

# The IID Assumption and YOU!

UL VS, LLC. Joshua Hill, PhD

UL and the UL logo are trademarks of UL LLC © 2019

#### **Two Roads Diverged in a Wood**



# A: ???



#### In Today's News

- Almost all commercially-available noise source designs are not IID. Some of these noise source designs can be operated using parameters that cause the noise source behavior to be arbitrarily *close* to IID behavior.
- Implementations of IID noise source designs generally have implementation-specific emergent phenomena that induce non-IID behavior.
- SP800-90B does not provide a specification for what constitutes *close enough* to IID. Presently, any deviation from IID-behavior constitutes a failure to be IID.

In summary:

Almost all evaluated noise sources are non-IID.



#### What is IID?

#### **Definitions**

# An IID (Independent and Identically Distributed) noise source is:

"A quality of a sequence of random variables for which each element of the sequence has the same probability distribution as the other values, and all values are mutually independent."

1. Independent: Roughly, events can't influence each other.

2. Identically Distributed: Roughly, the distribution doesn't change over time.



#### **IID: Example Designs**

Each output is established by:

- the final side displayed after a (fair or unfair) coin is flipped,
- the value shown on a (fair or loaded) die after it is cast,
- the value resulting from a spin of a roulette wheel,
- selection with replacement.

Commonality: The sequence is made up of outputs from running multiple rounds of the **exact same** process, where the process's state is **completely reset** between each round.





IID is not the same thing as *good*.

- Bias is allowed, but variation in the distribution and/or dependence is not.
- This is why it is so easy to estimate entropy for an IID noise source.

Having said that, any full entropy noise source will be IID.



#### **IID: Non-Examples**

Example of noise sources that are Independent but **not** Identically Distributed:

• Rolling two dice with different numbers of sides.

• Outputting 
$$Y_{2i} = D4$$
,  $Y_{2i+1} = D6$ 

- A resetting counter tracking the number of rising edges of a jittery oscillator reset between rounds, when the underlying oscillator's period drifts as conditions change. (e.g., [T 2002])
  - > Outputting  $Y_i$  = count of rising edges since the last sample



Example of noise sources that are Identically Distributed but **not Independent**:

- Selection of 4 labeled balls {0, ..., 15} from an urn, selected without replacement. (e.g., Powerball, cards).
  - > Outputting  $Y_{4i}$  = first draw  $Y_{4i+1}$  = second draw, ...,  $Y_{4i+3}$  = fourth draw
- A (time-homogeneous, irreducible, aperiodic) Markov chain with 4 states, when the transition matrix rows are not all the same.
  - > Output  $Y_i$  = the current state



#### **IID: Non-Examples**

Example of noise sources that are **neither Independent**, **nor Identically Distributed**:

- A random walk with IID Gaussian steps.
  - > Output  $Y_i$  = the current location

There are many examples of this type of noise source design, including ring oscillators, a frequently sampled noisy circuit (e.g., a reversebiased diode), event-driven sampling of a free-running timer, etc.



It is sometimes possible to use a non-IID noise source design to build an IID noise source design.

This commonly involves discarding data, delaying sampling until some particular state occurs, bundling together distinct outputs into a single output, or resetting the noise source between samples.



#### From Non-IID to IID: Examples

For our Selection of 4 labeled balls {0, ..., 15} in an urn, selected without replacement

Non-IID:

- >  $Y_{4i}$  = first draw  $Y_{4i+1}$  = second draw, ...,  $Y_{4i+3}$  = fourth draw IID Output:
- > Package all 4 of these into a single data sample  $X_i = (Y_{4i}, Y_{4i+1}, \dots, Y_{4i+3})$

So long as the system is reset after selecting these 4 values, the  $X_i$  samples are IID.



#### From Non-IID to IID: Examples

- For our (finite, time-homogeneous, irreducible, aperiodic) Markov noise source design, you can use **thinning**:
  - Thinning is discarding sufficient states (outputs) so that the k-step transition matrix is *almost* the same as the asymptotic behavior.
- Easy Approach: Use thinning prior to every sample.
- More Efficient Approach: Use thinning prior to taking multiple samples, and combine these samples into one raw data sample.

**Q:** How close does *almost* have to be to make an IID claim?

A: 「\\_(ツ)\_/「



#### **Caution: Stateful Conditioning**

If the conditioning function retains state, it is also possible to spoil the IID property in the conditioning stage.

Some examples include:

- outputting a running XOR of (biased) IID raw data.
- output from an LFSR whose state is not reset between inputs of (biased) IID raw data.



## Making an IID Claim

#### To Make an IID Claim (SP800-90B)

- 1. "The submitter makes an IID claim on the noise source... The submitter shall provide rationale for the IID claim."
- 2. "The sequential dataset ... is tested using the statistical tests described in Section 5..."
- 3. "The [restart testing] row and column datasets... are tested using the statistical tests described in Section 5..."
- "[For non-vetted conditioning components], the conditioned sequential dataset... is tested using the statistical tests described in Section 5."



#### To Make an IID Claim (IG 7.18)

- 1. "Provide a **rigorous proof** in support of this [IID] claim."
- 2. "A claim of independence and that of an identical distribution shall be substantiated separately."
  - a) "For an independence claim, a deep understanding of the underlying operation of the noise source is required."
  - b) "A claim of an identical distribution of the samples shall consider a possible deterioration of the source's entropy generation pattern due to the mechanical or the environmental changes or to the timing variations in human behavior."



#### **In Summary**

If you try the IID track, then (probably)...



#### **In Summary**

#### If you try the IID track, then (probably)...





## Case Study: Ring Oscillators

#### **Ring Oscillators**

- A free-running ring oscillator has a substantial amount of internal state, namely the current phase of the ring with respect to the sample clock.
- The phase values can be thought of as residing on a unit circle, and the output is established by where on the circle the current phase is when the ring oscillator is sampled.
- The free-running ring oscillator is effectively a random walk on the unit circle.
- When periodically sampled (with most parameter sets) there is substantial autocorrelation between adjacent outputs. Autocorrelation prevents the data from being independent.



#### **Ring Oscillators: Entropy**



## **Ring Oscillators: IID?**

- The modeled entropy asymptotically approaches full entropy.
- If the output is full entropy, it must be IID.
- Idea: As you let the ring oscillator accumulate uncertainty between samples, the initial condition becomes less important, and the samples become *almost* IID.

**Q:** How close does *almost* have to be to make an IID claim?



#### **Ring Oscillators: IID Testing**

- We don't know how close to IID you need to be in order to support an IID claim under SP800-90B, but we can tell what actually passes the IID testing.
- We simulated a ring oscillator and generated 100 1million sample sets for each parameter setting.
- We varied the jitter percentage of the ring oscillator period and performed the testing specified in SP800-90B Section 5 on each set.



#### **Ring Oscillators: IID Testing Results**



Permutation Test Starts Passing

#### **Ring Oscillators: IID Testing Summary**

- Idealized ring oscillators start passing all the subtests within IID testing at the expected rates when the jitter percentage is about 200% of the ring oscillator period.
- Ring oscillator designs typically have a jitter percentage between 0.01% and 5%.
- This cutoff is only valid for ideal ring oscillators. The actual cutoff depends on the noise proportion that is due to local Gaussian noise.



#### **Ring Oscillators: Worked Example**

1GHz ring oscillator, sampled at 1MHz, with a per-sample 5% jitter percentage, 30% of which is due to local Gaussian noise.

**Option 1: Non-IID Source** 

- Each sample contains more than 0.0175851 bits of entropy, produced at one-million samples per second.
- $\approx 22$  ms to seed a DRBG to a 256-bit security strength.

Option 2: IID(-ish) Source

- Requires decimating at a rate of 1:17778.
- Each sample contains more than 0.999998 bits of entropy, produced at about 56 samples per second.
- $\approx$ 7 **s** to seed a DRBG to a 256-bit security strength.

It is much more efficient to use this as a non-IID noise source.



#### **In Summary**

#### Vendors:

• You probably shouldn't attempt to make an IID claim.

#### Labs:

• You probably aren't encountering IID sources, even in the instance where the vendor claims IID.

#### NIST, CMVP, NIAP and Other Regulators:

- Consider removing the IID track.
- If the IID track remains, consider establishing a maximum amount of *mutual information* that can be tolerated between random variables that can qualify as *independent*, and a maximum *statistical distance* that can be tolerated between random variables' distributions that can qualify as *identically distributed*.



#### References

- [BLMT 2011] Baudet, Lubicz, Micolod, and Tassiaux. *On the security of oscillator-based random number generators*. Journal of Cryptology, April 2011, Volume 24, Issue 2.
- [BBFV 2010] Bochard, Bernard, Fischer, and Valtchanov. *True-Randomness and Pseudo-Randomness in Ring Oscillator-Based True Random Number Generators*. International Journal of Reconfigurable Computing, Vol. 2010.
- [HJ 2018] Hill and Jackson. NIST Special Publication 800-90B Comments. http://bit.ly/UL90BCOM
- [T 2002] Thomas E. Tkacik. A Hardware Random Number Generator. CHES 2002.
- [SP800-90B] Turan, Barker, Kelsey, McKay, Baish, and Boyle. Special Publication 800-90B: Recommendation for Entropy Sources Used for Random Bit Generation. January 2018.
- [FIPS IG] Implementation Guidance for FIPS 140-2 and the Cryptographic Module Validation Program. May 7, 2019.



## THANK YOU.

