

July 3, 2023

Vulnerabilities in Constant-Time Cryptographic Code Ferhat Erata[†], Ruzica Piskac[†], Victor Mateu[‡], and Jakub Szefer[†]

Automated Detection of Single-Trace Side-Channel Vulnerabilities in Constant-Time Cryptographic Code







Post Quantum Cryptography: Kyber's message encoding

```
void poly_frommsg(poly *r,
2
        const uint8_t msg[KYBER_INDCPA_MSGBYTES]) {
    unsigned int i, j;
    int16 t mask;
4
    for (i = 0; i < KYBER N / 8; i++) {
5
   for (j = 0; j < 8; j++) {
6
       mask = -(int16_t)((msg[i] >> j) & 1);
       r->coeffs[8*i + j] = mask & ((KYBER_Q+1)/2); *
8
      }
9
    }
11 }
```

Listing: CRYSTALS-Kyber's message encoding, attacked by [Steffen et al., 2021, Ravi et al., 2020]

- The number of cases of the mask value is 2: -1 (0xFFFF) and 0 (0x0000).
- The complete shared secret can be extracted from one single trace only.

Kyber's message encoding - Instruction-level





Listing: Partial disassembly at -00

Listing: Partial disassembly at -03

- The shared secret can be read from an oscilloscope display directly with the naked eye with optimization turned off (-00);
- When optimizations are enabled (-03), the attack requires template-based attack, but the attack still works on single power traces.

Leakage Models: Data Dependent Power Consumption



Hamming Weight - ASR inst. - ARM Cortex-M4F3





Tooling Workflow

- Input: A binary executable or Region of Interest & Marking Secrets;
- Output: A set of leakage locations (Pols) and their corresponding leakage values.
- Output: Test Vector Generation.



Figure: Pascal: Power Analysis Side Channel Attack Locator - Tooling Workflow

Differential Register Analysis

Example of conditional addition written in a constant-time style using masking.

$$egin{aligned} f(sum_{[8]S}, \ x_{[8]S}) : & & \ mask := (x-64) \gg 7 & \ sum := sum + (\sim mask \wedge x) \end{aligned}$$

Dissassembly of the binary code & forward taint analysis

state	lifted binary code	symbolic store σ
S_0	$f(sum_{0[8]}, x_{0[8]})$	$\sigma_0 := \{ \mathbf{x}_0 = \mathbf{\beta}_{[8]} \land sum_0 = \lambda_{[8]} \}$
S_1	$r_0 := x_0 - 64$	$\sigma_1 := \{ \sigma_0 \land r_0 = x_0 - 64 \}$
S_2	$r_1 := r_0 \gg 7$	$\sigma_2 := \{ \sigma_1 \wedge r_1 = f_{asr}(r_0, 7) \}$
S_3	$r_2 := \sim r_1$	$\sigma_3 := \{ \sigma_2 \land r_2 = \sim r_1 \}$
S_4	$r_3 := r_2 \wedge x_0$	$\sigma_4:=\!\{\sigma_3\wedge r_3=r_2\wedge x_0\}$
S_5	$r_4 := sum_0 + r_3$	$\sigma_5 := \{ \sigma_4 \wedge r_4 = sum_0 \wedge r_3 \}$

Dissassembly of the binary code & forward taint analysis

state	lifted binary code	symbolic store σ
S_0 S_1 S_2 S_3 S_4 S_2	$f(sum_{0[8]}, x_{0[8]})$ $r_{0} := x_{0} - 64$ $r_{1} := r_{0} \gg 7$ $r_{2} := \sim r_{1}$ $r_{3} := r_{2} \times x_{0}$ $r_{4} := c_{1} x_{0}$	$\sigma_{0} := \{x_{0} = \beta_{[8]} \land sum_{0} = \lambda_{[8]}\}$ $\sigma_{1} := \{\sigma_{0} \land r_{0} = x_{0} - 64\}$ $\sigma_{2} := \{\sigma_{1} \land r_{1} = f_{asr}(r_{0}, 7)\}$ $\sigma_{3} := \{\sigma_{2} \land r_{2} = \sim r_{1}\}$ $\sigma_{4} := \{\sigma_{3} \land r_{3} = r_{2} \land x_{0}\}$ $\sigma_{5} := \{\sigma_{1} \land r_{3} = \sigma_{2} \land x_{0}\}$

Relational Symbolic Execution over Fixed-Size Bit-Vectors

$$\varphi_{SC_{S_2}} \triangleq \overbrace{r_1 \neq r'_1}^{\text{disjoint 2-secrets}} \land \underbrace{r_1 = (\beta - 64) \gg 7}_{\text{symbolic register } r_1} \land \overbrace{r'_1 = (\beta' - 64) \gg 7}^{\text{self-composition of } r_1}$$

Relational Symbolic Execution over Fixed-Size Bit-Vectors

$$\varphi_{SC_{S_2}} \triangleq \overbrace{r_1 \neq r_1'}^{\text{disjoint 2-secrets}} \wedge \underbrace{r_1 = (\beta - 64) \gg 7}_{\text{symbolic register } r_1} \wedge \overbrace{r_1' = (\beta' - 64) \gg 7}^{\text{self-composition of } r_1}$$

Single-Objective Optimization Queries

 $\begin{array}{c} \mbox{state} \quad \Delta_{\omega} \mbox{ objective function optimization query} \\ \hline \\ \hline S_2 \quad \begin{array}{c} \mbox{maximize } \Delta_{\omega}(r_1,r_1') \quad \varphi_{SC_{S_2}} \wedge max(|\omega(r_1) - \omega(r_1')|) \\ \mbox{minimize } \Delta_{\omega}(r_1,r_1') \quad \varphi_{SC_{S_2}} \wedge min(|\omega(r_1) - \omega(r_1')|) \end{array} \end{array}$

Reporting of Points of Interest & Quantification of the Differential Behavior

state	lifted binary code	Δ_{ω} (weight)	d(distance)
S_1	$r_0 := x_0 - 64$	$\Delta_{\uparrow\downarrow\Delta_{\omega}} = 8$	$\Delta_{\uparrow\downarrow \ d} = 7$
S_2	$r_1 := r_0 \gg 7$ *	$\Delta_{\uparrow\downarrow\Delta_{\omega}} = 0$	$\Delta_{\uparrow\downarrow \ d} = 0$
S_3	$r_2 := \sim r_1 \star$	$\Delta_{\uparrow\downarrow\Delta_{\omega}} = 0$	$\Delta_{\uparrow\downarrow \ d} = 0$
S_4	$r_3 := r_2 \wedge x_0$	$\Delta_{\uparrow\downarrow\Delta_{\omega}} = 8$	$\Delta_{\uparrow\downarrow \ d} = 7$
S_5	$r_4 := sum_0 + r_3$	$\Delta_{\uparrow\downarrow\Delta_{\omega}} = 8$	$\Delta_{\uparrow\downarrow \ d} = 7$

ω classes and probabilities for \mathbb{F}_8										
	$-\omega_i$	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	$ \omega_i $	1	8	28	56	70	56	28	8	1
	\mathbb{P}_{ω_i}	.004	.031	.109	.219	.273	.219	.109	.031	.004

 An approximate model to obtain the entropy of destination registers to quantify the leakage over the single-trace.

ω -class sampling model

$$ilde{\eta}(r) = -\sum_{i=0}^n \mathbb{P}_{\omega_i}(r) \cdot \log_2 \mathbb{P}_{\omega_i}(r), \,\, ext{where} \, r \in \mathbb{F}_n$$

Symbolic Register Analysis

An approximate model to obtain the entropy of destination registers to quantify the leakage over the single-trace.

ω -class sampling model

$$ilde{\eta}(r) = -\sum_{i=0}^n \mathbb{P}_{\omega_i}(r) \cdot \log_2 \mathbb{P}_{\omega_i}(r), \,\, ext{where} \, r \in \mathbb{F}_n$$

state	machine code	$\tilde{\eta}(entropy)$	Δ_{ω} (weight)	d(distance)
S_1	$r_0 := x_0 - 64$	$\tilde{\eta}(r_0) = 2.54$	$\Delta_{\uparrow\downarrow\Delta_{\omega}} = 8$	$\Delta_{\uparrow\downarrow \ d} = 7$
S_2	$r_1 := r_0 \gg 7$ *	$\tilde{\eta}(r_1) = 1.00$	$\Delta_{\uparrow\downarrow\Delta\omega} = 0$	$\Delta_{\uparrow\downarrow \ d} = 0$
S_3	$r_2 := \sim r_1 \star$	$\tilde{\eta}(r_2) = 1.00$	$\Delta_{\uparrow\downarrow\Delta_{\omega}} = 0$	$\Delta_{\uparrow\downarrow d} = 0$
S_4	$r_3 := r_2 \wedge x_0$	$\tilde{\eta}(r_3) = 2.54$	$\Delta_{\uparrow\downarrow\Delta_{\omega}} = 8$	$\Delta_{\uparrow\downarrow d} = 7$
S_5	$r_4 := sum_0 + r_3$	$\tilde{\eta}(r_4) = 2.54$	$\Delta_{\uparrow\downarrow\Delta_{\omega}} = 8$	$\Delta_{\uparrow\downarrow \ d} = 7$

Post Quantum Cryptography: Kyber's message encoding

```
void poly_frommsg(poly *r,
            const uint8 t msg[KYBER INDCPA MSGBYTES]) {
    unsigned int i, j;
3
     int16 t mask:
 4
      for (i = 0; i < KYBER_N / 8; i++) {</pre>
5
     for (j = 0; j < 8; j++) {
6
          mask = -(int16_t)((msg[i] >> j) & 1);
7
          /* \uparrow \Delta_{\omega} = 16 \circ \downarrow \Delta_{\omega} = 16 \parallel \uparrow \Delta_{d} = 16 \circ \downarrow \Delta_{d} = 16 \parallel \tilde{\eta} = 1.00 */
8
          r \rightarrow coeffs[8*i + j] = mask \& ((KYBER_Q+1)/2);
9
         7
      }
12 }
```

Listing: CRYSTALS-Kyber's message encoding, attacked by [Steffen et al., 2021, Ravi et al., 2020]

The mask value can be either 0x0000 or 0xFFFF; therefore, the number of cases of the mask value is 2: -1 (0xFFFF) with $\omega = 16$ and 0 (0x0000) with $\omega = 0$.

Post Quantum Cryptography: Dilithium poly. generation

```
void poly_challenge(poly *c,
                const uint8 t seed[SEEDBYTES]) {
3
     for (i = 0; i < 8; ++i) signs |= (uint64_t)buf[i] << 8 * i;</pre>
4
    pos = 8:
5
    for (i = 0; i < N; ++i) c->coeffs[i] = 0;
6
     for (i = N - TAU; i < N; ++i) {
7
       do {
8
         if (pos >= SHAKE256_RATE) {
9
            shake256_squeezeblocks(buf, 1, &state); pos = 0;}
10
         b = buf[pos++];
11
    \} while (b > i):
12
   c->coeffs[i] = c->coeffs[b];
13
       c->coeffs[b] = 1 - 2 * (signs & 1); /* \Delta_{\omega} = 31 \circ \downarrow \Delta_{\omega} = 31 */
14
       signs >>= 1:
15
     }
16
17 }
```

Listing: CRYSTALS-Dilithium polynomial generation, attacked by [Karabulut et al., 2022]

• How many negative and positive coefficients the private polynomial has can leak: -1 (0xFFF...F) with $\omega = 32$ and 1 (0x000...1) with $\omega = 1$

Lightweight Cryptography: SPECK's ARX-box

```
1 // Rotate left for 16 bit registers.
2 #define ROTL(x, n) (((x) << n) | ((x) >> (16-(n))))
3 // Rotation and Addition.
4 void A(uint16_t* 1, uint16_t* r) {
5 (*1) = ROTL((*1), 9);
6 (*1) += (*r);
7 (*r) = ROTL((*r), 2);
8 (*r) ^= (*1);
9 }
```

Listing: SPECK's ARX-box Implementation attacked by [Yan and Oswald, 2019]

• Maximum $\Delta_{\omega} = 2$ and minimum $\Delta_{\omega} = 0$.

Vulnerability Detection: SPECK's ARX-box

```
1 ldrh r2, [r0] ; arg1;
 2 lsrs r3, r2, 7 ; \uparrow \Delta_\omega = 9 \circ \downarrow \Delta_\omega = 0
 3 orr.w r3, r3, r2, lsl 9 ; \uparrow \Delta_{\omega} = 25 \circ \downarrow \Delta_{\omega} = 0
 4 uxth r3, r3 ; \uparrow \Delta_\omega = 16 \circ \downarrow \Delta_\omega = 0
 5 strh r3, [r0] ; arg1
 6 ldrh r2, [r1]
                                               ; arq2
 7 add r3. r2

      8 strh r3, [r0]
      ; arg1

      9 ldrh r2, [r1]
      ; arg2

      10 lsrs r3, r2, 0xe
      ; \uparrow \Delta_{\omega} = 2 \circ \downarrow \Delta_{\omega} = 0

11 orr.w r3, r3, r2, lsl 2 ; \uparrow \Delta_{\omega} = 18 \circ \downarrow \Delta_{\omega} = 0
12 uxth r3, r3 ; \uparrow \Delta_{\omega} = 18 \circ \downarrow \Delta_{\omega} = 0
13 strh r3, [r1] ; arg2
14 ldrh r2, [r0] ; arg1
15 eors r3, r2 ; \uparrow \Delta_{\omega} = 18 \circ \downarrow \Delta_{\omega} = 0
16 strh r3, [r1]
                                           ; arg2
17 bx lr
```

Listing: Full disassembly of ARX-box, attacked by [Yan and Oswald, 2019]

Over the set of 2¹⁶ numbers, the register r3 at line 10 can take only one of {0, 1, 2, 3} and therefore this reduces the number of traces required for the attack.

contributions

- Developed Pascal, an advanced analysis tool, for the detection and quantification of potential single-trace power side-channel vulnerabilities at the binary level.
- 2. Introduced two novel register analysis techniques that utilize relational symbolic execution for power side-channel analysis.
- 3. Conducted a comprehensive systematic analysis of power side-channel attacks documented in the literature to validate the effectiveness of Pascal.
- 4. Identified 30 distinct vulnerabilities present in a wide range of cryptographic schemes.



https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.02102



References

[Karabulut et al., 2022] Karabulut, E., Alkim, E., and Aysu, A. (2022).

Single-trace side-channel attacks on ω -small polynomial sampling.

Cryptology ePrint Archive, Report 2022/494.

https://ia.cr/2022/494.

[Ravi et al., 2020] Ravi, P., Bhasin, S., Roy, S. S., and Chattopadhyay, A. (2020).

Drop by drop you break the rock - exploiting generic vulnerabilities in lattice-based pke/kems using em-based physical attacks.

Cryptology ePrint Archive, Report 2020/549.

https://ia.cr/2020/549.

[Steffen et al., 2021] Steffen, H. M., Kogelheide, L. J., and Bartkewitz, T. (2021).

In-depth analysis of side-channel countermeasures for crystals-kyber message encoding on arm cortex-m4.

Cryptology ePrint Archive, Report 2021/1307.

https://ia.cr/2021/1307.

[Yan and Oswald, 2019] Yan, Y. and Oswald, E. (2019).

Examining the practical side channel resilience of arx-boxes.

Cryptology ePrint Archive, Report 2019/335.

https://ia.cr/2019/335.