#### Side-Channel Attacks

Cryptographic algorithms assume that secret keys are utilized by implementations of the algorithm in a secure fashion, **with access only allowed through the I/Os** 

Unfortunately, cryptographic implementations reveal information about internal operations in the power supply as they execute the algorithm

Power supply transient signals (I<sub>DDT</sub>) and electromagnetic radiation can be measured using benchtop oscilloscopes and reverse-engineered to deduce the secret key Dynamic current can measured by inserting a small resistance in series with the power supply wires, or by using current or EM probes

All types of hardware devices are vulnerable, including microprocessors, FPGAs and dedicated ASICs

Some are more vulnerable than others, e.g., microprocessors execute instructions on different functional units within the ALU

Therefore,  $I_{DDT}$  in these cases is dependent on both data and instructions



**SPA** or Simple Power Analysis is a technique that involves directly analyzing I<sub>DDT</sub>

during cryptographic operations





Above trace is measured over 1 ms, sampled at 5 MHz (5000 pts)

Blow-up of previous figure showing 2nd and 3rd rounds of DES encryption



between the rounds are also visible, which can be exploited b/c they result from conditional jumps based on key bits, etc.

Small variations



ECE UNM



HOST

### Simple Power Analysis (SPA)

The DES key schedule algorithm

```
Algorithm KeySchedule(K) // |K| = 56

K \leftarrow PC-1(K)

Parse K as C_0 \parallel D_0

for r = 1, ..., 16 do

if r \in \{1, 2, 9, 16\} then j \leftarrow 1 else j \leftarrow 2 fi

C_r \leftarrow leftshift_j(C_{r-1}); D_r \leftarrow leftshift_j(D_{r-1})

K_r \leftarrow PC-2(C_r \parallel D_r)

return(K_1, ..., K_{16})
```

An even higher resolution trace through two regions, each with 7 clock cycles at 3.5714 MHz



ECE UNM

The differences in the traces result primarily from differences in the power consumption of **different microprocessor instructions** 

It is clear that SPA can reveal the sequence of instructions executed Therefore, it can be used to break crypto. implementations in which the execution path depends on the data being processed

For example:

### • DES Key Schedule

The key schedule involves rotating 28-bit key registers

A conditional branch is commonly used to check the bit shifted off the end so that "1" bits can be wrapped around

The resulting power consumption traces for a "1" bit and a "0" bit will contain different SPA features if the execution paths takes different branches for each

# • DES permutations

DES implementations perform a variety of **bit permutations** 

Conditional branching in software or microcode can cause significant power consumption differences for "0" and "1" bits

# • Comparisons

String or memory comparison operations typically perform a conditional branch when a mismatch is found

This conditional branching causes large SPA (and sometimes timing) characteristics

# • Multipliers

Modular multiplication circuits tend to leak a great deal of information about the data they process

The leakage functions depend on the multiplier design, but are often strongly correlated to operand values and Hamming weights

### • Exponentiators

A simple modular exponentiation function parses the exponent, performing a squaring operation in every iteration

An additional multiplication occurs for each exponent bit that is equal to "1"

The exponent can be compromised if squaring and multiplication operations have different power consumption characteristics Or take different amounts of time

# **Preventing SPA**

Avoiding procedures that use secret intermediates or keys for conditional branching operations will mask many SPA characteristics

The microcode in some microprocessors cause large operand-dependent power consumption features, which are vulnerabilities

ASIC implementations of symmetric cryptographic algorithms have sufficiently small power consumption variations, so SPA cannot be used to extract keys

In addition to large-scale power variations due to the instruction sequence, there are effects correlated to **data values** being manipulated

These variations tend *to be smaller* and are sometimes overshadowed by measurement errors and other noise

In such cases, it is still often possible to break the system using statistical functions

AES will be used here to demonstrate this

function  $AES_{K}(M)$ 

```
(K<sub>0</sub>, ..., K<sub>10</sub>) <- expand(K)
s <- M XOR K<sub>0</sub>
for r = 1 to 10 do
    s <- S(s)
    s <- shift-rows(s)
    if r <= 9 then s <- mix-cols(s) fi
    s <- s XOR K<sub>r</sub>
endfor
```

return s

HOST

#### **Differential Power Analysis (DPA)**

AES first XORs the subkey  $K_0$  (which is in fact **the key** -- see key sched.) with the

plaintext byte and then uses the result to 'lookup' a value in the SBOX function

63	7c	77	7b	f2	6b	6f	c5	-30	01	67	2b	fe	d7	ab	76	
ca	82	c9	7d	fa	59	47	fO	ad	d4	a2	af	9c	$\mathbf{a4}$	72	cO	
b7	$\mathbf{fd}$	93	26	36	3f	f7	cc	34	a5	e5	f1	71	d8	31	15	This table lists the
04	c7	23	c3	18	96	05	9a	07	12	80	e2	$^{\rm eb}$	27	b2	75	
09	83	2c	1a	1b	6e	5a	a0	52	3b	d6	b3	29	$\mathbf{e}3$	2f	84	values of $S(0), S(1),$
53	d1	00	$\mathbf{ed}$	20	$\mathbf{fc}$	$\mathbf{b1}$	5b	6a.	$^{\rm cb}$	be	39	4a	4c	58	$\mathbf{cf}$	S(255)
d0	ef	aa	fb	43	4d	33	85	45	f9	02	7f	50	3c	9f	a8	S(255)
51	a3	40	8f	92	9d	38	f5	$\mathbf{b}\mathbf{c}$	b6	da	21	10	$\mathbf{f}\mathbf{f}$	f3	d2	
$\mathbf{cd}$	0c	13	ec	5f	97	44	17	c4	a7	7e	$^{3d}$	64	5d	19	73	
60	81	4f	dc	22	2a	90	88	46	ee	b8	14	de	5e	0b	db	
e0	32	3a	0a.	49	06	$^{24}$	5c	c2	d3	ac	62	91	95	e4	79	
e7	c8	37	6d	8d	d5	4e	a9	6c	56	f4	ea	65	7a	ae	08	
ba	78	25	2e	1c	a6	$\mathbf{b4}$	c6	e8	dd	74	1f	4b	bd	8b	8a	
70	3e	b5	66	48	03	f6	0e	61	35	57	b9	86	c1	1d	9e	
e1	f8	98	11	69	d9	8e	94	9b	1e	87	e9	ce	55	28	df	
8c	al	89	0d	bf	e6	42	68	41	99	2d	Of	b0	54	bb	16	

Figure 2.9: The AES S-box, which is a function  $S : \{0,1\}^8 \to \{0,1\}^8$  specified by the following list. All values in hexadecimal. The meaning is:  $S(00) = 63, S(01) = 7c, \ldots, S(ff) = 16$ .

Therefore, each output byte in the first round can be computed given a specified, i.e., known, plaintext byte and a *guess* of the subkey K<sub>0</sub> as:

S(p XOR k), with p representing the plaintext and k the subkey

Let's focus on the high order bit, *v*, of the output byte

The attack assumes the power consumption during processing of this high order bit will depend on whether it is a '0' or a '1'

The attack begins by measuring the power supply curve as each of 1000 random (but known) plaintexts are encrypted

Once these traces are obtained, we have ALL the information we need to learn the key, i.e., the rest of the attack focuses only on post-processing these wfms

The process of 'learning' *k* simply involves creating two subsets of the 1000 power trace wfms for each *guess* of *k* 

Given that k can be 1 of 256 different values, this requires this process to be repeated 256 times, once for each guess

The two subsets are created by computing the value of *v* under each guess of *k* Remember, the plaintext bytes are known

Therefore, for each guess of *k*, each is XORed and run through SBOX

The bit value that is generated for v is used to define the subsets, with all plaintext wfms that generate a '0' for v in one subset, and those generating a '1' in the other

An important part of the attack is to eliminate the 'background noise' Background noise is generated by **simultaneous switching activity** on other SBOX output bits during the *time region of interest* 

The *time region of interest* is simply the period of time when AES is computing the XOR and subsequently carrying out the SBOX operation

Background noise is eliminated by computing an **average trace** using all wfms in each of the subsets

The assumption here is that each of the other 127 bits on the SBOX outputs in each wfm subset have nearly equal numbers 0's and 1's

If this is true, then the average power trace will become **flat** for these bits because of the averaging, effectively cancelling them out



The final step is to compute a **difference trace** from the two averages, for each guess of the subkey *k* 



*Figure 1.5.* Difference plots for the key guesses 117, 118, 119, and 120.

S. Mangard, E. Oswald and T. Popp, "Power Analysis Attacks: Revealing the Secrets of Smart Cards", Springer, 2007

The above shows guesses for k of 117, 118, 119 and 120

It is clear from the spikes that the actual subkey k used by AES is 119

ECE UNM

(3/20/18)

DPA works because it can inspect *intermediate* values in the computation process, something the authors of AES assumed was not possible

Power analysis provides internal observation of the temporal and spatial switching behavior of the chip

This feature has been heavily used in the manufacturing test community since the early 90's!

So DPA was not first to make use of power supply transient signal analysis

My Ph.D. research in 1997 (see ITC'96 and '97) is also based on an analysis of  $I_{DDT}$  signals

However, unlike manufacturing test methods, such as I<sub>DDQ</sub> and I<sub>DDT</sub>, DPA does NOT need to account for process variation effects between ICs This is true because DPA is carried out entirely on ONE chip

This allows much higher levels of resolution to be achieved