

---

**TD 8 – Digital signatures**


---

**Exercise 1.***DSA*

The *Digital Signature Algorithm* (DSA) is a standardized signature scheme based on the discrete logarithm problem. It uses an identification protocol, which is transformed into a signature scheme (though not through Fiat-Shamir transform). In the exercise,  $p$  is a prime number and  $G = \langle g \rangle$  is a (cyclic) subgroup of  $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^\times$  of prime order  $q$ . We define a pair keys  $\text{sk} = x \in \{0, \dots, q-1\}$  and  $\text{vk} = h = g^x$ .

1. The identification protocol works as follows:

- The prover chooses  $k \leftarrow \{1, \dots, q-1\}$  and sends  $\ell \leftarrow g^k$ ;
- The verifier chooses  $\alpha, r \leftarrow \{0, \dots, q-1\}$  and sends them;
- The prover computes  $s = k^{-1} \cdot (\alpha + xr) \bmod q$ ;
- The verifier accepts iff  $s \neq 0$  and  $g^{\alpha \cdot s^{-1} \bmod q} \cdot h^{r \cdot s^{-1} \bmod q} = \ell$ .

i. Prove that if  $s \neq 0$ , the protocol is correct.

ii. Compute the probability that  $s = 0$ .

2. To define the DSA signature scheme, we consider a hash function  $H : \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow \{0, \dots, q-1\}$ . To sign with the key  $\text{sk} = x$ , the signer simulates the identification protocol, replacing the random choices of  $\alpha$  and  $r$  by  $\alpha \leftarrow H(m)$  and  $r \leftarrow \ell \bmod q$ . If  $s = 0$ , the signer restarts with a new value  $k$ .

i. Write the algorithm Sign formally. *What should be the output?*

ii. Describe the verification algorithm Vrfy and prove that it is correct.

iii. We define a variant of DSA where the message space is  $\{0, \dots, q-1\}$ , and where  $H$  is simply omitted. Show that this variant is insecure, that is one can forge a signature without knowing the signing key. Is this an existential or a universal forgery?

**Exercise 2.***BLS signatures*

Let  $G = \langle g \rangle$  and  $\Gamma = \langle \gamma \rangle$  be two cyclic groups of the same prime order  $q$ . A *pairing* is an efficiently computable function  $e : G \times G \rightarrow \Gamma$  such that  $e(g^a, g^b) = \gamma^{ab}$  for all  $a, b \in \{0, \dots, q-1\}$ .

1. Prove that given a pairing, an adversary can win the DDH game in  $G$  with high probability.

Given a hash function  $H : \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow G$ , the BLS signature scheme<sup>1</sup> is:

- Gen samples  $x \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}/q\mathbb{Z}$  and outputs  $(vk, sk) = (g^x, x)$ ;
- $\text{Sign}_{sk}(m) = H(m)^{sk}$  for a message  $m \in \{0, 1\}^*$ ;
- $\text{Vrfy}_{vk}(m, \sigma) = 1$  if and only if  $e(\sigma, g) = e(H(m), vk)$ .

2. Show that this signature scheme is correct.

Our goal is to show that the BLS signature scheme is EUF-CMA secure under the CDH assumption in  $G$  when  $H$  is a random oracle. Given an adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  in the EUF-CMA game, we build an adversary  $\mathcal{C}$  in the CDH game. The adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  sends messages  $m_i$ , gets answer  $\sigma_i \leftarrow \text{Sign}_{sk}(m_i)$ , and must output a valid pair  $(m, \sigma)$ . The goal of  $\mathcal{C}$  is, given  $h_a = g^a$  and  $h_b = g^b$ , to compute  $h = g^{ab}$ . The idea is for  $\mathcal{C}$  to play the role of the challenger in the EUF-CMA game against  $\mathcal{A}$ . It also plays the role of  $H$ .

The adversary  $\mathcal{C}$  must answer the queries of  $\mathcal{A}$ , both to  $H$  and  $\text{Sign}_{sk}$ . It sets the keys  $vk = h_a$  and  $sk = a$ . Let  $m_1, \dots, m_t$  be the queries made by  $\mathcal{A}$  to  $H$  (in order). We make the strong assumption that  $\mathcal{A}$  outputs a pair  $(m, \sigma)$  with  $m = m_t$ . To answer a query  $H(m_i)$ ,  $1 \leq i < t$ ,  $\mathcal{C}$  samples  $r_i \leftarrow \{0, \dots, q-1\}$  and outputs  $H(m_i) = g^{r_i}$ . To answer  $H(m_t)$ ,  $\mathcal{C}$  outputs  $H(m_t) = h_b = g^b$ .

3. Show that if  $\mathcal{A}$  outputs  $(m, \sigma)$  without querying  $H(m)$ , its advantage is  $1/q$ . *Hint.  $H$  is a random oracle.*
4.
  - i. Show that  $\mathcal{A}$  is able to answer a query  $\text{Sign}_{sk}(m_i)$  although it does not know  $sk = a$ , using its answers to  $H$ .
  - ii. Assume that  $\mathcal{A}$  outputs a valid pair  $(m, \sigma)$  where  $m = m_t$ . Prove that  $\mathcal{C}$  can use this result to compute  $h = g^{ab}$ .

We now remove the strong assumption: the message  $m$  in the pair output by  $\mathcal{A}$  can be any  $m_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq t$ . As a first step,  $\mathcal{C}$  now guesses the value of  $i$ .<sup>2</sup> The rest remains the same, replacing  $m_t$  by  $m_i$ . If the guess is incorrect,  $\mathcal{C}$  returns FAILURE.

5.
  - i. What is the probability that the guess of  $\mathcal{C}$  is correct?
  - ii. Express the advantage and the running time of  $\mathcal{C}$  in terms of those of  $\mathcal{A}$ .
6. Draw a conclusion: Why do the previous questions allow to conclude that if the CDH is hard in  $G$  and  $H$  is modeled as a random oracle, then the BLS signature scheme is EUF-CMA secure?

---

<sup>1</sup>Due to Boneh, Lynn and Shacham.

<sup>2</sup>Here we assume that  $\mathcal{C}$  knows the value of  $t$  and samples  $i \leftarrow \{1, \dots, t\}$ . It is actually possible to perform the same task without knowing  $t$  beforehand.