Stream ciphers

The One Time Pad

Symmetric Ciphers: definition

Def: a **cipher** defined over $(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{C})$

is a pair of "efficient" algs $(\boldsymbol{E}, \boldsymbol{D})$ where

$E: \mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$, $D: \mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$

s.t. $\forall m \in \mathcal{M}, k \in \mathcal{K}: \; D(k, E(k, m)) = m$

- ***E*** is often randomized. ***D*** is always deterministic.

The One Time Pad (Vernam 1917)

First example of a “secure” cipher

$M = C = \{0,1\}^n$, $\mathcal{K} = \{0,1\}^n$

key = (random bit string as long the message)

The One Time Pad (Vernam 1917)

$C := E(k,m) = k \oplus m$

$D(k,c) = k \oplus c$

msg: 0 1 1 0 1 1 1

key: 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 $\oplus$

CT:

Indeed:

$D(k, E(k,m)) = D(k, k \oplus m) = k \oplus (k \oplus m) = (k \oplus k) \oplus m = 0 \oplus m = m$

You are given a message (m) and its OTP encryption (c).

Can you compute the OTP key from m and c ?

No, I cannot compute the key.

Yes, the key is $k = m \oplus c$. 

I can only compute half the bits of the key.

Yes, the key is $k = m \oplus m$.

The One Time Pad (Vernam 1917)

Very fast enc/dec !!

… but long keys (as long as plaintext)

Is the OTP secure? What is a secure cipher?

What is a secure cipher?

Attacker's abilities: **CT only attack** (for now)

Possible security requirements:

attempt #1: **attacker cannot recover secret key**

$E(k, m) = m$ would be secure

attempt #2: **attacker cannot recover all of plaintext**

$E(k, m_0 \| m_1) = m_0 \| k \oplus m_1$ would be secure

Shannon's idea:

CT should reveal no "info" about PT

Information Theoretic Security

(Shannon 1949)

Def: A cipher (E, D) over $(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{C})$ has **perfect secrecy** if

$\forall m_0, m_1 \in \mathcal{M} \quad (\text{len}(m_0) = \text{len}(m_1)) \quad \text{and} \quad \forall c \in \mathcal{C}$

$$\Pr[E(k, m_0) = c] = \Pr[E(k, m_1) = c]$$

where k is uniform in $\mathcal{K}$ $\quad (k \xleftarrow{R} \mathcal{K})$

Information Theoretic Security

Def: A cipher ***(E,D)*** over (K,M,C) has **perfect secrecy** if

$\forall m_0, m_1 \in M \quad (|m_0| = |m_1|) \quad \text{and} \quad \forall c \in C$

$$\boldsymbol{Pr[E(k,m_0)=c] = Pr[E(k,m_1)=c]} \quad \text{where } k \xleftarrow{R} K$$

$\Rightarrow$ Given CT can't tell if msg is m_0 or m_1 (for all m_0, m_1)

$\Rightarrow$ most powerful adv. learns nothing about PT from CT

$\Rightarrow$ no CT only attack!! (but other attacks possible)

Lemma: OTP has perfect secrecy.

Proof:

$$\forall m, c: \quad \Pr_{k}\left[E(k,m)=c\right] = \frac{\#\text{keys } k \in \mathcal{K} \text{ s.t. } E(k,m)=c}{|\mathcal{K}|}$$

So: if $\forall m, c: \#\{k \in \mathcal{K} : E(k,m)=c\} = \text{const.}$

$\Rightarrow$ cipher has perfect secrecy

Let $m \in \mathcal{M}$ and $c \in \mathcal{C}$.

How many OTP keys map $\boldsymbol{m}$ to $\boldsymbol{c}$?

None

1 

2

Depends on $\boldsymbol{m}$

Lemma: OTP has perfect secrecy.

Proof:

For OTP: $\forall m, c$: if $E(k,m)=c$

$\Rightarrow k \oplus m = c \Rightarrow k = m \oplus c$

$\Rightarrow \boxed{\#\{k \in \mathcal{K} : E(k,m)=c\} = 1}$

$\Rightarrow$ OTP has perfect secrecy ∎

The bad news …

Thm: perfect secrecy $\Rightarrow$ $|\mathcal{K}| \geq |\mathcal{M}|$

i.e. perfect secrecy $\Rightarrow$ key-len $\geq$ msg-len

$\Longrightarrow$ hard to use in practice !!

End of Segment

Stream ciphers

Pseudorandom Generators

Review

Cipher over (K,M,C): a pair of "efficient" algs (***E***, ***D***) s.t.

$\forall\, m \in M,\ k \in K$: $\boldsymbol{D}(k, \boldsymbol{E}(k, m)) = m$

Weak ciphers: subs. cipher, Vigener, …

A good cipher: **OTP** $M=C=K=\{0,1\}^n$

$E(k, m) = k \oplus m$, $D(k, c) = k \oplus c$

<u>Lemma</u>: OTP has perfect secrecy (i.e. no CT only attacks)

Bad news: perfect-secrecy ⇒ key-len ≥ msg-len

Stream Ciphers: making OTP practical

idea: replace "random" key by "pseudorandom" key

PRG is a function $G: \{0,1\}^s \rightarrow \{0,1\}^n$ $\quad n \gg s$

seed space

(eff. computable by a deterministic algorithm)

Stream Ciphers: making OTP practical

$C := E(k,m) = m \oplus G(k)$

$D(k,c) = c \oplus G(k)$



Can a stream cipher have perfect secrecy?

- Yes, if the PRG is really “secure”
- No, there are no ciphers with perfect secrecy
- Yes, every cipher has perfect secrecy
- No, since the key is shorter than the message

Stream Ciphers: making OTP practical

Stream ciphers cannot have perfect secrecy !!

- Need a different definition of security
- Security will depend on specific PRG

PRG must be unpredictable

Suppose PRG is predictable:

$\exists i$: $G(k)|_{1,\ldots,i} \xrightarrow{\text{alg}} G(k)|_{i+1,\ldots,n}$

Then:



even $G(k)|_{1,\ldots,i} \rightarrow G(k)|_{i+1}$ is a problem!

PRG must be unpredictable

We say that $G: K \longrightarrow \{0,1\}^n$ is **predictable** if:

$\exists$ "eff" alg. A and $\exists\, 0 \le i \le n-1$ s.t.

$$\Pr_{k \xleftarrow{R} K}\left[A(G(k))\big|_{1,\ldots,i} = G(k)\big|_{i+1} \right] > \frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon$$

For non-negligible ε (e.g. $\varepsilon = 1/2^{30}$)

Def: PRG is **unpredictable** if it is not predictable

$\Rightarrow$ $\forall i$: no "eff" adv. can predict bit (i+1) for "non-neg" ε

Suppose $G:K \longrightarrow \{0,1\}^n$ is such that for all k: **XOR(G(k)) = 1**

Is G predictable ??

Yes, given the first bit I can predict the second

No, G is unpredictable

Yes, given the first (n-1) bits I can predict the n'th bit 

It depends

Weak PRGs (do not use for crypto)

Lin. Cong. generator with parameters a, b, p:



glibc random():

$r[i] \leftarrow (r[i-3] + r[i-31]) \ \% \ 2^{32}$

output $r[i] >> 1$

never use random() for crypto !!

(e.g. Kerberos V4)

End of Segment

Stream ciphers

Negligible vs. non-negligible

Negligible and non-negligible

- In practice: ε is a scalar and
  - ε non-neg: $\varepsilon \geq 1/2^{30}$ (likely to happen over 1GB of data)
  - ε negligible: $\varepsilon \leq 1/2^{80}$ (won't happen over life of key)

- In theory: ε is a function $\varepsilon: Z^{\geq 0} \longrightarrow R^{\geq 0}$ and
  - ε non-neg: $\exists d: \varepsilon(\lambda) \geq 1/\lambda^d$ inf. often ($\varepsilon \geq$ 1/poly, for many λ)
  - ε negligible: $\forall d, \lambda \geq \lambda_d: \varepsilon(\lambda) \leq 1/\lambda^d$ ($\varepsilon \leq$ 1/poly, for large λ)

Few Examples

$\varepsilon(\lambda) = 1/2^{\lambda}$: negligible

$\varepsilon(\lambda) = 1/\lambda^{1000}$: non-negligible

$$\varepsilon(\lambda) = \begin{cases} 1/2^{\lambda} & \text{for odd } \lambda \\ 1/\lambda^{1000} & \text{for even } \lambda \end{cases}$$

Negligible

Non-negligible 

PRGs: the rigorous theory view

PRGs are "parameterized" by a security parameter λ

- **PRG** becomes "more secure" as λ increases

Seed lengths and output lengths grow with λ

For every $\lambda=1,2,3,\ldots$ there is a different PRG G_λ:

$$G_\lambda : K_\lambda \longrightarrow \{0,1\}^{n(\lambda)}$$

(in the lectures we will always ignore λ)

An example asymptotic definition

We say that $G_\lambda : K_\lambda \longrightarrow \{0,1\}^{n(\lambda)}$ is **predictable** at position i if:

there exists a polynomial time (in λ) algorithm A s.t.

$$\Pr_{k \leftarrow K_\lambda}\left[A\left(\lambda,\ G_\lambda(k)\big|_{1,\ldots,i}\right) = G_\lambda(k)\big|_{i+1} \right] > 1/2 + \varepsilon(\lambda)$$

for some non-negligible function $\varepsilon(\lambda)$

End of Segment

Stream ciphers

Attacks on OTP and stream ciphers

Review

OTP: $E(k,m) = m \oplus k$, $D(k,c) = c \oplus k$

Making OTP practical using a PRG: $G: K \longrightarrow \{0,1\}^n$

Stream cipher: $E(k,m) = m \oplus G(k)$, $D(k,c) = c \oplus G(k)$

Security: PRG must be unpredictable (better def in two segments)

Attack 1: **two time** pad is insecure !!

Never use stream cipher key more than once !!

$C_1 \leftarrow m_1 \oplus PRG(k)$

$C_2 \leftarrow m_2 \oplus PRG(k)$

Eavesdropper does:

$C_1 \oplus C_2 \rightarrow$ 

Enough redundancy in English and ASCII encoding that:

$m_1 \oplus m_2 \rightarrow m_1 , m_2$

Real world examples

- Project Venona

- MS-PPTP (windows NT):



Need different keys for C⟶S and S⟶C

Real world examples

802.11b WEP:



Length of IV: 24 bits

- Repeated IV after $2^{24} \approx 16M$ frames
- On some 802.11 cards: IV resets to 0 after power cycle

Avoid related keys

802.11b WEP:



key for frame #1: (1 ll k)

key for frame #2: (2 ll k)

⋮

24 bits

1024 bits

For the RC4 PRG:

FMS2001 ⇒ can recover k after 10^6 frames

Recent attacks ≈ 40,000 frames

A better construction



⇒ now each frame has a pseudorandom key

better solution: use stronger encryption method (as in WPA2)

Yet another example: disk encryption



Two time pad: summary

Never use stream cipher key more than once !!

- Network traffic: negotiate new key for every session (e.g. TLS)
- Disk encryption: typically do not use a stream cipher

Attack 2: no integrity (OTP is malleable)



Modifications to ciphertext are undetected and have **predictable** impact on plaintext

Attack 2: no integrity (OTP is malleable)



Modifications to ciphertext are undetected and have predictable impact on plaintext

End of Segment

Stream ciphers

Real-world Stream Ciphers

Old example (software): RC4 (1987)



- Used in HTTPS and WEP
- Weaknesses:
  1. Bias in initial output: $\Pr[\ 2^{nd} \text{ byte} = 0\ ] = 2/256$
  2. Prob. of (0,0) is $1/256^2 + 1/256^3$
  3. Related key attacks

Old example (hardware): CSS (badly broken)

Linear feedback shift register (LFSR):



DVD encryption (CSS): 2 LFSRs

GSM encryption (A5/1,2): 3 LFSRs

Bluetooth (E0): 4 LFSRs

} all broken

Old example (hardware): CSS (badly broken)

CSS: seed = 5 bytes = 40 bits



Easy to break in time $\simeq 2^{17}$

Cryptanalysis of CSS (2^{17} time attack)





For all possible initial settings of 17-bit LFSR do:

- Run 17-bit LFSR to get 20 bytes of output
- Subtract from CSS prefix ⇒ candidate 20 bytes output of 25-bit LFSR
- If consistent with 25-bit LFSR, found correct initial settings of both !!

Using key, generate entire CSS output

Modern stream ciphers: eStream

PRG: $\{0,1\}^s \times R \longrightarrow \{0,1\}^n$

seed

nonce

Nonce: a non-repeating value for a given key.

$$E(k, m ; r) = m \oplus PRG(k ; r)$$

The pair (k,r) is never used more than once.

eStream: Salsa 20 (SW+HW)

Salsa20: $\{0,1\}^{128 \text{ or } 256} \times \{0,1\}^{64} \longrightarrow \{0,1\}^{n}$ (max $n = 2^{73}$ bits)

nonce

Salsa20(k ; r) := H(k , (r, 0)) ll H(k , (r, 1)) ll …



h: invertible function. designed to be fast on x86 (SSE2)

Is Salsa20 secure (unpredictable) ?

- Unknown: no known **provably** secure PRGs

- In reality: no known attacks better than exhaustive search

Performance:

Crypto++ 5.6.0 [Wei Dai]

AMD Opteron, 2.2 GHz (Linux)

	PRG	Speed (MB/sec)
	RC4	126
eStream	Salsa20/12	643
eStream	Sosemanuk	727

Generating Randomness (e.g. keys, IV)



Pseudo random generators in practice: (e.g. /dev/random)

- Continuously add entropy to internal state
- Entropy sources:
  - Hardware RNG: Intel **RdRand** inst. (Ivy Bridge). 3Gb/sec.
  - Timing: hardware interrupts (keyboard, mouse)

NIST SP 800-90: NIST approved generators

End of Segment

Stream ciphers

PRG Security Defs

Let $G: K \longrightarrow \{0,1\}^n$ be a PRG

Goal: define what it means that

$[k \xleftarrow{R} K,\ \text{output } G(k)]$

is "indistinguishable" from

$[r \xleftarrow{R} \{0,1\}^n,\ \text{output } r]$

Statistical Tests

Statistical test on $\{0,1\}^n$:

not random — random

an alg. A s.t. A(x) outputs "0" or "1"

Examples:

(1) $A(x)=1$ iff $\left| \#0(x) - \#1(x) \right| \leq 10 \cdot \sqrt{n}$

(2) $A(x)=1$ iff $\left| \#00(x) - \frac{n}{4} \right| \leq 10 \cdot \sqrt{n}$

Statistical Tests

More examples:

(3) $A(x)=1$ iff max-run-of-0$(x) < 10 \cdot \log_2(n)$

Advantage

Let $G: K \longrightarrow \{0,1\}^n$ be a PRG and A a stat. test on $\{0,1\}^n$

Define:

$$Adv_{PRG}[A,G] := \left| \Pr_{k \xleftarrow{R} K}[A(G(k))=1] - \Pr_{r \xleftarrow{R} \{0,1\}^n}[A(r)=1] \right| \in [0,1]$$

Adv close to 1 $\Longrightarrow$ A can dist. G from random

Adv close to 0 $\Longrightarrow$ A cannot

A silly example: $A(x) = 0 \Rightarrow Adv_{PRG}[A,G] =$ 

Suppose $G:K \longrightarrow \{0,1\}^n$ satisfies **msb(G(k)) = 1** for 2/3 of keys in K

Define stat. test $A(x)$ as:

if [msb(x)=1] output "1" else output "0"

Then

$$Adv_{PRG}[A,G] = \left| \overbrace{Pr[A(G(k))=1]}^{2/3} - \overbrace{Pr[A(r)=1]}^{1/2} \right| =$$

Secure PRGs: crypto definition

Def: We say that $G: K \longrightarrow \{0,1\}^n$ is a **secure PRG** if

$\forall$ "eff" stat. tests A:

$Adv_{PRG}[A, G]$ is "negligible"

Are there provably secure PRGs?

but we have heuristic candidates.

Easy fact: a secure PRG is unpredictable

We show: PRG predictable $\Rightarrow$ PRG is insecure

Suppose A is an efficient algorithm s.t.

$$\Pr_{k \xleftarrow{R} K}\left[A(G(k)|_{1,\ldots,i}) = G(k)|_{i+1} \right] > \frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon$$

for non-negligible ε (e.g. $\varepsilon = 1/1000$)

Easy fact: a secure PRG is unpredictable

Define statistical test B as:

$B(x) =$ if $A(x|_{1,\ldots,i}) = x_{i+1}$ output 1
else output 0

$r \xleftarrow{R} \{0,1\}^n$: $Pr[B(r)=1] = \frac{1}{2}$

$r \xleftarrow{R} \mathcal{K}$: $Pr[B(G(k))=1] > \frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon$

$\Rightarrow Adv_{PRG}[B,G] = \left| Pr[B(r)=1] - Pr[B(G(k))=1] \right| > \varepsilon$

Thm (Yao'82): an unpredictable PRG is secure

Let $G:K \longrightarrow \{0,1\}^n$ be PRG

"Thm": if $\forall i \in \{0, \ldots, n-1\}$ PRG G is unpredictable at pos. i
then G is a secure PRG.

If next-bit predictors cannot distinguish G from random
then no statistical test can !!

Let $G:K \longrightarrow \{0,1\}^n$ be a PRG such that

from the last n/2 bits of G(k)

it is easy to compute the first n/2 bits.

Is G predictable for some $i \in \{0, \ldots, n-1\}$?

- Yes 
- No

More Generally

Let P_1 and P_2 be two distributions over $\{0,1\}^n$

Def: We say that P_1 and P_2 are

computationally indistinguishable (denoted $P_1 \approx_p P_2$)

if $\forall$ "eff" stat. tests A

$$\left| \Pr_{x \leftarrow P_1}[A(x)=1] - \Pr_{x \leftarrow P_2}[A(x)=1] \right| < \text{negligible}$$

Example: a PRG is secure if $\{ k \xleftarrow{R} K : G(k) \} \approx_p \text{uniform}(\{0,1\}^n)$

End of Segment

Stream ciphers

Semantic security

Goal: secure PRG ⇒ “secure” stream cipher

What is a secure cipher?

Attacker's abilities: **obtains one ciphertext** (for now)

Possible security requirements:

attempt #1: **attacker cannot recover secret key**

$E(k, m) = m$

attempt #2: **attacker cannot recover all of plaintext**

$E(k, m_0 \| m_1) = m_0 \| m_1 \oplus k$

Recall Shannon's idea:

CT should reveal no "info" about PT

Recall Shannon's perfect secrecy

Let (E,D) be a cipher over (K,M,C)

(E,D) has perfect secrecy if $\forall\, m_0, m_1 \in M \quad (\ |m_0| = |m_1|\ )$

$\{ E(k,m_0) \} \quad = \quad \{ E(k,m_1) \} \qquad \text{where} \quad k \leftarrow\!\!- K$

(E,D) has perfect secrecy if $\forall\, m_0, m_1 \in M \quad (\ |m_0| = |m_1|\ )$

$\{ E(k,m_0) \} \approx_p \{ E(k,m_1) \} \qquad \text{where} \quad k \leftarrow\!\!- K$

… but also need adversary to exhibit $m_0, m_1 \in M$ explicitly

Semantic Security (one-time key)

For b=0,1 define experiments EXP(0) and EXP(1) as:



for b=0,1: W_b := [event that EXP(b)=1]

$$Adv_{SS}[A,E] := \left| \Pr[W_0] - \Pr[W_1] \right| \in [0,1]$$

Semantic Security (one-time key)

Def: $\mathbb{E}$ is **semantically secure** if for all efficient A

$Adv_{SS}[A,\mathbb{E}]$ is negligible.

$\Rightarrow$ for all explicit $m_0, m_1 \in M$: $\{ E(k,m_0) \} \approx_p \{ E(k,m_1) \}$

Examples

Suppose efficient A can always deduce LSB of PT from CT.

$\Rightarrow$ $\mathbb{E}$ = (E,D) is not semantically secure.



Then $Adv_{SS}[B, \mathbb{E}]$ = | Pr[**EXP(0)**=1] − Pr[**EXP(1)**=1] | = [redacted]

OTP is semantically secure



For **all** A: $Adv_{SS}[A,OTP] = \left| Pr[\, \mathbf{A}(k \oplus \mathbf{m_0}) = 1 \,] - Pr[\, \mathbf{A}(k \oplus \mathbf{m_1}) = 1 \,] \right|$

End of Segment

Stream ciphers

Stream ciphers are semantically secure

Goal: secure PRG ⇒ semantically secure stream cipher

Stream ciphers are semantically secure

Thm: $G:K \longrightarrow \{0,1\}^n$ is a secure PRG $\Rightarrow$

stream cipher E derived from G is sem. sec.

$\forall$ sem. sec. adversary A , $\exists$a PRG adversary B s.t.

$$Adv_{SS}[A,E] \leq 2 \cdot Adv_{PRG}[B,G]$$

Proof: intuition



Proof: Let A be a sem. sec. adversary.



For b=0,1: W_b := [event that b'=1].

$$Adv_{SS}[A,E] = \left| \Pr[W_0] - \Pr[W_1] \right|$$

Proof: Let A be a sem. sec. adversary.



For b=0,1: W_b := [event that b'=1].

$$Adv_{SS}[A,E] = \left| Pr[W_0] - Pr[W_1] \right|$$

For b=0,1: R_b := [event that b'=1]

Proof: Let A be a sem. sec. adversary.

Claim 1: $\left|\Pr[R_0] - \Pr[R_1]\right| = Adv_{SS}[A, OTP] = 0$

Claim 2: $\exists B$: $\left|\Pr[W_b] - \Pr[R_b]\right| = Adv_{PRG}[B, G]$ For $b=0$ or 1



$\Rightarrow \quad Adv_{SS}[A,E] = \left|\Pr[W_0] - \Pr[W_1]\right| \le 2 \cdot Adv_{PRG}[B,G]$

Proof of claim 2: $\exists B: \left|\Pr[W_0] - \Pr[R_0]\right| = \mathrm{Adv}_{PRG}[B,G]$

Algorithm B:



$$\mathrm{Adv}_{PRG}[B,G] = \left| \Pr_{r \xleftarrow{R} \{0,1\}^n}[B(r)=1] - \Pr_{k \xleftarrow{R} \mathcal{K}}[B(G(k))=1] \right| = \left| \Pr[R_0] - \Pr[W_0] \right|$$

End of Segment