Kemeleon:

Elligator-like Obfuscation for Post-Quantum Cryptography

Felix Günther IBM Research – Zurich Michael Rosenberg

Douglas Stebila University of Waterloo **Shannon Veitch** ETH Zurich

Real World Crypto 2025. Sofia, Bulgaria

Internet protocols **hide metadata** to protect user privacy, dissuade protocol fingerprinting, and prevent network ossification

Internet protocols **hide metadata** to protect user privacy, dissuade protocol fingerprinting, and prevent network ossification

- TLS 1.3 Encrypted Client Hello, QUIC, obfs4, Shadowsocks, ...
- "Fully encrypted" protocols, with **obfuscated key exchange**

Internet protocols **hide metadata** to protect user privacy, dissuade protocol fingerprinting, and prevent network ossification

- TLS 1.3 Encrypted Client Hello, QUIC, obfs4, Shadowsocks, ...
- "Fully encrypted" protocols, with **obfuscated key exchange**

Some PAKEs need to operate on random bytestrings

Internet protocols **hide metadata** to protect user privacy, dissuade protocol fingerprinting, and prevent network ossification

- TLS 1.3 Encrypted Client Hello, QUIC, obfs4, Shadowsocks, ...
- "Fully encrypted" protocols, with **obfuscated key exchange**

Some PAKEs need to operate on random bytestrings

Previously: Elligator maps elliptic curve public keys to random bytestrings

Internet protocols **hide metadata** to protect user privacy, dissuade protocol fingerprinting, and prevent network ossification

- TLS 1.3 Encrypted Client Hello, QUIC, obfs4, Shadowsocks, ...
- "Fully encrypted" protocols, with **obfuscated key exchange**

Some PAKEs need to operate on random bytestrings

Previously: Elligator maps elliptic curve public keys to random bytestrings



Internet protocols **hide metadata** to protect user privacy, dissuade protocol fingerprinting, and prevent network ossification

- TLS 1.3 Encrypted Client Hello, QUIC, obfs4, Shadowsocks, ...
- "Fully encrypted" protocols, with **obfuscated key exchange**

Some PAKEs need to operate on random bytestrings

Previously: Elligator maps elliptic curve public keys to random bytestrings



What about post-quantum key exchanges? Can use Saber or FrodoKEM.

Internet protocols **hide metadata** to protect user privacy, dissuade protocol fingerprinting, and prevent network ossification

- TLS 1.3 Encrypted Client Hello, QUIC, obfs4, Shadowsocks, ...
- "Fully encrypted" protocols, with **obfuscated key exchange**

Some PAKEs need to operate on random bytestrings

Previously: Elligator maps elliptic curve public keys to random bytestrings



What about post-quantum key exchanges? Can use Saber or FrodoKEM.

What about standardized post-quantum key exchanges — ML-KEM?

Overview

- Kemeleon Encoding

- ML-Kemeleon: Obfuscated PQ KEM
- OEINC: Obfuscated KEM Combiner
- Hybrid Applications:
 - Obfuscated Key Exchange
 - Password Authenticated Key Exchange (with adaptive security)

0110010101101207
Lorton Control
² 02 ² 2710110100 ¹¹⁰⁰⁰

Byte Distribution of ML-KEM-768 Public Keys

ML-KEM public keys: Polynomials with coefficients mod q=3329, and a random seed

Byte Distribution of ML-KEM-768 Public Keys

ML-KEM public keys: Polynomials with coefficients mod q=3329, and a random seed





Image inspired by: Jack Wampler

ML-KEM public keys

 $[a_1][a_2][a_3] \dots [a_b]$ (a_i is a number mod q=3329)

ML-KEM public keys

[a_1][a_2][a_3] ... [a_b] (a_i is a number mod q=3329)

1. Accumulate into one **big integer**

[$A = a_1 + a_2 \cdot q + a_3 \cdot q^3 + \ldots + a_b \cdot q^{b-1}$] (A is a number mod q^{b-1})

ML-KEM public keys

[a_1][a_2][a_3] ... [a_b] (a_i is a number mod q=3329)

- 1. Accumulate into one **big integer**
- 2. Rejection sampling: **reject if msb is 1**

[
$$A = a_1 + a_{2^x}q + a_{3^x}q^3 + ... + a_{b^x}q^{b-1}$$
] (A is a number mod q^{b-1})

Most sig. bit still biased towards o

ML-KEM public keys

 $[a_1][a_2][a_3]\ldots [a_b]$ (a_i is a number mod q=3329)

- 1. Accumulate into one **big integer**
- 2. Rejection sampling: **reject if msb is 1**

Encoded public keys **~2.5% smaller** than regular (19/28/38 bytes for ML-KEM-512/768/1024)

[A = $a_1 + a_{2^x}q + a_{3^x}q^3 + ... + a_{b^x}q^{b-1}$] (A is a number mod q^{b-1})

Most sig. bit still biased towards o

ML-KEM public keys

 $[a_1][a_2][a_3]\ldots [a_b]$ (a_i is a number mod q=3329)

- 1. Accumulate into one **big integer**
- 2. Rejection sampling: **reject if msb is 1**

Encoded public keys ~2.5% smaller than regular (19/28/38 bytes for ML-KEM-512/768/1024)

MLKEM-768 **likelihood of rejection is 17%** (Elligator likelihood of rejection is ~50%)

```
[ A = a_1 + a_{2^x}q + a_{3^x}q^3 + ... + a_{b^x}q^{b-1}] (A is a number mod q<sup>b-1</sup>)
```

Most sig. bit still biased towards o

ML-KEM ciphertexts

Vector of polynomials, *compressed* before returned by Encap

ML-KEM ciphertexts

Vector of polynomials, *compressed* before returned by Encap



Compression step in Encap performs rounding which results in a non-uniform ciphertext distribution.

ML-KEM ciphertexts

						- 9000 - 8500 August - 8000 August - 7500 - 7000
0 20	40	60	80	100	120	_
	Ciphert	ext Coeffici	ient Value	S		

Vector of polynomials, *compressed* before returned by Encap

Compression step in Encap performs rounding which results in a non-uniform ciphertext distribution.

Kemeleon encoding for ciphertexts:

- 1. Decompress and "recover" randomness from ciphertexts
- 2. Use same rejection-sampling method as was used for public keys

ML-KEM ciphertexts

Vector of polynomials, compressed before returned by Encap

Compression step in Encap performs rounding which results in a non-uniform ciphertext distribution.

Kemeleon encoding for ciphertexts:

- 1. Decompress and "recover" randomness from ciphertexts
- 2. Use same rejection-sampling method as was used for public keys

Encoded ciphertexts are **6-15% larger** than regular (109/164/90 bytes for ML-KEM-512/768/1024)

Applying techniques from Tibouchi 2014 (Elligator²):

 Take the accumulated integer, A (mod q^{b-1}), from the original encoding with byte length < n

[$A = a_1 + a_2 \times q + a_3 \times q^3 + \ldots + a_b \times q^{b-1}$] (A is a number mod q^{b-1} , msb still biased towards 0)

Applying techniques from Tibouchi 2014 (Elligator²):

- Take the accumulated integer, A (mod q^{b-1}), from the original encoding with byte length < n
- 2. Add random value **r** such that result, **R** = **A** + **r**, has byte length n + 32 (or alternative value, depending on security parameters)

[$A = a_1 + a_2 \times q + a_3 \times q^3 + \ldots + a_b \times q^{b-1}$] (A is a number mod q^{b-1}, msb still biased towards 0)

[**R** = **A** + **r**] (r random s.t. R is a number modulo some power of 2)

Applying techniques from Tibouchi 2014 (Elligator²):

- Take the accumulated integer, A (mod q^{b-1}), from the original encoding with byte length < n
- 2. Add random value **r** such that result, **R** = **A** + **r**, has byte length n + 32 (or alternative value, depending on security parameters)

Decoding: Take the result R modulo q^{b-1} , to recover A, and decode as usual

[$A = a_1 + a_2 \cdot q + a_3 \cdot q^3 + \ldots + a_b \cdot q^{b-1}$] (A is a number mod q^{b-1}, msb still biased towards 0)

[**R** = **A** + **r**] (r random s.t. R is a number modulo some power of 2)

Applying techniques from Tibouchi 2014 (Elligator²):

- Take the accumulated integer, A (mod q^{b-1}), from the original encoding with byte length < n
- Add random value r such that result, R = A + r, has byte length n + 32 (or alternative value, depending on security parameters)

Encoded public keys are **~ same size** as in standard ML-KEM.

Likelihood of rejection is ${\bf 0\%}$

Decoding: Take the result R modulo q^{b-1} , to recover A, and decode as usual

[$A = a_1 + a_2 \cdot q + a_3 \cdot q^3 + \ldots + a_b \cdot q^{b-1}$] (A is a number mod q^{b-1}, msb still biased towards 0)

[**R** = **A** + **r**] (r random s.t. R is a number modulo some power of 2)

Overview

- Kemeleon Encoding
- ML-Kemeleon: Obfuscated PQ KEM
- OEINC: Obfuscated KEM Combiner
- Hybrid Applications:
 - Obfuscated Key Exchange
 - Password Authenticated Key Exchange (with adaptive security)

10110010101101101101101101101101010101
1001000 100000000000000000000000000000
TTOTON TOOL
TIOIIOIOUV

ML-KEM can naturally be combined with Kemeleon (by encoding public keys and ciphertexts) to obtain an Obfuscated KEM (OKEM)



ML-KEM + Kemeleon = ML-Kemeleon

ML-KEM can naturally be combined with Kemeleon (by encoding public keys and ciphertexts) to obtain an Obfuscated KEM (OKEM)



ML-KEM + Kemeleon = ML-Kemeleon

OKEM Security Properties:

- IND-CCA: indistinguishability of shared secrets

ML-KEM can naturally be combined with Kemeleon (by encoding public keys and ciphertexts) to obtain an Obfuscated KEM (OKEM)



ML-KEM + Kemeleon = ML-Kemeleon

OKEM Security Properties:

- IND-CCA: indistinguishability of shared secrets
- **SPR-CCA (strong pseudorandomness)**: indistinguishability of shared secrets, random/ simulatable ciphertexts

- implies anonymity (ANO-CCA)

ML-KEM can naturally be combined with Kemeleon (by encoding public keys and ciphertexts) to obtain an Obfuscated KEM (OKEM)



ML-KEM + Kemeleon = ML-Kemeleon

OKEM Security Properties:

- IND-CCA: indistinguishability of shared secrets
- **SPR-CCA (strong pseudorandomness)**: indistinguishability of shared secrets, random/ simulatable ciphertexts
 - implies anonymity (ANO-CCA)
- **Ciphertext and Public Key Uniformity**: indistinguishable from random bit strings

ML-KEM can naturally be combined with Kemeleon (by encoding public keys and ciphertexts) to obtain an Obfuscated KEM (OKEM)



ML-KEM + Kemeleon = ML-Kemeleon

OKEM Security Properties:

- **IND-CCA**: indistinguishability of shared secrets
- **SPR-CCA (strong pseudorandomness)**: indistinguishability of shared secrets, random/ simulatable ciphertexts
 - implies anonymity (ANO-CCA)
- **Ciphertext and Public Key Uniformity**: indistinguishable from random bit strings

ML-Kemeleon Properties:

- IND-CCA: IND-CCA of ML-KEM
- **SPR-CCA**: SPR-CCA of ML-KEM and ciphertext uniformity
- Ciphertext Uniformity: SPR-CCA of ML-KEM
- **Public Key Uniformity**: reduces to MLWE
- + small loss from rejection rates in each case

ML-KEM can naturally be combined with Kemeleon (by encoding public keys and ciphertexts) to obtain an Obfuscated KEM (OKEM)



ML-KEM + Kemeleon = ML-Kemeleon

OKEM Security Properties:

- **IND-CCA**: indistinguishability of shared secrets
- **SPR-CCA (strong pseudorandomness)**: indistinguishability of shared secrets, random/ simulatable ciphertexts
 - implies anonymity (ANO-CCA)
- **Ciphertext and Public Key Uniformity**: indistinguishable from random bit strings

ML-Kemeleon Properties:

- IND-CCA: IND-CCA of ML-KEM
- **SPR-CCA**: SPR-CCA of ML-KEM and ciphertext uniformity
- Ciphertext Uniformity: SPR-CCA of ML-KEM
- **Public Key Uniformity**: reduces to MLWE
- + small loss from rejection rates in each case

Note: while Elligator is statistically uniform, Kemeleon relies on MLWE assumption.

Using Kemeleon

Dos!

- Consider a constant-time implementation for big integer arithmetic, if this is in your threat model (also, consider timing side channels due to rejection sampling)

Using Kemeleon

Dos!

- Consider a constant-time implementation for big integer arithmetic, if this is in your threat model (also, consider timing side channels due to rejection sampling)

Don'ts!

- Use randomness derived from the KEM shared secret to seed the encoding algorithm (i.e., careful with key separation)
- Reveal randomness used for the encoding algorithm (i.e., randomness must be kept secret)

Using Kemeleon

Dos!

- Consider a constant-time implementation for big integer arithmetic, if this is in your threat model (also, consider timing side channels due to rejection sampling)

Don'ts!

- Use randomness derived from the KEM shared secret to seed the encoding algorithm (i.e., careful with key separation)
- Reveal randomness used for the encoding algorithm (i.e., randomness must be kept secret)

Time for Key Generation (and Encoding)



Overview

- Kemeleon Encoding
- ML-Kemeleon: Obfuscated PQ KEM
- OEINC: Obfuscated KEM Combiner
- Hybrid Applications:
 - Obfuscated Key Exchange
 - Password Authenticated Key Exchange (with adaptive security)












Approach used in hybrid TLS 1.3, Xyber, X-Wing, ...



Approach used in hybrid TLS 1.3, Xyber, X-Wing, ...

Hybrid IND-CCA



Approach used in hybrid TLS 1.3, Xyber, X-Wing, ...

Hybrid IND-CCA



Suffices to distinguish **either** ciphertext

Approach used in hybrid TLS 1.3, Xyber, X-Wing, ...

Hybrid IND-CCA



Approach used in hybrid TLS 1.3, Xyber, X-Wing, ...

Hybrid IND-CCA



Approach used in hybrid TLS 1.3, Xyber, X-Wing, ...

Hybrid IND-CCA

"outOKEM"



"inOKEM"







"outOKEM"



"outOKEM"



"outOKEM"



Hybrid IND-CCA









Security Properties

Security Properties

Requires:

Security Properties

Requires:

- outOKEM must have **statistical strong ciphertext uniformity** (ciphertexts must look uniform, even if you know sk, pk)

Security Properties

Requires:

- outOKEM must have **statistical strong ciphertext uniformity** (ciphertexts must look uniform, even if you know sk, pk)

outOKEM can be DHKEM $sk = x \quad pk = xG$ $ct = Elligator2(r \cdot pk)$

Security Properties

Requires:

- outOKEM must have **statistical strong ciphertext uniformity** (ciphertexts must look uniform, even if you know sk, pk)

Achieves IND-CCA/SPR-CCA, and:

outOKEM can be DHKEM sk = x pk = xG ct = Elligator2(r · pk)

Security Properties

Requires:

- outOKEM must have **statistical strong ciphertext uniformity** (ciphertexts must look uniform, even if you know sk, pk)

Achieves IND-CCA/SPR-CCA, and:

- **Ciphertext uniformity** outOKEM is IND-CCA or inOKEM is ct-unif

outOKEM can be DHKEM $sk = x \quad pk = xG$ $ct = Elligator2(r \cdot pk)$

Security Properties

Requires:

- outOKEM must have **statistical strong ciphertext uniformity** (ciphertexts must look uniform, even if you know sk, pk)

Achieves IND-CCA/SPR-CCA, and:

- Ciphertext uniformity outOKEM is IND-CCA or inOKEM is ct-unif
- **Public key uniformity** outOKEM is pk-unif and inOKEM is pk-unif

outOKEM can be DHKEM sk = x pk = xG ct = Elligator2(r · pk)

Security Properties

Requires:

- outOKEM must have **statistical strong ciphertext uniformity** (ciphertexts must look uniform, even if you know sk, pk)

Achieves IND-CCA/SPR-CCA, and:

- Ciphertext uniformity outOKEM is IND-CCA or inOKEM is ct-unif
- **Public key uniformity** outOKEM is pk-unif and inOKEM is pk-unif

We don't get hybrid public key uniformity! (Likely impossible)

outOKEM can be DHKEM $sk = x \quad pk = xG$ $ct = Elligator2(r \cdot pk)$

Security Properties

Requires:

- outOKEM must have **statistical strong ciphertext uniformity** (ciphertexts must look uniform, even if you know sk, pk)

Achieves IND-CCA/SPR-CCA, and:

- Ciphertext uniformity outOKEM is IND-CCA or inOKEM is ct-unif
- **Public key uniformity** outOKEM is pk-unif and inOKEM is pk-unif

We don't get hybrid public key uniformity! (Likely impossible)

We also don't always need hybrid pk-unif

outOKEM can be DHKEM $sk = x \quad pk = xG$ $ct = Elligator2(r \cdot pk)$

Security Properties

Requires:

- outOKEM must have **statistical strong ciphertext uniformity** (ciphertexts must look uniform, even if you know sk, pk)

Achieves IND-CCA/SPR-CCA, and:

- Ciphertext uniformity outOKEM is IND-CCA or inOKEM is ct-unif
- **Public key uniformity** outOKEM is pk-unif and inOKEM is pk-unif

We don't get hybrid public key uniformity! (Likely impossible)

We also don't always need hybrid pk-unif

 $\label{eq:steps} \begin{array}{ll} \textbf{outOKEM can be DHKEM} \\ sk = x & pk = xG \\ ct = Elligator2(r \cdot pk) \end{array}$

inOKEM can basically be any ct-unif KEM (and pk-unif if you want it)

Security Properties

Requires:

- outOKEM must have **statistical strong ciphertext uniformity** (ciphertexts must look uniform, even if you know sk, pk)

Achieves IND-CCA/SPR-CCA, and:

- Ciphertext uniformity outOKEM is IND-CCA or inOKEM is ct-unif
- Public key uniformity outOKEM is pk-unif and inOKEM is pk-unif

We don't get hybrid public key uniformity! (Likely impossible) We also **don't always need hybrid pk-unif** outOKEM can be DHKEM $sk = x \quad pk = xG$ $ct = Elligator_2(r \cdot pk)$

inOKEM can basically be any ct-unif KEM (and pk-unif if you want it)

Concrete Instantiation

outOKEM = DHKEM[Ristretto]+Elligator2

inOKEM = ML-Kemeleon/Saber/Frodo

Overview

- Kemeleon Encoding
- ML-Kemeleon: Obfuscated PQ KEM
- OEINC: Obfuscated KEM Combiner
- Hybrid Applications:
 - Obfuscated Key Exchange
 - Password Authenticated Key Exchange (with adaptive security)



All **handshake traffic** should appear **indistinguishable from random** (or simulatable).

-



- All **handshake traffic** should appear **indistinguishable from random** (or simulatable).
- Honest clients assumed to know server public key.



- All **handshake traffic** should appear **indistinguishable from random** (or simulatable).
- Honest clients assumed to know server public key.
- Applications in censorship circumvention:
 - obfs4 as a Tor pluggable transport
 - Traffic does not match any blocklists



- All **handshake traffic** should appear **indistinguishable from random** (or simulatable).
- Honest clients assumed to know server public key.
- Applications in censorship circumvention:
 - obfs4 as a Tor pluggable transport
 - Traffic does not match any blocklists

Existing KEM-based protocol requires **hybrid public key uniformity**



Drivel: A Hybrid Obfuscated Key Exchange Protocol

(O)KEM-based AKE

<u>Client</u>

<u>Server</u> sk_s pk_s
Drivel: A Hybrid Obfuscated Key Exchange Protocol

(O)KEM-based AKE

<u>Client</u>

(**sk**_e, **pk**_e) := KEM.Keygen()

<u>Server</u> sk_s pk_s

Ephemeral and static hybrid (O)KEM encapsulations



C₂

Drivel: A Hybrid Obfuscated Key Exchange Protocol

(O)KEM-based AKE

Client

(**sk**, **pk**) := KEM.Keygen()

 $(c_1, K_1) := OKEM.Encap(pk_s)$

c₁ pk_e V = OVEM Decen(ck c)

<u>Server</u> sk_s pk_s

K₂ := KEM.Decap(sk_e, c₂)

Ephemeral and static hybrid (O)KEM encapsulations

$$\mathbf{k}_1 := \text{OKEM:} \text{Decap}(\mathbf{SK}_{S_1}, \mathbf{C}_1)$$

 $(c_2, K_2) := KEM.Encap(pk_2)$

Drivel: A Hybrid Obfuscated Key Exchange Protocol

(O)KEM-based AKE

<u>Client</u>

(sk_e, pk_e) := KEM.Keygen()

(c1, K1) := OKEM.Encap(pks)

Ephemeral and static hybrid (O)KEM encapsulations

$$\mathbf{c_1} \ \mathbf{pk_e} \qquad \mathbf{K_1} := OKEM.Decap(\mathbf{sk_s}, \mathbf{c_1})$$

(c₂, K₂) := KEM.Encap(pk_e)

 $K_{2} := KEM.Decap(sk_{e}, c_{2})$ return H(K₁, K₂) return H(K₁, K₂)

Drivel: A Hybrid Obfuscated Key Exchange Protocol

(O)KEM-based AKE

<u>Client</u>

 $K_2 := KEM.Decap(sk_e, c_2)$ return $H(K_1, K_2)$ <u>Server</u> sk_s pk_s

hybrid (O)KEM encapsulations No public key uniformity necessary

Ephemeral and static

$$K_{1} := OKEM.Decap(sk_{s}, c_{1})$$
$$pk_{e} := SE.Dec_{K1}(epk_{e})$$
$$(c_{2}, K_{2}) := KEM.Encap(pk_{e})$$
$$ec_{2} := SE.Enc_{K1}(c_{2})$$

return $H(K_1, K_2)$

Overview

- Kemeleon Encoding
- ML-Kemeleon: Obfuscated PQ KEM
- OEINC: Obfuscated KEM Combiner
- Hybrid Applications:
 - Obfuscated Key Exchange
 - Password Authenticated Key Exchange (with adaptive security)

01 01 01 01 01 01 01 01 01 01 01 01 01 0	of the second se
---	--

Password authenticated key exchange (PAKE)

Password authenticated key exchange (PAKE)

- Parties w/ low-entropy password want to establish a highentropy shared secret:
 - Active adversary has 1 pw guess per protocol execution
 - Passive adversary has no advantage at all

Password authenticated key exchange (PAKE)

- Parties w/ low-entropy password want to establish a highentropy shared secret:
 - Active adversary has 1 pw guess per protocol execution
 - Passive adversary has no advantage at all

KEM-based PAKEs (NoIC, CHIC, EKE-PRF, CAKE, OCAKE, ...)

Password authenticated key exchange (PAKE)

- Parties w/ **low-entropy password** want to establish a **high**entropy shared secret:
 - Active adversary has 1 pw guess per protocol execution
 - Passive adversary has no advantage at all

KEM-based PAKEs (NoIC, CHIC, EKE-PRF, CAKE, OCAKE, ...)

- CAKE proven secure in the UC model with **adaptive corruptions** (adversaries can corrupt any user at any time)

$\mathbf{A}(sid, pw)$		$\mathbf{B}(sid, pw)$
$(pk, sk) \leftarrow s KGen()$		
$epk \leftarrow E^{sid \parallel 1}_{pw}(pk)$	$\stackrel{epk}{-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!$	$pk \leftarrow D_{pw}^{sid\parallel 1}(epk)$
		$(c,Z) \leftarrow $ s Encap (pk)
$c \leftarrow D_{pw}^{sid\parallel 2}(ec)$	\xleftarrow{ec}	$ec \leftarrow E^{sid\parallel 2}_{pw}(c)$
$Z \leftarrow Decap_{sk}(c)$		
$K \leftarrow H(sid, A, B, epk, ec, Z)$		$K \leftarrow H(sid, A, B, epk, ec, Z)$
return K		return K

CAKE

Password authenticated key exchange (PAKE)

- Parties w/ **low-entropy password** want to establish a **high**entropy shared secret:
 - Active adversary has 1 pw guess per protocol execution
 - Passive adversary has no advantage at all

KEM-based PAKEs (NoIC, CHIC, EKE-PRF, CAKE, OCAKE, ...)

- CAKE proven secure in the UC model with **adaptive corruptions** (adversaries can corrupt any user at any time)
- Needs ciphertext and **public key uniformity**

$\mathbf{A}(sid, pw)$		$\mathbf{B}(sid, pw)$
$(pk, sk) \leftarrow sKGen()$		
$epk \leftarrow E^{sid \parallel 1}_{pw}(pk)$	$\stackrel{epk}{-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!$	$pk \leftarrow D^{sid \parallel 1}_{pw}(epk)$
		$(c,Z) \leftarrow $ s Encap (pk)
$c \leftarrow D^{sid\parallel 2}_{pw}(ec)$	\xleftarrow{ec}	$ec \leftarrow E_{pw}^{sid\parallel 2}(c)$
$Z \leftarrow Decap_{sk}(c)$		
$K \leftarrow H(sid, A, B, epk, ec, Z)$		$K \leftarrow H(sid, A, B, epk, ec, Z)$
return K		return K
	~	

CAKE

Password authenticated key exchange (PAKE)

- Parties w/ **low-entropy password** want to establish a **high**entropy shared secret:
 - Active adversary has 1 pw guess per protocol execution
 - Passive adversary has no advantage at all

KEM-based PAKEs (NoIC, CHIC, EKE-PRF, CAKE, OCAKE, ...)

- CAKE proven secure in the UC model with **adaptive corruptions** (adversaries can corrupt any user at any time)
- Needs ciphertext and **public key uniformity**
 - LWE schemes only fail this bc of an optimization

$\mathbf{A}(sid, pw)$		$\mathbf{B}(sid, pw)$
$(pk, sk) \leftarrow *KGen()$		
$epk \leftarrow E^{sid \parallel 1}_{pw}(pk)$	$epk \longrightarrow$	$pk \leftarrow D_{pw}^{sid \parallel 1}(epk)$
		$(c,Z) \leftarrow $ Encap (pk)
$c \leftarrow D^{sid\parallel 2}_{pw}(ec)$	\xleftarrow{ec}	$ec \leftarrow E^{sid\parallel 2}_{pw}(c)$
$Z \leftarrow Decap_{sk}(c)$		
$K \leftarrow H(sid, A, B, epk, ec, Z)$		$K \leftarrow H(sid, A, B, epk, ec, Z)$
return K		return K
	01117	

CAKE

Password authenticated key exchange (PAKE)

- Parties w/ **low-entropy password** want to establish a **high- entropy shared secret**:
 - Active adversary has 1 pw guess per protocol execution
 - Passive adversary has no advantage at all

KEM-based PAKEs (NoIC, CHIC, EKE-PRF, CAKE, OCAKE, ...)

- CAKE proven secure in the UC model with **adaptive corruptions** (adversaries can corrupt any user at any time)
- Needs ciphertext and **public key uniformity**
 - LWE schemes only fail this bc of an optimization

$\mathbf{A}(sid, pw)$		$\mathbf{B}(sid, pw)$
$(pk, sk) \leftarrow sKGen()$		
$epk \leftarrow E^{sid\parallel 1}_{pw}(pk)$	$\stackrel{epk}{-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!$	$pk \leftarrow D_{pw}^{sid \parallel 1}(epk)$
		$(c,Z) \leftarrow $ s Encap (pk)
$c \leftarrow D^{sid\parallel 2}_{pw}(ec)$	\xleftarrow{ec}	$ec \leftarrow E^{sid\parallel 2}_{pw}(c)$
$Z \leftarrow Decap_{sk}(c)$		
$K \leftarrow H(\textit{sid}, A, B, \textit{epk}, \textit{ec}, Z)$		$K \leftarrow H(sid, A, B, epk, ec, Z)$
return K		return K

CAKE

We can instantiate CAKE with OEINC[DHKEM+Elligator, StatFrodoKEM]

Password authenticated key exchange (PAKE)

- Parties w/ **low-entropy password** want to establish a **high- entropy shared secret**:
 - Active adversary has 1 pw guess per protocol execution
 - Passive adversary has no advantage at all

KEM-based PAKEs (NoIC, CHIC, EKE-PRF, CAKE, OCAKE, ...)

- CAKE proven secure in the UC model with **adaptive corruptions** (adversaries can corrupt any user at any time)
- Needs ciphertext and **public key uniformity**
 - LWE schemes only fail this bc of an optimization
- First hybrid PAKE with security against adaptive corruptions

$\mathbf{A}(sid, pw)$		$\mathbf{B}(sid, pw)$
$(pk, sk) \leftarrow *KGen()$		
$epk \leftarrow E^{sid \parallel 1}_{pw}(pk)$	$\stackrel{epk}{-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!$	$pk \leftarrow D_{pw}^{sid\parallel 1}(epk)$
		$(c,Z) \leftarrow $ s Encap (pk)
$c \leftarrow D^{sid \parallel 2}_{pw}(ec)$	$\stackrel{ec}{\longleftarrow}$	$ec \leftarrow E^{sid\parallel 2}_{pw}(c)$
$Z \gets Decap_{sk}(c)$		
$K \leftarrow H(\textit{sid}, A, B, \textit{epk}, \textit{ec}, Z)$		$K \leftarrow H(sid, A, B, epk, ec, Z)$
return K		return K

CAKE

We can instantiate CAKE with OEINC[DHKEM+Elligator, StatFrodoKEM]

Password authenticated key exchange (PAKE)

- Parties w/ **low-entropy password** want to establish a **high- entropy shared secret**:
 - Active adversary has 1 pw guess per protocol execution
 - Passive adversary has no advantage at all

KEM-based PAKEs (NoIC, CHIC, EKE-PRF, CAKE, OCAKE, ...)

- CAKE proven secure in the UC model with **adaptive corruptions** (adversaries can corrupt any user at any time)
- Needs ciphertext and **public key uniformity**
 - LWE schemes only fail this bc of an optimization
- First hybrid PAKE with security against adaptive corruptions

$\mathbf{A}(sid, pw)$		$\mathbf{B}(sid, pw)$
$(pk, sk) \leftarrow *KGen()$		
$epk \leftarrow E^{sid\parallel 1}_{pw}(pk)$	$\stackrel{epk}{-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!$	$pk \leftarrow D_{pw}^{sid\parallel 1}(epk)$
		$(c,Z) \leftarrow $ s Encap (pk)
$c \leftarrow D^{sid\parallel 2}_{pw}(ec)$	\xleftarrow{ec}	$ec \leftarrow E^{sid\parallel 2}_{pw}(c)$
$Z \leftarrow Decap_{sk}(c)$		
$K \leftarrow H(\textit{sid}, A, B, \textit{epk}, \textit{ec}, Z)$		$K \leftarrow H(sid, A, B, epk, ec, Z)$
return K		return K

CAKE

We can instantiate CAKE with OEINC[DHKEM+Elligator, StatFrodoKEM]

This is **2 rounds**. Other PAKEs are 3 rounds or inefficient (350x slowdown).

Password authenticated key exchange (PAKE)

- Parties w/ **low-entropy password** want to establish a **high- entropy shared secret**:
 - Active adversary has 1 pw guess per protocol execution
 - Passive adversary has no advantage at all

KEM-based PAKEs (NoIC, CHIC, EKE-PRF, CAKE, OCAKE, ...)

- CAKE proven secure in the UC model with **adaptive corruptions** (adversaries can corrupt any user at any time)
- Needs ciphertext and **public key uniformity**
 - LWE schemes only fail this bc of an optimization
- First hybrid PAKE with security against adaptive corruptions

1	$\mathbf{A}(sid, pw)$		$\mathbf{B}(sid, pw)$
	$(pk, sk) \leftarrow *KGen()$		
_	$epk \leftarrow E^{sid\parallel 1}_{pw}(pk)$	$\stackrel{epk}{-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!\!\!-\!$	$pk \leftarrow D_{pw}^{sid\parallel 1}(epk)$
			$(c,Z) \leftarrow s Encap(pk)$
	$c \leftarrow D_{pw}^{sid\parallel 2}(ec)$	\xleftarrow{ec}	$ec \leftarrow E^{sid\parallel 2}_{pw}(c)$
	$Z \leftarrow Decap_{sk}(c)$		
	$K \leftarrow H(sid, A, B, epk, ec, Z)$		$K \leftarrow H(\textit{sid}, A, B, \textit{epk}, \textit{ec}, Z)$
	return K		return K

CAKE

We can instantiate CAKE with OEINC[DHKEM+Elligator, StatFrodoKEM]

This is **2 rounds**. Other PAKEs are 3 rounds or inefficient (350x slowdown).

7.5x comms overhead compared to 3-round PAKEs

Thanks! Questions?

Kemeleon: Elligator-like Obfuscation for Post-Quantum Cryptography

We made:

- an encoding for ML-KEM
- an OKEM from ML-KEM
- an OKEM combiner

We got:

- Hybrid obfuscated key exchange
- Hybrid PAKE

References:

- Günther, Stebila, Veitch. Obfuscated Key Exchange. CCS 2024. ia.cr/2024/1086
- Günther, Stebila, Veitch. Kemeleon Encodings.
 Internet-Draft. https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/ draft-veitch-kemeleon/ <— send us your feedback!
- Günther, Rosenberg, Stebila, Veitch. Hybrid Obfuscated KEMs and Key Exchange. ia.cr/2025/408