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## Chapter 6 - Contemporary Symmetric Ciphers

"I am fairly familiar with all the forms of secret writings, and am myself the author of a trifling monograph upon the subject, in which I analyze one hundred and sixty separate ciphers, " said Holmes.

- The Adventure of the Dancing Men, Sir Arthur Conan Doyle


## Multiple Encryption \& DES

> clear a replacement for DES was needed - theoretical attacks that can break it

- demonstrated exhaustive key search attacks
$\Rightarrow$ AES is a new cipher alternative
> prior to this alternative was to use multiple encryption with DES implementations
$>$ Triple-DES is the chosen form


## Double-DES?

> could use 2 DES encrypts on each block

- $\mathrm{C}=\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{K} 2}\left(\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{K} 1}(\mathrm{P})\right)$
$>$ issue of reduction to single stage
> and have "meet-in-the-middle" attack
- works whenever use a cipher twice
- since $\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{K} 1}(\mathrm{P})=\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{K} 2}(\mathrm{C})$
- attack by encrypting P with all keys and store
- then decrypt $C$ with keys and match $X$ value
- can show takes O( $2^{56}$ ) steps


## Triple-DES with Two-Keys

> hence must use 3 encryptions

- would seem to need 3 distinct keys
$>$ but can use 2 keys with E-D-E sequence
- $\mathrm{C}=\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{K} 1}\left(\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{K} 2}\left(\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{K} 1}(\mathrm{P})\right)\right)$
- nb encrypt \& decrypt equivalent in security
- if K1=K2 then can work with single DES
> standardized in ANSI X9.17 \& ISO8732
> no current known practical attacks


## Triple-DES with Three-Keys

$>$ although are no practical attacks on twokey Triple-DES have some indications
$>$ can use Triple-DES with Three-Keys to avoid even these

$$
\text { - } C=E_{\mathrm{K} 3}\left(\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{K} 2}\left(\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{K} 1}(\mathrm{P})\right)\right)
$$

$>$ has been adopted by some Internet applications, eg PGP, S/MIME

## Modes of Operation

> block ciphers encrypt fixed size blocks - eg. DES encrypts 64-bit blocks with 56 -bit key
> need some way to en/decrypt arbitrary amounts of data in practise
ANSI X3.106-1983 Modes of Use (now FIPS 81) defines 4 possible modes
> subsequently 5 defined for AES \& DES
$>$ have block and stream modes

## Electronic Codebook Book (ECB)

$>$ message is broken into independent blocks which are encrypted
$>$ each block is a value which is substituted, like a codebook, hence name
$>$ each block is encoded independently of the other blocks

$$
C_{i}=\operatorname{DES}_{\mathrm{K} 1}\left(\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)
$$

> uses: secure transmission of single values

## Electronic Codebook Book (ECB)



## Advantages and Limitations of

## ECB

> message repetitions may show in ciphertext

- if aligned with message block
- particularly with data such graphics
- or with messages that change very little, which become a code-book analysis problem
weakness is due to the encrypted message blocks being independent
> main use is sending a few blocks of data


## Cipher Block Chaining (CBC)

$>$ message is broken into blocks
$>$ linked together in encryption operation
$>$ each previous cipher blocks is chained with current plaintext block, hence name
$>$ use Initial Vector (IV) to start process

$$
\begin{aligned}
& C_{i}=D E S_{K 1}\left(P_{i} \text { XOR } C_{i-1}\right) \\
& C_{-1}=I V
\end{aligned}
$$

> uses: bulk data encryption, authentication

## Cipher Block Chaining (CBC)



## Message Padding

> at end of message must handle a possible last short block

- which is not as large as blocksize of cipher
- pad either with known non-data value (eg nulls)
- or pad last block along with count of pad size
- eg. [ b1 b2 b3 0000 5]
- means have 3 data bytes, then 5 bytes pad+count
- this may require an extra entire block over those in message
there are other, more esoteric modes, which avoid the need for an extra block


## Advantages and Limitations of

## CBC

> a ciphertext block depends on all blocks before it
> any change to a block affects all following ciphertext blocks
> need Initialization Vector (IV)

- which must be known to sender \& receiver
- if sent in clear, attacker can change bits of first block, and change IV to compensate
- hence IV must either be a fixed value (as in EFTPOS)
- or must be sent encrypted in ECB mode before rest of message


## Cipher FeedBack (CFB)

message is treated as a stream of bits
> added to the output of the block cipher
$>$ result is feed back for next stage (hence name)
$>$ standard allows any number of bit (1,8, 64 or 128 etc) to be feed back

- denoted CFB-1, CFB-8, CFB-64, CFB-128 etc
$>$ most efficient to use all bits in block (64 or 128)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& C_{i}=P_{i} \text { XOR DES } S_{K 1}\left(C_{i-1}\right) \\
& C_{-1}=I V
\end{aligned}
$$

> uses: stream data encryption, authentication

## Cipher FeedBack (CFB)



## Advantages and Limitations of

## CFB

> appropriate when data arrives in bits/bytes
$>$ most common stream mode
$>$ limitation is need to stall while do block encryption after every n-bits
$>$ note that the block cipher is used in encryption mode at both ends
> errors propogate for several blocks after the error

## Output FeedBack (OFB)

message is treated as a stream of bits
> output of cipher is added to message
$>$ output is then feed back (hence name)
$>$ feedback is independent of message
$>$ can be computed in advance

$$
\begin{aligned}
& C_{i}=P_{i} \operatorname{XOR} O_{i} \\
& O_{i}=D E S_{K 1}\left(O_{i-1}\right) \\
& O_{-1}=I V
\end{aligned}
$$

> uses: stream encryption on noisy channels

## Output FeedBack (OFB)



## Advantages and Limitations of

## OFB

> bit errors do not propagate
> more vulnerable to message stream modification
> a variation of a Vernam cipher

- hence must never reuse the same sequence (key+IV)
> sender \& receiver must remain in sync
> originally specified with m -bit feedback
> subsequent research has shown that only full block feedback (ie CFB-64 or CFB-128) should ever be used


## Counter (CTR)

> a "new" mode, though proposed early on
> similar to OFB but encrypts counter value rather than any feedback value
> must have a different key \& counter value for every plaintext block (never reused)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& C_{i}=P_{i} \operatorname{XOR} O_{i} \\
& O_{i}=\operatorname{DES}_{K 1}(i)
\end{aligned}
$$

> uses: high-speed network encryptions

## Counter (CTR)



## Advantages and Limitations of

## CTR

$>$ efficiency

- can do parallel encryptions in h/w or s/w
- can preprocess in advance of need
- good for bursty high speed links
$>$ random access to encrypted data blocks
$>$ provable security (good as other modes)
> but must ensure never reuse key/counter values, otherwise could break (cf OFB)


## Stream Ciphers

process message bit by bit (as a stream)
> have a pseudo random keystream
$>$ combined (XOR) with plaintext bit by bit
> randomness of stream key completely destroys statistically properties in message

- $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{i}}=\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{i}}$ XOR StreamKey $\mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{i}}$
$>$ but must never reuse stream key
- otherwise can recover messages (cf book cipher)


## Stream Cipher Structure



## Stream Cipher Properties

> some design considerations are:

- long period with no repetitions
- statistically random
- depends on large enough key
- large linear complexity
> properly designed, can be as secure as a block cipher with same size key
> but usually simpler \& faster


## RC4

> a proprietary cipher owned by RSA DSI
> another Ron Rivest design, simple but effective
> variable key size, byte-oriented stream cipher
$>$ widely used (web SSL/TLS, wireless WEP)
$>$ key forms random permutation of all 8-bit values
> uses that permutation to scramble input info processed a byte at a time

## RC4 Key Schedule

> starts with an array S of numbers: 0.. 255
> use key to well and truly shuffle
$>$ S forms internal state of the cipher

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { for } i=0 \text { to } 255 \text { do } \\
& \text { S[i] }=\text { i } \\
& T[i]=\text { K[i mod keylen]) } \\
& j=0 \\
& \text { for } i=0 \text { to } 255 \text { do } \\
& j=(j+S[i]+T[i])(\bmod 256) \\
& \text { } \operatorname{swap}(S[i], S[j])
\end{aligned}
$$

## RC4 Encryption

> encryption continues shuffling array values
> sum of shuffled pair selects "stream key" value from permutation
$>$ XOR S[t] with next byte of message to en/decrypt

```
i = j = 0
for each message byte M}\mp@subsup{M}{i}{
    i = (i + 1) (mod 256)
    j = (j + S[i]) (mod 256)
    swap(S[i], S[j])
    t = (S[i] + S[j]) (mod 256)
    Ci
```


## RC4 Overview



## RC4 Security

> claimed secure against known attacks

- have some analyses, none practical
$>$ result is very non-linear
> since RC4 is a stream cipher, must never reuse a key
> have a concern with WEP, but due to key handling rather than RC4 itself


## Summary

> Triple-DES
$>$ Modes of Operation

- ECB, CBC, CFB, OFB, CTR
> stream ciphers
> RC4

