#### Lattice-based Cryptography

# Phong Nguyễn





February 2016



 It is an exciting time, ten years after the 1st Post-Quantum Crypto conference.

 A competition is likely to significantly improve the state-of-the-art.

# Summary

o Lattices Lattice-based Cryptography • Design Cryptanalysis • Algorithms Security Estimates



# Lattices



# The Ubiquity of Lattices

#### o In mathematics

- Algebraic number theory, Algebraic geometry, Sphere packings, etc.
- Fields medals: G. Margulis (1978), E.
   Lindenstrauss and S. Smirnov (2010), M.
   Bhargava (2014).
- Applications in computer science, statistical physics, etc.

## What is a Lattice?

#### An infinite arrangement of "regularly spaced" points







# What is a Lattice?

A lattice is a discrete subgroup of R<sup>n</sup>, or the set L(b<sub>1</sub>,...,b<sub>d</sub>) of all linear combinations Σx<sub>i</sub>b<sub>i</sub> where x<sub>i</sub>∈Z, and the b<sub>i</sub>'s are linearly independent.







# Integer Lattices

# A (full-rank) integer lattice is any subgroup L of (Z<sup>d</sup>,+) s.t. Z<sup>d</sup>/L is finite.



 A lattice is infinite, but lattice crypto actually uses the finite abelian group Z<sup>d</sup>/L: it works modulo the lattice L.

#### Lattice Invariants

The dim is the dim of span(L).
The (co-)volume is the volume of any basis parallelepiped: can be computed in poly-time.
Ex: vol(Z<sup>n</sup>)=1.





# The Gaussian Heuristic

 The volume measures the density of lattice points.

 For "nice" full-rank lattices L, and "nice" measurable sets C of R<sup>n</sup>:

 $\operatorname{Card}(L \cap C) \approx \frac{\operatorname{vol}(C)}{\operatorname{vol}(L)}$ 





# Volume of Balls

They at marked the states

#### • The volume of the n-dim ball of radius R is:

$$V_n(R) = \frac{\pi^{n/2}}{\Gamma(1+n/2)} R^n \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n\pi}} \left(\frac{2\pi e}{n}\right)^{n/2} R^n$$

# Short Lattice Vectors



 Any d-dim lattice L has exponentially many vectors of norm ≤  $O\left(\sqrt{d}\right) \operatorname{vol}(L)^{1/d}$ • In a random d-dim lattice L, all nonzero vectors have norm >  $\Omega\left(\sqrt{d}\right)\operatorname{vol}(L)^{1/d}$ 



# Hermite's Constant (1850)

 This is the "worst-case" for short lattice vectors.

Hermite showed the existence of this constant:

$$\sqrt{\gamma_d} = \max_L \frac{\min_{\vec{v} \in L, \vec{v} \neq 0} \|\vec{v}\|}{\operatorname{vol}(L)^{1/d}}$$



# Lattices and Complexity

Since 1996, lattices are very trendy in complexity (STOC/FOCS): classical and quantum.
Depending on the approximation factor with respect to the dimension: 1

O(1)

 $\sqrt{n}$ 

 $O(n \log n)$ 

 $n^{O(1)}$ 

**70**(n log log n/logn)

- NP-hardness
- o non NP-hardness (NP∩co-NP)
- worst-case/average-case reduction
- o cryptography
- o polynomial-time algorithms

#### The Shortest Vector Problem (SVP)

- O Input: a basis of a d-dim lattice L
  Output: nonzero v∈L minimizing ||v||.
- Approx: ||v||≤f(d) ||w|| for all non-zero w∈L.





# Lattice-based Cryptography





# Lattice-based Cryptography

RSA uses large finite (abelian) groups G=(Z/NZ)×
 (2048 bits, 4096 bits...). To speed things up:

• Elliptic curve crypto uses smaller groups, whose operations are more expensive.

 Lattice cryptography uses larger groups, but whose operations are much cheaper.

# Lattice-based Cryptography: the Pros

- Can be more efficient than
- Potentially resistant to quantum computers.
   Several groups are working on a lattice-TLS.
- Can have security properties based on worst-case assumptions.

 Very trendy. Recent breakthroughs: fully homomorphic encryption, multilinear maps and obfuscation.

# Lattice-based Cryptography: the Cons



 Apart from NTRU, few concrete proposals of parameter sets: practicality is often unclear.

• Gain might only be asymptotic.



# Lattices in Cryptology

• Three years stand out: 01982: First use of lattices in cryptanalysis: knapsack cryptosystems. 01996: First crypto schemes based on hard lattice problems: NTRU, Ajtai-Dwork, GGH ....

 2009: Fully-homomorphic encryption based on lattices.



# Lattice-based Crypto

- Somewhat a revival of knapsack crypto (MerkleHellman78...)
- Two Families:
  - "Theoretical": [Ajtai96...] focus on security proofs.
  - "Applied": [NTRU96...] focus on efficiency.
- They "interact" more and more: [Micc02,GPV08,Gentry09,Peikert10,MiPe12...]

# Lattice Problems in Crypto

 In many crypto schemes, one actually deals with problems not defined using lattices:
 SIS.

o LWE.

 Both are connected to lattice problems and usually presented with linear algebra: instead, we adopt a group-theoretical point of view, to clarify the use of duality.

The SIS Problem (Ajtai1996) [Small Integer Solution]  $\circ$  Let (G,+) be a finite Abelian group: [Ajtai96] used  $G=(Z/qZ)^n$ . • Pick g1,..., gm uniformly at random from G. • Goal: Find short  $\mathbf{x}=(\mathbf{x}_1,...,\mathbf{x}_m)\in \mathbf{Z}^m$  s.t.  $\Sigma_i \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{g}_i = \mathbf{0}$ . • This is essentially finding a short vector in a (uniform) random lattice of L(G) = { lattices

 $L \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^m$  s.t.  $\mathbb{Z}^m/L \sim G$ 



# Worst-case to Average-case Reduction

- [Ajtai96]: If one can efficiently solve SIS for G=(Z/qZ)<sup>n</sup> on the average, then one can efficiently find short vectors in every n-dim lattice.
- [GINX16]: This can be generalized to any finite abelian group G, provided that #G is sufficiently large ≥n<sup>Ω(max(n,rank(G)))</sup>
   Note: (Z/2Z)<sup>n</sup> is not.



Duality

- A character of G is a morphism from G to the torus T=R/Z.
- G is isomorphic to its dual group G<sup>×</sup> = {characters of G}.
- The dual lattice of the SIS lattice  $L=\{x=(x_1,...,x_m)\in \mathbb{Z}^m \text{ s.t. } \Sigma_i | x_i g_i = 0\}$  is

 $L^{x}= \{ y=(y_{1},...,y_{m}) \in \mathbb{R}^{m} \text{ s.t. } y_{i} \equiv s(g_{i}) \pmod{1}$  for some  $s \in G^{x} \}$ 

# The LWE Problem (Regev2005) [Learning with Errors]

 $\circ$  Let (G,+) be a finite Abelian group: [Regev05] used  $G=(Z/qZ)^n$  like [Ajtai96]. • Pick g1,...,gm uniformly at random from G. • Pick a random character s in G<sup>×</sup>. • Goal: recover s given g1,..., gm and noisy approximations of  $s(g_1), \dots, s(g_m)$ , where the noise is Gaussian.



# Ex: Cyclic G

- $\circ$  Let G = Z/qZ
- Pick g1,...,gm uniformly at random mod q.
- Goal: recover s given g<sub>1</sub>,...,g<sub>m</sub> and randomized approximations of sg<sub>1</sub> mod q,..., sg<sub>m</sub> mod q.

 This is exactly a randomized variant of Boneh-Venkatesan's Hidden Number
 Problem from CRYPTO '96.



# Worst-case to Average-case Reduction

 [Regev05]: If one can efficiently solve LWE for G=(Z/qZ)<sup>n</sup> on the average, then one can quantum-efficiently find short vectors in every n-dim lattice.

 [GINX16]: This can be generalized to any finite abelian group G, provided that #G is sufficiently large.

# Lattice Cryptography: Design





# Lattice-based Crypto

#### Two Types of Techniques

 Cryptography using trapdoors, i.e. secret short basis of a lattice. Similarities with RSA/Rabin cryptography.

 Cryptography without trapdoors. Similarities with DL cryptography.

• Case study: Encryption.

#### Trapdoor-based Encryption

The state of the s

ALT THE DESTABLES





• N=pq product of two large random primes.  $\circ ed = 1 \pmod{\phi(N)}$  where  $\phi(N) = (p-1)(q-1)$ . o e is the public exponent od is the secret exponent  $\circ$  Then m $\rightarrow$ m<sup>e</sup> is a trapdoor one-way permutation over Z/NZ, whose inverse is  $c \rightarrow c^d$ 

#### Bounded Distance Decoding (BDD)

Input: a basis of a lattice L of dim d, and a target vector t very close to L.
Output: v∈L minimizing ||v-t||. Easy if one knows a nearly-orthogonal basis.





# Reducing Modulo a Lattice

If L is an integer lattice, the quotient Z<sup>n</sup>/L is a finite group, with many representations: lattice crypto works modulo a lattice.

 • We call L-reduction any efficiently computable map f from Z<sup>n</sup> s.t. f(x)=f(y) iff x-y∈L.

## **One-Way Functions from BDD**

 If BDD is hard, any public L-reduction f is a one-way function.

Let (t,L) be a BDD instance: t=v+e where
 v∈L and e is very short.

 Then f(t)=f(e) because t-e∈L: if f is not one-way, then given f(e), one can recover e and also the BDD solution v=t-e.

# **Building L-Reductions**

Any basis provides two L-reductions, thanks to Babai's nearest plane algorithm and rounding-off algorithm.
NTRU encryption implicitly uses a L-reduction.
#### Ex: Babai's rounding off



Choose f(t) in the basis parallelepiped s.t.  $t-f(t) \in L$ 

#### Ntrū

## **Ex: NTRU Encryption**

- Ring R=Z[X]/(X<sup>N</sup>-1), secret key=short (f,g)∈R<sup>2</sup>, public key h=g/f (mod q).
- A message m is a short element of R.
- Its ciphertext is c=m+pr\*h (mod q) where r is a sparse element of R. This corresponds to the L-reduction F(m,-r) = (m+pr\*h (mod q),0) for the lattice L={(u,v)∈R<sup>2</sup> s.t. u=pv\*h (mod q)}

### Solving BDD by L-reduction

The L-reductions derived from Babai's algorithms leave some set invariant: there exists D(B)⊆Z<sup>n</sup> s.t. f(x)=x for all x∈D(B). This allows to solve BDD when the error∈D(B).

 The largest ball inside D(B) depends on the quality of the basis.

# Deterministic Public-Key Encryption [GGH97-Micc01]

Secret key = Good basis
Public key = Bad basis
Message = Short vector



Encryption = L-reduction with the public key
 Decryption = L-reduction with the secret key

## Ntrū Optimization: NTRU Encryption

- Ring R=Z[X]/(X<sup>N</sup>-1), secret key (f,g)∈R<sup>2</sup>, public
- key  $h=g/f \pmod{q}$ .
- Encryption can be viewed [Mi01] as L-reducing a short vector with the Hermite normal form, where L={(u,v)∈R<sup>2</sup> s.t. u=pv\*h (mod q)}.
- Decryption is a special BDD algorithm using the secret key (f,g).

## Trapdoor-less Encryption

" big stand a shirt a stand

ALC: MORATAN PAN



Diffie-Hellman Key Exchange

Both can compute the shared key g<sup>ab</sup>.
 This key exchange is the core of El Gamal public-key encryption.

### Abstracting DH

- Let e:  $(a,b) \mapsto g^{ab}$ . This map is a pairing: it  $Z_q \times Z_q \to G$  is bilinear.
- Let f:  $a \mapsto g^a$  be the DL one-way function  $\mathbf{Z}_q \to \mathbf{G}$
- e(a,b) can be computed using (f(a),b) or (a,f(b)),
   i.e. even if a or b is hidden by f.
- Security = hard to distinguish (f(a), f(b), e(a, b))
   from (f(a), f(b), random). This is called DDH.

#### DH with Lattices?

• What would be the pairing?
• What would be the one-way function to hide inputs?

## Pairing from Lattices

- Let  $g_1,...,g_m$  in G. The dual group  $G^x$  induces a pairing  $G^x \times \mathbb{Z}^m \to \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ by  $\varepsilon (s,(x_1,...,x_m)) = s(\Sigma_i \times_i g_i)$
- Let y=f<sub>g</sub>(x<sub>1</sub>,...,x<sub>m</sub>)=Σ<sub>i</sub> x<sub>i</sub> g<sub>i</sub> ∈G where x<sub>i</sub>'s small. and b=f<sup>x</sup><sub>g</sub>(s,e)= (s(g<sub>1</sub>),...,s(g<sub>m</sub>))+e ∈(R/Z)<sup>m</sup>, e small.
  Then ε (s,(x<sub>1</sub>,...,x<sub>m</sub>)) can be computed from (s,y) or (b,(x<sub>1</sub>,...,x<sub>m</sub>)) as s(Σ<sub>i</sub> x<sub>i</sub> g<sub>i</sub>) =Σ<sub>i</sub> x<sub>i</sub> s(g<sub>i</sub>) ≈⟨(x<sub>1</sub>,...,x<sub>m</sub>),b⟩ because the x<sub>i</sub>'s are small.



Both compute an approx of ε (s,(x<sub>1</sub>,...,x<sub>m</sub>))=s(y):
 Alice computes s(y)+e' and
 Bob computes Σ<sub>i</sub> x<sub>i</sub> b<sub>i</sub>.



# El Gamal Encryption from Lattices

This key exchange gives rise to two El
 Gamal-like public-key encryption schemes,
 because the lattice pairing is not symmetric.

• These El-Gamal-like schemes are IND-CPAsecure under the hardness of LWE/SIS.

 Similarly, many LWE/SIS schemes can be viewed as analogues of the RSA/DL world: [GPV08] is a lattice analogue of Rabin's signature, etc.



# Concrete Lattice Schemes

• Encryption

 NTRU [HPS1998...]: Parameters have changed several times (Ex: decryption failure attacks), but the core idea remains the same. Has been standardized.

 RLWE schemes: more efficient than LWE, but stronger hardness assumption. Being used in lattice-TLS prototypes.



# Concrete Lattice Schemes

o Signature

 NTRU: Less succesful than encryption. The latest version is NTRU-MLS [PQC '14], after deadly attacks on NSS [GJSS2001,GeSz02] and NTRUSign [NgRe2006,DuNg12].

• BLISS [DDLL2013]: the most optimized version uses NTRU-like assumptions.

 For now, Fiat-Shamir signatures are more efficient than Hash-and-Sign signatures...



# Cryptanalysis of Latticebased Cryptography

## **SVP** Algorithms

- Polynomial-time approximation algorithms.
   The LLL algorithm [1982].
  - Block generalizations by [Schnorr1987],
     [GHKN2006], [Gama-N2008], [MiWa2016].
- o Exponential exact algorithms.
  - Polynomial-space: Enumeration [Kannan1983] and pruning variants etc.
  - Exponential-space: Sieving [AKS2001], [MiVo10]

#### Maths vs Algorithms

 Maths: Proving the existence of short lattice vectors i.e. upper bounds on Hermite's constant.

Algorithms: Finding short or shortest lattice vectors.

#### Maths vs Algorithms

• Three mathematical inequalities have been turned into efficient algorithms. • Hermite's inequality: the LLL algorithm. • Mordell's inequality: blockwise algorithms. Minkowski's inequality (Mordell's proof) Worst-case to average-case reductions • Sieve algorithms [ADRS15]



# Hermite's Inequality and the LLL Algorithm

#### Short Lattice Vectors



◦ [Lagrange1773]: In any 2-dim lattice L, there is a nonzero vector of norm  $\leq$  (4/3)<sup>1/4</sup> vol(L)<sup>1/2</sup>.  $\sqrt{\gamma_2} = \left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^{1/4}$ 



 ○ [Hermite1850]: In any d-dim lattice, there is a nonzero vector of norm
 ≤ (4/3)<sup>(d-1)/4</sup> vol(L)<sup>1/d</sup>

 $\sqrt{\gamma_d} \le \left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^{(d-1)/4} = \sqrt{\gamma_2}^{d-1}$ 

## Finding Short Lattice Vectors



◦ [Lagrange1773]'s algorithm efficiently outputs a nonzero vector of norm  $\leq (4/3)^{1/4}$  vol(L)<sup>1/2</sup>.  $\sqrt{\gamma_2} = \left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^{1/4}$ 



 ○ [Hermite1850] gives an implicit (inefficient) algorithm to output a vector of norm ≤ (4/3)<sup>(d-1)/4</sup> vol(L)<sup>1/d</sup>

 $\sqrt{\gamma_d} \le \left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^{(d-1)/4} = \sqrt{\gamma_2}^{d-1}$ 

# The Lenstra-Lenstra-Lovász Algorithm (1982)

• Th: Given  $\varepsilon > 0$  and a d-dim lattice L, [LLL82] finds, in time polynomial in size(lattice) and  $1/\varepsilon$ , a basis whose 1st vector satisfies:

 $\frac{||b_1|| \leq (4/3 + \epsilon)^{(d-1)/4} \operatorname{vol}(L)^{1/d}}{||b_1|| \leq (4/3 + \epsilon)^{(d-1)/2} ||L||}$ 

• LLL is an algorithmic version of Hermite's inequality:  $\|L\| \le \left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^{(d-1)/4} \operatorname{vol}(L)^{1/d}$ 

#### Intuition

 Hermite's inequality is based on two ideas:

 Projection: this creates a lowerdimensional lattice.

 Lifting short projected vectors
 LLL adds relaxation to guarantee polynomial time.

#### The Magic of LLL

 One of the main reasons behind the popularity of LLL is that it performs "much better" than what the worstcase bounds suggest, especially in low dimension.

#### LLL: Theory vs Practice

- The approx factors (4/3+ε)<sup>(d-1)/4</sup> and (4/3+ε)<sup>(d-1)/2</sup> are tight in the worst case: but this is only for worst-case bases of certain lattices.
- Experimentally,  $4/3+\epsilon \approx 1.33$  can be replaced by a smaller constant  $\approx 1.08$ , for any lattice, by randomizing the input basis.
- But there is no good explanation for this phenomenon, and no known formula for the experimental constant  $\approx 1.08$ .

#### Illustration



Mordell's Inequality and Blockwise Algorithms





## Divide and Conquer



LLL is based on a local reduction in dim 2.
Blockwise algorithms find shorter vectors than LLL by using an exact SVP-subroutine in low dim k called the blocksize.

 Even if the subroutine takes exponential time in k, this is polynomial in d if k=log d.



# Mathematical Analogy

 If we show the existence of very short lattice vectors in dim k, can we use it to prove the existence of very short lattice vectors in dim d > k?

[Mordell1944]'s inequality generalizes
 Hermite's inequality:

$$\sqrt{\gamma_d} \leq \sqrt{\gamma_k}^{(d-1)/(k-1)}$$
$$\|L\| \leq \sqrt{\gamma_k}^{(d-1)/(k-1)} \operatorname{vol}(L)^{1/d}$$

#### Approximation Algorithms

o [LLL82] corresponds to [Hermite1850]'s inequality.

$$||L|| \le \left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^{(d-1)/4} \operatorname{vol}(L)^{1/d} = \sqrt{\gamma_2}^{d-1} \operatorname{vol}(L)^{1/d}$$

 The [GamaN08] algorithm is an algorithmic version of [Mordell1944]'s inequality.

$$||L|| \le \sqrt{\gamma_k}^{(d-1)/(k-1)} \operatorname{vol}(L)^{1/d}$$



# Mordell's Inequality (1944)

 Hermite's inequality is the k=2 particular case of Mordell's inequality:

$$\gamma_d \leq \gamma_k^{(d-1)/(k-1)}$$
 if  $2 \leq k \leq d$ 

 All known proofs of Mordell's inequality are based on duality: the Gama-N algorithm also uses duality, which provides a different way to decrease the lattice dimension.



# An Algorithmic Version of Mordell's Inequality



- The algorithm of [GamaN2008] solves Hermite-SVP with factor essentially  $\sqrt{\gamma_k}^{(d-1)/(k-1)}$  using a k-dim SVP-oracle.
- This algorithm is to Mordell's inequality what LLL is to Hermite's inequality.
- By choosing an appropriate k=log d, the whole algorithm is poly-time with a subexponential approx factor.

# Security Estimates



#### In the 1980s-1990s

#### Lattice algorithms were somewhat a dark art.



 It was noticed that algorithms performed better than theoretically expected, but it was unclear by how much exactly.





 Theory is usually insufficient: worst-case analyses do not match experiments.

 For crypto, we want more than a worstcase bound, we would like to "predict" the running times.

Much more difficult
Analogy with physics





## Security Estimates

 Somewhat independent of security proofs o Identify the best attack based on the state-of-the art • Find as many attacks as possible o Identify the "best" one Select keysizes/parameters accordingly


## A Core Problem

 To assess the cost of a lattice attack, it is useful to reduce it to a core problem.

 The most popular core problem is the Hermite-Approx-SVP problem:

• Given a basis of a n-dim lattice L and an approximation factor f(n), find a non-zero v of norm ≤ f(n) vol(L)<sup>1/n</sup>.

## Solving Lattice Problems In Practice

- The Hermite-factor is convenient:
  - Run the algorithm on a random lattice. • Measure  $\frac{\|\vec{b}_1\|}{\operatorname{vol}(L)^{1/d}}$ , typically exp. in d.

 Performances for the main lattice problems (SIS, LWE, etc.) can be derived [GaN08, MiRe09...]. But maybe not so clear for NTRU.



• Given some lattice attack, it is often possible to (roughly) estimate its efficiency • Assess the required Hermite-factor o If LLL is enough, assess cost(LLL) o Otherwise, assess the required BKZblocksize and its cost • We only require an order of magnitude.



# Predicting BKZ [ChN11]

 O Predict the behaviour of high-blocksize state-of-the-art BKZ (k≥50), using an efficient simulation algorithm: the minimum of most k-dim blocks seems to behave like random lattices.





## Analogy with Factoring

When analyzing sieve algorithms (QS, NFS, etc.), we assume heuristically that certain numbers behave like random numbers, when it comes to smoothness probability.

 Here, we assume that certain (projected) lattices behave like random lattices, when it comes to the first minimum.

## Illustration for Average Dim

1. Dy Low day The Stranger with better at the state of th

| Approx Blocksize | Target H-factor    |  |  |
|------------------|--------------------|--|--|
| 85               | 1.01 <sup>d</sup>  |  |  |
| 106              | 1.009 <sup>d</sup> |  |  |
| 133              | 1.008 <sup>d</sup> |  |  |
| 168              | 1.007 <sup>d</sup> |  |  |
| 216              | 1.006 <sup>d</sup> |  |  |
| 286              | 1.005 <sup>d</sup> |  |  |

#### Are We Done?



 It remains to estimate the cost of the BKZ-subroutine: finding (nearly-)shortest vectors in ``small" dimensions...

 This is where things are not so clear: optimization is difficult and there has been progress in the past few years.

## In a Nutshell



 In current implementations, the SVPsubroutine for BKZ is extreme-pruning enumeration [GNR10].

 There are "reasonable" predictions [GNR10] for this subroutine, but optimization is unclear: lower and upper bounds in [ChN11].

| Approx Blocksize | Cost in core-days        |
|------------------|--------------------------|
| 140              | <u>≤2<sup>23</sup></u>   |
| 170              | <b>≤2</b> <sup>49</sup>  |
| 250              | <b>≤2</b> <sup>135</sup> |

[ChN11] Figures

#### SVP CHALLENGE

#### HALL OF FAME

| Position | Dimension | Euclidean<br>Norm | Seed | Contestant                            | Solution | Algorithm | Subm.<br>Date  | Approx.<br>Factor |
|----------|-----------|-------------------|------|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|----------------|-------------------|
| 1        | 146       | 3195              | 0    | Kenji KASHIWABARA and Tadanori TERUYA | vec      | Other     | 2015-<br>08-24 | 1.04534           |
| 2        | 144       | 3154              | 0    | Kenji KASHIWABARA and Tadanori TERUYA | vec      | Other     | 2015-<br>06-21 | 1.04284           |
| 3        | 142       | 3141              | 0    | Kenji KASHIWABARA and Tadanori TERUYA | vec      | Other     | 2015-<br>03-15 | 1.04609           |
| 4        | 140       | 3025              | 0    | Kenji KASHIWABARA and Tadanori TERUYA | vec      | Other     | 2015-<br>01-23 | 1.01139           |
| 5        | 138       | 3077              | 0    | Kenji KASHIWABARA and Tadanori TERUYA | vec      | Other     | 2014-<br>12-7  | 1.03516           |
| 6        | 134       | 2976              | 0    | Kenji KASHIWABARA and Tadanori TERUYA | vec      | Other     | 2014-<br>07-13 | 1.01695           |
| 7        | 132       | 3012              | 0    | Kenji Kashiwabara and Masaharu Fukase | vec      | Other     | 2014-<br>04-24 | 1.03787           |
| 8        | 130       | 2883              | 0    | Yoshinori Aono and Phong Nguyen       | vec      | ENUM, BKZ | 2014-<br>10-9  | 0.99871           |
| 9        | 130       | 3025              | 0    | Kenji Kashiwabara and Masaharu Fukase | vec      | Other     | 2013-<br>11-15 | 1.04787           |
| 10       | 128       | 2984              | 0    | Kenji Kashiwabara and Masaharu fukase | vec      | Other     | 2013-<br>09-23 | 1.04017           |
| 11       | 128       | 2992              | 0    | Kenji Kashiwabara and Masaharu Fukase | vec      | Other     | 2013-<br>09-19 | 1.04313           |
| 12       | 126       | 2855              | 0    | Yoshinori Aono and Phong Nguyen       | vec      | ENUM, BKZ | 2014-<br>09-9  | 1.00556           |

100

- - - -

## The SVP Challenges





# Comparison with RSA

The largest computation for the SVP challenges is for dim 138 :
 66,000 core-days ≈ 2<sup>63</sup> clock cycles.

 This is 11 times cheaper than RSA-768 = 730,000 core-days ≈ 2<sup>67</sup> clock cycles.

 The 140-dim computation confirms that the upper bounds of [ChN11] are only upper bounds.

#### State-of-the-Art

- We understand reasonably well the best lattice algorithms: we can guess the approximate quality and the approximate running time for a given set of parameters.
- But we don't know well how to optimize the selection of parameters, and there might be improvements for the subroutine: the latest SVP records use a different form of pruned enumeration.

#### Impact

 We should be conservative: security margin. Fortunately, only a major improvement in blocksize can impact Hfactor estimates: an order of magnitude for the blocksize is sufficient.

 Security estimates are tricky, especially for high security levels like 256-bit security: already non-trivial for RSA.

# The Importance of Numerical Challenges

a way a service where the states of the state

#### Challenges are very useful to check the state-of-the-art

#### NTRU Challenges

| and the second |  |
|--|--|
| roducts  |  |
| Automotive Security  |  |
| imbedded Security  |  |
| NTRU   |  |
| NTRU Implementation  |  |
| NTRU FAQs  |  |
| NTRU Scrutiny  |  |
| NTRU Resources   |  |
| NTRU Challenge   |  |
| ARM7 / ARM9  |  |
| 755  |  |

SecurityInnovation<sup>•</sup>

Congratulations to our winners!

TRAINING

Solved Challenges

PRODUCTS

SERVICES

(to be updated periodically)

Challenge #1 107r0 - Nick H.

Challenge #2 113r0 - Nick H.

Challenge #3 131r1 - Léo D., and Phong Q. N.

Challenge #4 139r1 - Léo D., and Phong Q. N.

Challenge #5 149r1 - Léo D., and Phong Q. N.

Challenge #6 163r1 - Léo D., and Phong Q. N.

Challenge #7 173r1 - Léo D., and Phong Q. N.

# Conclusion







- RSA/DL works in certain finite (abelian) groups G.
   Lattice cryptography works in (abelian) finite quotient groups G'=Z<sup>n</sup>/L.
  - The trapdoor is a secret representation of G'.
  - G' may be much bigger than G, but has cheaper operations.
  - Noise and small preimages require to adapt RSA/DL constructions.





 Lattice cryptography is different from classical public-key cryptography, but there are also many similarities.

 Making analogies hopefully helps our understanding.



# Trends in Design

 More and more classical PK schemes have been adapted to the lattice setting.

• Can all be adapted?

 A few lattice schemes achieve new functionalities (FHE, multilinear maps, general attribute-based encryption).

• Can they be achieved without lattices?



Cryptanalysis

• There has been significant progress in lattice algorithms in the past 10 years. o It is a positive sign that the problem is attracting more and more attention. • On the other hand, how are we going to model future progress in security estimates?



# Quantum Cryptanalysis

 There are very few examples of quantum algorithms... especially in cryptanalysis.

 Ontil we have a quantum computer to play with, it will be difficult to know the true power of quantum computers.



Security

How confident are we that our problems are resistant to quantum computers?
The most efficient lattice-based cryptosystems use special lattices like ideal lattices.

 How much can we trust our security estimates? How precise are they?

#### Challenges

# Post-quantum cryptography is a revolution



#### • There is a lot of exciting work to do

#### Thank you for your attention...

Any question(s)?