

Random Oracles are Practical: A Paradigm for Designing Efficient Protocols

Mihir Bellare Phillip Rogaway

ACM Computer & Comm. Security 1993

presented by: Eun-kyung Kim

Agenda

- Definitions
 - ▶ Random Oracle Model
 - ▶ Notations
- Encryption
 - ▶ Polynomial Security
 - ▶ Chosen Cipher-text Security
 - ▶ Non-Malleability
- Signatures
- Instantiation

Abstract

- Random Oracle Model (ROM)
 - ▶ an ideal mathematical model for a hash function
 - ▶ The ROM that they claim more accurately models the real world while simultaneously making proofs easier
- Motivation
 - ▶ Large gap between the theoreticians' and practitioners' works and views
 - ▶ theoretical work gains security at cost of efficiency
 - ▶ theorists build PRFs from one-way functions, while in practice, one-way functions are built from PRFs
 - ▶ PRF: Pseudo Random Functions

Random Oracle Paradigm

1. Find a formal definition of the problem in the random oracle model
2. Devise a protocol that solves the problem
3. Prove the protocol satisfies definition
4. Replace oracle accesses by computation of a real function (e.g., hash function)

Notations

- $G: \{0,1\}^* \rightarrow \{0,1\}^\infty$ is a random generator
- k is the security parameter
- $H: \{0,1\}^* \rightarrow \{0,1\}^k$ is a random hash function
- f is a trapdoor permutation with inverse f^{-1}
- $G(r) \oplus x$ denotes the bitwise XOR of x with the first $|x|$ bits of the output of $G(r)$
- \parallel denotes concatenation

Encryption

- Goal
 - ▶ possible but impractical in the standard setting become practical in the random oracle setting
- Scheme
 - ▶ extend the notion of public key encryption to the random oracle model
 - ▶ PPT generator $G:1^k \rightarrow (E,D)$
 - ▶ PPT: Probabilistic, Polynomial Time
 - ▶ encryption: $y \leftarrow E^R(x)$
 - ▶ decryption: $x \leftarrow D^R(y)$

Polynomial Security

- by Goldwasser, Micali's notion (1984)
- B_f denotes a hard core predicate for f
- $E(x) = f(r_1) \parallel \dots \parallel f(r_{|x|})$
 - ▶ r_i are randomly chosen such that $B_f(r_i) = x_i$
 - ▶ encryption length: $O(k \cdot |x|)$
 - ▶ encryption effort: $O(f \cdot |x|)$
 - ▶ decryption effort: $O(f^1 \cdot |x|)$
 - ▶ It is not practical!

Polynomial Security

- in Random Oracle Model
- Given CP-adversary (F,A) chosen plaintext security in the model is:

$$\Pr[R \leftarrow 2^{\infty};$$

$$(E,D) \leftarrow G(1^k);$$

$$(m_0, m_1) \leftarrow F^R(E);$$

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

$$y \leftarrow E^R(m_b);$$

$$A^R(E, m_0, m_1, y) = b] \leq \frac{1}{2} + k^{-\omega(1)}$$

Polynomial Security

- $E(x) = f(r) || G(r) \oplus x$
 - ▶ E is the algorithm which on input x picks $r \leftarrow d(1^k)$
- encryption size $O(|x| + k)$

Chosen Ciphertext Security

- The scheme of the previous is not secure against RS-attack
 - ▶ Given “Rackoff-Simon”-adversary (F,A) chosen ciphertext security in this model is:

$$\Pr[R \leftarrow 2^\infty;$$

$$(E,D) \leftarrow \mathcal{G}(1^k);$$

$$(m_0, m_1) \leftarrow F^{R,D^R}(E);$$

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

$$y \leftarrow E^R(m_b);$$

$$A^{R,D^R}(E, m_0, m_1, y) = b] \leq \frac{1}{2} + k^{-\omega(1)}$$

- Encryption by $E(x) = f(r) || G(r) \oplus x || H(rx)$

Non-Malleability

- An encryption algorithm is **malleable** if it is possible for an adversary to transform a cipher-text into another cipher-text which decrypts to a related plaintext
- Non-Malleability is that given the cipher-text it is impossible to generate a different cipher-text so that the respective plain texts are related

Non-Malleability

- Encryption by $E(x) = f(r) || G(r) \oplus x || H(rx)$
 - ▶ same as that of the previous
- Given adversary(F,A) security in the sense of malleability is:

$\Pr[R \leftarrow 2^\infty;$ $(E,D) \leftarrow \mathcal{G}(1^k);$ $\pi \leftarrow F^R(E);$ $x \leftarrow \pi^R(1^k);$ $y \leftarrow E^R(x);$ $y' \leftarrow A^R(E,\pi,y);$ $\rho^R(x,D^R(y')) = 1]$	-	$\Pr[R \leftarrow 2^\infty;$ $(E,D) \leftarrow \mathcal{G}(1^k);$ $\pi \leftarrow F^R(E);$ $x \leftarrow \pi^R(1^k);$ $y' \leftarrow A_*^R(E,\pi);$ $\rho^R(x,D^R(y')) = 1]$
--	---	---

is negligible !!

Results

- Efficient Encryption

- ▶ $E^G(x) = f(r) || G(r) \oplus x$

- :achieves polynomial/semantic security

- ▶ $E^{G,H}(x) = f(r) || G(r) \oplus x || H(rx)$

- :against chosen ciphertext attack, non-malleable

Signatures

- A digital signature scheme: (G, S, V)
 - ▶ G : generator
 - ▶ S : signing algorithm
 - ▶ V : verifying algorithm

 - ▶ $G: \mathbb{1}^k \rightarrow (PK, SK)$
 - ▶ PK : public key
 - ▶ SK : secret key
 - ▶ To sign message m
 - ▶ $\sigma \leftarrow \text{Sign}^R(SK, m)$
 - ▶ To verify (m, σ)
 - ▶ $\text{Verify}^R(PK, m, \sigma) \in \{0, 1\}$

Signatures

- in Random Oracle Model
- Given signing adversary F , security is:

$$\Pr[R \leftarrow 2^{\infty}; \\ (PK, SK) \leftarrow \mathcal{G}(1^k); \\ (m, \sigma) \leftarrow F^{R, \text{Sign}^R(SK, \cdot)}(PK): \\ \text{Verify}^R(PK, m, \sigma) = 1]$$

is negligible !!

Instantiation Tips

- Do not instantiate based on the protocol
 - ▶ an appropriate instantiation should work for any protocol designed using a black box
- Avoid instantiations revealing internal structure
 - ▶ e.g. $\text{MD5}(x||y||z)$ can be easily computed given $|x|$, $\text{MD5}(x)$, and z
 - ▶ suggestions include:
 - ▶ truncating output: $h(x) =$ the first 64 bits of $\text{MD5}(x)$
 - ▶ limiting input length: $h(x) = \text{MD5}(x)$, where $|x| \leq 400$
 - ▶ non-standard use: $h(x) = \text{MD5}(x||x)$

Wrap-up

- A random oracle is a mathematical abstraction used in cryptographic proofs
 - ▶ In practice, random oracles are typically used to model **cryptographic hash functions** in schemes where strong randomness assumptions are needed of the hash function's output
- Random Oracle Paradigm
 - ▶ The idea is to make use of hash functions that are assumed in the analysis to behave randomly
 - ▶ This is a bridge between theory and practice