Security assessment of WhibOx 2017 candidates

Alexander Treff

WhibOx 2019 workshop

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ 三三 - のへぐ

WhibOx 2017 rules

- Submit white-boxed AES-128 implementation
- Pure C code (no includes, libraries, ...)
- Source \leq 50MB, binary \leq 20 MB, avg. runtime \leq 1s

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● ● ●

- Designer goal: remain unbroken
- Attacker goal: break as fast as possible

WhibOx 2017 results

- 94 implementations (1 invalid)
- 13 earned > 0 points
 - 10 designers
- ALL broken
- Detailed presentation & write-up for winning challenge

▲ロ ▶ ▲周 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ● の Q @

No (public) write-ups for others(?)

How many can be broken in an *automated* way?

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

- i.e., without (much) reverse engineering
- DCA/DFA
- Classification by size, speed, security

Attack classification

- Automated
 - DCA
 - DFA
 - Higher-order DCA
- Manual effort
 - DCA after modification
 - Devirtualization
 - Removal of time-consuming code
 - DFA after modification
 - Removal of duplicate rounds
 - Removal of pseudo-randomness

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ 三 のへぐ

- Other methods
- Unbroken
 - Reverse engineering effort

Toolchain

- customized Intel PIN plugin for trace acquisition
- Jlsca for efficient DCA
- DFA script from SideChannelMarvels
- customized aes-brute-force tool for round-10-key-bruteforcing
 - Hulk from SideChannelMarvels does the same, but better

▲ロ ▶ ▲周 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ● の Q @

Differential computation analysis (DCA)

Software counterpart to differential power analysis (DPA)

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● ● ●

- Collect software execution traces
- Use statistical methods to figure out correct key bytes

DCA countermeasures

- Masking sensitive values throughout computation
 - Generate pseudo-randomness from input
- Artificially enlarging traces by dummy operations
 - Useful for contest
 - Not desired for real-world implementations

Differential fault analysis (DFA)

- Obtain correct output for specific input
- Induce faulty outputs by e.g. flipping bits

- Collect faulty outputs
- Compare against correct output
- Compute last round key
- Compute actual AES key

DFA countermeasures

- Compute results twice & compare
- Mute output/set output to unrelated
- Other countermeasures
 - < 4 faulty state bytes in r9</p>
 - > 4 faulty state bytes in r9
 - Faulty state bytes in wrong position

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ■ ●の00

"Skip" r9 vulnerability

Higher-order DCA

- Combine k samples of computation trace
- Exponential complexity
- Second-order is feasible for some implementations
- Reveals key for at least one first-order-resistant implementation
 - Apparently also breakable using other methods

▲ロ ▶ ▲周 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ● の Q @

DCA

- A lot of dummy-submissions
- Some using dual ciphers
 - Use different selection function (Klemsa model)
- > 2 1 Challenge resistant against input-DCA but vuln. to output-DCA

- Majority breakable by DCA
 - 14 AES reference implementations
 - 19 T6_256 by chaes
 - 17 other
 - = 50 in total
- Some more can be broken when modified

DFA

- Only applied when DCA failed
- Good against virtualized implementations (Tigress)
- Manual injection sometimes better than automated
- ▶ 3/4 columns sufficient (last can be brute-forced)
- Another 7 broken using script, 7 broken manually

Modifications

DCA improvements

- Removal of dummy code
- Removal of non-constant code
- Removal of trace-enlarging code (JH hash computation)

▲ロ ▶ ▲周 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ● の Q @

- Devirtualization
- Breaks 5 more challenges using DCA

DFA improvements

- Removal of duplicate rounds
- Removal of DFA protection (obviously)

Leftover challenges

- All with > 0 points except *festive_jennings* (using DFA, 3/4 cols)
- Second generation by kluxc3qa1 (5 submissions)
- Two more submissions by different authors
 - One of them encoding input bits as (0=0x00000000, 1=0xfffffff7), adding rk-bits as uint32, then bitsliced implementation

The other one using multiple nested lookups

All source size



▲□▶ ▲圖▶ ▲園▶ ▲園▶ 三国 - 釣ん(で)

Top 8 source size



▲□▶ ▲圖▶ ▲園▶ ▲園▶ 三国 - 釣ん(で)

Top 8 binary size



◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ ○臣 - の々ぐ

Security considerations

- Unbroken = good, broken = bad?
- Can we combine: small, fast, secure?
 - lndustry: "secure" \approx not broken in $\leq x$ days

- Only breakable with manual effort
- Refresh implementation before it is broken
- Automated attacks vs. manual effort
- Break one, break all?