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## Bettering DES

Given the vulnerability of DES to a brute-force attack, there had been (before AES) considerable interest in finding an alternative:

- Completely new algorithms: Blowfish, RC5, ...
- Multiple encryption with DES and multiple keys (to preserve the existing investment in software and equipment):

Double DES
Triple DES

## Multiple Encryption: Double DES



Decryption

Source: Figure 6.1, Stallings 2006
Information Security 2009: More on Symmetric Ciphers - 3/25

## Reduction to a Single Stage?

Question: Given any two keys $K_{1}$ and $K_{2}$, would it be possible to find a key $K_{3}$ such that

$$
E_{K_{2}}\left(E_{K_{1}}(P)\right)=E_{K_{3}}(P) ?
$$

- If so, then any multiple encryption would be equivalent to some single encryption.
- But, this is unlikely. (Affirmed in 1992.)
- There are $2^{64}!>10^{10^{20}}$ distinct permutations of the set of $2^{64}$ different 64 -bit blocks.
, Each 56-bit DES key defines one such permutation; $2^{56}<10^{17}$.


## Meet-in-the-Middle Attack

If we have $C=E_{K_{2}}\left(E_{K_{1}}(P)\right)$, then for some $X$,

$$
E_{K_{1}}(P)=X=D_{K_{2}}(C)
$$

Given a known pair $(P, C)$, the meet-in-the-middle attack proceeds as follows:

1. Encrypt $P$ for all $2^{56}$ possible values of $K_{1}$ and then sort and store the results in a table.
2. Decrypt $C$ using each possible value of $K_{2}$ and check the result against the table.
3. If a match occurs, then test the two keys against a new known pair.

## Multiple Encryption: Triple DES



Source: Figure 6.1, Stallings 2006

## Two-Key Triple DES

- Proposed by Tuchman

Encryption: $C=E_{K_{1}}\left(D_{K_{2}}\left(E_{K_{1}}(P)\right)\right)$

- Interoperable with DES:

$$
E_{K_{1}}\left(D_{K_{1}}\left(E_{K_{1}}(P)\right)\right)=E_{K_{1}}(P)
$$

- Adopted in ANS X9.17, ISO 8732, etc.
- No known practical cryptanalytic attacks


## Three-Key Triple DES

- Many researchers now prefer three-key triple DES
- Encryption: $C=E_{K_{3}}\left(D_{K_{2}}\left(E_{K_{1}}(P)\right)\right)$
- Backward compatible with DES by setting $K_{3}=K_{2}$ or $K_{2}=K_{1}$
- Adopted in PGP, S/MIME, etc.


## Modes of Operation

| Mode | Description | Typical Application |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Electronic Codebook (ECB) | Each block of 64 plaintext bits is <br> encoded independently using the <br> same key. | $\bullet$ Secure transmission of <br> single values (e.g., an <br> encryption key) |
| Cipher Block Chaining (CBC) | The input to the encryption <br> algorithm is the XOR of the next <br> 64 bits of plaintext and the <br> preceding 64 bits of ciphertext. | $\bullet$ General-purpose block- <br> oriented transmission <br> $\bullet$ Authentication |
| Cipher Feedback (CFB) | Input is processed $s$ bits at a time. <br> Preceding ciphertext is used as <br> input to the encryption algorithm <br> to produce pseudorandom output, <br> which is XORed with plaintext to <br> produce next unit of ciphertext. | •General-purpose stream- <br> oriented transmission |
| $\bullet$ Outhentication |  |  |

## Electronic Codebook (ECB) Mode


(a) Encryption

(b) Decryption

Source: Figure 6.3, Stallings 2006

## Characteristics of the ECB Mode

The same 64 -bit block of plaintext produces the same ciphertext
May subject the encryption algorithm to known plaintext attacks

- May be vulnerable to modification attacks (substituting or rearranging blocks)
- Ideal only for a short amount of data such as an encryption key


## Cipher Block Chaining (CBC) Mode



Source: Figure 6.4, Stallings 2006

## Characteristics of the CBC Mode

The Initialization Vector (IV) must be known to both the sender and receiver, and should be protected.

- The opponent may be able to change selected bits of the first block.

$$
\begin{aligned}
P_{1}[i] & =I V[i] \oplus D_{K}\left(C_{1}\right)[i] \\
P_{1}[i]^{\prime} & =I V[i]^{\prime} \oplus D_{K}\left(C_{1}\right)[i]
\end{aligned}
$$

- It can also be used for authentication.


## Cipher Feedback (CFB) Mode



Source: Figure 6.5, Stallings 2006

## Output Feedback (OFB) Mode



Source: Figure 6.06, Stallings 2006

## Characteristics of CFB and OFB

- They both can convert a block cipher into a stream cipher.
- Only the encryption function of a cipher is needed.
- In OFB, bit erros in transmission do not propagate.
- OFB is more vulnerable than CFB to a message stream modification attack.


## Counter (CTR) Mode


(a) Encryption

(b) Decryption

Source: Figure 6.7, Stallings 2006

## Advantages of the CTR MODE

- Hardware/Software efficiency: parallel processing, pipelining, etc.
- Preprocessing: outputs of the encryption boxes
- Random access
- Provable security: as secure as other modes

Simplicity: similar to CFB and OFB, only the encryption function is needed

## Stream Ciphers

- Encrypt plaintext one byte at a time; other units are possible.
- Typically use a keystream from a pseudorandom byte generator (conditioned on the input key).
- Decryption requires the same pseudorandom sequence.
- Usually are faster and use far less code than block ciphers.
Design considerations:
The encryption sequence should have a large period.
The keystream should approximate a truly random stream.
e The input key needs to be sufficiently long.


## Stream Cipher Diagram



Source: Figure 6.8, Stallings 2006

- Probably the most widely used stream cipher, e.g., in SSL/TLS and in WEP (part of IEEE 802.11)
- Developed in 1987 by Ron Rivest for RSA Security Inc.
- Variable key size with byte-oriented operations
- Based on the use of random permutation
- The period of the cipher likely to be $>10^{100}$
- Simple and fast
- Proprietary, though its algorithm has been disclosed


## Comparisons of Symmetric Ciphers

| Cipher | Key Length | Speed (Mbps) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| DES | 56 | 9 |
| 3DES | 168 | 3 |
| RC2 | variable | 0.9 |
| RC4 | variable | 45 |

Source: Table 6.2, Stallings 2006

## Stream Generation in RC4

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{i}, \mathrm{j}=0 ; \\
& \text { while (true) } \\
& \mathrm{i}=(\mathrm{i}+1) \bmod 256 ; \\
& \mathrm{j}=(\mathrm{j}+\mathrm{S}[\mathrm{i}) \bmod 256 ; \\
& \mathrm{Swap}(\mathrm{~S}[i], \mathrm{S}[j]) ; \\
& \mathrm{t}=(\mathrm{S}[i]+\mathrm{S}[\mathrm{j}) \bmod 256 ; \\
& \mathrm{k}=\mathrm{S}[\mathrm{t}] ;
\end{aligned}
$$

## Initialization of S in RC4

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

## RC4 in Picture



Source: Figure 6.9, Stallings 2006

