

Admin:

Psct #3 due 3/27.  
Proj. proposals due 3/24.

Today:

Pedersen commitments

PK encryption

El Gamal PK encryption

Semantic security

DDH (Decision Diffie-Hellman)

DDH  $\Rightarrow$  El Gamal is semantically secure

Readings:

Paar: Ch. 6, 7, 8

Katz: 10, 11

Anmasson: Ch. 11

## Group theory facts: (review)

Let  $G$  be a cyclic group with generator  $g$ .

Let  $m = |G|$  (order of  $G$ )

Then:

$$\textcircled{1} \quad G = \{g^0, g^1, \dots, g^{m-1}\}$$

\textcircled{2} To pick a random element of  $G$ :

$$\text{Let } x \stackrel{R}{\in} \mathbb{Z}_m = \{0, 1, \dots, m-1\}$$

$$\text{return } y = g^x$$

\textcircled{3} If  $y \stackrel{R}{\in} G$  &  $z \stackrel{R}{\in} G$ , then  $yz$  uniformly  
random in  $G$ .

\textcircled{4} Suppose  $d \mid m$

Then set of  $d^{\text{th}}$  powers

$$\{g^0, g^d, g^{2d}, \dots, g^{m-d}\}$$

is a subgroup of order  $m/d$

Ex: quadratic residues in  $\mathbb{Z}_p^*$  has order  $\frac{p-1}{2}$ .

Subgroup is cyclic with generator  $g^d$ .

## Pedersen Commitment Scheme

Recall:  $\text{Commit}(x) \rightarrow \text{"commitment to } x\text{"}$

Reveal ( $c$ )  $\rightarrow \text{"opens commitment, reveals } x\text{"}$

Properties: Hiding:  $\text{Commit}(x)$  reveals nothing about  $x$

Binding: Can only open in one way (can't change  $x$ )

Nonmalleability (?): Can't produce commitment to e.g.  $x+1$  from commitment to  $x$ .

values  
can be  
chosen by  
receiver

Setup:  $p, q$  large primes s.t.  $q \mid p-1$  (e.g.  $p$  "safe prime")

$g$  generator of order- $q$  subgroup of  $\mathbb{Z}_p^*$

(e.g. if  $p$  safe then  $\langle g \rangle = \mathbb{Q}_p = \text{squares mod } p$ )

$h = g^a$  a secret  $h$  generates  $\langle g \rangle$  as well

$a \neq 0 \pmod{q}$

Commit( $x$ ):  $x \in \mathbb{Z}_q$  (i.e.  $0 \leq x < q$ )

Sender chooses random  $r \in \mathbb{Z}_q$

$\text{Commit}(x) = c = g^x h^r \pmod{p}$

Reveal: Sender reveals  $x$  and  $r$

Receiver verifies that  $c = g^x h^r \pmod{p}$

## Pedersen commitment (cont.)

Hiding: Given  $c = g^x h^r$

"Perfectly Hiding"  
 (Adversary could  
 have  $\infty$  computational  
 power...)

Can in principle be opened to any  $x' \in \mathbb{Z}_q$ , for some  $r'$

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} g^x h^r = g^{x'} h^{r'} \\ g^x g^{ar} = g^{x'} g^{ar'} \\ g^{x+ar} = g^{x'+ar'} \end{array} \right\} (\text{mod } p)$$

$$x + ar = x' + ar' \pmod{q}$$

$$r' = (x - x')/a + r$$

$\nabla g$  is prime so  $a^{-1}$  exists  
 $r' \neq r$  since  $x \neq x'$

Binding: If sender can reveal two ways

$$c = g^x h^r = g^{x'} h^{r'} \pmod{p}$$

$$x + ar = x' + ar' \pmod{q}$$

$$a = (x - x')/(r' - r)$$

$\nabla r' \neq r$  &  $g$  is prime  
 $=$  discrete log of  $h$ , base  $g$ , mod  $p$   $\blacksquare$

Non-malleable: Nope.

$$\text{If } c = \text{Commit}(x) = g^x h^r$$

$$\text{then } c' = \text{Commit}(x') = g^{x'} h^{r'} = g^{x+1} h^{r+1}$$

(Some applications don't need non-malleability)

Public-key encryption:

Let  $\lambda$  = "security parameter" (i.e. "key size")

Then  $1^\lambda = \underbrace{1 \dots 1}_{\lambda}$   $\lambda$  1's in a row. Length =  $\lambda$

Need three algorithms:

(1) Keygen( $1^\lambda$ )  $\rightarrow$  (PK, SK)

(2)  $E(PK, m) \rightarrow c$

Encryption takes  $m \in$  message space M

to  $c \in$  ciphertext space C

(with given public key PK)

Encryption may be randomized.

(3)  $D(SK, c) \rightarrow m$

Decryption is deterministic

s.t. (Correctness condition)

$$(\forall (PK, SK)) (\forall m) D(SK, E(PK, m)) = m$$

## El-Gamal PK encryption (Taher El Gamal, 1984)

Let  $G = \langle g \rangle$  be a cyclic group with generator  $g$ .  
 (Key gen may output description of  $g$  &  $G$ , given  $\lambda$ .)

### Keygen:

Pick  $x$  at random from  $[0 \dots |G|-1]$

Let  $SK = x$ .

Let  $PK = g^x$

Output  $(PK, SK)$  (& description of  $G$ , if needed)

### Encryption: (.f message $m$ )

randomized!

Pick  $k$  at random from  $[0 \dots |G|-1]$

Assume message  $m$  represented as element of  $G$ .

Let  $y = g^x$  be PK of recipient

Output  $c = (g^k, moy^k)$  as ciphertext

### Decryption:

Let  $c = (a, b)$  be received ciphertext

Let  $m = b / a^x$ . Output  $m$ .

[Correctness follows since  $a^x = g^{kx} = g^{xk} = y^k$ .]

### E) Gmail encryption related to DH key exchange:

Alice

$$y = g^x \quad (\text{via PKI?})$$

Bob

$$a = g^k$$

$$\text{DH Key} = (g^x)^k$$

$$= g^{kx}$$

DH Key

$$= (g^x)^k = g^{kx}$$

$$b = m \cdot (\text{DH Key})$$

Encrypt by multiplying by DH key.

Decrypt by dividing by DH key.

How to define security for PK encryption?

We'll see two definitions:

① "semantic security" (Goldwasser & Micali)

② "adaptive chosen ciphertext attack" (CCA) secure

( $\approx$  to IND-CCA we saw for symmetric encryption)

"Game" definition of semantic security:

Phase I ("Find"):

- Examiner generates  $(PK, SK)$  using Keygen( $1^\lambda$ )
- Examiner sends  $PK$  to Adversary
- Adversary computes for polynomial (in  $\lambda$ ) time, then outputs two messages  $m_0, m_1$  of same length, and "state information"  $s$ .  $[m_0 \neq m_1$ , required]

Phase II ("Guess"):

- Examiner picks  $b \in \{0, 1\}$ , computes  $c = E(PK, m_b)$
- Examiner sends  $c, s$  to Adversary
- Adversary computes for polynomial (in  $\lambda$ ) time, then outputs  $\hat{b}$  (his "guess" for  $b$ ).

Adversary "wins" game if  $\hat{b} = b$ .

Def: A PK encryption scheme is semantically secure

if  $\text{Prob}[\text{Adv wins}] \leq \frac{1}{2} + \text{negligible}$

Fact: In order for a PK encryption scheme to

be semantically secure, it must necessarily

be randomized. \* (Randomized encryption is)

necessary but not sufficient for semantic security.)

Is El Gamal PK encryption semantically secure?

\* More precisely: it can't be stateless & deterministic.

It may be randomized, or stateful, or both.

for  
stateless  
enc

## DDH (Decision Diffie-Hellman Assumption):

Given a group  $G$  with generator  $g$ :

It is hard/infeasible to decide whether a given triple of elements was generated as

$$(g^a, g^b, g^c) \quad [a, b, c \text{ random}]$$

or as

$$(g^a, g^b, g^{ab}) \quad [a, b \text{ random}]$$

That is, if DDH holds in a group, you can't even recognize the DH key  $g^{ab}$  when it is given to you! (You can't distinguish it from a random element.)

Theorem:  $\text{DDH} \Rightarrow \text{CDH}$

Proof: If  $\neg \text{CDH}$ , then  $\neg \text{DDH}$  (contrapositive).

If you can compute  $g^{ab}$  from  $g^a$  and  $g^b$  (i.e.  $\neg \text{CDH}$ ) then you can decide if given third element is  $g^{ab}$  (i.e.  $\neg \text{DDH}$ ). 

Recall:  
 $\text{CDH} \equiv$   
 Computing  $g^{ab}$   
 from  $g^a$  &  $g^b$   
 is hard

Theorem (Tsounis & Yung):

El Gamal is semantically secure in  $G$



DDH holds in  $G$

- Semantic security may not be enough for some applications.

- El Gamal is malleable:

Given  $E(m) = (g^k, m \cdot y^k)$

it is easy to produce  $E(2m) = (g^k, (2 \cdot m) \cdot y^k)$

without knowing  $m$ !

- More generally, El Gamal is homomorphic:

Given  $c_1 \in E(m_1) = (g^r, m_1 \cdot y^r)$

& given  $c_2 \in E(m_2) = (g^s, m_2 \cdot y^s)$

can produce  $c_1 \cdot c_2 = (g^{r+s}, (m_1 \cdot m_2) \cdot y^{r+s})$   
 $\in E(m_1 \cdot m_2)$

- Product of ciphertexts yields an encryption of product of plaintexts.

- Special case: multiplying by  $E(1) = (g^s, y^s)$

$\approx$ -randomizes encryption.

- What is stronger notion of security for PK encryption?  
(e.g. one that excludes malleability...)
- "IND-CCA2 secure" (CCA secure = secure  
under adaptive chosen ciphertext attack)  
 $\approx$  IND-CCA secure defn we saw for symmetric enc.
- Similar to semantic security defn, except that  
Adv allowed access to decryption oracle, too.  
(He has PK so access to encryption oracle already there.)  
(As before, may not use oracle to decrypt  
challenge ciphertext during "guess" phase.)