

Roll no: \_\_\_\_\_ Name: \_\_\_\_\_

[ Write your answers in the question paper itself. Be brief and precise. Answer all questions. ]

1. Bellare and Rogaway (ACM CCS 1993) propose the following public-key encryption scheme. Let  $f$  be a one-way trapdoor function, the message space be  $\{0, 1\}^l$ , and  $G : \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^l$  a hash function. The encryption of a message  $m$  is the pair  $(u, v)$ , where  $u = f(r)$  for a uniformly random  $r$  in the domain of  $f$ , and  $v = m \oplus G(r)$ .

(a) How can a ciphertext  $(u, v)$  prepared by this encryption scheme be decrypted? (5)

*Solution* The recipient uses his knowledge of the trapdoor to recover  $r = f_{td}^{-1}(u)$ . The message is then recovered as  $m = v \oplus G(r)$ .

(b) Prove that this scheme is IND-CPA secure in the random-oracle model, given that  $f$  is one-way. Ronald interacts with a hypothetical PPT adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  that can win the IND-CPA game against this Bellare–Rogaway scheme with non-negligible advantage. Clearly mention: (i) the reduction objective of Ronald, (ii) how Ronald simulates encryption, (iii) how random-oracle queries are answered before and after the challenge, and (iv) how Ronald’s objective is satisfied at the end of the game. (20)

*Solution* (i) **Objective of Ronald:** Ronald is supplied with a random  $u^*$  in the range of  $f$ . Ronald wants to compute  $r^* = f_{td}^{-1}(u^*)$  without knowing the trapdoor.

(ii) **Simulation of Encryption:**  $\mathcal{A}$  supplies two different  $l$ -bit messages  $m_0, m_1$ . Ronald chooses a random bit  $b \in_U \{0, 1\}$ , and a random  $v^* \in_U \{0, 1\}^l$ . Ronald sends to  $\mathcal{A}$  the pair  $c^* = (u^*, v^*)$  as the purported encryption of  $m_b$ . Ronald’s input  $u^*$  uniquely identifies  $r^*$ . In order that  $c^*$  is a valid ciphertext of  $m_b$ , we must have  $G(r^*) = v^* \oplus m_b$ .

*Solution* **(iii) RO Queries:** Ronald maintains a  $G$ -table of  $(Q, G(Q))$  pairs queried by  $\mathcal{A}$ . Now, suppose  $\mathcal{A}$  asks Ronald to return  $G(Q)$ . Ronald can verify whether  $Q = r^*$  by checking whether  $f(Q) = u^*$ . In the pre-challenge phase, we have  $Q = r^*$  only with negligible probability, because without seeing  $u^*$  the probability that  $\mathcal{A}$  makes this query is negligible.

If  $Q \neq r^*$ , then Ronald searches his  $G$ -table for  $Q$ . If  $Q$  is already present, the corresponding  $G(Q)$  value is returned. Otherwise, Ronald generates a uniformly random string  $\gamma \in_U \{0, 1\}^l$ , adds the pair  $(Q, \gamma)$  to his  $G$ -table, and returns  $\gamma$  to  $\mathcal{A}$ .

So suppose that  $Q = r^*$ , and this can happen, except with negligible probability, in the post-challenge phase. If  $G(r^*)$  is already defined, the saved value is returned. Otherwise, Ronald computes  $\gamma^* = v^* \oplus m_b$ , stores the pair  $(r^*, \gamma^*)$  in his  $G$ -table, and returns  $\gamma^*$  to  $\mathcal{A}$ .

**(iv) End of Game:** If  $G(r^*)$  is not defined, then both the values  $m_0 \oplus v^*$  and  $m_1 \oplus v^*$  are equiprobable to be the value of  $G(r^*)$ . Consequently, without making the oracle query of  $G(r^*)$ , the adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  cannot have any advantage in deciding the bit  $b$ . But then since  $\mathcal{A}$  is supposed to have a non-negligible advantage, it would make the query  $G(r^*)$  at some point in the post-challenge phase. Whenever it does, Ronald sees  $f(r^*) = u^*$ , and his objective of inverting  $f$  on  $u^*$  is fulfilled.

(c) Show that this scheme not IND-CCA2 secure.

(5)

*Solution* Let  $c^* = (u^*, v^*)$  be the challenge ciphertext presented by the oracle as an encryption of  $m_b$ . But then, for any random  $l$ -bit string  $\rho$ ,  $c' = (u^*, v^* \oplus \rho)$  is an encryption of  $m_b \oplus \rho$ . Since  $c' \neq c^*$  (if  $\rho$  is non-zero), a decryption query on  $c'$  is allowed in the post-challenge phase. If  $m'$  is returned, then  $m_b = m' \oplus \rho$ .

(d) We apply the Fujisaki–Okamoto transform to convert this Bellare–Rogaway scheme to an IND-CCA2 secure scheme. Explain how encryption and decryption work after the application of the FO transform. (10)

*Solution* Let  $l = l_0 + l_1$ . We now encrypt an  $l_0$ -bit message  $m$  padded by an  $l_1$ -bit random salt  $s$ . We need to use a second hash function  $H$  from  $\{0, 1\}^l$  to the domain of  $f$ . So the steps during encryption are as follows.

1. Choose  $s \in_U \{0, 1\}^{l_1}$ .
2. Compute  $r = H(m || s)$ .
3. Compute  $u = f(r)$  and  $v = (m || s) \oplus G(r)$ .
4. Output the ciphertext  $(u, v)$ .

For decrypting  $(u, v)$ , we proceed as follows.

1. Use the trapdoor to compute  $r = f_{id}^{-1}(u)$ .
2. Compute  $\mu = v \oplus G(r)$ .
3. If  $r \neq H(\mu)$ , return *failure*.
4. Decompose  $\mu = m || s$  with  $|m| = l_0$  and  $|s| = l_1$ .
5. Return  $m$ .

Use this space for leftover answers and rough work

---