

Introduction to Cryptology

9.1 - The Public-key Revolution

Federico Pintore

Mathematical Institute, University of Oxford (UK)



UNIVERSITY OF
OXFORD

Private keys

Assuming that communicating parties are able to share a secret key, symmetric-key schemes ensure secrecy and integrity.

Private keys

Assuming that communicating parties are able to share a secret key, symmetric-key schemes ensure secrecy and integrity.

How communicating parties share a secret key?

Private keys

Assuming that communicating parties are able to share a secret key, symmetric-key schemes ensure secrecy and integrity.

How communicating parties share a secret key?

They should have access to a secure channel.

Private keys

Assuming that communicating parties are able to share a secret key, symmetric-key schemes ensure secrecy and integrity.

How communicating parties share a secret key?

They should have access to a secure channel.

- ❖ A secure channel is usually slow and costly!

Private keys

Assuming that communicating parties are able to share a secret key, symmetric-key schemes ensure secrecy and integrity.

How communicating parties share a secret key?

They should have access to a secure channel.

- ❖ A secure channel is usually slow and costly!
- ❖ It does not work well for open systems.

Private keys

Assuming that communicating parties are able to share a secret key, symmetric-key schemes ensure secrecy and integrity.

How communicating parties share a secret key?

They should have access to a secure channel.

- ❖ A secure channel is usually slow and costly!
- ❖ It does not work well for open systems.
- ❖ There is the need to securely store a big number of keys.

Key-Distribution Centers (KDCs)

A KDC is a trusted **third party**; each user share a key with the KDC by means of a secure channel.

When Alice and Bob want to communicate, the KDC provides a key to them.

Key-Distribution Centers (KDCs)

A KDC is a trusted **third party**; each user share a key with the KDC by means of a secure channel.

When Alice and Bob want to communicate, the KDC provides a key to them.

- ❖ Each user has to store only one long-term secret key.

Key-Distribution Centers (KDCs)

A KDC is a trusted **third party**; each user share a key with the KDC by means of a secure channel.

When Alice and Bob want to communicate, the KDC provides a key to them.

- ❖ Each user has to store only one long-term secret key.
- ❖ Still requires the use of a private channel.
- ❖ Each user must trust the KDC.
- ❖ The KDC is a **single point of failure**, and a high-value target.

New Directions in Cryptography

In 1976, Diffie and Hellman published a paper, titled

New Directions in Cryptography

that has revolutionised Cryptography.

- ❖ They posed the first step towards **Public-key Cryptography**, but they did not give any candidate construction.
- ❖ They proposed an interactive protocol to **share a secret key** via communication **over a public channel**.

New Directions in Cryptography

In 1976, Diffie and Hellman published a paper, titled

New Directions in Cryptography

that has revolutionised Cryptography.

- ❖ They posed the first step towards **Public-key Cryptography**, but they did not give any candidate construction.
- ❖ They proposed an interactive protocol to **share a secret key** via communication **over a public channel**.

In 1977, R. Rivest, A. Shamir and L. Adleman introduced the **RSA problem**, and designed the **first public-key encryption** and **digital signature** scheme based on its hardness.

Key-exchange protocol

It is a probabilistic protocol Π to generate a shared, secret key.

Key-exchange protocol

It is a probabilistic protocol Π to generate a shared, secret key.

- ❖ Alice and Bob start by holding a security parameter n .
- ❖ They run Π using independent random bits.
- ❖ At the end of the protocol, they output k_A and k_B , respectively.

Key-exchange protocol

It is a probabilistic protocol Π to generate a shared, secret key.

- ❖ Alice and Bob start by holding a security parameter n .
- ❖ They run Π using independent random bits.
- ❖ At the end of the protocol, they output k_A and k_B , respectively.

Correctness: with overwhelming probability $k_A = k_B$.

Key-exchange - Security definition

The key-exchange Experiment $\text{KE}_{\mathcal{A}, \Pi}^{\text{eav}}(n)$

Key-exchange - Security definition

The key-exchange Experiment $\text{KE}_{\mathcal{A},\Pi}^{\text{eav}}(n)$

Challenger Ch

Adversary \mathcal{A}

Execute Π

Access to the transcript

$$b \leftarrow \{0, 1\}$$

If $b = 0$, $\hat{k} := k$
else $\hat{k} \leftarrow \{0, 1\}^{|k|}$

$$\xrightarrow{\hat{k}}$$

Output their guess b'

\mathcal{A} wins the game, i.e. $\text{KE}_{\mathcal{A},\Pi}^{\text{eav}}(n) = 1$, if $b' = b$.

Key-exchange - Security definition

Definition

The key-exchange protocol Π is secure if, for every PPT \mathcal{A} , the following holds:

$$\text{Adv}_{\mathcal{A}, \Pi}^{\text{eav}}(n) = \Pr(\text{KE}_{\mathcal{A}, \Pi}^{\text{eav}}(n) = 1) \leq 1/2 + \text{negl}(n).$$

Public-Key Cryptography

In the public-key setting, a party generates a **pair of keys**: a public key and a private key.

They can be used to achieve:

- ❖ secrecy, by means of a **public-key encryption scheme**;
- ❖ integrity and authenticity, by means of a **digital signature scheme**.

Public-Key Cryptography

- ❖ Key distribution over public, but authenticated channels.
- ❖ The need to store many secret keys is reduced.
- ❖ Suitable for open systems.

Public-Key Encryption

A public-key encryption scheme $(\text{KeyGen}, \text{Enc}, \text{Dec})$ consists of three algorithms:

- ❖ $(\text{PK}, \text{SK}) \leftarrow \text{KeyGen}(n)$: randomised algorithm which, on input n , returns a pair of keys (PK, SK) - the public key PK and the corresponding secret key SK .
- ❖ $c \leftarrow \text{Enc}(\text{PK}, m)$: a (possibly randomised) algorithm that takes a public key PK , a message m and returns a ciphertext c .
- ❖ $m \leftarrow \text{Dec}(\text{SK}, c)$: a deterministic algorithm that, on input a secret key SK and a ciphertext c , returns a message $m \in \mathcal{M} \cup \perp$.

Correctness: for every $m \in \mathcal{M}$ it holds

$$\Pr(\text{Dec}(\text{SK}, \text{Enc}(\text{PK}, m)) = m \mid (\text{SK}, \text{PK}) \leftarrow \text{KeyGen}(n)) = 1$$

Public-key Encryption - Definition of Security

The eavesdropping indistinguishability Experiment $\text{PubK}_{\mathcal{A},E}^{\text{eav}}(n)$

Public-key Encryption - Definition of Security

The eavesdropping indistinguishability Experiment $\text{PubK}_{\mathcal{A},E}^{\text{eav}}(n)$

Challenger Ch

Adversary \mathcal{A}

$(\text{PK}, \text{SK}) \leftarrow \text{KeyGen}(n)$

$\xrightarrow{\text{PK}}$
 $\xleftarrow{m_0, m_1, |m_0|=|m_1|}$

$b \leftarrow \{0, 1\}$

$\xrightarrow{c = \text{Enc}(\text{PK}, m_b)}$

Output their guess b'

Public-key Encryption - Definition of Security

The eavesdropping indistinguishability Experiment $\text{PubK}_{\mathcal{A},E}^{\text{eav}}(n)$

Challenger Ch

Adversary \mathcal{A}

$(\text{PK}, \text{SK}) \leftarrow \text{KeyGen}(n)$

$\xrightarrow{\text{PK}}$
 $\xleftarrow{m_0, m_1, |m_0|=|m_1|}$

$b \leftarrow \{0, 1\}$

$\xrightarrow{c=\text{Enc}(\text{PK}, m_b)}$

Output their guess b'

\mathcal{A} wins the game, i.e. $\text{PubK}_{\mathcal{A},E}^{\text{eav}}(n) = 1$, if $b' = b$.

Public-key Encryption - Definition of Security

Definition

An encryption scheme E has indistinguishable encryptions in the presence of an eavesdropper if, for every PPT adversary \mathcal{A} , the following holds:

$$\text{Adv}_{\mathcal{A},E}^{\text{eav}}(n) = \Pr(\text{PubK}_{\mathcal{A},E}^{\text{eav}}(n) = 1) \leq 1/2 + \text{negl}(n).$$

CPA-security

\mathcal{A} knows PK, hence they have access to an **encryption oracle**.

Consequently, if E has indistinguishable encryptions in the presence of an eavesdropper, then it is CPA-secure.

CPA-security

\mathcal{A} knows PK, hence they have access to an **encryption oracle**.

Consequently, if E has indistinguishable encryptions in the presence of an eavesdropper, then it is CPA-secure.

This is in contrast to the symmetric-key setting.

CPA-security

A knows PK , hence they have access to an **encryption oracle**.

Consequently, if E has indistinguishable encryptions in the presence of an eavesdropper, then it is CPA-secure.

This is in contrast to the symmetric-key setting.

Also in the public-key setting, a **deterministic** encryption scheme **cannot be CPA-secure**.

Public-key Encryption - CCA-security

CCA Indistinguishability Experiment $\text{PubK}_{\mathcal{A},E}^{\text{cca}}(n)$

Public-key Encryption - CCA-security

CCA Indistinguishability Experiment $\text{PubK}_{\mathcal{A},E}^{\text{cca}}(n)$

Challenger Ch

Adversary \mathcal{A}

$(\text{PK}, \text{SK}) \leftarrow \text{KeyGen}(n)$

$\xrightarrow{\text{PK}}$

Access to $\text{Dec}(\text{SK}, \cdot)$

$\xleftarrow{m_0, m_1, |m_0|=|m_1|}$

$b \leftarrow \{0, 1\}$

$\xrightarrow{c=\text{Enc}(\text{PK}, m_b)}$

Access to $\text{Dec}(\text{SK}, \cdot)^c$

Output their guess b'

Public-key Encryption - CCA-security

CCA Indistinguishability Experiment $\text{PubK}_{\mathcal{A},E}^{\text{cca}}(n)$

Challenger Ch

Adversary \mathcal{A}

$(\text{PK}, \text{SK}) \leftarrow \text{KeyGen}(n)$

$\xrightarrow{\text{PK}}$

Access to $\text{Dec}(\text{SK}, \cdot)$

$\xleftarrow{m_0, m_1, |m_0|=|m_1|}$

$b \leftarrow \{0, 1\}$

$\xrightarrow{c=\text{Enc}(\text{PK}, m_b)}$

Access to $\text{Dec}(\text{SK}, \cdot)^c$

Output their guess b'

\mathcal{A} wins the game, i.e. $\text{PubK}_{\mathcal{A},E}^{\text{cca}}(n) = 1$, if $b' = b$.

Public-key Encryption - CCA-security

Definition

An encryption scheme is CCA-secure if, for every PPT adversary \mathcal{A} , the following holds:

$$\text{Adv}_{\mathcal{A},E}^{\text{cca}}(n) = \Pr(\text{PubK}_{\mathcal{A},E}^{\text{cca}}(n) = 1) \leq 1/2 + \text{negl}(n).$$

Dealing with arbitrary-length messages

In the indistinguishability of multiple encryptions experiment, \mathcal{A} is given access to a **left-or-right encryption oracle**.

On input a pair of messages m_0, m_1 (with $|m_0| = |m_1|$), the oracle returns $c \leftarrow \text{Enc}(\text{PK}, m_b)$.

Dealing with arbitrary-length messages

In the indistinguishability of multiple encryptions experiment, \mathcal{A} is given access to a **left-or-right encryption oracle**.

On input a pair of messages m_0, m_1 (with $|m_0| = |m_1|$), the oracle returns $c \leftarrow \text{Enc}(\text{PK}, m_b)$.

Theorem

If a public-key encryption scheme is CPA-secure, then it also has indistinguishable multiple encryptions.

Dealing with arbitrary-length messages

In the indistinguishability of multiple encryptions experiment, \mathcal{A} is given access to a **left-or-right encryption oracle**.

On input a pair of messages m_0, m_1 (with $|m_0| = |m_1|$), the oracle returns $c \leftarrow \text{Enc}(\text{PK}, m_b)$.

Theorem

If a public-key encryption scheme is CPA-secure, then it also has indistinguishable multiple encryptions.

Any CPA-secure public-key encryption scheme for **fixed-length messages** (down to one bit!) can be used as a CPA-secure public key-encryption scheme for **arbitrary-length messages**.

Further Reading I



Mihir Bellare, Alexandra Boldyreva, and Silvio Micali.
Public-Key Encryption in a Multi-user Setting: Security Proofs and Improvements.

In Bart Preneel, editor, *Advances in Cryptology — EUROCRYPT 2000*, volume 1807 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 259–274. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2000.



Dan Boneh.

Simplified OAEP for the RSA and Rabin Functions.

In Joe Kilian, editor, *Advances in Cryptology — CRYPTO 2001*, volume 2139 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 275–291. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2001.

Further Reading II



Ronald Cramer and Victor Shoup.

Design and analysis of practical public-key encryption schemes secure against adaptive chosen ciphertext attack. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 33(1):167–226, 2003.



Whitfield Diffie and Martin E Hellman.

New directions in cryptography. *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, 22(6):644–654, 1976.



Itai Dinur, Orr Dunkelman, Nathan Keller, and Adi Shamir.

New attacks on Feistel Structures with Improved Memory Complexities.

In *Advances in Cryptology - CRYPTO 2015 - 35th Annual Cryptology Conference*, Santa Barbara, CA, USA, August 16-20, 2015, Proceedings, Part I, pages 433–454, 2015.

Further Reading III



Naofumi Homma, Atsushi Miyamoto, Takafumi Aoki, Akashi Satoh, and Adi Shamir.

Collision-Based Power Analysis of Modular Exponentiation Using Chosen-Message Pairs.

In Cryptographic Hardware and Embedded Systems - CHES 2008, 10th International Workshop, Washington, D.C., USA, August 10-13, 2008. Proceedings, pages 15–29, 2008.