Secret Key Systems (block encoding)

Encrypting a small block of text (say 64 bits) General Considerations:

Encrypting a small block of text (say 64 bits)

General Considerations:

1. Encrypted data should look random.

As though someone flipped a fair coin 64 times and heads means 1 and tails 0.

Any change in one bit of output corresponds to a huge change in the input (bits are uncorrelated).

Should be about as many 1's as 0's usually.

Encrypting a small block of text (say 64 bits)

General Considerations:

1. Encrypted data should look random.

As though someone flipped a fair coin 64 times and heads means 1 and tails 0.

Any change in one bit of output corresponds to a huge change in the input (bits are uncorrelated).

Should be about as many 1's as 0's usually.

2. Crypto algorithms try to spread the influence of each input bit to all output bits and change in one input bit should have 50% chance of changing any of the output bits (hence many rounds).

Encrypting a small block of text (say 64 bits)

General Considerations:

1. Encrypted data should look random.

As though someone flipped a fair coin 64 times and heads means 1 and tails 0.

Any change in one bit of output corresponds to a huge change in the input (bits are uncorrelated).

Should be about as many 1's as 0's usually.

- 2. Crypto algorithms try to spread the influence of each input bit to all output bits and change in one input bit should have 50% chance of changing any of the output bits (hence many rounds).
- 3. Operations should be invertable hence *xor* and table lookup. Use of one key for both encryption and decryption.

Encrypting a small block of text (say 64 bits)

General Considerations:

1. Encrypted data should look random.

As though someone flipped a fair coin 64 times and heads means 1 and tails 0.

Any change in one bit of output corresponds to a huge change in the input (bits are uncorrelated).

Should be about as many 1's as 0's usually.

- 2. Crypto algorithms try to spread the influence of each input bit to all output bits and change in one input bit should have 50% chance of changing any of the output bits (hence many rounds).
- 3. Operations should be invertable hence xor and table lookup. Use of one key for both encryption and decryption.
- 4. Attacks may be mitigated if they rely on operations that are not efficiently implemented in hardware yet allow normal operation to complete efficiently, even in software (e.g. permute)

IBM/NSA 1977 - 64 bit blocks, 56 bit key, 8 bits parity



IBM/NSA 1977 - 64 bit blocks, 56 bit key, 8 bits parity



Generating per round keys $K_1 K_2 \dots K_{16}$ from the 56 bit Key + 8 parity bits

Key bits:

1

8	916	1724	2532	3340	4148	4956	5764
---	-----	------	------	------	------	------	------

Generating per round keys $K_1 K_2 \dots K_{16}$ from the 56 bit Key + 8 parity bits

Key bits:		18		9	16	1′	72	4	25	532	2	33	40)	41.	48		49.	56	5	57	64	
C_0 :																							
57 49 41	33 25	17	9	1	58 50) 42	34	26	18	10	2	59	51	43	35	27	19	11	3	60	52	44	36
D_0 :																							
63 55 47	<mark>39 3</mark> 1	23	15	7	62 54	46	38	30	22	14	6	61	53	45	37	29	21	13	5	28	8 20	12	4

Generating per round keys $K_1 K_2 \dots K_{16}$ from the 56 bit Key + 8 parity bits



Each round: K_i has 48 bits assembled in 2 halves permuted from 24 bits each of C_i and D_i , K_{i+1} is obtained by rotating C_i and D_i left to form C_{i+1} and D_{i+1} (rotation is 1 bit for rounds 1,2,9,16 and 2 bits for other rounds)

Generating per round keys $K_1 K_2 \dots K_{16}$ from the 56 bit Key + 8 parity bits

Key bits:		18	3	9	91	6	1′	72	24	2:	53	2	33	540	0	41	48	3	49.	56	5	57	64	
C_0 :																								
57 49 41 3	33 25	17	9	1	58	50	42	34	26	18	10	2	59	51	43	35	27	19	11	3	60	52	44	36
D_0 :																								
63 55 47 3	39 31	23	15	7	62	54	46	38	30	22	14	6	61	53	45	37	29	21	13	5	28	3 20) 12	4

Each round: K_i has 48 bits assembled in 2 halves permuted from 24 bits each of C_i and D_i , K_{i+1} is obtained by rotating C_i and D_i left to form C_{i+1} and D_{i+1} (rotation is 1 bit for rounds 1,2,9,16 and 2 bits for other rounds)

Permutations:

Left half C_i : (9,18,22,25 are missing)

14 17 11 24 1 5 3 28 15 6 21 10 23 19 12 4 26 8 16 7 27 20 13 2 Right half D_i : (35,38,43,54 are missing)

41 52 31 37 47 55 30 40 51 45 33 48 44 49 39 56 34 53 46 42 50 36 29 32

The Mangler function: mixes 32 bit input with 48 bit key to produce 32 bits



The Mangler function: mixes 32 bit input with 48 bit key to produce 32 bits

1. Expansion of input bits:

32 bit R_i Mangler Function 32 bit R_{i+1}

4 bits4 bits4 bits4 bits4 bits4 bits

The Mangler function: mixes 32 bit input with 48 bit key to produce 32 bits

1. Expansion of input bits:

32 bit R_i



The Mangler function: mixes 32 bit input with 48 bit key to produce 32 bits

1. Expansion of input bits:

32 bit R_i



The Mangler function: mixes 32 bit input with 48 bit key to produce 32 bits

1. Expansion of input bits:

32 bit R_i



The Mangler function: mixes 32 bit input with 48 bit key to produce 32 bits

1. Expansion of input bits:

32 bit $R_{\rm c}$



The *S* Box: maps 6 bit blocks to 4 bit sections $S Box_1$ (first 6 bits):

Input bits 2,3,4,5

0000
0001
0010
0011
0100
0111
1000
1001
1011
1100
1101
1111

00
1110
0100
1101
0101
1111
1000
0011
1010
1101
1101
1111
1111

00
1110
0100
1101
0101
1111
1010
0011
1000
0101
1000
0111

01
0000
1111
0101
1000
0111
1000
0101
1000
0111

01
0000
1111
0110
0010
1101
0001
1010
0110
1001
0000
0111

01
0000
1101
0110
0001
1011
1111
1001
1011
0011
1001
1011
1001
1011
1001
1011
1010
1011
1010
1011
1010
1011
1010
1011
1011
1011
1011
1011
1011
10

Input bits 1 and 6

Final permutation:

 $16\ 7\ 20\ 21\ 29\ 12\ 28\ 17\ 1\ 15\ 23\ 26\ 5\ 18\ 31\ 10\ 2\ 8\ 24\ 14\ 32\ 27\ 3\ 9\ 19\ 13\ 30\ 6\ 22\ 11\ 4\ 25$

Weak and semi-weak keys:

If key is such that C_0 or D_0 are: 1) all 0s; 2) all 1s;

3) alternating 1s and 0s, then attack is easy. There are 16 such keys. Keys for which C_0 and D_0 are both 0 or both 1 are called *weak* (encrypting with key gives same

result as decrypting).

Weak and semi-weak keys:

If key is such that C_0 or D_0 are: 1) all 0s; 2) all 1s;

3) alternating 1s and 0s, then attack is easy. There are 16 such keys. Keys for which C_0 and D_0 are both 0 or both 1 are called *weak* (encrypting with key gives same result as decrypting).

Discussion:

- 1. Not much known about the design not made public Probably attempt to prevent known attacks
- 2. Changing S-Boxes has resulted in provably weaker system

Two keys K_1 and K_2 :



Two keys K_1 and K_2 :



Why not 2DES

1. Double encryption with the same key still requires searching 2^{56} keys

Two keys K_1 and K_2 :



- 1. Double encryption with the same key still requires searching 2^{56} keys
- 2. Double encryption with two different keys is just as vulnerable as DES due to the following, assuming some $\langle m, c \rangle$ pairs are known:

Two keys K_1 and K_2 :



- 1. Double encryption with the same key still requires searching 2^{56} keys
- 2. Double encryption with two different keys is just as vulnerable as DES due to the following, assuming some $\langle m, c \rangle$ pairs are known:

$$2^{56} \begin{cases} m: K_{I} \mid E(K_{I},m) \\ 101010 \mid 1000011 \\ \dots & \dots \\ 100010 \mid 0101111 \\ 001011 \mid 0001101 \end{cases}$$

Two keys K_1 and K_2 :



- 1. Double encryption with the same key still requires searching 2^{56} keys
- 2. Double encryption with two different keys is just as vulnerable as DES due to the following, assuming some $\langle m, c \rangle$ pairs are known:

$$2^{56} \begin{cases} m: K_{1} \mid E(K_{1},m) \\ 101010 \mid 1000011 \\ \dots & \dots \\ 100010 \mid 0101111 \\ 0001101 \mid 0001101 \end{cases} 2^{56} \begin{cases} c: K_{2} \mid D(K_{2},c) \\ 101110 \mid 0001101 \\ \dots & \dots \\ 001110 \mid 0001101 \\ 001011 \mid 0001101 \end{cases}$$

Two keys K_1 and K_2 :



- 1. Double encryption with the same key still requires searching 2^{56} keys
- 2. Double encryption with two different keys is just as vulnerable as DES due to the following, assuming some $\langle m, c \rangle$ pairs are known:

$$2^{56} \begin{cases} m: K_{1} \mid E(K_{1},m) \\ 101010 \mid 1000011 \\ \dots & \dots \\ 100010 \mid 0101111 \\ 0001101 \mid 0001101 \end{cases} 2^{56} \begin{cases} c: K_{2} \mid D(K_{2},c) \\ 101110 \mid 0001101 \\ \dots & \dots \\ 001110 \mid 0001101 \\ 001011 \mid 0001101 \end{cases}$$

Two keys K_1 and K_2 :



Why not 2DES

- 1. Double encryption with the same key still requires searching 2^{56} keys
- 2. Double encryption with two different keys is just as vulnerable as DES due to the following, assuming some $\langle m, c \rangle$ pairs are known:

$$2^{56} \begin{cases} m: K_{1} \mid E(K_{1,}m) \\ 101010 \mid 1000011 \\ \dots & \dots \\ 100010 \mid 01011111 \\ 0001101 \mid 0001101 \end{cases} 2^{56} \begin{cases} c: K_{2} \mid D(K_{2,}c) \\ 101110 \mid 0001101 \\ \dots & \dots \\ 001110 \mid 1000011 \\ 001011 \mid 0001101 \end{cases}$$

Test matches on other *<m,c>* pairs

$$m \succ \mathrm{E}(K_1, m)$$
$$\mathrm{D}(K_2, c) \blacktriangleleft c$$

Why not 2DES

2. Double encryption with two different keys is just as vulnerable as DES due to the following, assuming some <*m*,*c*> pairs are known: How many <*m*,*c*> pairs do you need?

 2^{64} possible blocks 2^{56} table entries each block has probability $2^{-8} = 1/256$ of showing in a table probability a block is in both tables is 2^{-16} average number of matches is 2^{48} average number of matches for two < m, c > pairs is about 2^{32} for three < m, c > pairs is about 2^{16} for four < m, c > pairs is about 2^{0}

- 3. Triple encryption with two different keys
 - 112 bits of key is considered enough
 - straightforward to find a triple of keys that maps a given plaintext to a given ciphertext (no known attack with 2 keys)
 - EDE: use same keys to get DES, EEE: effect of permutations lost

CBC with 3DES:



inside

CBC with 3DES:

- 1. On the outside same attack as with CBC change a block with side effect of garbling another
- 2. On the inside attempt at changing a block results in all block garbled to the end of the message.
- 3. On the inside use three times as much hardware to pipeline encryptions resulting in DES speeds.
- 4. On the outside EDE simply is a drop-in replacement for what might have been there before.

ETH Zuria 1991 - 64 bit blocks, 128 bit key, 0 bits parity:



ETH Zuria 1991 - 64 bit blocks, 128 bit key, 0 bits parity:



Key generation 52 16 bit keys needed (2 per even round 4 per odd):



Key generation 52 16 bit keys needed (2 per even round 4 per odd):





25 bits

NIST (2001) parameterized key size (128 bits to 256 bits)



1. Byte Substitution via S-box - the transformation is invertable



1. Byte Substitution via S-box - the transformation is invertable



A byte as a polynomial: $b_7 x^7 + b_6 x^6 + b_5 x^5 + b_4 x^4 + b_3 x^3 + b_2 x^2 + b_1 x^1 + b_0$, $b_i \in \{0,1\}$

1. Byte Substitution via S-box - the transformation is invertable



A byte as a polynomial: $b_7 x^7 + b_6 x^6 + b_5 x^5 + b_4 x^4 + b_3 x^3 + b_2 x^2 + b_1 x^1 + b_0$, $b_i \in \{0,1\}$ Addition: $(x^6 + x^4 + x^2 + x^1 + 1) + (x^7 + x^1 + 1) = x^7 + x^6 + x^4 + x^2$ (exclusive or)

1. Byte Substitution via S-box - the transformation is invertable



A byte as a polynomial: $b_7 x^7 + b_6 x^6 + b_5 x^5 + b_4 x^4 + b_3 x^3 + b_2 x^2 + b_1 x^1 + b_0$, $b_i \in \{0,1\}$ Addition: $(x^6 + x^4 + x^2 + x^1 + 1) + (x^7 + x^1 + 1) = x^7 + x^6 + x^4 + x^2$ (exclusive or) Multiplication: $(x^6 + x^4 + x^2 + x^1 + 1)*(x^7 + x^1 + 1) = x^{13} + x^{11} + x^9 + x^8 + x^6 + x^5 + x^4 + x^3 + x^1 + 1$

1. Byte Substitution via S-box - the transformation is invertable



A byte as a polynomial: $b_7x^7 + b_6x^6 + b_5x^5 + b_4x^4 + b_3x^3 + b_2x^2 + b_1x^1 + b_0$, $b_i \in \{0,1\}$ Addition: $(x^6 + x^4 + x^2 + x^1 + 1) + (x^7 + x^1 + 1) = x^7 + x^6 + x^4 + x^2$ (exclusive or) Multiplication: $(x^6 + x^4 + x^2 + x^1 + 1)^*(x^7 + x^1 + 1) = x^{13} + x^{11} + x^9 + x^8 + x^6 + x^5 + x^4 + x^3 + x^1 + 1$ Irreducible polynomial: $m(x) = x^8 + x^4 + x^3 + x^1 + 1$

1. Byte Substitution via S-box - the transformation is invertable



A byte as a polynomial: $b_7 x^7 + b_6 x^6 + b_5 x^5 + b_4 x^4 + b_3 x^3 + b_2 x^2 + b_1 x^1 + b_0$, $b_i \in \{0,1\}$ Addition: $(x^6 + x^4 + x^2 + x^1 + 1) + (x^7 + x^1 + 1) = x^7 + x^6 + x^4 + x^2$ (exclusive or) Multiplication: $(x^6 + x^4 + x^2 + x^1 + 1)^* (x^7 + x^1 + 1) = x^{13} + x^{11} + x^9 + x^8 + x^6 + x^5 + x^4 + x^3 + x^1 + 1$ Irreducible polynomial: $m(x) = x^8 + x^4 + x^3 + x^1 + 1$ Multiplication mod m(x): $(x^6 + x^4 + x^2 + x^1 + 1)^* (x^7 + x^1 + 1) \mod m(x) = x^7 + x^6 + 1$

1. Byte Substitution via S-box - the transformation is invertable



A byte as a polynomial: $b_7x^7 + b_6x^6 + b_5x^5 + b_4x^4 + b_3x^3 + b_2x^2 + b_1x^1 + b_0$, $b_i \in \{0,1\}$ Addition: $(x^6 + x^4 + x^2 + x^1 + 1) + (x^7 + x^1 + 1) = x^7 + x^6 + x^4 + x^2$ (exclusive or) Multiplication: $(x^6 + x^4 + x^2 + x^1 + 1)^*(x^7 + x^1 + 1) = x^{13} + x^{11} + x^9 + x^8 + x^6 + x^5 + x^4 + x^3 + x^1 + 1)$ Irreducible polynomial: $m(x) = x^8 + x^4 + x^3 + x^1 + 1$ Multiplication mod m(x): $(x^6 + x^4 + x^2 + x^1 + 1)^*(x^7 + x^1 + 1) \mod m(x) = x^7 + x^6 + 1$ Use Euclid's algorithm to compute, for any b(x): $b(x)^*a(x) + c(x)^*m(x) = 1$

That is, b(x) and a(x) are inverses modulo m(x): $b^{-1}(x) = a(x) \mod m(x)$ This defines the S-box.

2. Row shift (cycle, left)



N _b Row	1	2	3
4	1	2	3
6	1	2	3
8	1	3	4

3. Mixed Column Transformation – constants are 8 bits now



Let $e(x) = e_3 x^3 + e_2 x^2 + e_1 x^1 + e_0$, where $e_3 = 0x03$, $e_2 = e_1 = 0x01$, $e_0 = 0x02$ Then $c(x) = e(x)*b(x) \mod x^4 + 1$, multiplication obtained via E*b

4. Round Key Addition (that is, exclusive or)



Number of round key bits = blck_lngth*(rnds+1) (e.g. 128bit, 10rnds = 1408) Taken from expansion of cipher key Let's forget about the expansion right now

Key Schedule example for $N_{h}=6$



Notes:

- 1. Many operations are table look ups so they are fast
- 2. Parallelism can be exploited
- 3. Key expansion only needs to be done one time until the key is changed
- 4. The S-box minimizes the correlation between input and output bits

Number of rounds

N _k N _b	4	6	8
4	10	12	14
6	12	12	14
8	14	14	14