

Filippos Vogiatzian

Quantum Key Distribution

Quantum Cryptography

• Cryptography relies on adversarial computational power

- Cryptography relies on adversarial computational power
- Backwards unreliable secrecy

- Cryptography relies on adversarial computational power
- Backwards unreliable secrecy
- As soon as we have quantum computers:
 - Shor's Algorithm: Integer factorisation in polynomial time!

- Cryptography relies on adversarial computational power
- Backwards unreliable secrecy
- As soon as we have quantum computers:
 - Shor's Algorithm: Integer factorisation in polynomial time!

Can't we obtain perfect security ?

- Cryptography relies on adversarial computational power
- Backwards unreliable secrecy
- As soon as we have quantum computers:
 - Shor's Algorithm: Integer factorisation in polynomial time!

Can't we obtain perfect security ?

One-Time Pad !!!

- Cryptography relies on adversarial computational power
- Backwards unreliable secrecy
- As soon as we have quantum computers:
 - Shor's Algorithm: Integer factorisation in polynomial time!

Can't we obtain perfect security ? One-Time Pad !!!



Quantum Cryptography

Post-quantum Cryptography

Quantum Cryptography

- Perfect Security
- Relies only on the laws of nature

Post-quantum Cryptography

Quantum Cryptography

- Perfect Security
- Relies only on the laws of nature

Post-quantum Cryptography

- Quantum Computational Security
- Relies on primitives that are equally hard for classical and quantum computers to solve
 - Lattice-Based Cryptography

QKD 2PC and more

 Quantum Key Distribution (QKD): Two parties (Alice and Bob) communicate with perfect secrecy in the presence of an eavesdropper (Eve) [1,3,4]

- Two-Party Cooperation (2PC): Two parties that don't trust each other cooperate in a secure way
- How to encrypt or authenticate a quantum state
- Implementations

 $\langle \phi_{k} | \phi_{k'} \rangle = \langle \phi_{k} | \int dx | x \rangle \langle x | \phi_{k'} \rangle = \rangle (\overline{z} - 1) = \overline{z} (2l - 1), l = 1, 2 ... = > K_{0} = -\overline{z} (\frac{1}{0}, \frac{1}{0})$ Yn (x)=[= cos [= (2n-1)x] ; Pa-96=TT; Yu(x)=[=sin [=nx] LONION'> = Sdx Ox (x). Ox (x) · Hus (x)=- th dx " Yus (x)= th (E[2u-1])" Yus (x) (qu | qu') = 2 (dre tex Ens = The I (2n-1)2, n=1,2 ...; Hyman = the (21) Aya=- the dx " Yacx)= En 2 Yacx)- En 4 (x-x) + MG = Wole In th =- the (- A + (A (x-x)) e - 4 + (Y i V(x) = the A (x-x)) I dre = = H-> H== # 9x+V(2); HYa= # 1= 4a = Ea 4a A= 292=>> 140 = (210) 34 $V(x) = \frac{1}{2}m\omega^2(x-x_0)^2 \rightarrow m\omega^2 = \frac{t^2}{myay} = (\omega = \frac{t_1}{2ma})$ [p,x]=节; p= 平 2x / H= = + = m ~ * * 1 à +12 = (u+ib)(a-ib); a, b eR; 2 (ap ib x)(ap-ibx), a, b eR; 2) 2(x-x,)> al(x-x) Na) $\hat{H} = (a\hat{p} + ib\hat{x})(a\hat{p} - ib\hat{x}) \cdot bati; a^2 = \frac{1}{2}m; b^2 = \frac{1}{2}mw^2$ 04 = 4X-X3 [dx 1x)<x=] XM RIX)=XIX) to Ckl Dy ct this (ap + ibit); C= this (ap - ibit)=> H=twete (dr 4" (x) (x-x.) (ya(x)) (~===) 12, se () {+1? isu(2)=53 A ~~ wAw + 2to)



• Eve has complete control over the channel



- Eve has complete control over the channel
- She can intercept or measure the sent qubits



- Eve has complete control over the channel
- She can intercept or measure the sent qubits
- No cloning theorem: Forbidden to clone of an unknown quantum state (Wooters and Zurek and Dieks 1982)



- Eve has complete control over the channel
- She can intercept or measure the sent qubits
- No cloning theorem: Forbidden to clone of an unknown quantum state (Wooters and Zurek and Dieks 1982)
- Eve can block the channel by sending random qubits and prevent communication over the channel



Quantum Key Distribution

- Alice and Bob use the public quantum channel to agree on a private secure key
- Eve has no information about the key
- Having a private key they can use any other classical encryption scheme to communicate through the public classical channel
- If they use OTP they can communicate with perfect secrecy!

 Two-state quantum-mechanical system

 Two-state quantum-mechanical system



- Two-state quantum-mechanical system
- Polarisation of photon
 - rectilinear / diagonal polarization



- Two-state quantum-mechanical system
- Polarisation of photon
 - rectilinear / diagonal polarization







- Measuring a qubit:
 - opening the box



- Measuring a qubit:
 opening the box
 - opening the box



- Collapses the wavefunction to one of the two states:
 - The cat is DEAD or ALIVE

Measuring a qubit:
opening the box

- Collapses the wavefunction to one of the two states:
 - The cat is DEAD or ALIVE





- Measuring a qubit:
 - opening the box
 - filter the photon through one of the modes
- Collapses the wavefunction to one of the two states:
 - The cat is DEAD or ALIVE





- Measuring a qubit:
 - opening the box
 - filter the photon through one of the modes
- Collapses the wavefunction to one of the two states:
 - The cat is DEAD or ALIVE
 - The polarization is VERTICAL or HORIZONTAL
 - The bit is o or 1









1. Measuring the qubit in the "wrong basis"





- 1. Measuring the qubit in the "wrong basis"
- 2. No information gain! (we get o or 1 with P=0.5)





- 1. Measuring the qubit in the "wrong basis"
- 2. No information gain! (we get o or 1 with P=0.5)
- 3. It changes the state to one of the states corresponding to the new basis





BB84 QKD Scheme

- 1. Alice chooses a random bit (0,1) and basis (+ or X)
- 2. She sends the qubit to Bob with the appropriate polarization
- 3. Bob measures the qubit with a random basis
- 4. Alice and Bob compare the string of bases they used and only keep those bits where they used the same basis
- 5. Error estimation and correction
- 6. Privacy amplification

BB84 QKD in Action



BB84 QKD in Action









-Confirm bases used -Error estimation -Privacy Amplification

Alice

Bob



-Confirm bases used -Error estimation -Privacy Amplification

Alice

Bob



This scheme can be proven to be perfectly secure!

> -Confirm bases used -Error estimation -Privacy Amplification

+´×´& & ×´+´& +´&

Alice





 If Eve measures a state in the wrong basis she will change the state of the photon



 If Eve measures a state in the wrong basis she will change the state of the photon

 This might introduce errors that can be detected by Alice and Bob



- If Eve measures a state in the wrong basis she will change the state of the photon
- This might introduce errors that can be detected by Alice and Bob
- If too many errors are detected they know that there was an eavesdropper and abort

Applications

- Commercial QKD systems already exist
- 2007 Voting in Geneva [5]
- Approximately 4 commercial companies
- and 5 Quantum Key Distribution Networks



Too good to be true?

• Distances: ~200km using optic fiber and much less through free space (air)

Expensive equipment

Imperfect implementations, at least two successful attacks

Conclusions

- Quantum Cryptography only relies on laws of nature
- Post-quantum cryptography relies on primitive that are difficult for quantum and classical computers
- Quantum Key Distribution allows two parties to share a key using a public quantum channel
- OKD schemes are perfectly secure, possible and work in practice although the implementation of them so far is not perfect

References

- **1. Quantum Cryptography**, S Fehr, Foundations of Physics 2010
- 2. Quantum Computing, Lecture Notes, R de Wolf (Ch. 5)
- 3. Quantum Cryptography: Public Key Distribution and Coin Tossing, Bennett and Brassard 1984
- **4.** Assumptions in Quantum Cryptography, NJ Beaudry, PhD Thesis, ETHZ 2014
- **5.** Ouantum protocols for anonymous voting and surveying, JA Vaccaro, J Spring, A Chefles, Physical Review A 75, 012333 2007
- 6. <u>http://www.newscientist.com/article/dn12786-quantum-</u> cryptography-to-protect-swiss-election.html#.VEoePxbcBkA

