

## Standardization efforts for PQC in OpenPGP in the Project PQC@Thunderbird

Stephan Ehlen<sup>BSI</sup>, Andreas Hülsing<sup>TU/e</sup>, Evangelos Karatsiolis<sup>MTG</sup>, **Stavros Kousidis**<sup>BSI</sup>, Johannes Roth<sup>MTG</sup>, **Falko Strenzke**<sup>MTG</sup>, Christian Tobias<sup>MTG</sup>  
**Aron Wussler**<sup>Proton</sup>

BSI: German Federal Office for Information Security

MTG: MTG AG, Germany

Proton: Proton AG, Switzerland

TU/e: University of Eindhoven

Design Criteria

Algorithm and Parameter Choices

Kyber-KEM

Signatures

Next Steps

## Design Criteria

### Algorithm and Parameter Choices

### Kyber-KEM

### Signatures

- PQC and Hash-and-Sign

- Multiple signatures on the protocol level

### Next Steps

# Design Criteria

- ▶ Use **composite** multi-algorithm (classic + PQC, a.k.a. hybrid) for Kyber and Dilithium, standalone for SPHINCS<sup>+</sup>
- ▶ Backwards compatibility:
  - ▶ Having two different certificates (v4/v5)
  - ▶ Multiple signatures on the protocol level
- ▶ As classical algorithms we propose ECC:
  - ▶ “fix” all previously existing inconsistencies regarding data formats
    - ▶ i.e. native format for CFRG curves

## Design Criteria

## Algorithm and Parameter Choices

## Kyber-KEM

## Signatures

PQC and Hash-and-Sign

Multiple signatures on the protocol level

## Next Steps

# Algorithm Choices

## **Kyber512 + X25519**

Kyber1024 + X448

Kyber768 + ECDH-NIST-P-384

Kyber1024 + ECDH-NIST-P-521

Kyber768 + ECDH-brainpoolP384r1

Kyber1024 + ECDH-brainpoolP512r1

## **Dilithium2 + Ed25519**

Dilithium5 + Ed448

Dilithium3 + ECDSA-NIST-P-384

Dilithium5 + ECDSA-NIST-P-521

Dilithium3 + ECDSA-brainpoolP384r1

Dilithium5 + ECDSA-brainpoolP512r1

SPHINCS<sup>+</sup>-simple-SHA2

SPHINCS<sup>+</sup>-simple-SHAKE

**MUST**

SHOULD

MAY

MAY

MAY

MAY

**MUST**

SHOULD

MAY

MAY

MAY

MAY

SHOULD

MAY

# SPHINCS+ Parameters

SPHINCS+ -simple- <b>SHA2</b> -128s	SHOULD
SPHINCS+ -simple- <b>SHA2</b> -128f	SHOULD
SPHINCS+ -simple- <b>SHA2</b> -192s	SHOULD
SPHINCS+ -simple- <b>SHA2</b> -192f	SHOULD
SPHINCS+ -simple- <b>SHA2</b> -256s	SHOULD
SPHINCS+ -simple- <b>SHA2</b> -256f	SHOULD
SPHINCS+ -simple- <b>SHAKE</b> -128s	MAY
SPHINCS+ -simple- <b>SHAKE</b> -128f	MAY
SPHINCS+ -simple- <b>SHAKE</b> -192s	MAY
SPHINCS+ -simple- <b>SHAKE</b> -192f	MAY
SPHINCS+ -simple- <b>SHAKE</b> -256s	MAY
SPHINCS+ -simple- <b>SHAKE</b> -256f	MAY

Design Criteria

Algorithm and Parameter Choices

**Kyber-KEM**

Signatures

PQC and Hash-and-Sign

Multiple signatures on the protocol level

Next Steps



# Kyber-KEM

Basic design paradigms:

- ▶ use ECDH / X25519 / X448 as KEMs
  - ▶ omit the key derivation step and output a shared key
- ▶ derive the KEK from the ECDH and Kyber shared keys
  - ▶ use SHA3-based simple concatenate-and-hash construction with some fixed info

Design Criteria

Algorithm and Parameter Choices

Kyber-KEM

**Signatures**

PQC and Hash-and-Sign

Multiple signatures on the protocol level

Next Steps

Design Criteria

Algorithm and Parameter Choices

Kyber-KEM

**Signatures**

PQC and Hash-and-Sign

Multiple signatures on the protocol level

Next Steps

# PQC and Hash-and-Sign

- ▶ SPHINCS<sup>+</sup> and Dilithium are not following the simple hash-and-sign paradigm
  - ▶ SPHINCS<sup>+</sup> uses randomized hashing, not to rely on the collision resistance of the hash function
  - ▶ Dilithium prepends the public key
- ▶ OpenPGP v5 signatures also features randomized hashing but the details differ

# Hashing in PQC Schemes vs. v5 Signatures

	<b>SPHINCS<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>Dilithium</b>	<b>v5 signatures</b>
<b>Hash algo</b>	SHA2 / SHA3	SHA3	SHA2 / SHA3
<b>Salt size</b>	128, 192, or 256 bit	N/A	128 bit

- ▶ Depending on the SPHINCS<sup>+</sup> security level, SPHINCS<sup>+</sup> hash-and-sign v5 signatures will be weaker than original SPHINCS<sup>+</sup>.
- ▶ In order to preserve the security level of SPHINCS<sup>+</sup>, a larger salt value in v5 signatures is necessary for some parameters.
- ▶ Dilithium uses only SHA3 hashing. We considered binding the hash function to the algorithm ID.

Design Criteria

Algorithm and Parameter Choices

Kyber-KEM

**Signatures**

PQC and Hash-and-Sign

**Multiple signatures on the protocol level**

Next Steps

# Signature Concatenation

The goal is backwards compatibility to legacy clients

- ▶ E-mail: concatenate two signatures
  - ▶ For instance Thunderbird and Proton clients currently process only the first signature
  - ▶ Classical signature followed by PQC
- ▶ OpenPGP messages
  - ▶ Multiple signatures already specified
  - ▶ State of implementation support apparently not optimal
  - ▶ Need additional testing in interoperability suite

Design Criteria

Algorithm and Parameter Choices

Kyber-KEM

Signatures

PQC and Hash-and-Sign

Multiple signatures on the protocol level

Next Steps



# Next Steps

- ▶ Wait for publication of Kyber IP results from NIST
- ▶ Publication of the draft
  - ▶ Currently draft is still under construction
  - ▶ Expected publication Nov. or Dec. '22
- ▶ Implementations
  - ▶ Proton already has an experimental go implementation
  - ▶ MTG will work on implementations:
    - ▶ in Libgcrypt/OpenPGP, Botan/RNP/Thunderbird
    - ▶ covering all algorithms proposed here
    - ▶ work from Jan. '23 to Nov. '23
- ▶ Improve the testing suite to include the missing tests

# Questions for the WG

What do you think of:

- ▶ The algorithm selection?
- ▶ Binding the signature salt size to the hash ID?
- ▶ Binding the hash function to the algorithm ID?

Any feedback on the draft is very welcome!

An open discussion will follow in Mezzanine 12 starting at 14:50  
(link for remote participants in the side-meetings wiki)