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What’s Wrong? >50 distinct attacks… Best = $2^{101}$
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- Weak Key Schedule
- Poor Diffusion
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- Guess Then …
  - "Algebraic Complexity Reduction"
  - Reflection
  - Slide
  - Fixed P.
  - Involution

- AC / Software / SAT Solvers
- multiple random keys
- MITM
- multiple points, HO

- Combinatorial Optimisation
- Truncated Differentials (DC)
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Development History

- $2^{225}$
- $2^{224}$
- $2^{223}$
- $2^{206}$
- $2^{192}$
- $2^{191}$
- $2^{179}$
- $2^{201}$
- $2^{210}$
- $2^{2100}$
- $2^{2159}$
- $2^{206}$
- $2^{101}$
- $2^{110}$
- $2^{117}$
- $2^{130}$

- FSE 2011
- FSE 2012

- single key attacks

- multiple keys generated at random

- new update!

Kara et al, will appear in CANS 2012 December 2012
History: Cold War
Russia vs. USA
code breakers ==
взломщики кодов
Cryptanalysis

from Greek

- kryptós, "hidden"
- analýein, "to untie"

Term coined in 1920 by William F. Friedman.

- Born in Moldavia
- Chief cryptologist at NSA, 1950s.
History: 1918

- Tzarist secret services
  => continued their work with the armies of white generals.
- In 1918 - 1920 almost all encrypted correspondence of the Soviet Army and Government was easily broken by
  - the white (counterrevolutionary) armed forces
  - the British
  - the Swedish
  - the Polish: broke key messages and won the War against Russia in 1920-1921
1930

1930: Russian code breaker Bokiy broke a U.S. code.

- US ciphers were really not good at that time…
  - In 1929 US government disbanded its Federal crypto services because… “Gentlemen don’t read each other’s mail”…
**Fialka = Фиалка = Violet = M-125**

Around 1965.

MUCH stronger than Enigma…

Used until 1987 in East Germany…
Fialka Versions

- Each country of the Warsaw pact had their own version
- Different keyboard, different fonts…
- Different **SECRET** set of 10 wheels.
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Cold War Soviet Cryptanalysis

• Soviet Union was breaking codes and employed at least 100 cryptologists…
  [Source: Cryptologia, interviews by David Kahn with gen. Andreev=first head of FAPSI=Russian NSA]

Example: In 1967 GRU (Soviet Intelligence) was intercepting cryptograms from 115 countries, using 152 cryptosystems, and among these they broke 11 codes and “obtained” 7 other codes.
Was Fialka Broken?

- Israel have captured Fialka machines during the 6-day war in 1967 and … nothing more was disclosed.
- Austria would intercept and decrypt a fair proportion of Fialka traffic during the Cold War…
- In the 1970s the NSA would build a supercomputer to decrypt Fialka routinely
Secret Specs: ROTORS vs. S-boxes

FIALKA

GOST
Compare: Rotors of Enigma [1930s]

- The specs of Enigma were reverse-engineered by the Polish in early 1930s in tight collaboration with French intelligence... [and the British].
- Finding the rotors by Marian Rejewski was much harder than daily code breaking at Bletchley Park...
US Ciphers

• US/NATO:
  Russia broke the NATO KW-7 cipher machine
    – the NSA did not see it was weak…
    – The spec became known because of a spy ring
      – by John A. Walker Jr + family.
      – was paid more than 1M USD (source: NSA)
      – to this day the spec has NOT been made public

• greatest exploit in KGB history,

• allowed the Soviet Union to “read millions” of American messages [1989, Washington Post]
Walker Amazing Machine

Walker obtained from the KGB a pocket machine to read the connections of rotors of KL-7
Modern Cryptanalysis
Algebraic Cryptanalysis [Shannon]

Breaking a « good » cipher should require:

“as much work as solving a system of simultaneous equations in a large number of unknowns of a complex type”

[Shannon, 1949]
Motivation

Linear and differential cryptanalysis usually require **huge quantities** of known/chosen plaintexts.

**Q:** What kind of cryptanalysis is possible when the attacker has only one known plaintext (or very few) ?

LOW DATA CRYPTANALYSIS  **NEW!**
Two Worlds:

• The “approximation” cryptanalysis:
  – Linear, differential, approximation, attacks etc..
  – based on probabilistic characteristics
    • true with some probability.
  – consequently, the security will grow exponentially with the number of rounds, and so does the number of required plaintexts in the attacks
    • main limitation in practice.

• The “exact algebraic” approach:
  – Write equations to solve, true with probability 1.
  => Low data complexity
Algebraic Attacks on Block Ciphers

1. Write +
2. Solve [key recovery].
Algebraic Attacks on Block Ciphers

Gröbner Bases:

- Optimising the expansion step at high degree.
- Mostly the dense case is understood and implemented.
- Then either AES-128 is broken at up to say 4 [Gwenolé Ars thesis: maybe it is?]. AND if not at this degree, it must be secure (!).

Fast Algebraic Attacks [will just explain]:

- Avoid expansion, start with BIGGER initial systems but never allow any expansion or increase in the degree.
- Sparse case! Essential problems: preserve sparsity.
2. Fast Algebraic Attacks On Block Ciphers
Fast Algebraic Attacks on Block Ciphers

Definition [informal on purpose] Methods to lower the degree of equations that appear throughout the computations… [e.g. max deg in F4]

(more generally need to substantially lower the memory requirements of algebraic attacks compared to their running time).

⇒ Very rich galaxy of attacks to be studied in the next 20 years…

How to lower the degree?
• by having several P/C pairs (bigger yet much easier !)
• by CPA, CPCA, etc…
• by fixing internal variables (Guess-then-Algebraic).
• by finding [approximate] equations on bigger blocks
  – by interpolation [cf. W. Meier’s talk]
  – by guessing equations that have strong bias
    • Linear-Algebraic or Bi-Linear-Algebraic Cryptanalysis
    • Differential-Algebraic.
• by clever choice of representation
• by introducing new variables (oh yes !)
• by having a larger key
• new tricks to be invented?

cumulative effect !!!
3. Solving Methods...

Complete description:
• Find linear equations in the linear span.
• Substitute, and repeat.

Amazingly powerful…
3.3. ElimLin – Remark:

In a way it is:

Doing things which Gröbner bases usually ignore or do not care about
at "degree 1.05" ...

(very small number of higher-degree monomials).
3.4. ANF-to-CNF - The Outsider

Before we did try,
we actually never believed it could work…

😊 😊 😊

Convert MQ to a SAT problem.
(both are NP-hard problems)
3.4. ANF-to-CNF - The Outsider

Principle 1:
each monomial = one dummy variable.

\[ a = wxyz \]

\[ \iff \]

\[ a \iff (w \land x \land y \land z) \]

\[ (w \lor \bar{a})(x \lor \bar{a})(y \lor \bar{a})(z \lor \bar{a})(a \lor \bar{w} \lor \bar{x} \lor \bar{y} \lor \bar{z}) \]

\( d+1 \) clauses for each degree \( d \) monomial
Also

Principle 2:
Handling XORs – Not obvious. Long XORs known to be hard problems for SAT solvers.

\[ a \oplus b \oplus c \oplus d = 0 \]

\[ (\bar{a} \lor b \lor c \lor d)(a \lor \bar{b} \lor c \lor d)(a \lor b \lor \bar{c} \lor d)(a \lor b \lor c \lor \bar{d}) \]

\[ (\bar{a} \lor \bar{b} \lor c \lor d)(\bar{a} \lor \bar{b} \lor c \lor \bar{d})(\bar{a} \lor b \lor \bar{c} \lor d)(a \lor b \lor \bar{c} \lor \bar{d}) \]

- Split longer XORs in several shorter with more dummy variables.
- About 4 \( h \) clauses for a XOR of size \( h \).
ANF-to-CNF

This description is enough to produce a working version.

Space for non-trivial optimisations. See:

Gregory V. Bard, Nicolas T. Courtois and Chris Jefferson:
“Efficient Methods for Conversion and Solution of Sparse Systems of Low-Degree Multivariate Polynomials over GF(2) via SAT-Solvers”.
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Ready Software

Several ready programs to perform this conversion are made available on this web page:

www.cryptosystem.net/aes/tools.html
SAT Solvers in the Cloud

UCL spin-off company

solving SAT problems on demand...

commercial but also for free...

http://www.satalia.com/
Solving SAT

What are SAT solvers?
Heuristic algorithms for solving SAT problems.

• Guess some variables.
• Examine consequences.
• If a contradiction found, I can add a new clause saying “In this set of constraints one is false”.

Very advanced area of research.
Introduction for “dummies”:
Gregory Bard PhD thesis.
MiniSat 2.0.

Winner of SAT-Race 2006 competition.
An open-source SAT solver package,
by Niklas Eén, Niklas Sörensson,

More recent version [2012]:
**CryptoMiniSat 2.92.**
improved by Mate Soos,
added also some linear algebra...
Ready Software for Windows

Ready programs:

www.cryptosystem.net/aes/tools.html
ANF-to-CNF + MiniSat 2.0.

Gives amazing results in algebraic cryptanalysis of just any (not too complex/not too many rounds) cipher, cf. (VSH). Also for random sparse MQ.

- Certain VERY large systems solved in seconds on PC (thousands of variables!).
- Few take a couple hours/days…
- Then infeasible, sharp increase.

Jump from 0 to $\infty$. 
What Are the Limitations of Algebraic Attacks?

- When the number of rounds grows: complexity jumps from 0 to \( \infty \).

- With new attacks and new “tricks” being proposed: some systems are suddenly broken with no effort.

=> jumps from \( \infty \) to nearly 0!
DES

At a first glance,
DES seems to be a very poor target:

there is (apparently)
no strong algebraic structure
of any kind in DES
What’s Left?

Idea 1: (IOH)
Algebraic I/O relations.
Theorem [Courtois-Pieprzyk]:
Every S-box has a low I/O degree.
=> 3 for DES.

Idea 2: (VSH)
DES has been designed to be implemented in hardware.
=> Very-sparse quadratic equations at the price of adding some 40 new variables per S-box.
Results?

Both Idea 1 (IOH) and Idea 2 (VSH) (and some 20 other I have tried…) can be exploited in working key recovery attacks.
S-boxes S1-S4 [Matthew Kwan]
I / O Degree

Consider function \( f : GF(2)^n \rightarrow GF(2)^m \),
\[ f(x) = y, \text{ with } x = (x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1}), \ y = (y_0, \ldots, y_{m-1}). \]

Definition [The I/O degree] The I/O degree of \( f \) is the smallest degree of the algebraic relation
\[ g(x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1}; y_0, \ldots, y_{m-1}) = 0 \]
that holds with certainty for every couple \((x, y)\) such that \( y = f(x) \).

A “good” cipher should use at least some components with high I/O degree.
Results on DES

Nicolas T. Courtois and Gregory V. Bard: 
Algebraic Cryptanalysis of the D.E.S.
In IMA conference 2007, pp. 152-169, 
LNCS 4887, Springer.

See also: 
eprint.iacr.org/2006/402/
What Can Be Done?

Idea 1 (Cubic IOH) + ElimLin:
We recover the key of 5-round DES with 3 KP faster than brute force.
- When 23 variables fixed, takes 173 s.
- Magma crashes > 2 Gb of RAM.

Idea 2 (VSH\textsuperscript{40}) + ANF-to-CNF + MiniSat 2.0.:
Key recovery for 6-round DES. Only 1 KP (!).
- Fix 20 variables takes 68 s.
- Magma crashes with > 2 Gb.
And GOST?

Essentially the same software methods…


… allow also to break up to 8 rounds of GOST…

Can we hope to break 32 rounds?
4. Self Similarity

or What’s Wrong With Some Ciphers
KEY IDEA

REDUCE the complexity.
For example:
REDUCE the number of rounds.

How? Use self-similarity and high-level structure.
Magic process which allows the attacker to
guess/determine values INSIDE the cipher.

We now call it **Algebraic Complexity Reduction**
[Courtois 2011]
4.1. Crypto-1 Cipher
Waste of Silicon

MiFare was manufactured by Philips, now NXP, and licensed to Infineon. BUT, even a hardware or software designer would NOT notice how weak the cipher is.

Camouflage?
Due to a combination with another terrible weakness half of the silicon is wasted...
The diagram illustrates the Crypto1 Cipher, which is a block cipher. It shows the key stream generation process with the following equations:

\[ f_a^4 = 0x9E98 = (a+b)(c+1)(a+d)+(b+1)c+a \]

\[ f_b^4 = 0xB48E = (a+c)(a+b+d)+(a+b)cd+b \]

The cipher consists of a sequence of functions \( f_a \) and \( f_b \), each applied in a specific order to generate the cipher text. The key is divided into two parts, and the output is used as a response to the challenge. The diagram also shows the Tag/Reader IV and the Tag IV, which are used in the encryption process. The serial number is also used in the encryption process, as indicated by the equation:

\[ f_c^5 = 0xEC57E80A \]
Waste of Silicon

Internal bits are computed 2-3 times.
One could save half of the gates!
“Courtois Dark Side” Attack on MiFare Classic

Cf. eprint.iacr.org/2009/137. Basic Facts:
It is a multiple differential attack.
Form of multiple “self-similarity” as well..
I exhibit a differential that
• holds simultaneously for 256 differentials this works with probability of about 1/17.
• for 8 differentials the probability is about 0.75 (!!).

Both are differences on 51 bits of the state of the cipher.
A VERY STRONG property(!).
Summary

- We broke >1 billion smart cards covering 70% of the contactless badge/ticketing market.
- Our attack require more than 10 times less data than the Dutch attacks about which there were 10,000 press reports...

- Security of many buildings (banks, military, UK Cabinet Office) is badly compromised.
- Security of many transport [metro, bus] and parking cards worldwide is badly compromised.
- Property and important assets [e.g. government and financial data] are directly under threat.
4.3. Self-Similarity and KeeLoq
KeeLoq

- Designed in the 80's by Willem Smit.
- In 1995 sold to Microchip Inc for more than 10 Million of US$.
How Secure is KeeLoq

According to Microchip, KeeLoq should have ``a level of security comparable to DES''. Yet faster.

Miserably bad cipher, main reason:
its periodic structure: cannot be defended. The complexity of most attacks on KeeLoq does NOT depend on the number of rounds of KeeLoq.
Notation

\( f_k() \) – 64 rounds of KeeLoq

\( g_k() \) – 16 rounds of KeeLoq, prefix of \( f_k() \).

We have: \( E_k = g_k \circ f_8^k \).

528 = 16+8*64 rounds.
4.4. Sliding Properties of KeeLoq

[and one simple attack from FSE 2008]
Sliding Attacks – 2 Cases

- **Complete periodicity [classical].**

  \[
  \begin{array}{ccc}
  P & P & P \\
  \end{array}
  \]

- **Incomplete periodicity [new] – harder.**

  \[
  \begin{array}{cccc}
  P & P & P & Q \\
  \end{array}
  \]

  - KeeLoq: Q is a functional prefix of P. Helps a lot.
Sliding Attacks

• Take $2^{n/2}$ known plaintexts (here $n=32$, easy!)
• We have a “slid pair” $(P_i, P_j)$ s.t.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
64 \text{ rounds} & 64 \text{ rounds} & 64 \text{ rounds} & 64 \text{ rounds} \\
\hline
P_i & P_j & \cdots & C_i \\
\hline
P_j & P_i & \cdots & C_j
\end{array}
\]

Gives an unlimited number of other sliding pairs !!!
KeeLoq and Sliding


- Take $2^{n/2}$ known plaintexts (here $n=32$, easy!)
- We have a “slid pair” $(P_i, P_j)$ s.t.

```
| 64 rounds | 64 rounds | 64 rounds | 64 rounds | 16 r |
```

Classical sliding fails – because of the “odd” 16 rounds:
Classical Sliding – Not Easy

• Take $2^{n/2}$ known plaintexts (here $n=32$, easy!)
• We have a “slid pair” ($P_i, P_j$).

![Diagram of classical sliding attack with 64 rounds and 16 r, showing $P_i, P_j, C_i, C_j$ and the question: What’s the values here?](image)

HARD - Problem:
What’s the values here?
Algebraic Sliding

Answer [Courtois, Bard, Wagner FSE2008]:

Look here!

don’t care about these
Algebraic Attack [FSE 2008]

We are able to use $C_i, C_j$ directly!

Write and merge 2 systems of equations:
System of Equations

64-bit key. Two pairs on 32 bits.
Just enough information.

Attack:
• Write an MQ system.
  • Gröbner Bases methods – miserably fail.
• Convert to a SAT problem
  • [Cf. Courtois, Bard, Jefferson, eprint/2007/024/].
• Solve it.
  • Takes 2.3 seconds on a PC with MiniSat 2.0.
Attack Summary:

Given about $2^{16}$ KP.
We try all $2^{32}$ pairs $(P_i, P_j)$.

- If OK, it takes 2.3 seconds to find the 64-bit key.
- If no result - early abort.

Total attack complexity about $2^{64}$ CPU clocks which is about $2^{53}$ KeeLoq encryptions.
4.6. Snow 2.0. Cipher
ISO

- Less than 10 crypto algorithms were ever standardized by ISO. E.g. AES.
- All in ISO 18033.
  - Snow 2.0. is an international standard for stream cipher encryption.
  - In 2010 the Russian National Standard GOST was also submitted to ISO 18033 to become an international standard.
I / O Degree (a.k.a. [Graph] Alg. Immunity)

Consider function $f : GF(2)^n \rightarrow GF(2)^m$, $f(x) = y$, with $x = (x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1})$, $y = (y_0, \ldots, y_{m-1})$.

**Definition [The I/O degree]** The I/O degree of $f$ is the smallest degree of the algebraic relation

$$g(x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1}; y_0, \ldots, y_{m-1}) = 0$$

that holds with certainty for every couple $(x, y)$ such that $y = f(x)$.
Modular Addition

+ modulo $2^{32}$

in several ciphers: GOST, SNOW 2.0.

$$(x, y) \mapsto z = x \oplus y \mod 2^n$$

Theorem 6.1.1. The Multiplicative Complexity (MC) of the addition modulo $2^n$ is exactly $n - 1$. 
Modular Addition I/O Degree = 2

Quadratic. More importantly: Quadratic I/O without extra variables

\[
\begin{align*}
z_0 &= x_0 + y_0 \\
z_1 &= x_1 + y_1 + c_1 \\
z_2 &= x_2 + y_2 + c_2 \\
&\vdots \\
z_i &= x_i + y_i + c_i \\
&\vdots \\
z_{n-1} &= x_{n-1} + y_{n-1} + c_{n-1},
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
c_1 &= x_0 y_0 \\
c_2 &= x_1 y_1 + (x_1 + y_1) c_1 \\
&\vdots \\
c_i &= x_{i-1} y_{i-1} + (x_{i-1} + y_{i-1}) c_{i-1} \\
&\vdots \\
c_{n-1} &= x_{n-2} y_{n-2} + (x_{n-2} + y_{n-2}) c_{n-2}
\end{align*}
\]

(the \(c_i\) can be all eliminated)
Theorem 6.1.1. The Multiplicative Complexity (MC) of the addition modulo $2^n$ is exactly $n - 1$.

Proof:

we have:

$$xy + (x + y)c = (x + c)(y + c) - c^2$$

$1x$ each
Conditional A.I. = Conditional I/O Degree

Already exploited by Krause, Armknecht, Fischer and Meier [FSE 2007 and ICALP 2007]

**Definition:** Let us assume $n > m$. Given some fixed output $y$, a $y$-conditional I/O equation for $S$ is a nonzero algebraic equation $r_y(x) = 0$ that holds with probability 1 for every $x$ such that $S(x) = y$.

Given some fixed output $y$, let $d$ be the minimum degree of a $y$-conditional I/O equation. The conditional algebraic immunity $CAI$ of $S$ is the minimum of $d$ over all $y$ in $GF(2)^m$. 
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Conditional Describing Degree

**Definition:** Given some fixed output $y$, let $d$ be the minimum degree such that the equation $S(x) = y$ is entirely defined by conditional I/O equations of degree at most $d$. The minimal $d$ over all $y$ in $GF(2)^m$ is called conditional describing degree ($CDD$) of $S$. 
This paper:

For \( + \mod 2^n \): We show that:

- The Conditional Describing Degree is 1 (!)
- Is it trivial? Well, we know that for minus \( \mod 2^n \): consider \( x-y=0 \).
  - Where \((x,y)\) is the input, 0 is the fixed output.
- NEW: Holds also for \( + \mod 2^n \): consider \( x+y=111111\ldots111 \).
This paper:

For $+ \mod 2^n$:

- The Conditional Describing Degree is 1 (!)
- So what?
  - View it as follows: fix $n$ linear equations, get $2^n$!
- Amplification…
This paper:

Larger Blocks of Snow 2.0.

- However some equations can be more interesting than others.
  - How to generate (lots of) extra degree falls elsewhere, because of the structure of Snow?
  - This is not wishful thinking. We constructed such an attack a particularly good one.
4.7. High-Level Attacks on Snow 2.0.

[Courtois-Debraize ICICS 2008]
Moreover:

• If I have to assume that the output for whole 32-bit + mod $2^n$: is one specific value – this will happen with VERY LOW probability.

• We can do much better:

We present a LARGE family of outputs, not only 00000 or 111 for which the $+ \mod 2^n$: can be partly linearized.

Interest: we want to fix some WELL CHOSEN bits, determine other.
How? Structure of Snow dictates that.
**BTW: Link to LC**

- Is it LC with multiple approximations?
- Not at all, all the equations hold simultaneously.

- Find 1 linear equation true with probability 50% – trivial, no interest.
- Find 10 that simultaneously hold for 50% on inputs of this S-box/operation. Very strong and helps AC a lot.
Conditional algebraic attacks:

Amplification:

- given \( n \) linear assumptions, get \( C^n \) consequences.
  - Find attacks that maximize \( C \)
  - A precise measure of “structural” algebraic vulnerability.

- \( C=2 \) for \( + \mod 2^n \).
- \( C=4 \) for Snow 2.0. Keystream generator.
  - Non-trivial result and method…
Amplification=4 or How to Linearize Snow?

Fix to 0.

For 9 consecutive steps.

Linearizes both \(+\)!
And the S-box layer

\(n \rightarrow 4n\) equations.
Seems optimal.
5. GOST Cipher
GOST 28148-89

- The Official Encryption Standard of Russian Federation.
- Developed in the 1970s, or the 1980s,
  - First "Top Secret" algorithm.
  - Downgraded to "Secret" in 1990.
Why Declassified

• 1994:
  – By mistake???
  – No country ever declassified their national algorithm.
Applications of GOST

- Much cheaper to implement than DES, AES and any other known cipher… (details later).

- Widely implemented and used:
  - Crypto ++,
  - Open SSL,
  - RSA Labs, Etc.
  - Central Bank of Russia,
  - other very large Russian banks..
GOST vs. DES

We hear that: “GOST 28147 “was a Soviet alternative to the United States standard algorithm, DES”

- ?? ?? this is just wrong:
- very long key, 256 bits, military-grade
  - in theory secure for 200 years…
  - not a commercial algorithm for short-term security such as DES…
Can GOST be Used to Encrypt Secret documents?

United States DES
can be used ONLY for unclassified documents.

In contrast,
GOST "does not place any limitations on the secrecy level of the protected information".

193.166.3.2/pub/crypt/cryptography/papers/gost/russian-des-preface.ps.gz
GOST

- Key = $2^{256}$ initial settings.
- S-boxes = $2^{512}$ possibilities.
  - But if bijective $2^{354}$ possibilities.
- Total $2^{610}$ (or $2^{768}$).
  - Compare to $2^{151}$ possibilities with FIALKA.
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GOST Boxes

- 8 secret S-boxes. (354 bits of info)
  - Central Bank of Russia uses these:
- Secret S-boxes are the equivalent of secret rotors in FIALKA
- Our attacks work for any S-boxes but they must be known.
  - there are methods about how to recover the secret S-boxes...
Analysis of GOST

- It was analysed by Schneier, Biham, Biryukov, Dunkelman, Wagner, Pieprzyk, Gabidulin,…
- Nobody found an attack…
Claims on GOST

Wikipedia April 2011:
Cryptanalysis of GOST

Compared to DES, GOST has a very simple round function. However, the designers of GOST attempted to offset the simplicity of the round function by specifying the algorithm with 32 rounds and secret S-boxes.

Another concern is that the avalanche effect is slower to occur in GOST than in DES. This is because of GOST's lack of an expansion permutation in the round function, as well as its use of a rotation instead of a permutation. Again, this is offset by GOST's increased number of rounds.

There is not much published cryptanalysis of GOST, but a cursory glance says that it seems secure (Schneier, 1996).

The large number of rounds and secret S-boxes makes both linear and differential cryptanalysis difficult. Its avalanche effect may be slower to occur, but it can propagate over 32 rounds very effectively.
“Even after considerable amount of time and effort, no progress in cryptanalysis of the standard was made in the open literature”
“GOST looks like a cipher that can be made both arbitrarily strong or arbitrarily weak depending on the designer's intent since some crucial parts of the algorithm are left unspecified.”
5.2. GOST on the International Stage
Consensus on GOST Security [2010]

Axel Poschmann, San Ling, and Huaxiong Wang:
256 Bit Standardized Crypto for 650 GE – GOST Revisited,
In CHES 2010

“Despite considerable cryptanalytic efforts spent in the past 20 years, GOST is still not broken.”
Security + Implementation
Or Why GOST is Very Competitive


- GOST-PS, fully Russian standard compliant variant using the S-boxes taken from PRESENT cipher:
  - only 651 GE
- The Russian Central Bank version is called GOST-FB,
  - it requires 800 GE
- AES-128
  - requires 3400 GE for a much lower security level!
- DES
  - requires also about 4000 GE…
- PRESENT: 1900 GE for 128-bit version.

in terms of cost/security level claimed GOST is probably strictly the best symmetric cipher known…
GOST and International Standards Organization [ISO]
ISO

- Less than 10 crypto algorithms were ever standardized by ISO. E.g. AES.
- All in ISO 18033.
  - Four 64-bit block ciphers:
    - e.g. TDES
  - Only three 128-bit block ciphers:
    - e.g. AES
GOST in ISO

- In 2010 GOST was also submitted to ISO 18033 to become an international standard.
- In the mean time GOST was broken.
- Two attacks were published in early 2011:
  - One by Takanori Isobe [FSE 2011].
  - One by Nicolas Courtois [eprint/2011/211].
Future of GOST in ISO

• Our report [eprint/2011/211] was officially submitted to ISO.

• It says: […] to standardize GOST now would be really dangerous and irresponsible […]

• But Why?
  – Half-broken in very serious sense
  – Really broken in academic sense
What’s Wrong? >50 distinct attacks… Best = $2^{101}$

- Weak Key Schedule
- Poor Diffusion
  - Self-similarity
  - Guess Then …
    - Reflection
    - Slide
    - Fixed P.
    - Involution

“Algebraic Complexity Reduction”

- AC / Software / SAT Solvers
- multiple random keys
- MITM

combination attacks

- multiple points, HO
- Truncated Differentials (DC)
- Combinatorial Optimisation

best = $2^{101}$
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6. Algebraic Complexity Reduction
[Black Box] Reduction Paradigm

Black-box
  high-level
guess and determine methods
which transform
an attack … into another…
Reductions

- Given $2^X$ KP for the full 32-round GOST.
- Obtain $Y$ KP for 8 rounds of GOST.
- This valid with probability $2^{-Z}$.
- For a proportion $2^{-T}$ of GOST keys.

Some 40 distinct reductions of this type with a large variety of $X,Y,Z,T$ can be found in 
[eprint/2011/626](https://eprint.iacr.org/2011/626)
Example

- Given $2^{32}$ KP for the full 32-round GOST.
- Obtain 4 KP for 8 rounds of GOST.
- This valid with probability $2^{-128}$. 
Is Algebraic Complexity Reduction Already Known?

There exists many known attacks which enter the framework of Algebraic Complexity Reduction:

- Slide attacks
- Fixed Point Attacks
- Cycling Attacks
- Involution Attacks
- Guessing [Conditional Algebraic Attacks]
- Etc..
What’s New?

Slide / Fixed Point / Cycling / Guessing / Etc..

WHAT’S NEW?
• There are now many completely new attacks which are exactly none of the above [though similar or related].
• Many new attacks are possible and many of these attacks were never studied because they generate only a few known plaintexts, and only in the last 5 years it became possible to design an appropriate last step for these attacks which is a low-data complexity key recovery attack [e.g. algebraic, MITM].
Feistel Schemes
2x Same
6.2. Structure of GOST

\[ \text{Enc}_k = D \circ S \circ E \circ E \circ E \]
We write GOST as the following functional decomposition (to be read from right to left) which is the same as used at Indocrypt 2008 [29]:

\[ \text{Enc}_k = D \circ S \circ \varnothing \circ \varnothing \circ \varnothing \]

Where \( \varnothing \) is exactly the first 8 rounds which exploits the whole 256-bit key, \( S \) is a swap function which exchanges the left and right hand sides and does not depend on the key, and \( D \) is the corresponding decryption function with \( \varnothing \circ D = D \circ \varnothing = Id \).
*Compare: DES

16*48 subsets of 56 bits.

1: $K \xrightarrow{PC1} (C, D)$
2: for $i = 1$ to 16 do
3: $C \leftarrow \text{ROL}_{r_i}(C)$
4: $D \leftarrow \text{ROL}_{r_i}(D)$
5: $K_i \leftarrow PC2(C, D)$
6: end for
Fixed Points: DES Key Schedule

- Can DES key be periodic?
- After step 1 = key for R1
- After step 8 = key for R8
- After step 15 = key for R15
- We have a pattern G of length 7 which repeats twice.
- Unhappily G = + 13 mod 28 (and not 14)
- Does NOT have many fixed points.
Last 16 Rounds of GOST

\[ \text{\( Enc_k = D \circ S \circ E \circ E \circ E \)} \]

“Theorem Which Won World War 2”,

\[ P \text{ and } Q^{-1} \circ P \circ Q \]

have the same cycle structure
Last 16 Rounds of GOST

\[ Enc_k = D \circ S \circ E \circ E \circ E \]

“Theorem Which Won World War 2”,

⇒ Has **exactly** \(2^{32}\) fixed points (order 1) 
and \(2^{64} - 2^{32}\) points of order 2.

⇒ A lot of fixed points (very few for DES).
6.3. Complexity Reduction in Guess-Then-Determine attacks

Reason: Self-Similarity
6.3.1. Guess-Then-Determine: Amplification
Amplification

Definition 3.2.1 (Amplification, Informal). The goal of the attacker is to find a reduction where he makes some assumption at a certain initial cost, for example they are true with probability $2^{-X}$ or work for certain proportion $2^{-Z}$ of keys. Then the attacker can in constant time determine many other internal bits inside the cipher to the total of $Y$ bits. We call amplification the ratio $A = Y/X$.

We are only interested in cases in which the values $X$ and $Z$ are judged realistic for a given attack, for example $Z < 32$ and $X < 128$.

Killer examples:

- Slide attacks – unlimited.
- Weak Key Family 3 in GOST – VERY large => attack on GOST with $2^{159}$ per key
6.4. Complexity Reduction: First Example:

Relaxing the Requirements of A Sliding Attack
Black Box Reduction: Pseudo-Sliding Attack
[Cryptologia Jan 2012]
One Encryption

$$Enc_k = D \circ S \circ E \circ E \circ E$$
Two Encryptions with A Slide

not similar
Assumptions

We proceed as follows. We consider plaintexts with a very peculiar property: Assumption 1 (Assumption W). Let $A$ be such that $\mathcal{E}(D) = \overline{D}$ where $D$ is defined as $D = \mathcal{E}^3(A)$. 

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
8 \\
\downarrow \\
D \\
\downarrow \\
D \otimes \overline{D}
\end{array} & \mathcal{E} & \begin{array}{c}
C \\
\downarrow \\
8
\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{c}
D \otimes \overline{D} \\
\uparrow \\
D \\
\uparrow \\
C
\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}
\mathcal{E} \\
D \otimes \overline{D}
\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{c}
\mathcal{E} \\
\downarrow \\
C
\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}
256 \\
D \otimes \overline{D} \\
\uparrow \\
256
\end{array}
\end{array}
\]
Fact 2 (Property W). Given $2^{64}$ KP there is on average one value $A$ which satisfies the Assumption. For 63% of all GOST keys at least one such $A$ exists.

Remark: For the remaining 37% of keys this attack fails. However many other attacks still work, see [12].
Reduction
New Attack on GOST

Fact 3 (Consequences of Property W). If $A$ satisfies the Assumption W above and defining $B = \mathcal{E}(A)$ and $C = \mathcal{E}(B)$ we have:
1. $\text{Enc}_k(A) = D$. This is illustrated on the right hand side of Fig. 1.
2. $\text{Enc}_k(B) = C$ This can be seen on the left hand side of Fig. 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rounds</th>
<th>values</th>
<th>key size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$\mathcal{E}$</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$\mathcal{E}$ down</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$\mathcal{E}$ down</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$\mathcal{E}$ down</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$\mathcal{E}$ down</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$\mathcal{E}$ down</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$\mathcal{E}$ down</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$\mathcal{E}$ down</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$2^{64}$ KP

guess A, B

correct $P=2^{-128}$

$P=2^{-128}$

=>

4 pairs for 8 rounds

Fig. 1. A black-box “Algebraic Complexity Reduction” from 32 to 8 rounds of GOST
Final Key Recovery 8R

4 Pairs, 8 rounds.
The key is found within $2^{110}$ GOST computations.
Overall Attack

$2^{128+110}$ GOST computations. $2^{17}$ times faster than brute force.

Not the best attack yet.
Cryptologia [Jan 2012]

Editorial:

Cryptologia
Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:
http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/ucry20

Space Crunchers and GOST Busters!
Craig Bauer
Available online: 12 Jan 2012

Finally, I welcome Nicolas T. Courtois to our pages. His paper attacking the GOST cipher is the first of several I hope to receive.

Best Wishes,
Craig Bauer
Editor-in-Chief
6.5. More Single Key Attacks…
Many more single-key attacks on full 32-round GOST…

cf. eprint.iacr.org/2011/626/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reduction Summary</th>
<th>Reduction cf.</th>
<th>Red. 1 §9.1</th>
<th>Red. 2 §10</th>
<th>Red. 3 §11</th>
<th>Red. 4 §11.1</th>
<th>Red. 5 §12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td></td>
<td>1x Internal Reflection</td>
<td>2x Reflection</td>
<td>Fixed Point</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From (data 32 R)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2^{32} KP</td>
<td>2^{64} KP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtained (for 8R)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 KP</td>
<td>3 KP</td>
<td>3 KP</td>
<td>4 KP</td>
<td>2 KP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid w. prob.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2^{-96}</td>
<td>2^{-128}</td>
<td>2^{-96}</td>
<td>2^{-128}</td>
<td>2^{-64}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last step</th>
<th>MITM</th>
<th>Guess+ Det.</th>
<th>Hybrid MITM-Software/Algebraic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases ∈ Inside</td>
<td>2^{128}</td>
<td>2^{128}</td>
<td>2^{128}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then Fact cf.</td>
<td>Fact 9</td>
<td>Fact 4</td>
<td>Fact 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to break 8R</td>
<td>2^{127}/2</td>
<td>2^{127}/2</td>
<td>2^{128}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage bytes</td>
<td>2^{132}</td>
<td>2^{39}/2^{146}</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># false positives</td>
<td>2^{224}</td>
<td>2^{192}</td>
<td>2^{128}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attack time 32 R</td>
<td>2^{224}</td>
<td>2^{228}/2^{224}</td>
<td>2^{200}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

© Nicolas T. Courtois, 2006-2012
Science ≠ Politics

Main paper was submitted to Asiacrypt 2011. One referee wrote: “I think that the audiences of Asiacrypt will not feel it is interesting.”

=> however about half of papers accepted at this Asiacrypt are about things about which nobody ever heard, not even professional cryptologists (say JH42, Armadillo, theory, incremental research, things which would interest very few people)... not to say it would interest anybody in the industry or government circles...

=> HOW many times it ever happened at Asiacrypt that a military-grade cipher, and an official government standard of a major country, used by large banks, implemented in SSL, was broken, while being in the process of being standardized by ISO to become a global industrial standard? Not many times.

⇒ impacting potentially all of: national critical infrastructures, key financial systems and even ordinary computer software

⇒ It could be worth tens of billions of dollars to fix problems due to GOST..

⇒ For now nothing bad happened, just some bad press.

⇒ BUT is GOST really broken?
Science ≠ Politics

But is GOST really so bad?
When it was submitted to ISO, and only then,
suddenly some cryptanalysts tried to break it… And succeeded.
And there is now more than 50 attacks… Academic attacks.
We do in “the West” put VERY HIGH super-paranoid
requirements on security of ciphers…
⇒ It is debatable whether the Russian designers of GOST ever thought that it should not have attacks faster than $2^{256}$…
⇒ Remember that GOST can have a secondary key: secret S-boxes.

Even today, in spite of all our 20+ attacks, GOST is better than any comparable cipher:
Look at the (best attack) / (implementation cost) ratio
– Key schedule could be easily fixed to avoid academic shortcut attacks…
– GOST-P is even better (better S-box <= PRESENT: new ISO standard).

cf. Poschmann et al CHES 2010
6.6. Black Box Reduction: Reflection Attack
Reflection – Happens $2^{32}$ Times - KPA

- guess A det C
  info=64 cost=$2^{-32}$
- guess B
  info=64+64 cost=$2^{-64}$
- [guess D
  info=64 cost=$2^{-32}$ ]

Summary: we get 2/3 KP for 8R for the price of $2^{-96}/2^{-128}$.

break 8R 2KP $2^{127}$
  => break 32R $D=2^{32} \ T=2^{223}$
break 8R 3KP $2^{110}$
  => break 32R $D=2^{32} \ T=2^{238}$
6.7. Double Reflection Attack
2x Reflection, Happens About Once:

- guess C det A
  info=64 cost=$2^{-32}$

- guess B det Z
  info=64+64+64 cost=$2^{-64}$

- [guess D
  info=64 cost=$2^{-32}$ ]

Summary: we get 3/4 KP for 8R for the price of $2^{-96}/2^{-128}$

break 8R 3KP $2^{110}$

=> break 32R D=$2^{64}$ T=$2^{206}$

break 8R 4KP $2^{94}$

=> break 32R D=$2^{64}$ T=$2^{222}$
Other Attacks?

Best single key attack:
\[ D=2^{64} \quad T=2^{179} \]


However ciphers are NEVER used with single keys in the real life… On the contrary.
7. Multiple Random Key Scenario

“stronger, more versatile and MORE practical than any known single key attack”
7.1. One Triple Reflection Attack
3x Reflection, Weak Keys $2^{-64}$

$$E^2(A) = A$$

$$E(A) = \overline{A}$$

No guessing =>
Very high amplification.
All data obtained nearly “for free”.
7.2. Combined Attacks: DC + Algebraic Complexity Reduction

two totally unrelated families of attacks…
…until December 2012
New Combined Attacks

New attacks from November 2012 combine ALL of truncated differentials, fixed points, advanced MITM, software/SAT solvers and reflection in ONE single attack. Example:

Family 5.3. Fact 47 Section 19.5.
Given \(2^{52}\) devices with random keys on 256 bits and \(2^{32}\) ACP (Adaptively Chosen Plaintexts), we can recover one GOST key in time of \(2^{139}\).

Total data = \(2^{84}\). Mostly used to reject keys which do not satisfy our conditions.
Combined DC+Algebraic Complexity Reduction

3 KP for 8R obtained. Time(8R) = $2^{110}$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rounds</th>
<th>values/differences</th>
<th>key size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$A \leftarrow 80700700$ $80700700 \Rightarrow B$</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$A \leftarrow 80700700$ $80700700 \Rightarrow B$</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$A \leftarrow 80700700$ $80700700 \Rightarrow B$</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$A \leftarrow 80700700$ $80700700 \Rightarrow B$</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bits</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Multiple-Point Events and Bicliques
Attacks with Multiple Fixed Points and Bicliques

New attacks with multiple related encryptions + additional well-chosen properties, as usual.

A form of advanced higher-order differential attack.

Greatly decreases the cost of making assumptions such as $A=B'$ etc.
Fig. 18. An approximate fixed point biclique with $k = 4$
Attacks with Multiple Fixed Points and Bicliques

Example:

Family 8.4. Fact 73 Section 22.6.
Given \(2^{79}\) devices with random keys on 256 bits and \(2^{32}\) CP per key we can recover one GOST key in time of \(2^{101}\).

=> Nearly feasible (for a large intelligence agency).
=> Further improvements expected…
8.2. Summary
The Multiple Key Scenario (1)

cf. eprint.iacr.org/2011/626/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attack Ref.</th>
<th>§10.3/[32]</th>
<th>§13.1/[32]</th>
<th>Red. 3 §12</th>
<th>[27]</th>
<th>F.0 [54]</th>
<th>Fam. 2</th>
<th>Fam. 2</th>
<th>Fam. 3</th>
<th>Fam. 4.X.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keys density $d$</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2^{-32}$</td>
<td>$2^{-64}$</td>
<td>$2^{-64}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data/key 32R</td>
<td>$2^{32}$ KP</td>
<td>$2^{64}$ KP</td>
<td>$2^{64}$ KP</td>
<td>$2^{32}$ CP</td>
<td>$2^{32}$ CC</td>
<td>$2^{32}$ ACC</td>
<td>$2^{64}$ KP</td>
<td>$2^{32}$ CP</td>
<td>$2^{64}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtained for 8R</td>
<td>2 KP</td>
<td>3 KP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 KP</td>
<td>3 KP</td>
<td>4 KP</td>
<td>2 KP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid w. prob.</td>
<td>$2^{-96}$</td>
<td>$2^{-64}$</td>
<td>$2^{-64}$</td>
<td>$2^{-1}$</td>
<td>$2^{-64}$</td>
<td>$2^{-64}$</td>
<td>$2^{-1}$</td>
<td>$2^{-0}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage bytes</td>
<td>$2^{26}/2^{39}$</td>
<td>$2^{46}/2^{39}$</td>
<td>$2^{57}$</td>
<td>$2^{0}$</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>$2^{57}$</td>
<td>for data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># False positives</td>
<td>$2^{128}$</td>
<td>$2^{128}$</td>
<td>$2^{192}$</td>
<td>$2^{64}$</td>
<td>$2^{-0}$</td>
<td>$2^{264}$</td>
<td>$2^{128}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time for 8 R</td>
<td>$2^{127}/2^{128}$</td>
<td>$2^{127}/2^{128}$</td>
<td>$2^{110}$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2^{192}$</td>
<td>$2^{110}$</td>
<td>$2^{94}$</td>
<td>$2^{94}$</td>
<td>$2^{128}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attack time 32 R</td>
<td>$2^{223}/2^{224}$</td>
<td>$2^{219}/2^{192}$</td>
<td>$2^{206}$</td>
<td>$2^{179}$</td>
<td>$2^{192}$</td>
<td>$2^{174}$</td>
<td>$2^{158}$</td>
<td>$2^{159}$</td>
<td>$2^{128}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of 1 key, if key diversity $\geq$ single key attacks or for $&gt; 50%$ of keys</td>
<td>$2^{224}/2^{225}$</td>
<td>$2^{192}/2^{193}$</td>
<td>$2^{207}$</td>
<td>$2^{179}$</td>
<td>$2^{193}$</td>
<td>$2^{206}$</td>
<td>$2^{190}$</td>
<td>$2^{159}$</td>
<td>$\geq 2^{129}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data x keys</td>
<td>$2^{233}$</td>
<td>$2^{64}$</td>
<td>$2^{55}$</td>
<td>$2^{64}$</td>
<td>$2^{64}$</td>
<td>$2^{65}$</td>
<td>$2^{96}/128$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Multiple Key Scenario (2)

cf. eprint.iacr.org/2011/626/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family cf.</th>
<th>Fam. 5.3</th>
<th>Fam. 5.4</th>
<th>Fam. 6</th>
<th>Fam. 7.2</th>
<th>Fam. 8.1</th>
<th>Fam. 8.2</th>
<th>Fam. 8.3</th>
<th>Fam. 8.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keys density $d$</td>
<td>$2^{-52}$</td>
<td>$2^{-75}$</td>
<td>$2^{-84}$</td>
<td>$2^{-84}$</td>
<td>$2^{-98}$</td>
<td>$2^{-84}$</td>
<td>$2^{-70}$</td>
<td>$2^{-79}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data/key 32R</td>
<td>$2^{32}$ ACP</td>
<td>$2^{32}$ ACP</td>
<td>$2^{32}$ CP</td>
<td>$2^{32}$ ACC</td>
<td>$2^{32}$ CP</td>
<td>$2^{32}$ CP</td>
<td>$2^{32}$ CP</td>
<td>$2^{32}$ CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtained for 8R.</td>
<td>3 KP</td>
<td>4 KP</td>
<td>4 KP</td>
<td>6 KP</td>
<td>3 KP</td>
<td>3 KP</td>
<td>3 KP</td>
<td>4 KP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid w. prob.</td>
<td>$2^{-9}$</td>
<td>$2^{-9}$</td>
<td>$2^{-0}$</td>
<td>$2^{-4}$</td>
<td>$2^{-0}$</td>
<td>$2^{-0}$</td>
<td>$2^{-0}$</td>
<td>$2^{-0}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Storage bytes</th>
<th>small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># False positives</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time for 8 R</td>
<td>$2^{110}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attack time 32 R</td>
<td>$2^{119}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of 1 key, if key diversity $\geq$ Data x keys</td>
<td>$2^{139}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2^{52}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2^{84}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Major attacks on full GOST cipher: single vs. multiple random keys scenario. Various attacks are here compared according to their capacity to find some keys when weak keys occur at random with their natural probability. In lower table we see that if we allow higher key diversity requirements and more data collected in total (for all keys), the overall time cost to recover one key, this including the cost to examine keys which are not weak, decreases down to $2^{101}$ and beats all known single key attacks.
8.3. Facts or Fictions?
In CTCrypt 2012, workshop held in English, in Russia, July 2012.

Algebraic and Differential Cryptanalysis of GOST: Fact or Fiction


A. DMukh, V. Rudskoy

SR algebraic attack is not well-grounded

Fact Fiction 3 (Key Recovery for 4 Rounds and 2 KP)

Fact Fiction 5 (Key Recovery for 8 Rounds and 3 KP)

Differential attacks
- S-boxes heavily affect security
- With "good" S-boxes the attack fails

Easy: try CryptoMiniSat

See Cryptologia Jan 2013 and eprint/2011/626

Super naïve: it makes little sense to take our differential property optimised for one set of S-boxes and apply it to another set of S-boxes. Another differential property is needed; carefully optimised for this another set of S-boxes...
9. GOST Hash
GOST Hash

Another Russian government standard: GOST-R-34.11-94

Obligatory part of Russian national Digital Signature standard.


Lots of Applications of GOST Hash:
- Message authentication in (financial) networks.
- Legally binding contracts.
- Trust: electronic commerce (implemented in OpenSSL).

=> An attack on GOST Hash could be potentially much more serious than breaking GOST encryption…
High Level

Very special version of Merkle-Damgard + Len.

security proof? works the same way collision => collision on the compression function

extra component (not much stronger...)

compression function

512 → 256
Collisions on The Compression Function

Sometimes called pseudo-collisions:
Because they may use intermediate values (IV or Hi) which will never occur in the real life…

“Certificational Weakness”:
- Any collision on this invalidates the security proof. But does not mean (yet) a real attack.
- Also because these conditions, again by the security proof are NECESSARY to develop collisions of the full hash process, this is a place to start working!

\[ \Delta \neq 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \Delta = 0 \quad < 2^{128} \text{ time} \]
Pre-Images on The Compression Function

given \( Y \) compute \( X \)

\[ < 2^{255} \text{ time} \]
9.1. How to Break GOST Compression

[Mendel-Pramstaller-Rechberger]
[Courtois- Mourouzis]
Collisions on Compression

Goal:

Pseudo-Collisions:

“Stronger” Collisions:

$H_{i-1}$ is arbitrary fixed,
use just $M_i$ to make it collide nevertheless

$\Delta \neq 0$ cannot chose
Inside

K, L are linear
C₁, C₂ are constants
CICO = Solve $f(x) = y$ with $x \in X, y \in Y$

Constrained Inputs Constrained Outputs

[term invented by the designers of Keccak SHA-3]

But how to constrain? How to choose $X, Y$?

“CICO Setup” problem
Key Idea

• Select a number of linear equations on the 512 outputs
• Which induces a smaller linear space for the 256-bit output.

Consequently both Ps.-collisions and preimage attacks are possible.
• For example if the output space is reduced to $2^{192}$ points, it is like breaking a hash function on 192 bits by brute force / collision search.
• This is if the input space is large enough...
Key Idea

assume $256+64+64$
linear equations, $2^{128}$

$H_{i-1}$ $M_i$

CICO =
Solve $f(x)=y$ with $x \in X, y \in Y$

“CICO Setup” problem: How to choose $X, Y$?

Here they are **linear spaces**.

$H_i$

obtain 64 linear
equations, $2^{192}$
Attacks:

[Mendel-Pramstaller-Rechberger]
[Courtois-Mourouzis]

assume \(256+64+64\) linear equations, \(2^{128}\)

obtain 64 linear equations, \(2^{192}\)
Method 1

assume $256+64+64$ linear equations, $2^{128}$

obtain 64 linear equations, $2^{192}$
Method 1

hypothetical 256+64+64 linear equations, $2^{128}$

Obtain 64 linear equations, $2^{192}$

$k_0 = P(h \oplus m)$

Ps-coll./prei with $x_0 = 0$
Method 2

[Courtois- Mourouzis]
SECRIPT 2011

assume \(256 + 64 + 64\) linear equations, \(2^{128}\)

\[L\]

\[H_{i-1}\]

\[c_0 = c_1\]

\[64\]

\[h_0 = h_1\]

\[64\]

\[K\]

Ps-coll.

with \(x_0 = x_1\)

obtain 64 linear equations, \(2^{192}\)
Why Do This?

assume $256+64+64$
linear equations, $2^{128}$

Application 1: find Ps-collisions $T=2^{96}$

Application 2: find Ps-pre-images $T=2^{192}$

$H_{i-1}$ $M_i$

$H_i$

obtain 64 linear equations, $2^{192}$

© Nicolas T. Courtois, 2006-2012
Pseudo-Collisions

\[ T = 2^{96} < 2^{128} \]
Ps-Collisions

Assume \(256+64+64\) linear equations, \(2^{128}\)

\[ H_{i-1} \quad M_i \]

Our input space is larger than \(2^{96}\).

Complexity is simply \(2^{96}\) due to output space size of \(2^{192}\). Birthday paradox attack.

Important: can be made totally memoryless by known cycling techniques…

Cf. Quisquater-Delescaille, How Easy is Collision Search. New Results and Applications to DES. In Crypto’89, LNCS 435, pp. 408-413.
Ps-Collisions

Easy, several methods

Assume $256 + 64 + 64$ linear equations, $2^{128}$

Apply birthday paradox to a set of size $2^{96}$ elements in output space of size $2^{192}$.

Method 1: Efficiently generate $2^{96}$ cases with $x_0 = 0$.

Method 2: Efficiently generate $2^{96}$ cases with $x_0 = x_1$. 

Obtain 64 linear equations, $2^{192}$
Ps-Pre-Images

$T = 2^{192} < 2^{255}$

fewer methods
Method 1

 assume $256+64+64$

linear equations, $2^{128}$

FSE 2008

$H_{i-1}$

$256+256$

linear redundancy

dim=512

$M_i$

$256+256$

linear

$64$

$64$

$64$

$64$

$64$

$k_0 = P(h \oplus m)$

guess $256+64$

correct?
Pre-Images

assume \(256+64+64\) linear equations, \(2^{128}\)

With Method 1 we can first of all chose \(h_0,k_0\) and compute \(c_0\) which we need to obtain for a correct target value \(x_0\).

now the triple of values \((h_0,k_0,c_0)\) determines \(256+64+64\) linear equations we fix for the inputs.

Random input produces the output we want with probability \(2^{-192}\). Time complexity is simply \(2^{192}\).

For every \(h_0,k_0\) we can determine \(c_0\) and explore the input space with \(2^{128}\) points. In total we can explore \(2^{256+64+128}\) possibilities, more than \(2^{192}\) necessary.
**Method 2’**

Assume 256 + 64 + 64 linear equations, $2^{128}$

- $m_0$
- $m_1$
- $m_2$
- $m_3$

Linear redundancy

$H_{i-1} \rightarrow 256 + 256 \rightarrow 256$

$256$ = $h_{0} \oplus h_{1}$

64 imposed

$h_0 = h_1$

Fix $c_0 \oplus c_1$

Correct?

Obtain 64 linear equations, $2^{192}$
Pre-Images

With Method 2' we can fix $c_0 \oplus c_1$ such that $s_0 \oplus s_1 = 0$ which we want to impose, 64 affine equations.

Other 64+256 linear equations as in Method 2: $k_0 = k_1$ and $h_0 = h_1$.

Now random input produces the output we want with probability $2^{-192}$. Complexity is again $2^{192}$.

Problem: input space is only $2^{128}$. Works with proba $2^{-64}$.

Six basic variants with 2 out of 4: Works with proba $2^{-61.4}$.

Due to GOST complementation we get $2^{-60.4}$.

This attack only works for some final outputs.

assume $256+64+64$

linear equations, $2^{128}$

$H_{i-1}$  $M_i$
Conclusion

Assume 256+64+64 linear equations, \(2^{128}\)

\[H_{i-1} \quad M_i\]

For the GOST compression function.

We find pseudo-collisions in time \(2^{96}\). Method 1/2

We find pseudo-pre-images in time \(2^{192}\). Method 1 only.

100% black-box methods, any block cipher.

In Method 2 needs to be same cipher twice. Self-similarity.
10. Diffusion in GOST
*Claims on GOST

Wikipedia April 2011:
Cryptanalysis of GOST

…Another concern is that the avalanche effect is slower to occur in GOST than in DES. This is because of GOST's lack of an expansion permutation in the round function, as well as its use of a rotation instead of a permutation. Again, this is offset by GOST's increased number of rounds…
1 Round + Next Round of GOST
Carry Propagation

determine $a$:
need $S3$, $S4$ and $c$

$d,e$ known
$\Rightarrow 2^{0.6}$ possibilities

3 more bits known
$\Rightarrow 2^{0.3}$ possibilities

$\ldots$
$2^{0.0}$
10.2. Guess-Then-Determine: What to Guess?
10.2.1. Contradiction Immunity
Attacks With SAT Solvers

2 strategies:

There are two main approaches in SAT cryptanalysis or two main algorithms to break a cipher with a SAT solver:

1. **The SAT Method:** Guess $X$ bits and run a SAT solver which, if the assumption on $X$ bits is correct takes time $T$. Abort all the other computations at time $T$. The total time complexity is about $2^X \cdot T$.

2. **The UNSAT Method:** Guess $X$ bits and run a SAT solver which, if the assumption on $X$ bits is incorrect finds a contradiction in time $T$ with large probability $1 - P$ say 99%.

   With a small probability of $P > 0$, we can guess more key bits and either find additional contradictions or find the solution.

   The idea is that if $P$ is small enough the complexity of these additional steps can be less then the $2^X \cdot T$ spent in the initial UNSAT step.

3. **A Mixed UNSAT/SAT Attack:** In practice maybe $P$ is not as small as we wish, and therefore we may have a mix of SAT and UNSAT method: where the final complexity will be a sum of two terms none of which can be neglected. We will see some specific examples later.
Phase Transitions for Naïve Cryptologists:

1 dimensional

HARD .................................. EASY

For Serious Cryptologists:

In fact we need to look at an exponential number of subsets!
UNSAT Immunity

Well chosen set of 68 bits.

UNSAT proba = 39%.
Jumps...

To increase 39% to 50% we need 10 more bits = 78 bits.

UNSAT proba=50%.
SAT Immunity

Same set of 68 bits as before.

All the other bits are found in 400 s on one laptop i7 CPU

=> using CryptoMiniSat x64 2.92.
UNSAT Immunity in DES

**Fact 1.** The Contradiction Immunity is at most 44 for 8 rounds of DES.

For 8 rounds of GOST: it is 78 [unpublished set].
More on UNSAT Immunity

See:

Nicolas Courtois, Jerzy A. Gawinecki, Guangyan Song: *Contradiction Immunity and Guess-Then-Determine Attacks On GOST*,
****

Multiplicative Complexity in GOST Optimal S-boxes
Theory of Optimal S-boxes

There is a theory of “optimal S-boxes” which are the best possible w.r.t. linear and differential criteria to build ciphers...

On the Classification of 4 Bit S-Boxes

G. Leander¹,∗ and A. Poschmann²

¹ GRIM, University Toulon, France
Gregor.Leander@rub.de

² Horst-Görtz-Institute for IT-Security, Ruhr-University Bochum, Germany
poschmann@crypto.rub.de
Affine Equivalence

We call two S-boxes $S_1, S_2$ equivalent if there exist bijective linear mappings $A, B$ and constants $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_2^4$ such that

$$S'(x) = B(S(A(x) + a)) + b.$$ 

If two S-boxes $S_1$ and $S_2$ are equivalent in the above sense we denote this by $S_1 \sim S_2$.

Abstract. In this paper we classify all optimal 4 bit S-boxes. Remarkably, up to affine equivalence, there are only 16 different optimal S-boxes.
Affine Equivalence

Only 16 S-boxes are “good”.

4x4 occur in Serpent, PRESENT, GOST, [AES…]

not surprising that some of the S-boxes of the Serpent cipher are linear equivalent. Another advantage of our characterization is that it eases the highly non-trivial task of choosing good S-boxes for hardware dedicated ciphers a lot.
Affine Equivalence \implies MC?!

Yes!

1. Determine another S-box for which our S-box is an affine equivalent of another S-box, for which the MC was already computed.
2. The affine equivalence can be determined by methods of [2] which are actually essentially the same methods which have been proposed at the same conference 10 years earlier [9] in a slightly different context.

Original algorithm: see
• Courtois Goubin Patarin, Eurocrypt 1998

Adaptation:
• Biryukov et al, Eurocrypt 2008
## Affine Equivalence in GOST

Or do Russian code makers read French-German papers about crypto S-boxes...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S-box Set Name</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>S4</th>
<th>S5</th>
<th>S6</th>
<th>S7</th>
<th>S8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GostR3411_94_TestParamSet</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- their inverses</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GostR3411_94_CryptoProParamSet</td>
<td>L1u</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>G10</td>
<td>G8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- their inverses</td>
<td>L1u</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>G10</td>
<td>G8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gost28147_TestParamSet</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- their inverses</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gost28147_CryptoProParamSetA</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>G8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- their inverses</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>G8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gost28147_CryptoProParamSetB</td>
<td>G13</td>
<td>G13</td>
<td>G13</td>
<td>G11</td>
<td>G7</td>
<td>G7</td>
<td>G11</td>
<td>G6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- their inverses</td>
<td>G13</td>
<td>G13</td>
<td>G13</td>
<td>G11</td>
<td>G7</td>
<td>G7</td>
<td>G11</td>
<td>G6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- their inverses</td>
<td>G13</td>
<td>G13</td>
<td>G13</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>G12</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>G13</td>
<td>G7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GostR3411_94_SberbankHashParamset</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- their inverses</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOST ISO 18033-3 proposal</td>
<td>G9</td>
<td>G9</td>
<td>G9</td>
<td>G9</td>
<td>G9</td>
<td>G9</td>
<td>G9</td>
<td>G9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- their inverses</td>
<td>G9</td>
<td>G9</td>
<td>G9</td>
<td>G9</td>
<td>G9</td>
<td>G9</td>
<td>G9</td>
<td>G9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Affine Equivalence in GOST - Observations

• There was a historical evolution of GOST S-boxes towards boxes of type $G_i$ which are optimal against LC/DC
• Most of more recent S-boxes which appear in OpenSSL are one of the $G_i$
• BTW. 12 out of these 'optimal' S-boxes are affine equivalent to their own inverse.
• Interestingly, only 9 of these 12 which are namely $G_4$, $G_6$, $G_7$, $G_8$, $G_9$, $G_{10}$, $G_{11}$, $G_{12}$, $G_{13}$ occur in our table for GOST, and only those which are equivalent to their inverse occur in this table.
### Table 1. Multiplicative Complexity for all known GOST S-Boxes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S-box Set Name</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>S4</th>
<th>S5</th>
<th>S6</th>
<th>S7</th>
<th>S8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GostR3411_94_TestParamSet</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GostR3411_94_CryptoProParamSet</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gost28147_TestParamSet</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gost28147_CryptoProParamSetA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gost28147_CryptoProParamSetB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gost28147_CryptoProParamSetC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gost28147_CryptoProParamSetD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GostR3411_94_SberbankHashParamset</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOST ISO 18033-3 proposal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GOST-P

A version of GOST with 8x PRESENT S-box
- Only 650 G.E.
MC = 4 each exactly (as we already proved).

The authors have obtained in 2011 for their work precisely on PRESENT cipher and 4-bit S-boxes, an “IT Security Price” of 100 000 € which is the highest scientific price in Germany awarded by a private foundation.
11. DC

COMP128v1

DES,

GOST
GOST vs. LC and DC

Bruce Schneier, Applied Cryptography, 1996, Section 14.1. page 334
“Against differential and linear cryptanalysis, GOST is probably stronger than DES”

Gabidulin 2000-2001:
For security = $2^{256}$, 5 rounds are sufficient to protect GOST against linear cryptanalysis.
Moreover, even if the S-boxes are replaced by identity, and the only non-linear operation in the cipher is the addition modulo $2^{32}$, the cipher is still secure against linear cryptanalysis after 6 rounds out of 32.
11.1. The “Holy Grail” of DC
How To Reduce The Number Of Rounds

Attack on Keyed One-Way $F$ or Keyed Hash Functions $\equiv$ MACs.

Produce extinguishing differentials: All $\Delta$ bits at 0.

Each collision leads is detected and leads to key recovery.

Huge weakness.
COMP128v1 – Very Weak

Closed-source algorithm designed by the GSM association.

Kept secret until leaked and broken in 1997. After it was BADLY broken, GSM Committee issued a statement saying it was just an example…

To this day the attack works and allows to clone many SIM cards…

We have extracted many keys…
COMP128v1 = Butterfly Algorithm, 8*5 rounds

5-round compression \( K \)

\( F_K : 128 \rightarrow 128 \)

\( x = \text{RAND} \)

derive new \( x \)
Weakness: “All Zero Output Difference”

Collision for the first 2 rounds! a.k.a. “Narrow Pipe”.

RAND

K
“All Zero Output Difference” for DES?

Impossible
for bijective functions.

The best we can hope:
reproduction
of small HW pattern $\Delta$. 
“All Zero Output Difference” for Round Functions

Possible for DES: not bijective.
Not easy
(3 or more boxes).

Impossible for GOST: bijective.
11.2. CPA = 
Comparative Power Analysis

[Shamir et al. 2010]
N. Homma, A. Miyamoto, T. Aoki, A. Satoh, and A. Shamir: 
Comparative Power Analysis of Modular Exponentiation Algorithms, 
IEEE Transaction on Computers 59(6), pp. 795-807, 2010
“All Zero Output Difference” on 32 Bits

⇒ the Same trace
⇒ If deterministic...

Δ=0

CPA = Comparative Power Analysis: Extended def:

• Compare longer traces:
  • if identical, we have an “all-zero differential” (all the inputs must be the same).
  • Usually a CPA (better chances of success).
11.3. DC on DES
DES:
DC on DES [Biham-Shamir]

Figure 1: An example of Differential Cryptanalysis
11.4. Classical DC or How to Get Misled
DC Complexity

Simple “naïve” attack like Biham-Shamir attack on DES.
Assume “Differential Property of any kind”
Propagation $P = 2^{-X}$

Data Complexity = $1/P = 2^X$. Data can be obtained with different keys!!!!
Time Complexity = $1/P = 2^X$.

This Assuming there is no “noise”.
Guess some key bits => observe an “exceptional” event
=> right key with high proba.

Advanced differential attacks: “signal” + “noise”.
Natural Event $P = 2^{-Y}$ for a RP.
Propagation: $P = 2^{-Y} + 2^{-X}$ for XXX rounds.
Distinguishing between two Gaussian distributions.
Q: How many standard deviations?
Right key with proba? <= Gauss error function.
StDev = $2^{-Y/2}$ => it is sufficient to obtain $2^{-X} = C \cdot 2^{-Y/2}$!!!! Complexity $\geq O(2^{Y/2})$??
Biham-Shamir DC and GOST

If our model was DES…
we have totally misunderstood differential cryptanalysis.

Gabidulin 2000-2001:
Also claimed that 7 rounds are sufficient
to protect GOST against DC.
How To Be Led Astray

There are many papers about “provably security of ciphers” against DC and LC. Such works was published also about GOST, even in 2010…

⇒ In fact it is possible to CHEAT someone and to make them believe that GOST is provably secure against DC…
⇒ While in reality GOST in insecure against DC! How interesting…
2 Rounds Further?

The most recent paper about this topic:
Martin Albrecht and Gregor Leander:
An All-In-One Approach to Differential Cryptanalysis for Small Block Ciphers, Preprint, eprint.iacr.org/2012/401.

In Section 1.1. page 3:
“Truncated differentials, first mentioned in [15] can be seen as a collection of differentials and in some cases allow to push differential attacks one or two rounds further… “

NOT QUITE …
⇒ For Russian GOST they allowed us to push the attack more than 20 rounds further!
DES:
Quasi constant probability, or 2 cases...

Figure 1: An example of Differential Cryptanalysis
GOST vs. DES

DES: quasi constant probability. Does not become zero typically.
GOST, general case: propagation probability depends on the key.
Can be zero.

The problem:
For some keys it will be 0.
With probabilities as high as $\frac{1}{2}$ or similar.
If for some keys it is 0,
then however strong it can sometimes be…
It is guaranteed to be 0 after a few rounds(!)
(assuming independent round keys…)

Our early estimation: a single differential attack on GOST would propagate
with probability not better than $2^{-62}$ for 32 rounds.
For most keys it would propagate with probability 0.
11.5. DC With Sets
More Differential Cryptanalysis

[Seki, Kaneko SAC 2000]:

Sets of differentials = most general
Incomplete/truncated Differentials = With free bits…

Between 12 and 17 rounds out of 32 can be broken…

No attack beyond.
   Or it is not clear how one would proceed: signal>noise…
Sets Of Differentials [Seki-Kaneko, Courtois-Misztal]

\[ A \rightarrow B \]

any non-zero \( a \in A \), any non-zero \( b \in B \)

In this 64-bit string:

\[ 0x70707070, 0x07070707 \]

one half can be 0,
the whole must be non-zero

\( 2^{24} - 1 \) differences

24 active bits
Seki-Kaneko Split

0x70707070, 0x07070707057071-3
Seki-Kaneko Set

3 bits active per every second box.
S1357 in odd rounds 1,3,…
S2468 in even rounds 2,4,…

Rough estimation: there are only 4 bits coming “out” in each round. These differences must be 0 “by accident”.

Maybe 0x70707070,0x07070707 propagates with probability $2^{-4}$ per round?
Seki-Kaneko Set (contd.)

4 bits coming “out” in each round. these differences must be 0 “by accident”.

So $0x70707070,0x07070707$ propagates with probability $2^{-4}$ per round?

Not quite. There are also carries: on picture bits 123 active, 4 always inactive, S2 will be active with proba about

$$1-3.5/16 = 2^{-0.36}.$$ 

So we expect $2^{-4-3.5*0.36} = 2^{-5.3}$. Simulations also give $2^{-5.3}$ average (odd vs. even rounds, for the S-boxes of Central Bank of Russia)
Seki-Kaneko

Is $0x70707070,0x07070707$ dangerous? Probability $2^{-5.3}$ for 1 round. Means $2^{-170}$ for 32 rounds.

No hope to break GOST so far. There is only $2^{64+24-1} = 2^{87}$ pairs with input difference $\in 0x70707070,0x07070707$. 
Very Surprising

Propagation is MUCH better than expected. Already true for this old Japanese set from 2000.

0x70707070, 0x07070707.

Strong improvement. Examples:

- 2 Rounds: predicted $2^{-10.6}$ actual $2^{-8.6}$
- 4 Rounds: predicted $2^{-21.2}$ actual $2^{-16.7}$
- 8 Rounds: predicted $2^{-42.4}$ actual $2^{-28.4}$
New Sets [Courtois-Misztal, 2011]

References:
1. Nicolas Courtois, Michał Misztal:
   Aggregated Differentials and Cryptanalysis of PP-1 and GOST,
   In CECC 2011, 11th Central European Conference on Cryptology,
   => invention of new sets

2. Nicolas Courtois, Michał Misztal:
   First Differential Attack On Full 32-Round GOST, In ICICS'11, Beijing, China,
   => first simple attack (very slightly) faster than brute force \(2^{254.6}\)

3. Nicolas Courtois, Michał Misztal:
   Differential Cryptanalysis of GOST,
   => progressive improved approach, heuristic and not very precise... \(2^{226}\)

4. Nicolas Courtois:
   An Improved Differential Attack on Full GOST,
   => symmetric + many further refinements + very careful work on individual
   bits + tight [barely working] distinguishers + justification of earlier results \(2^{179}\)
New vs. Old Sets

- Seki-Kaneko:
  0x70707070, 0x07070707
  \(2^{24} - 1\) differences
  24 active bits
  naturally occurs: \(2^{-40}\)

- Courtois-Misztal
  0x80700700, 0x80700700
  \(2^{14} - 1\) differences
  14 active bits
  naturally occurs: \(2^{-50}\)
### New Sets [Courtois, Misztal, 2011]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input Aggregated Differential</th>
<th>0x70707070, 0x07070707</th>
<th>0x80700700, 0x80700700</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output Aggregated Differential</td>
<td>0x70707070, 0x07070707</td>
<td>0x80700700, 0x80700700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Seki-Kaneko [38]</td>
<td>this paper and [10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propagation 2 R</td>
<td>$2^{-8.6}$</td>
<td>$2^{-7.5}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propagation 4 R</td>
<td>$2^{-16.7}$</td>
<td>$2^{-13.6}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propagation 6 R</td>
<td>$2^{-24.1}$</td>
<td>$2^{-18.7}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propagation 8 R</td>
<td>$2^{-28.4}$</td>
<td>$2^{-25.0}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propagation 10 R</td>
<td>$2^{-35}$</td>
<td>$2^{-31.1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propagation 12 R</td>
<td>$2^{-43}$</td>
<td>$2^{-36}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propagation 14 R</td>
<td>$2^{-50}$</td>
<td>$2^{-42}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propagation 16 R</td>
<td>$2^{-56}$</td>
<td>$2^{-48}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propagation 18 R</td>
<td>$2^{-62}$</td>
<td>$2^{-54}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propagation 20 R</td>
<td>$2^{-70}$</td>
<td>$2^{-60}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propagation 22 R</td>
<td>$2^{-77}$</td>
<td>$2^{-66}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output $\Delta$ Occurs Naturally</td>
<td>$2^{-40.0}$</td>
<td>$2^{-50.0}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0x80700700, 0x80700700

Type 3+3: S836 + S836
11.7. Refined Attacks
Key Scheduling

Essential Weakness:
Same Keys Inversed Order
+ small size << whole key.

GOST: 32 bits guessed => gain 2 rounds!
- 0.06 of the key space per round
DES: 48 key bits guessed => 1 round
- 0.86 of the key space per round
New Attacks

References:

1. Nicolas Courtois, Michał Misztal:
   Aggregated Differentials and Cryptanalysis of PP-1 and GOST,
   In CECC 2011, 11th Central European Conference on Cryptology,
   => invention of new sets

2. Nicolas Courtois, Michał Misztal:
   First Differential Attack On Full 32-Round GOST,
   In ICICS'11, Beijing, China, pp. 216-227, Springer LNCS 7043, 2011.
   => first simple attack (very slightly) faster than brute force $2^{254.6}$

3. Nicolas Courtois, Michał Misztal:
   Differential Cryptanalysis of GOST,
   => progressive improved approach, heuristic and not very precise… $2^{226}$

4. Nicolas Courtois:
   An Improved Differential Attack on Full GOST,
   => symmetric + many further refinements + very careful work on individual
   bits + tight [barely working] distinguishers + justification of earlier results $2^{179}$
Figure 6: The Alpha Property
Key Principles

```
<plaintext>
0xFFFFFFFF 0xFFFFFFFF
 (1 Round)
0xFFFFFFFF 0xFFFFFFFF
 (1 Round)
0xFFFFFFFF 0xFFFFFFFF8787
 (1 Round)
0xFFFFFFFF8787 0x807FFF80
 (1 Round)
0x807FFF80 0xF0000787
 (1 Round)
0xF0000787 0x80780000
 (1 Round)
0x80780000 0x0000700
 |__________________|
```

```
| 0x00000700 0x80780000
 |__________________|
 (1 Round)
0x80780000 0xF0000787
 |__________________|
 (1 Round)
0xF0000787 0x807FFF80
 |__________________|
 (1 Round)
```

```
Figure 6: The Alpha Property
```
Key Principles

- **unconstrained propagation, high proba!**
- **constrained at 2 ends, arbitrary inside**
- **unconstrained propagation, high proba!**

Figure 6: The Alpha Property

---

GOST, Self-Similarity and Cryptanalysis of Block Ciphers
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11.8. Best Symmetric Result for 20 R (best known)
Propagation - Middle 20 Rounds

Propagation with probability???
What is Propagation???

0x80780000  0x000000700

20 rounds
What is Propagation? - 20 R

For 6 middle rounds:
We have 14 active bits, $2^{14}-1$ differences.
There are $2^{64+14-1} = 2^{77}$ input differences.
Propagation with probability $2^{-18.7}$ (experimental).
There are $2^{77-18.7} = 2^{58.3}$ pairs for the 6 middle rounds.

Result: $2^{58.3-22.2-22.2} = 2^{13.9}$ cases.

Natural: $2^{15}$.  

© Nicolas T. Courtois, 2006-2012
11.9. Distinguishers
**Key Result**

**Fact 4.2.1** For the full 32-round GOST and on average over the GOST keys, there exists $2^{13.0} + 2^{11.9}$ distinct pairs of plaintexts $P_i \neq P_j$ which have the Alpha property.

If we replace the inner 20 rounds by a random permutation or with GOST with more rounds, we expect only about $2^{13.0}$ distinct pairs with a standard deviation of $2^{6.5}$.
Gauss Error

How many standard deviations?

Example: right key assumption rejected = half of this number

\[
\text{erf}(x) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^x e^{-t^2} dt.
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(x)</th>
<th>(\text{erf}(x))</th>
<th>(\text{erfc}(x))</th>
<th>(x)</th>
<th>(\text{erf}(x))</th>
<th>(\text{erfc}(x))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.934</td>
<td>0.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.888</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.952</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>0.777</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>0.671</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.976</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.428</td>
<td>0.572</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.520</td>
<td>0.480</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.989</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.604</td>
<td>0.396</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.993</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.678</td>
<td>0.322</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.995</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.742</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.997</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.843</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.880</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.910</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Separation

Natural: $2^{13}$  
Attack: $2^{13} + 2^{11.9}$

Crucial Question.
Without this, NONE of differential attacks on GOST work.

We need a solid argument to say that this works.
- a quantitative argument to show that our distinguisher works.
- (and then a precise computation of number of right keys being rejected…)
- Etc…
Separation: Problem

Natural: $2^{13}$  
Attack: $2^{13} + 2^{11.9}$

Problem: it does NOT always work.
• For few rounds we get $\text{Max}(2^{13}, 2^{11.9})$.
• For more rounds we get $2^{13} + 2^{11.9}$. 
Our plan:

• We will first work on a different case. Not \(2^{13} + 2^{11.9}\) but \(2^{15} + 2^{13.9}\).
  – For 20 middle rounds.

• Then we will filter out \(2^{-2}\) of cases.
  – Also propagates for the 6+6 outer rounds.
Separation For 20 Middle Rounds

Natural: $2^{15}$  

Attack: $2^{15} + 2^{13.9}$.

Problem: It does NOT always work.

- For few rounds we get $\text{Max}(2^{15}, 2^{13.9})$.
- For more rounds we get $2^{15} + 2^{13.9}$.

We make an "artificial distinction" assumption which separates the two sets!

20 = 7 + 6 + 7

© Nicolas T. Courtois, 2006-2012
Natural Event – Accidental Output Differences

For any 64-bit permutation:
(does NOT have to be a RP!!)
We have 8 active bits on each side, $2^8 - 1$ differences. There are $2^{64+8-1} = 2^{71}$ input differences. Each works with probability $2^{8-64} = 2^{-56}$. $2^{71-56} = 2^{15}$ survive. Natural: $2^{15}$ XX rounds

0x80780000 0x00000700
Separation Failure: Less Rounds

For any permutation: we expect $2^{15}$.

Propagation in the first 7 rounds: $2^{-22.2}$ (obtained by simulation).

$2^{15} \cap 2^{13.9} \neq \emptyset$.

With few rounds in the middle the propagations from both directions will reinforce each other!
Separation Success: More Rounds

For any permutation: we expect $2^{15}$. But only about $2^{15-16.2-16.2} = 2^{-17}$ will have the middle differences required. Zero in practice.

$2^{15} \cap 2^{13.9} = \emptyset$.

With more rounds no reinforcement.
11.10. Improved Attacks
Guess Then Eliminate

Depth-First Tree Search.

51 bits

51 bits

51 bits

51 bits

51+10 bits

51+10 bits
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More Complicated

We need to guess up to 192 key bits in the first 6 rounds. Too costly?
How to avoid it?

Method 1: Guess 192 key bits => determine $2^{13} + 2^{11.9}$ pairs. Too costly.

Method 2: Progressive filtering.
Guess less key bits, determine more pairs, then more key bits but less pairs etc…
More Complicated…

Level 1: Generate Pairs by birthday approach.

Level 2: guess more key bits, eliminate cases.

$2^{171}$ cases per key

$2^{55}$ cases per key

$2^{175}$ cases per key

$2^{31}$ cases per key
Much Later:

Level 1:

- 116 bits
- $2^{171}$
- $2^{175}$
- 116+28 bits
- $2^{55}$ cases per key

Level 2:

- $2^{31}$ cases per key

Level 3:

- 264
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>guess key at S-boxes</th>
<th>correct</th>
<th>difference</th>
<th>new bits to cancel after outputs of</th>
<th>after round</th>
<th>new inactive bits (60 in total)</th>
<th>enumerate cases</th>
<th>per key</th>
<th>key bits assum.</th>
<th>time GOST encrypt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all bits in R12</td>
<td>$2^{64}$</td>
<td>FFFFF8787</td>
<td>$S7, S1$</td>
<td>2, 31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4-7, 12-15</td>
<td>$2^{127}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>birthday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3*4567R3</td>
<td>$2^{20}$</td>
<td>807FFFF80</td>
<td>$S456^37$</td>
<td>3, 30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24-31,1-7</td>
<td>$2^{55+116}$</td>
<td>$2^{55}$</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S812R3, S12345R4</td>
<td>$2^{32}$</td>
<td>F0000787</td>
<td>$S2^{345^1}$</td>
<td>4, 29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16-28</td>
<td>$2^{55+116}$</td>
<td>$2^{55}$</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6R4 S78R5</td>
<td>$2^{12}$</td>
<td>80780000</td>
<td>$S8$</td>
<td>5, 28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8-11</td>
<td>$2^{171+124-4}$</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7R4 S1R5</td>
<td>$2^{8}$</td>
<td>80780000</td>
<td>$S1$</td>
<td>5, 28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12-15</td>
<td>$2^{175+84-4}$</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8R4 S2R5</td>
<td>$2^{8}$</td>
<td>80780000</td>
<td>$S2$</td>
<td>5, 28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16-19</td>
<td>$2^{175+84-4}$</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3R5 S415R6</td>
<td>$2^{9}$</td>
<td>00000700</td>
<td>$S5^3$</td>
<td>6, 27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29,30,31</td>
<td>$2^{175+9123-3}$</td>
<td>226.2</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4R5 S6R6</td>
<td>$2^{8}$</td>
<td>00000700</td>
<td>$S6$</td>
<td>6, 27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32,1-3</td>
<td>$2^{179.2+84-4}$</td>
<td>218.2</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2^{18.2+2^{11.5}}$</td>
<td>is</td>
<td>chosen</td>
<td>at $2^{24}$</td>
<td>standard</td>
<td>deviations</td>
<td>*2-24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to survive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>except for the right</td>
<td>161 bits</td>
<td>we have</td>
<td>to remain</td>
<td>$2^{179.2-24}$</td>
<td>or $2^{-6}$ per key only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S56R5 S781R6 S23R7</td>
<td>$2^{28}$</td>
<td>00000700</td>
<td>$S8^1$</td>
<td>6, 27</td>
<td>1+</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$2^{155.2+28.5-5}$</td>
<td>28.2*</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2^{28.2+2^{10}}$</td>
<td>is</td>
<td>chosen</td>
<td>at $2^{59}$</td>
<td>standard</td>
<td>deviations</td>
<td>*-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>certitude</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**All Steps**
11.11. Improved Attacks
How To Find Such An Attack

Best differential property
we ever found was found BY HAND.

Is systematic approach possible?
Our Attack = Graph Walks With Costs
Remark:

- the structure of this graph does NOT depend on the S-boxes
- only costs (probabilities) depend on the S-boxes
13. New Attacks…
Strange Ideas…
13.1. Amplification Paradox
Involution => Amplification

1 pair 16 R =>
another pair for free

\[ Y = \mathcal{E}^2(X) \]

\[ \Downarrow \]

\[ \text{Enc}_k(X) = \mathcal{E}^2(\text{Dec}_k(Y)) \]

can we continue?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rounds</th>
<th>values</th>
<th>key size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$\Downarrow$ $\mathcal{E}$ $\Downarrow$</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$\Downarrow$ $\mathcal{E}$ $\Downarrow$</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$\Downarrow$ $\mathcal{E}$ $\Downarrow$</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$\overline{Q} \otimes Q$ $\overline{Q} \otimes Q$</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$\uparrow$ $\mathcal{D}$ $\uparrow$</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$\overline{Q} \otimes Q$ $\overline{Q} \otimes Q$</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

bits $64$ $64$
Bad News

continue?

\[ Y = \mathcal{E}^2(X) \]
\[
\vdash
Enc_k(X) = \mathcal{E}^2(Dec_k(Y))
\]
\[
\vdash
Enc_k(Dec_k(Y)) = \mathcal{E}^2(Dec_k(Enc_k(X)))
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rounds</th>
<th>values</th>
<th>key size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$X \downarrow$ $\epsilon$ $T \downarrow$</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$Y \downarrow$ $\epsilon$ $\downarrow$</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$Q \bowtie Q$ $\epsilon$ $Z \downarrow$</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$Z \uparrow$ $\mathcal{D}$</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\overline{Q} \bowtie Q$ $\epsilon$ $Y \uparrow$</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$\mathcal{D}$ $\uparrow$ 64</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\overline{Q} \bowtie Q$ $\epsilon$ $Y \uparrow$ 64</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>