

Rambus

ThreeBears round 2 updates

Mike Hamburg
Cryptographer

August 24, 2019



ThreeBears algorithm summary: similar to Kyber

Public key is seed to generate matrix A ; $X := As + e$

Matrix A is 2×2 , 3×3 or 4×4 depending on security parameters

KEM header is $Y := s'A + e'$

KEM payload is m masked by rounded digits of $s'X + e''$

Decrypt by calculating $Ys \approx s'As \approx s'X + e''$

Negligible failure probability

Fujisaki-Okamoto variant for CCA security

ThreeBears algorithm summary: innovations

Kyber: lattice is **coefficients** of polynomials mod $x^{256} + 1, q = 3329$

ThreeBears: lattice is **digits** of numbers mod $N = 2^{3120} - 2^{1560} - 1$

Equivalently: coefficients of polynomials mod $x^{312} - x^{156} - 1, x = 2^{10}$

Lattices with bignum math instead of polynomial math

- Easy to pack digits efficiently

- Fast if CPU has a big multiplier

- No NTT, but ring has no zero divisors → better security proof

Slightly larger lattices than other systems → more conservative params

Constant-time 2-error-correcting code for better failure-vs-efficiency tradeoff

Changes in round 2: reduced variance in CCA versions

LWE design decision: more efficiency at the cost of rare failures

Failure attacks possible, see eg D'Anvers-Vercauteren-Verbauwhede 2018

DVV-style attacks considered in ThreeBears' original 2017 design

ThreeBears' error-correcting code makes analysis harder

Can't calculate exact failure probabilities

Round 2: more rigorous and conservative (over)estimates of failure probability

Round 1 parameters are marginal vs 2^{64} queries

Round 2: reduced variance, reduced fail prob → less risk of failure attack

Slightly lower lattice security

Changes in round 2: reduced variance in CCA versions

| Param set | CCA secure | | | Ephemeral | | |
|--------------------|--------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|-----------|--------|
| | variance | failure | cl sec | variance | failure | cl sec |
| BabyBear r1 | 5/8 | 2^{-128} | 157 | 1 | 2^{-58} | 168 |
| BabyBear r2 | 9/16 | 2^{-156} | 154 | | | |
| MamaBear r1 | 1/2 | 2^{-141} | 242 | 7/8 | 2^{-51} | 262 |
| MamaBear r2 | 13/32 | 2^{-206} | 235 | | | |
| PapaBear r1 | 3/8 | 2^{-188} | 322 | 3/4 | 2^{-52} | 351 |
| PapaBear r2 | 5/16 | 2^{-256} | 314 | | | |

Changes in round 2: implicit rejection in CCA versions

Initial submission: explicit rejection

- Supported by CCA security proof (for ThreeBears only)

- Simpler and faster

- Wanted to promote discussion about rejection modes

Since then, state of the art has settled on implicit rejection

- Better usability

- Encourages constant time

- Everyone can use same security analysis (see SXY, HKSU, BHHP, ...)

Changes in round 2: implicit rejection in CCA versions

Optional in round 2 submission

Mandatory as of July 2019

PRF key lengthened to 40 bytes, otherwise same

Uses U_m^{\perp} , meaning ct isn't hashed into key: faster and simpler

[BHHP'19] says security equivalent to U^{\perp} in the QROM

Software now constant-time, doesn't return failure code

Performance penalty: $\approx 10\%$ slower CCA decapsulation

Changes in round 2: new toys and challenges

Toy schemes intended to be broken:

GummyBear (new): dimension = 120; N not prime

TeddyBear: dimension = 240 (vs BabyBear: dimension = 624)

Challenges generated by cut+choose

All standard and toy bears, plus dimensions 80 ... 320 for granularity

Not intended to be broken: Koala and KoalaEphem

Could find use as lightweight ThreeBears variant

Dimension = $240 \cdot 2$

Classical core-sieve difficulty 115 and 128 bits, resp.

Summary

ThreeBears is a competitive alternative for poly-LWE systems

Uses bignum math instead of polynomial math; otherwise similar

Original design was to provoke more study of possible LWE variants

Round 2 changes make it more conservative



Questions?

Rambus
Data • Faster • Safer