# **Security Hybridization: Towards Quantum-secure Communication Systems**

**DEFENCE AND SPACE** 

Johanna Sepúlveda, Ph.D. Expert Post-Quantum Secure Communications Chief Engineer Quantum Secure Communications



## **Quantum Computer**







## **Quantum-Secure Solutions are required**



# Quantum Key Distribution (QKD)



## **Quantum-Secure Technologies**



- PQC and QKD are not competing
- PQC and QKD can work together
- Two security technologies with different properties
- They can cover the security needs of a wide variety of applications

How?

## **Quantum-Key-Distribution**



#### **Space:** High range Quantum-Key-Distribution (QKD) > QKD is one part of the overall information Terrestrial: High performance Previously authenticated security infrastructure: parties Two parties can agree upon a shared key Wide Design Space Exploration protocol å L $K_{\rm A}$ , $K_{\rm B}$ : Final QKD keys on Alice and Bob's sides

- > QKD creates random, independent session keys
- > Public key cryptography for authentication and QKD for key agreement can lead to very strong long-term security
- Performance: QKD link technology and post-processing

#### Authentication:

- ✓ **Public key authentication** (CA)
  - PQC, Hybrid
- ✓ **Symmetric** (pre-shared secret)
  - Based on unconditionally secure message authentication code (Wegman-Carter)
  - Use QKD for QKD (QKD Composability)

## Quantum-Key-Distribution (QKD): System Level View is Relevant

 System level exploration is mandatory and critical (E2E secure communication)







## Quantum-crypto at AIRBUS: EuroQCI (EC) and SAGA (ESA)



**Post-Quantum Cryptography** 



## Post-Quantum Cryptography (PQC) Types

(e.g. McEliece, Bike)

#### Pros:

- Well studied error correcting codes
- Multipurpose
- Fast

#### Cons:

 Very large key sizes

#### Hash-based (e.g. SPHINCS+, XMSS,

Pros:

 Security relies on hash functions

LMS)

- Very efficient

#### Cons:

- No encryption schemes
- Track of signed messages

#### Multivariate

(e.g. Rainbow)

#### Pros:

- Multipurpose
- Very efficient for signature schemes

#### Cons:

 Most public key schemes are broken Isogeny

(e.g. SIKE)

Hash

Multivariate

#### Pros:

Code

Elliptic-based

 Smallest key sizes

#### Cons:

- Low efficiency
- Difficult to
  - construct

#### Lattice-based

Lattice

(e.g. Kyber, Dilithium, Falcon)

#### Pros:

Isogeny

- Efficient
- Public key, digital signatures, FHE, IBE

#### Cons:

 Key sizes when compared to classical crypto

13

## NIST PQC Roadmap and Airbus Footprint



## **E2E Quantum-secured communication**



## **Quantum-Secure Communication**

Alice Bob QKD Device A QKD Device B Purpose is to ensure Quantum Authentication 1) Authentication of Alice Secure Communication Request and Bob using PQC between two parties Response Algorithms uthentication QKD Devices Request 2) Authentication of QKD Devices Response epare Qubit Exchange 3) Quantum Key Exchange Quantum Layer Public Key Discussion Secret Key Secret Key Encryption 4) Encryption using QKD Application Data Key

## Software Implementation

Alice Bob Classical APP Layer Signing/Verification Signing/Verification Channel Data Encryption Decryption Data KM Layer Key Lifecycle Management Reconciliation Reconciliation Distillation Distillation Classical Quantum Layer Channel Sifting Sifting Raw Key Exchange Raw Key Exchange Optics Optics Quantum Channel

# **Fast prototyping tool** (Python) **PQC:**

- Secure PQC implementation (liboqs, pqclean) Baseline, time-protected, masked implementations
- Low and high processing capabilities

#### Quantum:

- Quantum virtual private Network (QVPN) point-topoint link
- Validated models and configurations with physical setups

- QKD Fibre model
- Protocols: decoy-BB84 and T12

## Post-Quantum Cryptography

#### > NIST PQC algorithms:

- PQC signature selection: Dilithium, Falcon, SPHINCS+
- Stateful XMSS (NIST SP 800-208)

#### Pre-shared Keys

#### Key Sizes in Bytes

SIG Parameter Set	Public key	Secret key	Signature
Falcon-512	897	1281	690
Falcon-1024	1793	2305	1330
Dilithium2	1312	2528	2420
Dilithium3	1952	4000	3293
Dilithium5	2592	4864	4595
SPHINCS+-SHA256-128s-simple	32	64	7856
SPHINCS+-SHA256-192s-simple	48	96	16224
SPHINCS+-SHA256-256s-simple	64	128	29792
XMSS	67	67	2564



#### Performance

SIG Parameter Set	$t_{Raspi}[ms]$	$t_{PC}[ms]$
Falcon-512	170.04	5.13
Falcon-1024 Dilithium2	454 71	14 78
Dilithium3	16.81	0.14
Dilithium5	26.71	0.28
SPHINCS <sup>+</sup> -SHA256-128s-simple	8674.60	200.09
SPHINCS <sup>+</sup> -SHA256-192s-simple	15076.81	385.69
SPHINCS <sup>+</sup> -SHA256-256s-simple	16056.43	301.41
XMSS	18197,.6	2246.93
Pre-Shared keys	0.091	0.0056

## Parameters

		Alice Bob
Decoy BB84, T12		OKD Device A OKD Device B
		Authenticellen Authenticellen
	Key Exchange	Bound Cable
		Application Data

Param.	Description	Value
$\mu_u$	intensity signal state	0.425
$\mu_v$	intensity decoy state	0.044
$\mu_w$	intensity vacuum state	0.0001
$\mathbf{p}_{v}$	probability sending decoy state	0.3
$\mathbf{p}_{w}$	probability sending vacuum state	0.1
$\alpha$	attenuation coefficient [1/km]	0.2
d	fibre dispersion coefficient[ps/(km*nm)]	4
t <sub>b</sub>	internal receiver loss[dB]	0.4
$\lambda_q$	signal frequency[nm]	1550
n	detection efficiency[-]	0.20
f	pulse generation rate [MHz]	500
$\rho_{AP}$	after-pulsing probability [-]	0.0525
$t_{dead}$	dead time of APD detectors[s]	$1 * 10^{-6}$
$\mathbf{p}_{dc}$	dark-count probability[-]	$2,1*10^{-5}$



QKD Parameter	skr [bit/sec]	$ m skr_{256}[key/sec]$	$t_{key}[ms]$
decoy-state BB84 - 10 km	179,749	702	1.42
T12 - 10 km	213,239	832	1.20
decoy-state BB84 - 50 km	12,762	49	20.06
T12 - 50 km	21,504	84	11.90

## **Experimental Results and Conclusions**

#### Performance results in [ms]

System	t <sub>Raspi</sub>	t <sub>PC</sub>
10 km - PSK - T12 - AES-256-CBC	4.8	4.7
10 km - Dilithium2 - T12 - AES-256-CBC	415.5	4.8
10 km - Dilithium3 - T12 - AES-256-CBC	421.6	4.9
10 km - Dilithium5 - T12 - AES-256-CBC	431.5	4.9
10 km - Falcon-512 - T12 - AES-256-CBC	575.8	9.8
10 km - Falcon-1024 - T12 - AES-256-CBC	859.5	19.4
10 km - SPHINCS <sup>+</sup> -128 - T12 - AES-256-CBC	9,079.4	204.8
10 km - SPHINCS <sup>+</sup> -192 - T12 - AES-256-CBC	15,481.6	390.4
10 km - SPHINCS+-256 - T12 - AES-256-CBC	16,461.2	306.1
50 km - PSK - T12 - AES-256-CBC	15.5	15.4
50 km - Dilithium2 - T12 - AES-256-CBC	426.2	15.5
50 km - Dilithium3 - T12 - AES-256-CBC	432.3	15.6
50 km - Dilithium5 - T12 - AES-256-CBC	442.2	15.6
50 km - Falcon-512 - T12 - AES-256-CBC	585.5	20.5
50 km - Falcon-1024 - T12 - AES-256-CBC	870.2	30.1
50 km - SPHINCS <sup>+</sup> -128 - T12 - AES-256-CBC	9090.1	215.5
50 km - SPHINCS <sup>+</sup> -192 - T12 - AES-256-CBC	15492.3	401.1
50 km - SPHINCS+-256 - T12 - AES-256-CBC	16471.9	316.8



## Conclusions



- System-level quantum-secure communication is relevant
- Hybrid approaches are key for deploying the QKD in real applications and to ensure the E2E quantum-secure communication
- The **design space of the overall system is wide** and must be explored: Performance, security, reliability, etc.
- Classical component of the QKD systems might have a strong impact on the overall performance and security
- Major time for executing was consumed by the PQC authentication

Thank you

## Johanna.sepulveda@airbus.com