

Faster ECDL

D. J. Bernstein

University of Illinois at Chicago

Tanja Lange

Technische Universiteit Eindhoven

Peter Schwabe

Technische Universiteit Eindhoven

ECDL = complete ECC break,
computing user's secret key
given user's public key.

The Certicom challenges

1997: ECCp-79 broken.

1997: ECC2-79 broken.

1998: ECC2-79 broken.

1998: ECC2-89 broken.

1998: ECCp-97 broken.

1998: ECC2K-95 broken.

1999: ECC2-97 broken.

2000: ECC2K-108 broken.

2002: ECCp-109 broken.

2004: ECC2-109 broken.

2009–: ECC2K-130 in progress;

many optimizations; still

10× harder than RSA-768.

Challenges too widely spaced!

Latest ECDL record

2009.07 Bos–Kaihara–
Kleinjung–Lenstra–Montgomery
“PlayStation 3 computing
breaks 2^{60} barrier:
112-bit prime ECDLP solved” .

Successful ECDL computation
for a standard curve over \mathbf{F}_p

where $p = (2^{128} - 3)/(11 \cdot 6949)$.

Latest ECDL record

2009.07 Bos–Kaihara–
Kleinjung–Lenstra–Montgomery

“PlayStation 3 computing
breaks 2^{60} barrier:

112-bit prime ECDLP solved” .

Successful ECDL computation
for a standard curve over \mathbf{F}_p

where $p = (2^{128} - 3)/(11 \cdot 6949)$.

“We did not use

the common negation map

since it requires branching

and results in code that runs

slower in a SIMD environment.”

2009.07 Bos–Kaihara–Kleinjung–
Lenstra–Montgomery “On the
security of 1024-bit RSA and 160-
bit elliptic curve cryptography” :

Group order $q \approx p$;

“expected number of iterations”

is “ $\sqrt{\frac{\pi \cdot q}{2}} \approx 8.4 \cdot 10^{16}$ ”; “we

do not use the negation map”;

“456 clock cycles per iteration

per SPU”; “24-bit distinguishing

property” \Rightarrow “260 gigabytes” .

“The overall calculation

can be expected to take

approximately **60 PS3 years.**”

2009.09 Bos–Kaihara–
Montgomery “Pollard rho
on the PlayStation 3” :

“Our software implementation is optimized for the SPE . . . the computational overhead for [the negation map], **due to the conditional branches required to check for fruitless cycles [13]**, results (in our implementation on this architecture) in an overall performance degradation.”

“[13]” is 2000 Gallant–Lambert–
Vanstone.

2010.07 Bos–Kleijung–Lenstra

“On the use of the negation map in the Pollard rho method” :

“If the Pollard rho method is parallelized in SIMD fashion, it is a challenge to achieve any speedup at all. . . . Dealing with cycles entails administrative overhead and branching, which cause a non-negligible slowdown when running multiple walks in SIMD-parallel fashion. . . .

[This] is a major obstacle to the negation map in SIMD environments.”

2010 Bernstein–Lange–Schwabe:
Our software solves
random ECDL on the same curve
(with no precomputation)
in 35.6 PS3 years on average.

For comparison:
Bos–Kaihara–Kleinjung–Lenstra–
Montgomery code
uses 65 PS3 years on average.

2010 Bernstein–Lange–Schwabe:
Our software solves
random ECDL on the same curve
(with no precomputation)
in 35.6 PS3 years on average.

For comparison:

Bos–Kaihara–Kleijnung–Lenstra–
Montgomery code
uses 65 PS3 years on average.

Computation used 158000 kWh
(if PS3 ran at only 300W),

wasting >70000 kWh,

unnecessarily generating >10000
kilograms of carbon dioxide.

(0.143 kg CO₂ per Swiss kWh.)

Several levels of speedups,
starting with fast arithmetic
and continuing up through rho.

Most important speedup:

We use the negation map
in a reasonable way.

Speedup very close to $\sqrt{2}$.

We also save time by using
better integer representation,
better multiplication methods,
adapting ideas from Curve25519.

Paper will be online very soon.

Advertisement

Fourteenth annual Workshop
on Elliptic-Curve Cryptography
is embedded into a larger
Workshop on Elliptic Curves
and Computation.

18–22 October 2010,

Redmond, Washington, USA

<http://eccworkshop.org>