

CS 427/519: Homework 5

Due: Monday February 26, 10pm; **typed** and **submitted electronically**.

Important notes for this homework and all future ones:

- When asked to show that something is **insecure**, please clarify what libraries you are going to distinguish. Explicitly write the code of the distinguisher / calling program. Explicitly derive the output probability of the distinguisher in the presence of each library.

1. Let F be a secure PRP with block length λ . Consider the encryption algorithm below:

$\begin{aligned} \text{Enc}(k, m) : \\ r &\leftarrow \{0, 1\}^\lambda \\ x &:= F(k, r \oplus m) \\ \text{return } (r, x) \end{aligned}$

Write the decryption algorithm. Then show that the scheme does **not** have CCA security. (Describe a distinguisher and compute its advantage.)

2. Let E be a CPA-secure encryption scheme and M be a secure MAC. Show that the following encryption scheme (called encrypt & MAC) is **not** CCA-secure:

$\begin{aligned} \text{E\&M.KeyGen:} \\ k_e &\leftarrow E.\text{KeyGen} \\ k_m &\leftarrow M.\text{KeyGen} \\ \text{return } (k_e, k_m) \end{aligned}$	$\begin{aligned} \text{E\&M.Enc}((k_e, k_m), m): \\ c &\leftarrow E.\text{Enc}(k_e, m) \\ t &:= M.\text{MAC}(k_m, m) \\ \text{return } (c, t) \end{aligned}$	$\begin{aligned} \text{E\&M.Dec}((k_e, k_m), (c, t)): \\ m &:= E.\text{Dec}(k_e, c) \\ \text{if } t &\neq M.\text{MAC}(k_m, m): \\ &\quad \text{return err} \\ \text{return } m \end{aligned}$
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Describe a distinguisher and compute its advantage.

3. When a user creates a new account at a website, they receive a browser cookie containing $(d, \text{MAC}(k, H(d)))$, where: d is a string of the form “username|timestamp”, H is a hash function, and k is the website’s secret key. The timestamp reflects the time that the cookie/account was created, encoded in format `yyyymmdd`; usernames must consist of entirely lowercase characters a-z. When a user connects to the website, the website checks that the MAC is valid and that the timestamp is in the past. A new user can request an account for any (available) username.

In general $\text{MAC}(k, H(d))$ is a secure MAC of d , but suppose the website inexplicably uses $H(d) = \text{first 5 bytes (40 bits) of MD5}(d)$. I already have an account on the server with username `mikero`, and I won’t let you see my authentication cookie.

Find and show me a username (other than `mikero`) that you can register for on this homework’s due date (Feb 26) which will allow you to authenticate as `mikero`. **Describe** the MAC forgery you have in mind and show **how** you found it, and **why** it takes the amount of time that it does.

Note: I chose the parameters for this problem so that you will not be able to solve this problem if you take the wrong approach. You can easily do 2^{20} work before the due date but

probably not 2^{40} . My solution typically takes between 5 and 10 seconds to find a forgery. If yours hasn't stopped after a few minutes, then you are probably doing it wrong.

Tip: You should be able to find an MD5 library implementation in your language of choice. In lieu of that, you can use the Linux command line as follows:

```
$ echo -n "mikero|20180219" | md5sum
014faa2a897a42e9af9d0b8f25087e8f -
$ echo -n "mikero|20180219" | md5sum | cut -c1-10
014faa2a89
```

`echo -n` sends its argument to `md5sum` without adding a trailing newline character. `cut -c1-10` returns the first 10 characters of `md5sum`'s output. Since `md5sum` returns the hex-encoded hash, the first 10 hex characters correspond to the first 5 bytes.

grad. Show that a scheme has CCA\$ security **if and only if** the following two libraries are interchangeable. That means a security proof in both directions.

$\mathcal{L}_{\text{left}}^{\Sigma}$
$k \leftarrow \Sigma.\text{KeyGen}$
<u>$\text{CHALLENGE}(m \in \Sigma.\mathcal{M}):$</u>
return $\Sigma.\text{Enc}(k, m)$
<u>$\text{DEC}(c \in \Sigma.\mathcal{C}):$</u>
return $\Sigma.\text{Dec}(k, c)$

$\mathcal{L}_{\text{right}}^{\Sigma}$
$k \leftarrow \Sigma.\text{KeyGen}$
$D := \text{empty assoc. array}$
<u>$\text{CHALLENGE}(m \in \Sigma.\mathcal{M}):$</u>
$c \leftarrow \Sigma.C(m)$
$D[c] := m$
return c
<u>$\text{DEC}(c \in \Sigma.\mathcal{C}):$</u>
if $D[c]$ exists: return $D[c]$
else: return $\Sigma.\text{Dec}(k, c)$

Note: In $\mathcal{L}_{\text{left}}$, the adversary can obtain the decryption of *any* ciphertext via `DEC`. In $\mathcal{L}_{\text{right}}$, the `DEC` subroutine is “patched” (via D) to give reasonable answers to ciphertexts generated in `CHALLENGE`.