This is last year’s exam study guide. An updated version will be published before the exam.

You should be able to…

• …explain how to use frequency analysis to break the Vigenere cipher and a substitution cipher.  

• …to apply frequency analysis to break the Vigenere and the substitution cipher. (In simple cases where no big computations are needed.)

• …distinguish between ciphertext-only attacks, known-plaintext attacks, chosen-plaintext attacks, and chosen-ciphertext attacks.

• …determine whether an encryption scheme has perfect secrecy.

• …explain the drawbacks of the one-time pad (both in terms of practicality and security).

• …construct an attack on a scheme that uses the one-time pad incorrectly.

• …list what disadvantages are unavoidable in schemes with perfect secrecy.

• …for any part of the definition of perfect secrecy, explain why this part of the definition is as it is.

• …describe the components of a stream cipher.

• …explain which properties a key stream should have and why.

• …describe how an LFSR is constructed and how it can be used to build a streamcipher (an insecure one, though).

• …from a fragment of the keystream produced by an LFSR derive the initial state (key) of the LFSR.

• …describe the advantages and disadvantages of “best-effort design” and provable security.

• …give examples of both.
• ... explain the different parts of the definition of IND-OT-CPA, i.e., why the definition is the way it is.

• ... given a variant of the definition in which one of the parts are changed, give an example why this leads to undesirable consequences. (E.g., by describing a scheme that satisfies the definition while having drawbacks that are excluded by the original definition.)

• ... explain the different parts of the definition of PRG, i.e., why the definition is the way it is.

• ... given a variant of the definition in which one of the parts are changed, give an example why this leads to undesirable consequences. (E.g., by describing a scheme that satisfies the definition while having drawbacks that are excluded by the original definition.)

• ... describe how to build a streamcipher from a PRG and sketch the reason for its security.

• ... explain why a streamcipher constructed from a PRG is not IND-CPA secure.

• ... given an encryption scheme that is not IND-OT-CPA secure, explain why it is not IND-OT-CPA by giving an attack.

• ... describe what a block cipher is.

• ... describe what a Feistel network is.

• ... explain how to decrypt a ciphertext encrypted with a Feistel network.

• ... given the description of a block cipher similar in structure to AES, identify the objectives behind different parts of the block cipher (e.g., why is the key XORed in at a given place, why do we have a key schedule, why are certain bits permuted, why are S-boxes applied, why is the construction repeated, etc.)

• ... explain the different parts of the definition of strong PRP, i.e., why the definition is the way it is.

• ... given a variant of the definition in which one of the parts are changed, give an example why this leads to undesirable consequences. (E.g., by describing a scheme that satisfies the definition while having drawbacks that are excluded by the original definition.)

• ... given an encryption scheme that is not a strong PRP, explain why it is not a strong PRP (e.g., by giving an attack).

• ... explain the different parts of the definition of IND-CPA (symmetric case), i.e., why the definition is the way it is.
• . . . given a variant of the definition in which one of the parts are changed, give an example why this leads to undesirable consequences. (E.g., by describing a scheme that satisfies the definition while having drawbacks that are excluded by the original definition.)

• . . . given an encryption scheme that is not IND-CPA, explain why it is not IND-CPA (e.g., by giving an attack).

• . . . motivate why IND-CPA encryption (i.e., security against chosen-plaintext attacks) is necessary. (I.e., why do we have to assume that the adversary can provide plaintexts of his choosing to be encrypted. – Example setting?)

• . . . describe the relation between the different security definitions of encryption schemes (IND-OT-CPA, IND-CPA, strong PRP). Which implies which? Which does not imply the which (separating example)?

• . . . determine in which situation which definition is needed and why (e.g., given the description of a use-case, tell which definition is necessary and why).

• . . . describe ECB mode (either in formulas, or pictorially in the special case of a message consisting of a few blocks).

• . . . explain the security drawbacks of ECB mode.

• . . . describe CBC mode (either in formulas, or pictorially in the special case of a message consisting of a few blocks).

• . . . explain why it is important that the IV is random in CBC mode. (Give attack for fixed IV against IND-CPA security.)

• . . . tell which of ECB and CBC mode satisfy which security property.

• . . . show that none of these is IND-CCA secure by giving an attack.

• . . . describe what is the difference between symmetric and public-key cryptography, and what are the advantages of public-key cryptography.

• . . . describe text-book RSA.

• . . . show that decryption returns the correct message in text-book RSA.

• . . . explain the relation between text-book RSA and the RSA assumption (in particular: if the RSA assumption holds, what do we know about the security of text-book RSA?)

• . . . describe the ElGamal encryption scheme.

• . . . show that decryption returns the correct message in ElGamal.
• . . . explain the different parts of the definition of IND-CPA (public key case), i.e., why the definition is the way it is.

• . . . given a variant of the definition in which one of the parts are changed, give an example why this leads to undesirable consequences. (E.g., by describing a scheme that satisfies the definition while having drawbacks that are excluded by the original definition.)

• . . . given an encryption scheme that is not IND-CPA, explain why it is not IND-CPA (e.g., by giving an attack).

• . . . explain the different parts of the definition of DDH assumption, i.e., why the definition is the way it is.

• . . . explain why ElGamal is secure under the DDH assumption (i.e., explain why \( m \cdot h^y \mod p \) hides \( m \) if the DDH assumption holds).

• . . . explain what malleability means.

• . . . given a malleable encryption scheme (ElGamal or text-book RSA), and a specific setting in which malleability poses a problem, describe an attack that makes use of the malleability. (Similar to the auction example and the chosen ciphertext attack example in Section 6.3.)

• . . . explain the different parts of the definition of IND-CCA (public key case), i.e., why the definition is the way it is.

• . . . given a variant of the definition in which one of the parts are changed, give an example why this leads to undesirable consequences. (E.g., by describing a scheme that satisfies the definition while having drawbacks that are excluded by the original definition.)

• . . . given an encryption scheme that is not IND-CCA, explain why it is not IND-CCA (e.g., by giving an attack).

• . . . explain why IND-CCA security implies that a scheme is not malleable.

• . . . explain how hybrid encryption works.

• . . . argue (without formal proof) why hybrid encryption is secure.

• . . . say under which conditions a hybrid encryption scheme is IND-CPA/IND-CCA secure.

• . . . describe collision-resistance.

• . . . give examples what collision-resistance is good for.

• . . . explain the different parts of the definition of collision-resistance, i.e., why the definition is the way it is.
• ...given a variant of the definition in which one of the parts are changed, give an example why this leads to undesirable consequences. (E.g., by describing a scheme that satisfies the definition while having drawbacks that are excluded by the original definition.)

• ...given a hash function that is not collision-resistant, explain why it is not collision-resistant (e.g., by giving an attack).

• ...explain what a compression function is.

• ...explain how to construct a hash function from a compression function using the Iterated Hash construction.

• ...say under which conditions Iterated Hash is collision-resistant and which are its limitations (in terms of security).

• ...construct a collision for Iterated Hash (given \( x^* \) with \( F(iv\|x^*) = iv \)), potentially under certain additional requirements on the messages that should collide (as long as this does not lead to an attack substantially different from the one in the lecture notes).

• ...explain why the Merkle-Damgård removes the restrictions of Iterated Hash (in terms of security).

• ...for simple variations in the padding of Merkle-Damgård, explain why they are not collision-resistant.

• ...describe the birthday attack, its approximate running time and memory consumption.

• ...explain what a MAC is and what it is for. \( \text{Section 8} \)

• ...explain the different parts of the definition of EF-CMA (MAC case), i.e., why the definition is the way it is.

• ...given a variant of the definition in which one of the parts are changed, give an example why this leads to undesirable consequences. (E.g., by describing a scheme that satisfies the definition while having drawbacks that are excluded by the original definition.)

• ...given a MAC that is not EF-CMA, explain why it is not EF-CMA (e.g., by giving an attack).

• ...explain why the naive construction \( MAC(k, m) := H(k\|m) \) is insecure (assuming that \( H \) is Merkle-Damgård constructed) by giving an attack.

• ...explain why this (or a similar) attack does not work on the HMAC scheme.

• ...list under which conditions HMAC is EF-CMA secure.
• ...explain under which conditions CBC-MAC is secure.

• ...show that CBC-MAC is not secure by describing an attack.

• ...explain why that attack does not work on DMAC.

• ...tell what properties are needed from a hash function to use it to extend the message space of a MAC without losing EF-CMA security.

• ...sketch why EF-CMA security is not lost when using a suitable hash function for extending the message space.

• ...describe the relation between PRFs and MACs. Which implies which? Which does not imply the which (separating example)?

• ...explain the different parts of the definition of one-way functions, i.e., why the definition is the way it is.

• ...given a variant of the definition in which one of the parts are changed, give an example why this leads to undesirable consequences. (E.g., by describing a function that satisfies the definition while having drawbacks that are excluded by the original definition.)

• ...given a function that is not one-way, explain why it is not one-way (e.g., by giving an attack).

• ...explain why, if the encryption function of an encryption scheme is one-way, this does not make it a good encryption scheme (in terms of security).

• ...list which of the different cryptographic primitives discussed in the lecture (like PRGs, IND-CCA symmetric encryption, IND-CPA public key encryption, etc.) can be constructed from OWFs and which cannot.

• ...explain the random-oracle model / the random-oracle heuristic.

• ...given a protocol that is secure in the random-oracle model, and given a sketch of the main argument of the security proof, decide (and justify) whether this is a case where the random-oracle heuristic may or should not be applied (in view of its unsoundness).

• ...explain what a signature is and what it is for.

• ...explain the different parts of the definition of EF-CMA (signature case), i.e., why the definition is the way it is.

• ...given a variant of the definition in which one of the parts are changed, give an example why this leads to undesirable consequences. (E.g., by describing a scheme that satisfies the definition while having drawbacks that are excluded by the original definition.)

• ...given a signature scheme that is not EF-CMA, explain why it is not EF-CMA (e.g., by giving an attack).
• ...tell what properties are needed from a hash function to use it to extend
the message space of a signature scheme without losing EF-CMA security.
• ...sketch why EF-CMA security is not lost when using a suitable hash
function for extending the message space
• ...explain how to use text-book RSA as a signature scheme.
• ...show that text-book RSA (as a signature scheme) is not EF-CMA se-
cure by giving an attack.
• ...explain the difference between signatures and one-time signatures.
• ...describe how to construct one-time signatures from one-way functions
(Lamport’s scheme).
• ...sketch why that construction is EF-OT-CMA secure.
• ...sketch the construction of tree-based signatures (no need to cover: us-
age of PRFs to fix the randomness).
• ...describe the RSA-FDH scheme.
• ...explain why the attack that breaks the EF-CMA security of text-book
RSA signatures does not break the security of RSA-FDH.
• ...list under what conditions RSA-FDH is EF-CMA secure (don’t over-
look the random oracle).
• ...discuss what we know about the security of RSA-FDH if we use a
real-life hash function $H$ instead of a random oracle.
• ...discuss advantages/disadvantages of symbolic cryptography. [Section 13]
• ...given a simple protocol, write down the adversary deduction rules.
• ...given a set of deduction rules, write down the grammar of all messages
that can be derived using these rules.
• ...given a grammar of all messages that can be derived by the adversary,
and a security definition, and given a protocol, decide whether the protocol
is secure in the symbolic model.
• ...given a set of deduction rules and a given message, show that the
message can be deduced (e.g., by drawing a derivation tree).

Good luck!