# **O** NTNU | Norwegian University of

## **RANDOMNESS 2: RANDOMIZATION**

TTM4205 – Lecture 3

Tjerand Silde

27.08.2024

#### **Contents**

#### **[Announcements](#page-2-0)**

**[Primality Testing](#page-5-0)**

**[Factorization](#page-42-0)**

**[De-Randomization](#page-68-0)**

#### **[Takeaways](#page-76-0)**



#### <span id="page-2-0"></span>**Contents**

#### **[Announcements](#page-2-0)**

**[Primality Testing](#page-5-0)**

**[Factorization](#page-42-0)**

**[De-Randomization](#page-68-0)**

**[Takeaways](#page-76-0)**



#### **Reference Group**

I am looking for an MTKOM student to join the reference group. We will meet three times during the semester, and your feedback is extremely valuable.

Send me an email and/or talk to me in the break :)



#### **Reference Material**

These slides are based on:

- $\blacktriangleright$  The referred papers in the slides
- ▶ JPA: parts of chapter 9



#### <span id="page-5-0"></span>**Contents**

**[Announcements](#page-2-0)**

#### **[Primality Testing](#page-5-0)**

**[Factorization](#page-42-0)**

**[De-Randomization](#page-68-0)**

**[Takeaways](#page-76-0)**



## **Primality Testing**

## How do we check if a number is prime?



#### **Deterministic Methods**

#### ▶ Brute Force

- ▶ Sieving methods
- ▶ Wilson's Theorem?



It is always possible to check all possibilities. But how long time does it take? Assume that  $p$  is of 2048 bits.



It is always possible to check all possibilities. But how long time does it take? Assume that  $p$  is of 2048 bits.

► divisible by any number between 1 and  $p$ ?  $\sim$  2<sup>2048</sup>



It is always possible to check all possibilities. But how long time does it take? Assume that  $p$  is of 2048 bits.

► divisible by any number between 1 and  $p$ ?  $\sim$  2<sup>2048</sup>

▶ by 2 or any odd number between 1 and  $p$ ?  $\sim$  2<sup>2047</sup>



It is always possible to check all possibilities. But how long time does it take? Assume that  $p$  is of 2048 bits.

► divisible by any number between 1 and  $p$ ?  $\sim$  2<sup>2048</sup>

- ▶ by 2 or any odd number between 1 and  $p$ ?  $\sim$  2<sup>2047</sup>
- ▶ by 2 or any odd number between 1 and  $\sqrt{p}$  ?  $\sim$  2<sup>1023</sup>

It is always possible to check all possibilities. But how long time does it take? Assume that p is of 2048 bits.

► divisible by any number between 1 and  $p$ ?  $\sim$  2<sup>2048</sup>

- ► by 2 or any odd number between 1 and  $p? \sim 2^{2047}$
- ▶ by 2 or any odd number between 1 and  $\sqrt{p}$  ?  $\sim$  2<sup>1023</sup>

This is infeasible to compute! Even  $2^{128}$  is considered impossible.



#### **Sieving Methods**

It is possible to pre-compute many small prime numbers to speed up the process, e.g., the sieve of Eratosthenes:



#### **Sieving Methods**

It is possible to pre-compute many small prime numbers to speed up the process, e.g., the sieve of Eratosthenes:

First, keep 2 and remove all even numbers. Then, keep 3 and remove all multiples of three. 4 is already removed. Keep 5 and remove all multiples of five. 6 has already been removed. ...

#### **Sieving Methods**

It is possible to pre-compute many small prime numbers to speed up the process, e.g., the sieve of Eratosthenes:

First, keep 2 and remove all even numbers. Then, keep 3 and remove all multiples of three. 4 is already removed. Keep 5 and remove all multiples of five. 6 has already been removed. ...

It still requires exponential work to check all possibilities!



#### **Wilson's Theorem**

Wilson's Theorem: *A natural number* p > 1 *is a prime number if and only if the product of all the positive integers less than* p *is one less than a multiple of* p*.*



Wilson's Theorem: *A natural number* p > 1 *is a prime number if and only if the product of all the positive integers less than* p *is one less than a multiple of* p*.*

This means:  $(p-1)! \equiv -1 \mod p \Longleftrightarrow p$  *is a prime number*.



Wilson's Theorem: *A natural number* p > 1 *is a prime number if and only if the product of all the positive integers less than* p *is one less than a multiple of* p*.*

This means:  $(p-1)! \equiv -1 \mod p \Longleftrightarrow p$  *is a prime number*.

It still requires exponential work to compute  $(p - 1)!$ 



Wilson's Theorem: *A natural number* p > 1 *is a prime number if and only if the product of all the positive integers less than* p *is one less than a multiple of* p*.*

This means:  $(p-1)! \equiv -1 \mod p \Longleftrightarrow p$  *is a prime number*.

It still requires exponential work to compute  $(p - 1)!$ 

But it is possible to use similar techniques to speed it up.



#### **Randomized Methods**

- ▶ Monte Carlo algorithms
- ▶ The Miller-Rabin method



#### **Monte Carlo Algorithms**

A Monte Carlo algorithm is a randomized algorithm whose output may be incorrect with a given probability.



A Monte Carlo algorithm is a randomized algorithm whose output may be incorrect with a given probability.

A **false**-biased Monte Carlo algorithm is always correct when it returns **false**, but it might be wrong it it outputs **True**. Similar for a **true**-biased algorithm.



#### **Monte Carlo Algorithms**

A Monte Carlo algorithm is a randomized algorithm whose output may be incorrect with a given probability.

A **false**-biased Monte Carlo algorithm is always correct when it returns **false**, but it might be wrong it it outputs **True**. Similar for a **true**-biased algorithm.

If the probability of being wrong is  $1/2$ , then it can be amplified by parallel repetition:  $\lambda$  rounds gives the probability ( $\frac{1}{2}$  $(\frac{1}{2})^{\lambda} \rightarrow 0$  of being wrong.



#### **Monte Carlo Algorithms**

A Monte Carlo algorithm is a randomized algorithm whose output may be incorrect with a given probability.

A **false**-biased Monte Carlo algorithm is always correct when it returns **false**, but it might be wrong it it outputs **True**. Similar for a **true**-biased algorithm.

If the probability of being wrong is 1/2, then it can be amplified by parallel repetition:  $\lambda$  rounds gives the probability ( $\frac{1}{2}$  $(\frac{1}{2})^{\lambda} \rightarrow 0$  of being wrong.

Some commonly used algorithms: Soloway-Strassen, Fermat testing (warning: Carmichael numbers) and Miller-Rabin.



#### Fermat's little theorem: if  $p$  is prime, then we have that  $a^{p-1} \equiv 1 \mod p$ .



Fermat's little theorem: if  $p$  is prime, then we have that  $a^{p-1} \equiv 1 \mod p$ .

Let  $p$  be an odd integer and write  $p-1$  as  $2^s \cdot d$  where  $d$  is an odd number.



Fermat's little theorem: if  $\rho$  is prime, then we have that  $a^{p-1}\equiv 1\mod p.$ 

Let  $p$  be an odd integer and write  $p-1$  as  $2<sup>s</sup> · d$  where  $d$  is an odd number.

Let  $1 <$   $a$   $<$   $\rho$  be a randomly sampled integer. Then  $a^d \equiv 1 \mod p$ or  $a^{2^rd}\equiv -1\mod p$  for some  $0\leq r < s.$  Only log $_2$   $p$  options to check.



Fermat's little theorem: if  $\rho$  is prime, then we have that  $a^{p-1}\equiv 1\mod p.$ 

Let  $p$  be an odd integer and write  $p-1$  as  $2^s \cdot d$  where  $d$  is an odd number.

Let  $1 <$   $a$   $<$   $\rho$  be a randomly sampled integer. Then  $a^d \equiv 1 \mod p$ or  $a^{2^rd}\equiv -1\mod p$  for some  $0\leq r < s.$  Only lo $\mathrm g_2$   $p$  options to check.

If this is false, then  $p$  is composite. However, the above fact is true for roughly  $\frac{1}{4}$  of all composite numbers for a randomly sampled value *a*.

Fermat's little theorem: if  $\rho$  is prime, then we have that  $a^{p-1}\equiv 1\mod p.$ 

Let  $p$  be an odd integer and write  $p-1$  as  $2^s \cdot d$  where  $d$  is an odd number.

Let  $1 <$   $a$   $<$   $\rho$  be a randomly sampled integer. Then  $a^d \equiv 1 \mod p$ or  $a^{2^rd}\equiv -1\mod p$  for some  $0\leq r < s.$  Only lo $\mathrm g_2$   $p$  options to check.

If this is false, then  $p$  is composite. However, the above fact is true for roughly  $\frac{1}{4}$  of all composite numbers for a randomly sampled value *a*.

If we sample  $\lambda$  random values a, the Miller-Rabin primality testing algorithm has ( $\frac{1}{4}$  $\frac{1}{4}$ ) $^\lambda$  chance of being wrong every time, which becomes negligible.





The most common way of checking the primality of a candidate  $p$  is a combination of the above as follows:

**1.** Pre-compute a list of the first thousand prime numbers.



- **1.** Pre-compute a list of the first thousand prime numbers.
- **2.** Check *p* is divisible by any prime number in the list.

- **1.** Pre-compute a list of the first thousand prime numbers.
- **2.** Check *p* is divisible by any prime number in the list.
- **3.** Run the Miller-Rabin algorithm, say, ∼ 40 times.



- **1.** Pre-compute a list of the first thousand prime numbers.
- **2.** Check *p* is divisible by any prime number in the list.
- **3.** Run the Miller-Rabin algorithm, say, ∼ 40 times.
- **4.** If all checks succeeds, then output: *probably prime*.

### **Primality Testing Failures**

It might be highly rewarding for an attacker to convince you that a composite number is prime. For example:


# **Primality Testing Failures**

It might be highly rewarding for an attacker to convince you that a composite number is prime. For example:

RSA is not secure if  $n$  is not a bi-prime, and it is easy to compute discrete logarithms in composite order groups (not containing large prime subgroups).



# **Primality Testing Failures**

It might be highly rewarding for an attacker to convince you that a composite number is prime. For example:

RSA is not secure if  $n$  is not a bi-prime, and it is easy to compute discrete logarithms in composite order groups (not containing large prime subgroups).

A classic mistake in Miller-Rabin: Integers a are sampled randomly but pre-fixed before testing. This gives an attacker the chance to find composite numbers (pseudo-primes) that pass the test after all.



# **Primality Testing Failures**

It might be highly rewarding for an attacker to convince you that a composite number is prime. For example:

RSA is not secure if  $n$  is not a bi-prime, and it is easy to compute discrete logarithms in composite order groups (not containing large prime subgroups).

A classic mistake in Miller-Rabin: Integers a are sampled randomly but pre-fixed before testing. This gives an attacker the chance to find composite numbers (pseudo-primes) that pass the test after all.

Sometimes it is a mix between fixed a's and freshly sampled a's, still giving the adversary a good chance to fool the test.



# **Primality Testing in OpenSSL**

#### Prime and Prejudice: Primality Testing Under Adversarial Conditions

Martin R. Albrecht<sup>1</sup>, Jake Massimo<sup>1</sup>, Kenneth G. Paterson<sup>1</sup>, and Juraj Somorovsky<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Royal Holloway, University of London <sup>2</sup> Ruhr University Bochum, Germany martin.albrecht@rhul.ac.uk, jake.massimo.2015@rhul.ac.uk, kenny.paterson@rhul.ac.uk, juraj.somorovsky@rub.de

**Figure:** <https://eprint.iacr.org/2018/749.pdf>



# **The Need for Secure Primality Testing**

#### Safety in Numbers: On the Need for Robust Diffie-Hellman Parameter Validation

Steven Galbraith<sup>1</sup>, Jake Massimo<sup>2</sup>, and Kenneth G. Paterson<sup>2</sup>

 $^1\,$  University of Auckland <sup>2</sup> Royal Holloway, University of London s.galbraith@auckland.ac.nz, jake.massimo.2015@rhul.ac.uk, kenny.paterson@rhul.ac.uk

**Figure:** <https://eprint.iacr.org/2019/032.pdf>



# **Secure Primality Testing API**

#### A Performant, Misuse-Resistant API for **Primality Testing**

Jake Massimo<sup>1</sup> and Kenneth G. Paterson<sup>2</sup>

Information Security Group. Royal Holloway, University of London jake.massimo.2015@rhul.ac.uk Department of Computer Science. ETH Zurich kenny.paterson@inf.ethz.ch

**Figure:** <https://eprint.iacr.org/2020/065.pdf>



#### <span id="page-42-0"></span>**Contents**

**[Announcements](#page-2-0)**

**[Primality Testing](#page-5-0)**

#### **[Factorization](#page-42-0)**

**[De-Randomization](#page-68-0)**

**[Takeaways](#page-76-0)**



#### **Factorization**

# How do we factor large bi-primes?





Some trivial ways to attack an RSA moduli n:

 $\triangleright$  Brute force by checking if n is divisible by 2 or any odd numbers less than ⊓<br>⁄  $\overline{\bf n}.$  This requires exponential work...

- $\triangleright$  Brute force by checking if n is divisible by 2 or any odd numbers less than ⊓<br>⁄  $\overline{\bf n}.$  This requires exponential work...
- Even only checking divisibility against primes between  $2^{1023}$  and  $2^{1024}$  for 2048 bit *n* requires exponential work...

- $\triangleright$  Brute force by checking if n is divisible by 2 or any odd numbers less than ⊓<br>⁄  $\overline{\bf n}.$  This requires exponential work...
- Even only checking divisibility against primes between  $2^{1023}$  and  $2^{1024}$  for 2048 bit *n* requires exponential work...
- ▶ Fermat Factorization find prime factors close to  $\sqrt{n}$ .



- $\triangleright$  Brute force by checking if n is divisible by 2 or any odd numbers less than ⊓<br>⁄  $\overline{\bf n}.$  This requires exponential work...
- Even only checking divisibility against primes between  $2^{1023}$  and  $2^{1024}$  for 2048 bit *n* requires exponential work...
- ▶ Fermat Factorization find prime factors close to  $\sqrt{n}$ .
- ▶ Pollard's Rho algorithm find largest prime factor in  $\sqrt[4]{n}$



Some trivial ways to attack an RSA moduli n:

- $\triangleright$  Brute force by checking if n is divisible by 2 or any odd numbers less than √  $\overline{\bf{\emph{n}}}$ . This requires exponential work...
- Even only checking divisibility against primes between  $2^{1023}$  and  $2^{1024}$  for 2048 bit *n* requires exponential work...
- ▶ Fermat Factorization find prime factors close to  $\sqrt{n}$ .
- ▶ Pollard's Rho algorithm find largest prime factor in  $\sqrt[4]{n}$

Randomness comes to the rescue in this situation as well!

## **Randomized Methods**

The Number Field Sieve is the most efficient algorithm for factorization.



The Number Field Sieve is the most efficient algorithm for factorization.

Collect many random pairs  $(a_i, b_i)$  where  $a_i^x \equiv b_i^y \mod n$ , for integers  $x, y$ .

## **Randomized Methods**

The Number Field Sieve is the most efficient algorithm for factorization.

Collect many random pairs  $(a_i, b_i)$  where  $a_i^x \equiv b_i^y \mod n$ , for integers  $x, y$ .

Then these equations can be combined in such a way that we can find  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ satisfying  $a^2 \equiv b^2 \mod n$ , which means that  $a^2-b^2 \equiv (a-b)(a+b) \equiv 0 \mod n$ .



## **Randomized Methods**

The Number Field Sieve is the most efficient algorithm for factorization.

Collect many random pairs  $(a_i, b_i)$  where  $a_i^x \equiv b_i^y \mod n$ , for integers  $x, y$ .

Then these equations can be combined in such a way that we can find a and  $b$ satisfying  $a^2\equiv b^2 \mod n$ , which means that  $a^2-b^2\equiv (a-b)(a+b)\equiv 0 \mod n.$ 

Then we *might* find a factor of n by computing the greatest common divisor between *n* and  $a - b$  and  $a + b$ .

The running time of the Number Field Sieve is

$$
\exp\left((64/9)^{1/3}(\log n)^{1/3}(\log \log n)^{2/3}(1+o(1))\right)
$$



#### **Number Field Sieve**

The running time of the Number Field Sieve is

$$
\exp\left((64/9)^{1/3}(\log n)^{1/3}(\log\log n)^{2/3}(1+o(1))\right)
$$

This algorithm is *sub-exponential*. The largest number we have ever factored (in public) is of size 829 bits.



## **Number Field Sieve**

The running time of the Number Field Sieve is

$$
\exp\left((64/9)^{1/3}(\log n)^{1/3}(\log\log n)^{2/3}(1+o(1))\right)
$$

This algorithm is *sub-exponential*. The largest number we have ever factored (in public) is of size 829 bits.

Factoring as a service: In 2015, it was possible to factor 512 bit RSA keys in less than four hours.



#### **Factoring as a Service**

# **Factoring as a Service**

Luke Valenta, Shaanan Cohney, Alex Liao, Joshua Fried, Satya Bodduluri, Nadia Heninger

University of Pennsylvania

**Figure:** <https://eprint.iacr.org/2015/1000.pdf>



#### **State of the Art**

#### The state of the art in integer factoring and breaking public key cryptography

Fabrice Boudot<sup>1</sup>, Pierrick Gaudry<sup>2</sup>, Aurore Guillevic<sup>2</sup>, Nadia Heninger<sup>3</sup>, Emmanuel Thomé<sup>2</sup>, and Paul Zimmermann<sup>2</sup>

> <sup>1</sup>Université de Limoges, XLIM, UMR 7252, F-87000 Limoges, France <sup>2</sup>Université de Lorraine, CNRS, Inria, LORIA, F-54000 Nancy, France <sup>3</sup>University of California, San Diego, USA

**Figure:** <https://hal.science/hal-03691141/document>





How do we break the following RSA keys?

▶ Same seed when sampling primes



- $\blacktriangleright$  Same seed when sampling primes
- $\triangleright$  Same seed + added entropy between sampling



- $\triangleright$  Same seed when sampling primes
- $\triangleright$  Same seed + added entropy between sampling
- ▶ Low entropy RNG or PRNG from known algorithm



- $\triangleright$  Same seed when sampling primes
- $\triangleright$  Same seed + added entropy between sampling
- ▶ Low entropy RNG or PRNG from known algorithm
- $\blacktriangleright$  Related primes from known algorithm

#### **PKE in the Wild**

# RSA. DH and DSA in the Wild\*

Nadia Heninger

University of California, San Diego, USA

**Figure:** <https://eprint.iacr.org/2022/048.pdf>



## **Fermat in the Wild**

# Fermat Factorization in the Wild

Hanno Böck

January 8, 2023

**Figure:** <https://eprint.iacr.org/2023/026.pdf>



#### **Shared Prime Factors**

#### Ron was wrong, Whit is right

Arjen K. Lenstra<sup>1</sup>, James P. Hughes<sup>2</sup>, Maxime Augier<sup>1</sup>, Joppe W. Bos<sup>1</sup>, Thorsten Kleinjung<sup>1</sup>, and Christophe Wachter<sup>1</sup>

> <sup>1</sup> EPFL IC LACAL, Station 14, CH-1015 Lausanne, Switzerland <sup>2</sup> Self, Palo Alto, CA, USA

**Figure:** <https://eprint.iacr.org/2012/064.pdf>



## **Shared Prime Factors**

Mining Your Ps and Os: Detection of **Widespread Weak Keys in Network Devices** 

Nadia Heninger<sup>†\*</sup> Zakir Durumeric<sup>#\*</sup> Eric Wustrow<sup>#</sup> I Alex Halderman<sup>#</sup>

<sup>†</sup> University of California, San Diego nadiah@cs ucsd edu

 $\overline{a}$  The University of Michigan {zakir, ewust, ihalderm}@umich.edu

**Figure:** Check out the blog post, paper and slides: 1) [https://freedom-to-tinker.com/2012/02/15/new-research-theres-no-need-panic](https://freedom-to-tinker.com/2012/02/15/new-research-theres-no-need-panic-over-factorable-keys-just-mind-your-ps-and-qs) [-over-factorable-keys-just-mind-your-ps-and-qs](https://freedom-to-tinker.com/2012/02/15/new-research-theres-no-need-panic-over-factorable-keys-just-mind-your-ps-and-qs), 2) <https://factorable.net/weakkeys12.extended.pdf>, 3) <https://crypto.stanford.edu/RealWorldCrypto/slides/nadia.pdf>

#### <span id="page-68-0"></span>**Contents**

**[Announcements](#page-2-0)**

**[Primality Testing](#page-5-0)**

**[Factorization](#page-42-0)**

#### **[De-Randomization](#page-68-0)**

**[Takeaways](#page-76-0)**



# **De-Randomized Crypto**

We need randomness for CPA secure encryption!?

We DO need randomness for key generation. However:



# **De-Randomized Crypto**

We need randomness for CPA secure encryption!?

We DO need randomness for key generation. However:

 $\blacktriangleright$  Use the secret key to generate nonces



# **De-Randomized Crypto**

We need randomness for CPA secure encryption!?

We DO need randomness for key generation. However:

- $\blacktriangleright$  Use the secret key to generate nonces
- $\triangleright$  Schnorr example with  $r = H(sk,m)$


## **De-Randomized Crypto**

We need randomness for CPA secure encryption!?

We DO need randomness for key generation. However:

- $\triangleright$  Use the secret key to generate nonces
- $\triangleright$  Schnorr example with  $r = H(sk,m)$
- $\triangleright$  Counters + master seed + hashing

### **De-Randomized Crypto**

We need randomness for CPA secure encryption!?

We DO need randomness for key generation. However:

- $\blacktriangleright$  Use the secret key to generate nonces
- $\triangleright$  Schnorr example with  $r = H(sk,m)$
- $\triangleright$  Counters + master seed + hashing
- ▶ HMAC with key for deterministic MAC

### **De-Randomized Crypto**

We need randomness for CPA secure encryption!?

We DO need randomness for key generation. However:

- $\triangleright$  Use the secret key to generate nonces
- $\triangleright$  Schnorr example with  $r = H(sk,m)$
- $\triangleright$  Counters + master seed + hashing
- ▶ HMAC with key for deterministic MAC
- ▶ Hedging techniques (paper on next slide)

#### **Shared Prime Factors**

#### **Hedged Public-Key Encryption: How to Protect Against Bad Randomness**

Mihir Bellare\* Zvika Brakerski $^{\dagger}$  Moni Naor<sup> $\ddagger$ </sup> Thomas Ristenpart<sup>§</sup> Gil Segev<sup>¶</sup> Hovav Shacham<sup>||</sup> Scott Yilek\*\*

April 21, 2012

**Figure:** <https://www.cs.utexas.edu/~hovav/dist/hedge.pdf>



#### <span id="page-76-0"></span>**Contents**

**[Announcements](#page-2-0)**

**[Primality Testing](#page-5-0)**

**[Factorization](#page-42-0)**

**[De-Randomization](#page-68-0)**

#### **[Takeaways](#page-76-0)**



#### **l** am so random





## **Random Number Generation**

Check the quality of the built-in RNG that you rely on:

- ▶ How does it collect randomness?
- ▶ Is the RNG seeded / pre-seeded?
- $\blacktriangleright$  How much entropy does it provide?
- ▶ Does it warn you about issues?
- $\blacktriangleright$  Is it cryptographically secure?
- ▶ (Linux's */dev/random* vs */dev/urandom*)

### **Faulty Voting Randomness**

# A faulty PRNG in a voting system

- a real-world cryptographic disaster

Kristian Giøsteen

Department of Mathematical Sciences Norwegian University of Science and Technology Real World Crypto, January 2018

**Figure:** https://youtu.be/xq\_6ey2JGAE?feature=shared



#### **Pseudo-Random Number Generation**

Check the quality of the built-in PRNG that you rely on:

- ▶ Does it rely on a proper RNG as seed? Is it pre-seeded?
- ▶ Is the PRNG cryptographically secure? NIST-approved?
- ▶ Verify the output: Do values repeat? Correct bit-size?
- ▶ Which library/version is used? Known vulnerabilities?

Some good resources are available at <https://github.com/veorq/cryptocoding#use-strong-randomness>.

#### **NIST Standard**



**Special Publication 800-22 Revision 1a** 

**A Statistical Test Suite for Random and Pseudorandom Number Generators for Cryptographic Applications** 

**Figure:** <https://csrc.nist.gov/pubs/sp/800/22/r1/upd1/final>



## **Choice of Primitives**

Check the cryptographic primitive that you rely on:

- ▶ Does it rely on a proper PRNG? Is it pre-seeded?
- ▶ Is it the newest/most secure primitive? NIST-approved?
- ▶ Verify the output: Do values repeat? Correct bit-size?
- ▶ Which library/version is used? Known vulnerabilities?
- ▶ Are there de-randomized algorithms available instead?

## **Rolling Your Own Crypto**

# **Security Cryptography Whatever**

The Great "Roll Your Own Crypto" Debate with Filippo Valsorda

JULY 31, 2021 SECURITY, CRYPTOGRAPHY, WHATEVER



**Figure:** [https://securitycryptographywhatever.buzzsprout.com/1822302/895384](https://securitycryptographywhatever.buzzsprout.com/1822302/8953842-the-great-roll-your-own-crypto-debate-with-filippo-valsorda) [2-the-great-roll-your-own-crypto-debate-with-filippo-valsorda](https://securitycryptographywhatever.buzzsprout.com/1822302/8953842-the-great-roll-your-own-crypto-debate-with-filippo-valsorda)



# Questions?

