

Assignment #3

Due: Monday, Mar. 10, 2008. In class.

Problem 1 Let's explore why in the RSA public key system each person has to be assigned a different modulus $N = pq$. Suppose we try to use the same modulus $N = pq$ for everyone. Each person is assigned a public exponent e_i and a private exponent d_i such that $e_i \cdot d_i = 1 \pmod{\varphi(N)}$. At first this appears to work fine: to encrypt a message to Bob, Alice computes $C = M^{e_{bob}}$ and sends C to Bob. An eavesdropper Eve, not knowing d_{bob} appears to be unable to decrypt C . Let's show that using e_{eve} and d_{eve} Eve can very easily decrypt C .

- Show that given e_{eve} and d_{eve} Eve can obtain a multiple of $\varphi(N)$.
- Show that given an integer K which is a multiple of $\varphi(N)$ Eve can factor the modulus N . Deduce that Eve can decrypt any RSA ciphertext encrypted using the modulus N intended for Alice or Bob.

Hint: Consider the sequence $g^K, g^{K/2}, g^{K/4}, \dots, g^{K/\tau(K)} \pmod{N}$ where g is random in \mathbb{Z}_N and $\tau(N)$ is the largest power of 2 dividing K . Use the the left most element in this sequence which is not equal to $\pm 1 \pmod{N}$.

Problem 2 Recall that a simple RSA signature $S = H(M)^d \pmod{N}$ is computed by first computing $S_1 = H(M)^d \pmod{p}$ and $S_2 = H(M)^d \pmod{q}$. The signature S is then found by combining S_1 and S_2 using the Chinese Remainder Theorem (CRT). Now, suppose a Certificate Authority (CA) is about to sign a certain certificate C . While the CA is computing $S_1 = H(C)^d \pmod{p}$, a glitch on the CA's machine causes it to produce the wrong value \tilde{S}_1 which is not equal to S_1 . The CA computes $S_2 = H(C)^d \pmod{q}$ correctly. Clearly the resulting signature \tilde{S} is invalid. The CA then proceeds to publish the newly generated certificate with the invalid signature \tilde{S} .

- Show that any person who obtains the certificate C along with the invalid signature \tilde{S} is able to factor the CA's modulus.
Hint: Use the fact that $\tilde{S}^e = H(C) \pmod{q}$. Here e is the public verification exponent.
- Suggest some method by which the CA can defend itself against this danger.

Problem 3 Commitment schemes. A commitment scheme enables Alice to commit a value x to Bob. The scheme is *secure* if the commitment does not reveal to Bob any information about the committed value x . At a later time Alice may *open* the commitment and convince Bob that the committed value is x . The commitment is *binding* if Alice cannot convince Bob that the committed value is some $x' \neq x$. Here is an example commitment scheme:

Public values: (1) a 1024 bit prime p , and (2) two elements g and h of \mathbb{Z}_p^* of prime order q .

Commitment: To commit to an integer $x \in [0, q - 1]$ Alice does the following: (1) she picks a random $r \in [0, q - 1]$, (2) she computes $b = g^x \cdot h^r \pmod p$, and (3) she sends b to Bob as her commitment to x .

Open: To open the commitment Alice sends (x, r) to Bob. Bob verifies that $b = g^x \cdot h^r \pmod p$.

Show that this scheme is secure and binding.

- a. To prove security show that b does not reveal any information to Bob about x . In other words, show that given b , the committed value can be any integer x' in $[0, q - 1]$.
Hint: show that for any x' there exists a unique $r' \in [0, q - 1]$ so that $b = g^{x'} h^{r'}$.
- b. To prove the binding property show that if Alice can open the commitment as (x', r') where $x \neq x'$ then Alice can compute the discrete log of h base g . In other words, show that if Alice can find an (x', r') such that $b = g^{x'} h^{r'} \pmod p$ then she can find the discrete log of h base g . Recall that Alice also knows the (x, r) used to create b .

Problem 4 Access control and file sharing using RSA. In this problem $N = pq$ is some RSA modulus. All arithmetic operations are done modulo N .

- a. Suppose we have a file system containing n files. Let e_1, \dots, e_n be relatively prime integers that are also relatively prime to $\varphi(N)$, i.e. $\gcd(e_i, e_j) = \gcd(e_i, \varphi(N)) = 1$ for all $i \neq j$. The integers e_1, \dots, e_n are public. Let $R \in \mathbb{Z}_N^*$ and suppose each file F_i is encrypted using the key $key_i = R^{1/e_i}$.

Now, let $S \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ and set $b = \prod_{i \in S} e_i$. Suppose user u is given $K_u = R^{1/b}$. Show that user u can decrypt any file $i \in S$. That is, show how user u using K_u can compute any key key_i for $i \in S$.

This way, each user u_j can be given a key K_{u_j} enabling it to access those files to which it has access permission.

- b. Next we need to show that using K_u user u cannot compute any key key_i for $i \notin S$. To do so we first consider a simpler problem. Let d_1, d_2 be two integers relatively prime to $\varphi(N)$ and relatively prime to each other. Suppose there is an efficient algorithm \mathcal{A} such that $\mathcal{A}(R, R^{1/d_1}) = R^{1/d_2}$ for all $R \in \mathbb{Z}_N^*$. In other words, given the d_1 'th root of $R \in \mathbb{Z}_N^*$ algorithm \mathcal{A} is able to compute the d_2 'th root of R . Show that there is an efficient algorithm \mathcal{B} to compute d_2 'th roots in \mathbb{Z}_N^* . That is, $\mathcal{B}(X) = X^{1/d_2}$ for all $X \in \mathbb{Z}_N^*$. Algorithm \mathcal{B} uses \mathcal{A} as a subroutine.
- c. Show using part (b) that user u cannot obtain the key key_i for any $i \notin S$ assuming that computing e 'th roots modulo N is hard for any e such that $\gcd(e, \varphi(N)) = 1$. (the contra-positive of this statement should follow from (b) directly).

Problem 5 In class we briefly noted that a one-time signature scheme can be converted into a many-time signature scheme. Let's explore how to do it. The signer in our many-time scheme will maintain internal state and update it every time he signs a message. Let (G, S, V) be a one-time signature scheme (i.e. a scheme secure as long as a public/secret pair is used to sign at most one message). To build a signature scheme for signing 2^n messages (say $n = 32$) visualize a complete binary tree with 2^n leaves. Every node in this tree stores a different public/secret key pair for the one-time system. The public key for our many-time scheme is the public key stored at the root of the tree. To sign message number i the signer uses the i th leaf in the tree (for $1 \leq i \leq 2^n$). Let u_0, \dots, u_n be the n nodes on the path from the root to the i th leaf (u_0 is the root of the tree, u_n is the leaf). To sign the message m , first use the secret key in the leaf node u_n to sign m . Let s_n be the resulting signature. Then for $i = 0, \dots, n - 1$ use the secret key in node u_i to sign the pair of public keys stored in its two children. Let (s_0, \dots, s_{n-1}) be the resulting n one-time signatures. For $1 \leq i \leq n$ let pk_i be the public key stored in node u_i and let pk'_i be the public key stored in the sibling of node u_i . The many-time scheme outputs $(i, (s_0, pk_1, pk'_1), \dots, (s_{n-1}, pk_n, pk'_n), s_n)$ as the signature on m .

- a. Write (short) pseudo-code to implement the signing and verification algorithms for the many-time scheme. Your signing code should maintain state containing at most $2n$ one-time public/private key pairs at any given time. Your verification code should be stateless.
- b. Briefly explain why your implementation is secure. In other words, explain why your signing code never uses a one-time public-key to sign two distinct messages.
- c. What is the size of the resulting signatures when using the Lamport one-time signature scheme discussed in class? How many applications of the one-way function are needed (on average) to generate a signature?