR PRAS

Attack

$$\begin{aligned} b \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}} \{0,1\} \\ \mathcal{C}_{b} &= c_{1}^{b} || c_{2}^{b} = ENC_{CCA1}(m_{b}, PK) || ENC_{CCA1}(m_{b}, PK) \\ &\downarrow \\ b' \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}} \{0,1\} \\ \mathcal{C}_{b'} &= c_{1}^{b} || c_{2}^{b'} = ENC_{CCA1}(m_{b}, PK) || ENC_{CCA1}(m_{b'}, PK) \\ &\downarrow \end{aligned}$$

if chosen ciphertext verification oracle returns 1, b = b', else $b \neq b'$

• There exists an IND-CCA1 secure encryption scheme but not IND-CCVA secure.

Thank You

◆□ ▶ ◆□ ▶ ◆ □ ▶ ◆ □ ▶ ● □

SUMIT KUMAR PANDEY, SANTANU SARKAR AND MAHAVIR PRAN