

**McGill**DECEMBER 2011
Final Examination

FINAL EXAMINATION

Computer Science COMP-547A
Cryptography and Data Security

16 DECEMBER 2011, 14h00

Examiner:	Prof. Claude Crépeau	Assoc Examiner:	Prof. David Avis
-----------	----------------------	-----------------	------------------

INSTRUCTIONS:

- This examination is worth 50% of your final grade.
- The total of all questions is 105 points.
- Each question heading contains (in parenthesis) a list of values for each sub-questions.
- This is an **open book** exam. **All documentation is permitted.**
- Faculty standard calculator permitted only.
- The exam consists of 5 questions on 4 pages, title page included.

Suggestion:**read all the questions and
their values before you start.**

Question 1. Pseudo-random function ? (5+5+5+5 = 20 points)

Let f_k for $k \in \{0,1\}^n$ be a candidate pseudo-random function family.

- i) Suppose f_k and $f_{\bar{k}}$ are actually the same exact function, for all possible values of k . Does that contradict the pseudo-randomness of f_k ? Explain your answer.
- ii) Suppose $f_k(000\dots 0) = 000\dots 0$ for all possible values of k . Does that contradict the pseudo-randomness of f_k ? Explain your answer.
- iii) Suppose $f_k(000\dots 0) = k$ for all possible values of k . Does that contradict the pseudo-randomness of f_k ? Explain your answer.
- iv) Suppose $f_k(k) = k$ for all possible values of k . Does that contradict the pseudo-randomness of f_k ? Explain your answer.

Question 2. Number Theory (8+7 = 15 points)

Let $N=143$ be an RSA modulus.

- Find all the square roots r ($1 \leq r \leq N$) of $1 \pmod{N}$.
- Give r_0 and r_1 that are two square roots of 1 such that $r_0 \not\equiv \pm r_1 \pmod{N}$.
- What are $\gcd(r_0 - r_1, N)$ and $\gcd(r_0 + r_1, N)$?

7.10 Corollary 7.21 shows that if $N = pq$ and $ed = 1 \pmod{\phi(N)}$ then for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}_N^*$ we have $(x^e)^d = x \pmod{N}$. Show that this holds for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}_N$.

Hint: Use the Chinese remainder theorem.

Question 3. Negligible (5+5+5 = 15 points)

Remember

DEFINITION 3.4 A function f is negligible if for every polynomial $p(\cdot)$ there exists an N such that for all integers $n > N$ it holds that

$$f(n) < 1/p(n)$$

A) Give an example of a negligible function and prove it is.

We can define non-negligible by simply changing as follows

DEFINITION 3.4* A function f is non-negligible if there exists a polynomial $p(\cdot)$ such that for all integers n it holds that

$$f(n) > 1/p(n)$$

B) Give an example of a non-negligible function and prove it is.

C) Give an example of a function which is neither negligible nor non-negligible and prove it is.

Question 4. Mac & Signature (7+7+7 = 21 points)

1) Explain why the term “Signature” is only used for the public-key setting.

2) Explain why textbook RSA is NOT existentially unforgeable.

3) It is possible to have MACs that are secure without computational assumptions. Why not signatures ?

Question 5. CPA security vs insecurity... (10+8+8+8 = 34 points)

i) Suppose pseudo-random permutations exist. Give two constructions of **CPA**-secure encryption schemes (for arbitrary-length messages) with identical key space.

You are given two **CPA**-secure encryption schemes $\mathbf{E}_1=(\mathbf{Gen},\mathbf{Enc}_1,\mathbf{Dec}_1)$, and $\mathbf{E}_2=(\mathbf{Gen},\mathbf{Enc}_2,\mathbf{Dec}_2)$ that share the same key-space and have the same key generation algorithm **Gen**.

ii) Consider the combined cryptosystem where encryption is the pair $(\mathbf{Enc}_{1,k_1}(m),\mathbf{Enc}_{2,k_2}(m))$ where encryptions are done using INDEPENDENT KEYS k_1, k_2 . Explain why this resulting system is still **CPA**-secure.

iii) Consider the combined cryptosystem where encryption is the pair $(\mathbf{Enc}_{1,k}(m),\mathbf{Enc}_{2,k}(m))$ where both encryptions are done using THE SAME KEY k . Explain why this resulting system might NOT be **CPA**-secure.

Suppose I give you a **CPA**-secure encryption $\mathbf{E}_0=(\mathbf{Gen}_0,\mathbf{Enc}_0,\mathbf{Dec}_0)$.

iv) Using \mathbf{E}_0 , give an example of such systems $\mathbf{E}_1, \mathbf{E}_2$ with properties as in iii). (You should involve \mathbf{E}_0 into the construction of \mathbf{E}_1 and of \mathbf{E}_2 so that they are as secure individually as \mathbf{E}_0 but not together...)

HINT: Put an apparent useless part in encrypted messages that will reveal the key when you get both $\mathbf{Enc}_{1,k}(m)$ and $\mathbf{Enc}_{2,k}(m)$.