Lecture 28: DDH Assumption, Key Agreement, and ElGamal Encryption

#### Problem Statement

- The objective of this lecture is to build key agreement and public-key encryption protocols from the Decisional Diffie-Hellman (DDH) assumption
- Moreover, understand the relationship between the DDH assumption and other computational hardness assumptions like the discrete log assumption and Computational Diffie-Hellman (CDH) assumption

## Decisional Diffie-Hellman Assumption

- Consider a group  $(G, \times)$  with generator g and order n; i.e.,  $g^n = e$ , the identity and  $\{g^1, g^2, \dots, g^n = e\} = G$
- ② The Decisional Diffie-Hellman (DDH) assumption states that it is computationally infeasible to have a non-trivial advantage in predicting whether the given sample  $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) \in G^3$  was sampled from the distribution  $(g^a, g^b, g^r)$ , where  $a, b, r \in_R \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ , or  $(g^a, g^b, g^{ab})$ , where  $a, b \in_R \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$
- Intuitively, given  $(g^a, g^b)$ , the element  $g^{ab}$  is computationally indistinguishable from the random  $g^r$

# Diffie-Hellman Key Agreement

- **1** Alice samples  $a \in_R \{1, 2, ..., n\}$  and sends  $A := g^a$  to Bob
- ② Bob samples  $b \in_R \{1, 2, ..., n\}$  and sends  $B := g^b$  to Alice
- **3** Alice computes  $k := B^a$  and Bob also computes  $k := A^b$

- Given  $(g^a, g^b)$ , for an eavesdropper, the distribution of the key  $k = g^{ab}$  seems indistinguishable from the random element  $g^r$
- Alice and Bob can perform steps 1 and 2 simultaneously

# ElGamal Encryption Scheme

- Any two-message key agreement protocol can be converted into a public-key encryption scheme
- **2** Gen(): Return a public key  $pk = A := g^a$  and a secret key sk = a
- **3** Enc<sub>pk</sub>(m): Compute  $B := g^b$  and  $c := m \cdot A^b$ . The ciphertext is (B, c)
- **1**  $\operatorname{Dec}_{\operatorname{sk}}(\widetilde{B},\widetilde{c})$ : Compute  $\widetilde{m}/\left(\widetilde{B}\right)^a$ , where  $\operatorname{sk}=a$ .

# Groups where DDH holds

- **1** The subgroup of k-th residues modulo a prime  $p = k \cdot q + 1$ , where q is also a prime. When k = 2, it is quadratic residues modulo a safe prime
- ② For a safe prime  $p=2\cdot q+1$ , the quotient group  $\mathbb{Z}_p^*/\{\pm 1\}$
- A prime-order elliptic curve over a prime field (with some additional technical restrictions)
- A Jacobian of a hyper-elliptic curve over a prime field (with some additional technical restrictions)

### DDH Assumption: Formal Definition

#### Security Game for DDH.

- ② If u=0, then it samples  $(\alpha,\beta,\gamma)$  from the distribution  $(g^a,g^b,g^{ab})$ , where  $a,b\in_R\{1,2,\ldots,n\}$ . If u=1, then it samples  $(\alpha,\beta,\gamma)$  from the distribution  $(g^a,g^b,g^r)$ , where  $a,b,r\in_R\{1,2,\ldots,n\}$
- **1** The honest challenge sends  $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$  to the adversary
- **4** Adversary replies back with  $\widetilde{u} \in \{0,1\}$  (its guess of the bit u)
- **5** The adversary wins the game if (and only if)  $u = \tilde{u}$ .
- ullet The DDH assumption states that any computationally efficient adversary only has a small (or, negligible) advantage in predicting the bit u

# Relation with Other Assumptions: Discrete Log

- **1** Suppose  $(G, \times)$  be a group generated by g, and discrete log is easy to compute. That is, given  $X := g^X$  as input, it is easy to compute  $x \in \{1, 2, ..., |X|\}$  (say, using an algorithm A)
- ② Using such an algorithm, it is easy to construct a DDH adversary and break that assumption.
  - **1** Our adversary receives  $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$  from the honest challenger
  - 2 Feeds  $\alpha$  as input to the algorithm  ${\cal A}$  and recovers  ${\it a}$
  - **3** Compute  $\delta := \beta^a$
  - 4 If  $\gamma = \delta$ , set  $\widetilde{u} = 0$ ; otherwise, set  $\widetilde{u} = 1$
- Sood for thought: Compute the advantage of our adversary
- The contrapositive of this statement is that if DDH is hard for a group, then DL is also hard for that group

## Attack using Legendre Symbol

- **1** Suppose there is an algorithm that, given  $X = g^x$  as input, can determine whether x is even or not
- 2 Note that when  $\gamma = g^{ab}$ , the exponent ab is even with probability 3/4
- **3** However, when  $\gamma = g^r$ , the exponent r is even with probability 1/2
- ullet So, using the algorithm mentioned above, we can construct an adversary who has a constant advantage in predicting u
- Food for thought: Construct this adversary and compute its distinguishing advantage

# Relation with Other Assumptions: Computational Diffie-Hellman

- The computational Diffie-Hellman assumption (CDH) states that given  $(g^a, g^b)$ , where  $a, b \in_R \{1, 2, ..., n\}$ , it is computationally inefficient to compute  $g^{ab}$
- ② Note that if CDH is easy in a group, there is an algorithm to compute  $g^{ab}$  from  $(g^a, g^b)$ . In this group, using this algorithm, an adversary can show that DDH is easy
- The contrapositive of this statement is that if DDH is hard for a group, then CDH is also hard for that group