New algorithm IDs for the CFRG algorithms in OpenPGP

Simplifying the use of Ed25519, Ed448, X25519, and X448

June 2012: RFC 6637 - Elliptic Curve Cryptography (ECC) in OpenPGP

- June 2012: RFC 6637 Elliptic Curve Cryptography (ECC) in OpenPGP
- March 2016: draft-koch-openpgp-rfc4880bis-02 added EdDSA and Ed25519, using OID 1.3.6.1.4.1.11591.15.1 ("ed25519", under private enterprises)

- June 2012: RFC 6637 Elliptic Curve Cryptography (ECC) in OpenPGP
- March 2016: draft-koch-openpgp-rfc4880bis-02 added EdDSA and Ed25519, using OID 1.3.6.1.4.1.11591.15.1 ("ed25519", under private enterprises)
- June 2017: draft-ietf-openpgp-rfc4880bis-02 added Curve25519 over ECDH, using OID 1.3.6.1.4.1.3029.1.5.1 ("curvey25519", now fixed)

- June 2012: RFC 6637 Elliptic Curve Cryptography (ECC) in OpenPGP
- March 2016: draft-koch-openpgp-rfc4880bis-02 added EdDSA and Ed25519, using OID 1.3.6.1.4.1.11591.15.1 ("ed25519", under private enterprises)
- June 2017: draft-ietf-openpgp-rfc4880bis-02 added Curve25519 over ECDH, using OID 1.3.6.1.4.1.3029.1.5.1 ("curvey25519", now fixed)
- August 2018: RFC 8410 Algorithm Identifiers for Ed25519, Ed448,
 X25519, and X448 for Use in the Internet X.509 Public Key Infrastructure

Last year: discussion in the DT about using new OIDs or new algorithm IDs

- Last year: discussion in the DT about using new OIDs or new algorithm IDs
- Decided against it due to deployed base of Curve25519 keys

- Last year: discussion in the DT about using new OIDs or new algorithm IDs
- Decided against it due to deployed base of Curve25519 keys
- February: new discussion about the OIDs on the WG mailing list

- Last year: discussion in the DT about using new OIDs or new algorithm IDs
- Decided against it due to deployed base of Curve25519 keys
- February: new discussion about the OIDs on the WG mailing list
- Proposal to switch to the X.509 OIDs

- Last year: discussion in the DT about using new OIDs or new algorithm IDs
- Decided against it due to deployed base of Curve25519 keys
- February: new discussion about the OIDs on the WG mailing list
- Proposal to switch to the X.509 OIDs
- Proposal to switch to new algorithm IDs

Ed25519 and Ed448

Ed25519 and Ed448

Hardcoded lengths for keys and signatures

Ed25519 and Ed448

- Hardcoded lengths for keys and signatures
- No MPIs

Hardcoded lengths for keys and ephemeral points

- Hardcoded lengths for keys and ephemeral points
- No MPIs

- Hardcoded lengths for keys and ephemeral points
- No MPIs
- No padding

- Hardcoded lengths for keys and ephemeral points
- No MPIs
- No padding
- No two-octet checksum

- Hardcoded lengths for keys and ephemeral points
- No MPIs
- No padding
- No two-octet checksum
- HKDF over the shared key

- Hardcoded lengths for keys and ephemeral points
- No MPIs
- No padding
- No two-octet checksum
- HKDF over the shared key
- Hardcoded info parameter

- Hardcoded lengths for keys and ephemeral points
- No MPIs
- No padding
- No two-octet checksum
- HKDF over the shared key
- Hardcoded info parameter
- Derived key used to encrypt the session key using AES-KW

• In a v3 PKESK, the symmetric algorithm ID was prepended to the session key

- In a v3 PKESK, the symmetric algorithm ID was prepended to the session key
- AES-KW can only encrypt a multiple of 8 octets

- In a v3 PKESK, the symmetric algorithm ID was prepended to the session key
- AES-KW can only encrypt a multiple of 8 octets
- Add padding?

- In a v3 PKESK, the symmetric algorithm ID was prepended to the session key
- AES-KW can only encrypt a multiple of 8 octets
- Add padding?
- Leave it unencrypted instead

- In a v3 PKESK, the symmetric algorithm ID was prepended to the session key
- AES-KW can only encrypt a multiple of 8 octets
- Add padding?
- Leave it unencrypted instead
- But: concern of cross-algorithm attacks

- In a v3 PKESK, the symmetric algorithm ID was prepended to the session key
- AES-KW can only encrypt a multiple of 8 octets
- Add padding?
- Leave it unencrypted instead
- But: concern of cross-algorithm attacks
- Mandate using AES?

Recipient fingerprint is not included in the KDF, unlike ECDH

- Recipient fingerprint is not included in the KDF, unlike ECDH
- No guarantee that the message was originally encrypted for you

- Recipient fingerprint is not included in the KDF, unlike ECDH
- No guarantee that the message was originally encrypted for you
- Need the Intended Recipient Fingerprint signature subpacket for that

- Recipient fingerprint is not included in the KDF, unlike ECDH
- No guarantee that the message was originally encrypted for you
- Need the Intended Recipient Fingerprint signature subpacket for that
- This also makes automatic forwarding easier

- Recipient fingerprint is not included in the KDF, unlike ECDH
- No guarantee that the message was originally encrypted for you
- Need the Intended Recipient Fingerprint signature subpacket for that
- This also makes automatic forwarding easier
- More about that later

Questions?