

Efficiently Masking Polynomial Inversion at Arbitrary Order

 Markus Krausz¹
 Georg Land^{1,2}
 Jan Richter-Brochmann¹
 Tim Güneysu^{1,2}

 ¹Chair for Security Engineering, Ruhr-Universität Bochum
 ²DFKI GmbH, Cyber-Physical Systems, Bremen, Germany
 1

September 29, 2022

Motivation



BIKE Key Generation	NTRU Key Generation	sNTRUp Key Generation
Require: BIKE parameters n, w, ℓ . Ensure: Private key (h_0, h_1, σ) and public key h . 1: Generate $(h_0, h_1) \stackrel{\$}{\leftarrow} \mathcal{R}^2$ both of odd weight $ h_0 = h_1 = w/2$. 2: Generate $\sigma \stackrel{\$}{\leftarrow} \{0, 1\}^\ell$ uniformly at random. 3: Compute $h \leftarrow h_1 h_0^{-1}$. 4: Return (h_0, h_1, σ) and h .	Require: NTRU parameters n, p, q . Ensure: Priv. key (f, f_p, f_q) , pub. key h . 1: Generate $f \stackrel{\$}{\leftarrow} \mathcal{L}_f$ 2: Generate $g \stackrel{\$}{\leftarrow} \mathcal{L}_g$ 3: Compute $f_p \leftarrow 1/f$ in S_3 4: Compute $f_q \leftarrow 1/f$ in S_q 5: Compute $g \leftarrow 3 \cdot g \cdot f_g$ in R_q 6: Compute $h_q \leftarrow 1/h$ in S_q	Require: sNTRUp parameter q. Ensure: Priv. key (f, g_{inv}) , pub key h. 1: repeat 2: Generate $g \stackrel{s}{\leftarrow} R, g$ small 3: until g is invertible in R_3 4: Generate $f \stackrel{s}{\leftarrow} Short$ 5: Compute $g_{inv} \leftarrow 1/g$ in R_3 6: Compute $h \leftarrow g/(3 \cdot f)$ in R_q 7: Return (f, g_{inv}) and h.
	(: Return (f, f_p, f_q) and h.	· · - · /

Observation: secret polynomials are inverted.

Motivation



Processing secrets requires **protection** against side-channel adversaries.

Motivation



Processing secrets requires protection against side-channel adversaries.

Constant time implementations counter timing attacks. Embedded devices: Attacker can measure **power consumption**. **Our Work**



1. First procedure for masking polynomial inversion.

2. It is efficient.

3. Possible at arbitrary masking order.

Conceptual Considerations



Attacker Model

- > All inversions happen in key generation, which is executed **once**.
- > The only valid attack is a (profiled) Simple Power Analysis with one attack measurement.

Shuffling and Masking

- Standard countermeasure: shuffling (randomizing the execution order of steps within the inversion procedure)
- Shuffling: highly non-trivial, probably infeasible for optimized inversion implementations.
- Masking: very efficient against SPA, possible on arithmetic shares using Fermat inversion (expensive)
- Usually, first-order masking is sufficient against realistic attackers.

Masking?



- Based on Shamir's secret sharing
- Hiding secret values from the CPU that processes it by splitting them up in multiple random shares
- Usual in PQC: boolean and additive masking

RUHR-UNIVERSITÄT BOCHUM





RUHR-UNIVERSITÄT BOCHUM





 $a \oplus b$





RUHR-UNIVERSITÄT BOCHUM





7

RUHR-UNIVERSITÄT BOCHUM





a + b





Observation: Applying functions that are **linear in the masking domain** is cheap.



Observation: Applying functions that are **linear in the masking domain** is cheap.

In which masking domain is polynomial inversion linear?

Polynomial-Multiplicative Masking



Old Idea: Multiplicative Masking

New: Shares are polynomials, whose polynomial product yields the secret polynomial.

Polynomial-Multiplicative Masking



Old Idea: Multiplicative Masking

New: Shares are polynomials, whose polynomial product yields the secret polynomial.

Old problem: Masking zero.

No new problem: The zero polynomial is not invertible and will never be masked.



RUB

















- 1× sampling a random polynomial
- ▶ $2 \times$ polynomial multiplication
- ▶ $1 \times$ polynomial inversion
- ▶ $1 \times$ polynomial addition





- 1× sampling a random polynomial
- ▶ $2 \times$ polynomial multiplication
- ▶ $1 \times$ polynomial inversion
- ▶ $1 \times$ polynomial addition





- 1× sampling a random polynomial
- ▶ $2 \times$ polynomial multiplication
- ► 3× polynomial inversion
- ▶ $1 \times$ polynomial addition





- 1× sampling a random polynomial
- ▶ $2 \times$ polynomial multiplication
- ► 3× polynomial inversion
- ► 1× polynomial addition
- ▶ + conversion back to additive





- 1× sampling a random polynomial
- ▶ $2 \times$ polynomial multiplication
- ► 3× polynomial inversion
- ► 1× polynomial addition
- ▶ + conversion back to additive





Invertibility: Two Cases



BIKE and NTRU

- There is an easy way of sampling invertible polynomials.
- BIKE: The polynomial must have an odd weight (sample uniform, check & correct).
- NTRU: All non-zero polynomials are invertible (sample uniform).

Invertibility: Two Cases



BIKE and NTRU

- There is an easy way of sampling invertible polynomials.
- BIKE: The polynomial must have an odd weight (sample uniform, check & correct).
- NTRU: All non-zero polynomials are invertible (sample uniform).

Streamlined NTRU Prime

- No easy way to sample invertible polynomials
- Even the (shared) input polynomial might not be invertible
- Invertibility check is done by inverting
- Uniform random polynomials are invertible with high probability
- Solution:
 - 1. Sample uniform random *r*
 - 2. If inversion of $ra_0 + ra_1$ fails, *a* or *r* were not invertible, start over

Multiplicative to Additive Conversion



 $p = a \times m$

► Idea: usually the inverted polynomial is multiplied by another polynomial

Multiplicative to Additive Conversion





► Idea: usually the inverted polynomial is multiplied by another polynomial

Multiplicative to Additive Conversion





► Idea: usually the inverted polynomial is multiplied by another polynomial

Multiplicative to Additive Conversion





- ► Idea: usually the inverted polynomial is multiplied by another polynomial
- ► Cost: 2 polynomial multiplications

Multiplicative to Additive Conversion





- ► Idea: usually the inverted polynomial is multiplied by another polynomial
- ► Cost: 4 polynomial multiplications

Multiplicative to Additive Conversion





- ► Idea: usually the inverted polynomial is multiplied by another polynomial
- Cost: 4 polynomial multiplications
- Higher orders: re-sharing needed as intermediate steps
- Multiplication of two secret polynomials in additive domain would require re-sharing already for first order!

Side-Channel Evaluation



Additive to Polynomial-Multiplicative Conversion with implicit Inversion



t-test (2000 traces) without randomness: **leakage**



More evaluation: see the paper.

NTRI	NTRU-HPS-2048677													
	A2M In	on	M2A	M2A Mul.			M2A Conversion							
Ord. d	Cycles	MUL	INV	Cycles	MUL	ADD	Cycles	MUL	ADD					
1	1723778	2	1	885773	4	4	486165	2	3					
2	2372502	5	1	2090841	9	12	1230767	5	8					
3	3211410	9	1	3802004	16	24	2238833	9	15					
4	4260732	14	1	6057128	25	40	3503189	14	$^{-24}$					
5	5524861	20	1	8848501	36	60	5049140	20	35					
6	6991050	27	1	12097869	49	84	6859272	27	48					

Unprotected operations:

Addition:	18 340 clock cycles
Multiplication:	201 383 clock cycles
Inversion:	1 273 864 clock cycles

NTRI	J-HPS-	-204	186	77						
	A2M Ir	iversi	on	M2A	Mul.		M2A Conversion			
Ord. d	Cycles	MUL	INV	Cycles	MUL	ADD	Cycles	MUL	ADD	
1	1723778	2	1	885773	4	4	486165	2	3	
2	2372502	5	1	2090841	9	12	1230767	5	8	
3	3211410	9	1	3802004	16	24	2238833	9	15	
4	4260732	14	1	6057128	25	40	3503189	14	24	
5	5524861	20	1	8848501	36	60	5049140	20	35	
6	6991050	27	1	12097869	49	84	6859272	27	48	

Unprotected operations:

Addition:	18 340 clock cycles
Multiplication:	201 383 clock cycles
Inversion:	1 273 864 clock cycles

1st order A2M with inversion vs unprotected inversion: 35 % overhead

RUB



NTRI	J-HPS	-204	186	77						
	A2M In	iversi	on	M2A	Mul.		M2A C	Conversion		
Ord. d	Cycles	MUL	INV	Cycles	MUL	ADD	Cycles	MUL	ADD	
1	1723778	2	1	885773	4	4	486165	2	3	
2	2372502	5	1	2090841	9	12	1230767	5	8	
3	3211410	9	1	3802004	16	24	2238833	9	15	
4	4260732	14	1	6057128	25	40	3503189	14	24	
5	5524861	20	1	8848501	36	60	5049140	20	35	
6	6991050	27	1	12097869	49	84	6859272	27	48	

Unprotected operations:

Addition:	18 340 clock cycles
Multiplication:	201 383 clock cycles
Inversion:	1 273 864 clock cycles

1st order A2M with inversion vs unprotected inversion: 35 % overhead

BIKE	Level	1								
	A2M In	versio	m	M2A	Mul.		M2A Conversion			
Ord. d	Cycles	MUL	INV	Cycles	MUL	ADD	Cycles	MUL	ADD	
1	21317392	2	1	4240017	4	4	2131405	2	3	
2	24487146	5	1	9584999	9	12	5342630	5	8	
3	28736397	9	1	17068753	16	24	9622491	9	15	
4	34007250	14	1	26740596	25	40	14994627	14	24	
5	40275530	20	1	38507790	36	60	21419851	20	35	
6	47744390	27	1	52493255	49	84	28945019	27	48	

Unprotected operations:

Addition:	3 534 clock cycles
Multiplication:	1 052 253 clock cycles
Inversion:	19 182 916 clock cycles



NTRI	J-HPS	-204	1867	77						
	A2M In	iversi	on	M2A	Mul.		M2A Conversion			
Ord. d	Cycles	MUL	INV	Cycles	MUL	ADD	Cycles	MUL	ADD	
1	1723778	2	1	885773	4	4	486165	2	3	
2	2372502	5	1	2090841	9	12	1230767	5	8	
3	3211410	9	1	3802004	16	24	2238833	9	15	
4	4260732	14	1	6057128	25	40	3503189	14	24	
5	5524861	20	1	8848501	36	60	5049140	20	35	
6	6991050	27	1	12097869	49	84	6859272	27	48	

Unprotected operations:

Addition:	18 340 clock cycles
Multiplication:	201 383 clock cycles
Inversion:	1 273 864 clock cycles

1st order A2M with inversion vs unprotected inversion: **35 % overhead**

BIKE	Level	1							
A2M Inversion M2A Mul. M2A Conversion									
Ord. d	Cycles	MUL	INV	Cycles	MUL	ADD	Cycles	MUL	ADD
1	21317392	2	1	4240017	4	4	2131405	2	3
2	24487146	5	1	9584999	9	12	5342630	5	8
3	28736397	9	1	17068753	16	24	9622491	9	15
4	34007250	14	1	26740596	25	40	14994627	14	24
5	40275530	20	1	38507790	36	60	21419851	20	35
6	47744390	27	1	52493255	49	84	28945019	27	48

Unprotected operations:

Addition:	3 534 clock cycles
 Multiplication: 	1 052 253 clock cycles
Inversion:	19 182 916 clock cycles

1st order A2M with inversion vs unprotected inversion: **11 % overhead**

▶ Efficient method for masking polynomial inversion to counter Simple Power Analysis

▶ Efficient method for masking polynomial inversion to counter Simple Power Analysis

► In the paper:

- M2A conversion without implicit multiplication
- Generalization to higher masking orders

- ► Efficient method for masking polynomial inversion to counter Simple Power Analysis
- ► In the paper:
 - M2A conversion without implicit multiplication
 - Generalization to higher masking orders
- Recent work by Coron et al.¹ shows theoretical vulnerability of A2M algorithm starting from third order
 - Can be mitigated with low cost (more random sampling)
 - ► Higher-order single-trace SPA attackers are rather theoretical

¹ "High-order masking of NTRU", https://eprint.iacr.org/2022/1188

- ▶ Efficient method for masking polynomial inversion to counter Simple Power Analysis
- ► In the paper:
 - M2A conversion without implicit multiplication
 - Generalization to higher masking orders
- Recent work by Coron et al.¹ shows theoretical vulnerability of A2M algorithm starting from third order
 - Can be mitigated with low cost (more random sampling)
 - ► Higher-order single-trace SPA attackers are rather theoretical
- Future work: formal proofs of our algorithms

¹ "High-order masking of NTRU", https://eprint.iacr.org/2022/1188