

Cryptography III

Question 1 *Public-key encryption and digital signatures* ()

Alice and Bob want to communicate over an insecure network using public-key cryptography. They know each other's public key.

- (a) Alice receives a message: Hey Alice, it's Bob. You owe me money. Plz send ASAP.
The message is encrypted with Alice's public key.

◇ *Question:* Can Alice be sure that this message is from Bob?

Solution: No. Alice's public key is public. Anyone can encrypt a message under Alice's public key, not necessarily Bob.

- (b) Bob receives a message: Hey Bob, it's Alice. How many dollars do I owe you?
The message is digitally signed using Alice's private key.

◇ *Question:* Can Bob be sure that this message is from Alice?

◇ *Question:* How does Bob verify this message?

Solution: Yes. Only Alice can create a signature under her key.
Bob can verify it using Alice's public key.

- (c) Alice receives a response: 10000

The message is encrypted with Alice's public key using ElGamal encryption.
Alice decrypted this successfully, but suddenly remembered that she only owed Bob \$100.

◇ *Question:* Assume Bob would not lie. How did an attacker tamper with the message?

◇ *Question:* What could Bob have additionally sent that would've stopped this attack?

Solution: The attacker multiplied c_2 by 100, or multiplied $c_1 \cdot c'_1, c_2 \cdot c'_2$ where c' is a valid encryption of 100, or they encrypted an entirely new message.

Bob could attach a signature to his original message.

Question 2 *Why do RSA signatures need a hash?* (min)

To generate RSA signatures, Alice first creates a standard RSA key pair: (n, e) is the RSA public key and d is the RSA private key, where n is the RSA modulus. For standard RSA signatures, we typically set e to a small prime value such as 3; for this problem, let $e = 3$.

To generate a **standard** RSA signature S on a message M , Alice computes $S = H(M)^d \bmod n$. If Bob wants to verify whether S is a valid signature on message M , he simply checks whether $S^3 = H(M) \bmod n$ holds. d is a private key known only to Alice and $(n, 3)$ is a publicly known verification key that anyone can use to check if a message was signed using Alice's private signing key.

Suppose we instead used a **simplified** scheme for RSA signatures which skips using a hash function and instead uses M directly, so the signature S on a message M is $S = M^d \bmod n$. In other words, if Alice wants to send a signed message to Bob, she will send (M, S) to Bob where $S = M^d \bmod n$ is computed using her private signing key d .

- (a) With this **simplified** RSA scheme, how can Bob verify whether S is a valid signature on message M ? In other words, what equation should he check, to confirm whether M was validly signed by Alice?

Solution: $S^3 = M \bmod n$.

- (b) Mallory learns that Alice and Bob are using the **simplified** signature scheme described above and decides to trick Bob into believing that one of Mallory's messages is from Alice. Explain how Mallory can find an (M, S) pair such that S will be a valid signature on M .

You should assume that Mallory knows Alice's public key n , but not Alice's private key d . The message M does not have to be chosen in advance and can be gibberish.

Solution: Mallory should choose some random value to be S and then compute $S^3 \bmod n$ to find the corresponding M value. This (M, S) pair will satisfy the equation in part (a).

Alternative solution: Choose $M = 1$ and $S = 1$. This will satisfy the equation.

- (c) Is the attack in part (b) possible against the **standard** RSA signature scheme (the one that includes the cryptographic hash function)? Why or why not?

Solution: This attack is not possible. A hash function is one way, so the attack in part (b) won't work: we can pick a random S and cube it, but then we'd need to find some message M such that $H(M)$ is equal to this value, and that's not possible since H is one-way.

Comment: This is why the real RSA signature scheme includes a hash function: exactly to prevent the attack you've seen in this question.

Question 3 Hashing passwords with salts

(15 min)

When storing a password pw , a website generates a random string $salt$, and saves:

$$(salt, Hash(pw \parallel salt))$$

in the database, where $Hash$ is a cryptographic hash function.

- (a) If a user tries to log in with password pw' (which may or may not be the same as pw), how does the site check if the user has the correct password?
- (b) Why use a hash function $Hash$ rather than just store pw directly?
- (c) Suppose the site doesn't use a salt and just stores $Hash(pw)$. What attack becomes easier?
- (d) Suppose the site has two candidate hash functions $Hash_1$ and $Hash_2$. Their properties are shown in the table below.

Function	One-Way	Collision Resistant
$Hash_1$	Yes	No
$Hash_2$	Yes	Yes

Which of them suffice for password hashing?

Solution:

- (a) The site computes $Hash(pw' \parallel salt)$ using the $salt$ in the database. If this hash output equals the stored hash value, the password is correct.
- (b) If the hash function is secure and the password has good entropy, even if an attacker hacks into the site, the attacker cannot figure out the passwords.
- (c) It makes inverting the hash much easier. Many hackers use a precomputed inverse hash table for some common passwords to reverse the hashes of common passwords.

Salts disable such tables and force the attacker to perform at least a dictionary attack for each user.
- (d) Both suffice since we only need one-wayness.