Tampering attacks in pairing-based cryptography

Johannes Blömer

University of Paderborn September 22, 2014









Definition 1

A pairing is a bilinear, non-degenerate, and efficiently computable map $e : \mathbb{G} \times \mathbb{G}' \to \mathbb{G}_T$, where $\mathbb{G}, \mathbb{G}', \mathbb{G}_T$ are finite groups of the same size. Bilinearity:

$$e(P+Q,R) = e(P,R) \cdot e(Q,R)$$
 for all $P, Q \in \mathbb{G}, R \in \mathbb{G}'$
 $e(P,R+Q) = e(P,R) \cdot e(P,Q)$ for all $P \in \mathbb{G}, Q, R \in \mathbb{G}'$.

Non-degeneracy: for all $P \in \mathbb{G} \setminus \{\mathcal{O}\}$ there is a $Q \in \mathbb{G}'$ such that $e(P, Q) \neq 1$.







Definition 1

A pairing is a bilinear, non-degenerate, and efficiently computable map $e : \mathbb{G} \times \mathbb{G}' \to \mathbb{G}_T$, where $\mathbb{G}, \mathbb{G}', \mathbb{G}_T$ are finite groups of the same size. Bilinearity:

$$e(P+Q,R) = e(P,R) \cdot e(Q,R)$$
 for all $P, Q \in \mathbb{G}, R \in \mathbb{G}'$
 $e(P,R+Q) = e(P,R) \cdot e(P,Q)$ for all $P \in \mathbb{G}, Q, R \in \mathbb{G}'$.

Non-degeneracy: for all $P \in \mathbb{G} \setminus \{\mathcal{O}\}$ there is a $Q \in \mathbb{G}'$ such that $e(P, Q) \neq 1$.

plus crypto assumptions







Definition 1

A pairing is a bilinear, non-degenerate, and efficiently computable map $e : \mathbb{G} \times \mathbb{G}' \to \mathbb{G}_T$, where $\mathbb{G}, \mathbb{G}', \mathbb{G}_T$ are finite groups of the same size. Bilinearity:

 $e(P+Q,R) = e(P,R) \cdot e(Q,R)$ for all $P, Q \in \mathbb{G}, R \in \mathbb{G}'$ $e(P,R+Q) = e(P,R) \cdot e(P,Q)$ for all $P \in \mathbb{G}, Q, R \in \mathbb{G}'$.

Non-degeneracy: for all $P \in \mathbb{G} \setminus \{\mathcal{O}\}$ there is a $Q \in \mathbb{G}'$ such that $e(P, Q) \neq 1$.

plus crypto assumptions

•
$$e(a \cdot P, b \cdot Q) = e(b \cdot P, a \cdot Q) = e(ab \cdot P, Q) = e(P, Q)^{ab}$$

can be used to combine and recombine shares of secrets or secrets and nonces

Applications

- identity-based encryption
- attribute-based encryption
- group signatures
- key agreement
- anonymous credentials

...







Applications

- identity-based encryption
- attribute-based encryption
- group signatures
- key agreement
- anonymous credentials

...

- encrypt data under attributes, not for individual users,
- users get rights,
- if rights and attributes match, data can be decrypted





Applications

....

- identity-based encryption
- attribute-based encryption
- group signatures
- key agreement
- anonymous credentials

- encrypt data under attributes, not for individual users,
- users get rights,
- if rights and attributes match, data can be decrypted





....



Applications

- identity-based encryption
- attribute-based encryption
- group signatures
- key agreement
- anonymous credentials

- encrypt data under attributes, not for individual users,
- users get rights,
- if rights and attributes match, data can be decrypted





....



Applications

- identity-based encryption
- attribute-based encryption
- group signatures
- key agreement
- anonymous credentials

- encrypt data under attributes, not for individual users,
- users get rights,
- if rights and attributes match, data can be decrypted







- \mathbb{F} a field (finite or infinite), $\overline{\mathbb{F}}$ algebraic closure
- $a, b \in \mathbb{F}$
- $E := \{(x, y) \in \overline{\mathbb{F}}^2 : y^2 = x^3 + ax + b = 0\} \cup \{\mathcal{O}\}$ elliptic curve over \mathbb{F}
- $\blacksquare \ \mathcal{O}$ point at infinity
- elliptic curves have group structure using chord and tangent law





- \mathbb{F} a field (finite or infinite), $\overline{\mathbb{F}}$ algebraic closure
- *a*, *b* ∈ 𝔽
- $E := \{(x, y) \in \overline{\mathbb{F}}^2 : y^2 = x^3 + ax + b = 0\} \cup \{\mathcal{O}\}$ elliptic curve over \mathbb{F}
- $\blacksquare \ \mathcal{O} \ \text{point} \ \text{at} \ \text{infinity}$
- elliptic curves have group structure using chord and tangent law





- \mathbb{F} a field (finite or infinite), $\overline{\mathbb{F}}$ algebraic closure
- *a*, *b* ∈ 𝔽
- $E := \{(x, y) \in \overline{\mathbb{F}}^2 : y^2 = x^3 + ax + b = 0\} \cup \{\mathcal{O}\}$ elliptic curve over \mathbb{F}
- $\blacksquare \ \mathcal{O}$ point at infinity
- elliptic curves have group structure using chord and tangent law





- \mathbb{F} a field (finite or infinite), $\overline{\mathbb{F}}$ algebraic closure
- *a*, *b* ∈ 𝔽
- $E := \{(x, y) \in \overline{\mathbb{F}}^2 : y^2 = x^3 + ax + b = 0\} \cup \{\mathcal{O}\}$ elliptic curve over \mathbb{F}
- $\blacksquare \ \mathcal{O}$ point at infinity
- elliptic curves have group structure using chord and tangent law











Torsion points on elliptic curves

- *E* elliptic curve, $P \in E, r \in \mathbb{N}$
- *P* torsion point of order *r*, iff $r \cdot P = O$
- E[r] := set of points of order r
- E[r] is subgroup of E







Torsion points on elliptic curves

- *E* elliptic curve, $P \in E, r \in \mathbb{N}$
- *P* torsion point of order *r*, iff $r \cdot P = O$
- E[r] := set of points of order r
- E[r] is subgroup of E







Torsion points on elliptic curves

- *E* elliptic curve, $P \in E, r \in \mathbb{N}$
- *P* torsion point of order *r*, iff $r \cdot P = \mathcal{O}$
- E[r] := set of points of order r
- E[r] is subgroup of E







Torsion points on elliptic curves

- *E* elliptic curve, $P \in E, r \in \mathbb{N}$
- *P* torsion point of order *r*, iff $r \cdot P = \mathcal{O}$
- E[r] := set of points of order r
- E[r] is subgroup of E

Embedding degree

- $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}_q$ finite field, $r \in \mathbb{N}$
- smallest k s.th. r | (q^k − 1) called embedding degree

•
$$E[r] \subset E(\mathbb{F}_{q^k}) := E \cap (\mathbb{F}_{q^k} \times \mathbb{F}_{q^k})$$





Miller Algorithm (MA)

input : $r \in \mathbb{N}, P, Q \in E, Q \neq P, \mathcal{O}, r = \sum_{j=0}^{t} r_j 2^j, r_j \in \{0, 1\}$

$$T \leftarrow P \qquad ;$$

for $j = t - 2 \dots 0$ do
$$\left| \begin{array}{c} T \leftarrow 2T; \\ \text{if } r_j = 1 \text{ then} \\ \\ \\ T \leftarrow T + P; \end{array} \right|$$





Miller Algorithm (MA)

input : $r \in \mathbb{N}, P, Q \in E, Q \neq P, \mathcal{O}, r = \sum_{j=0}^{t} r_j 2^j, r_j \in \{0, 1\}$ output: $f_{r,P}(Q)$ $T \leftarrow P, f \leftarrow 1;$ for $j = t - 2 \dots 0$ do $f \leftarrow f^2 \cdot I_{T,T}(Q) / I_{2T,-2T}(Q);$ $T \leftarrow 2T;$ if $r_j = 1$ then $f \leftarrow f \cdot I_{T,P}(Q) / I_{T+P,-(T+P)}(Q);$ $T \leftarrow T + P;$

return f;

 $I_{U,V}$:= equation of line through U, V







$$\mu_r := \{ u \in \mathbb{F}_{q^k} : u^r = 1 \}$$
 (set of *r*-th roots of unity)

Definition 2 (Weil/Miller)

The Weil pairing w_r is the map defined by

$$w_r : E[r] \times E[r] \to \mu_r$$
$$(P, Q) \mapsto (-1)^r \frac{f_{r,P}(Q)}{f_{r,Q}(P)}.$$







$$\mu_r := \{ u \in \mathbb{F}_{q^k} : u^r = 1 \}$$
 (set of *r*-th roots of unity)

Definition 2 (Weil/Miller)

The Weil pairing w_r is the map defined by

$$w_{r}: E[r] \times E[r] \to \mu_{r}$$
$$(P, Q) \mapsto (-1)^{r} \frac{f_{r,P}(Q)}{f_{r,Q}(P)}.$$

- w_r is bilinear and non-degenerate,
- but rather inefficient, two invocations of MA



The reduced Tate pairing



Definition 3

The reduced Tate pairing t_r is the map defined by

$$t_{r}: E[r] \times E(\mathbb{F}_{q^{k}}) / rE(\mathbb{F}_{q^{k}}) \to \mu_{r}$$
$$(P, Q) \mapsto f_{r, P}(Q)^{(q^{k}-1)/r}$$



The reduced Tate pairing



Definition 3

The reduced Tate pairing t_r is the map defined by

$$t_{r}: E[r] \times E(\mathbb{F}_{q^{k}}) / rE(\mathbb{F}_{q^{k}}) \to \mu_{r}$$
$$(P, Q) \mapsto f_{r, P}(Q)^{(q^{k}-1)/r}$$

- t_r requires one MA invocation and one exponentiation, the final exponentiation (FE)
- more efficient to compute than w_r
- variants of t_r lead to pairings currently proposed for applications
- most variants have the structure MA + FE





 most applications don't just compute a pairing never mind





- most applications don't just compute a pairing never mind
- secret is not the scalar r, rather it is P or Q

$$\begin{array}{l} \mathsf{MA} + \mathsf{FE} \\ \hline \mathsf{input} & : r \in \mathbb{N}, P, Q \in E \\ \mathsf{output}: f_{r,P}(Q) \\ T \leftarrow P, f \leftarrow 1; \\ \mathsf{for} \ j = t - 2 \dots 0 \ \mathsf{do} \\ & \left| \begin{array}{c} f \leftarrow f^2 \cdot I_{T,T}(Q) \ / I_{2T,-2T}(Q); \\ T \leftarrow 2T; \\ \mathsf{if} \ r_j = 1 \ \mathsf{then} \\ & \left| \begin{array}{c} f \leftarrow f \cdot I_{T,P}(Q) \ / I_{T+P,-(T+P)}(Q); \\ T \leftarrow T + P; \end{array} \right| \\ \mathsf{return} \ f^{(q^k-1)/r}; \end{array} \right. \end{array}$$

N / A





- most applications don't just compute a pairing never mind
- secret is not the scalar r, rather it is P or Q
- both MA and FE individually are usually hard to invert

$$\begin{split} \underline{\mathsf{MA}} &+ \mathsf{FE} \\ \hline \mathbf{input} : r \in \mathbb{N}, P, Q \in E \\ \mathbf{output}: f_{r,P}(Q) \\ T \leftarrow P, f \leftarrow 1; \\ \mathbf{for} \ j = t - 2 \dots 0 \ \mathbf{do} \\ & \left| \begin{array}{c} f \leftarrow f^2 \cdot I_{T,T}(Q) / I_{2T,-2T}(Q); \\ T \leftarrow 2T; \\ \mathbf{if} \ r_j = 1 \ \mathbf{then} \\ & \left| \begin{array}{c} f \leftarrow f \cdot I_{T,P}(Q) / I_{T+P,-(T+P)}(Q); \\ T \leftarrow T + P; \end{array} \right. \\ \mathbf{return} \ f^{(q^k-1)/r}; \end{split}$$





- most applications don't just compute a pairing never mind
- secret is not the scalar r, rather it is P or Q
- both MA and FE individually are usually hard to invert
- FE many-to-one, need to find the "right" preimage

 $\begin{array}{l} \underline{\mathsf{MA}} + \mathsf{FE} \\ \hline \mathsf{input} & : r \in \mathbb{N}, P, Q \in E \\ \mathtt{output}: f_{r,P}(Q) \\ T \leftarrow P, f \leftarrow 1; \\ \mathsf{for} \; j = t - 2 \dots 0 \; \mathsf{do} \\ & \left| \begin{array}{c} f \leftarrow f^2 \cdot I_{T,T}(Q) \, / I_{2T,-2T}(Q); \\ T \leftarrow 2T; \\ \mathtt{if} \; r_j = 1 \; \mathtt{then} \\ & \left| \begin{array}{c} f \leftarrow f \cdot I_{T,P}(Q) \, / I_{T+P,-(T+P)}(Q); \\ T \leftarrow T + P; \end{array} \right. \\ \mathsf{return} \; f^{(q^k-1)/r}; \end{array} \right. \end{array}$





- most applications don't just compute a pairing never mind
- secret is not the scalar r, rather it is P or Q
- both MA and FE individually are usually hard to invert
- FE many-to-one, need to find the "right" preimage
- \Rightarrow game is different from standard elliptic curve cryptography (ECC)
 - for practical evaluation see Marie's talk.

 $\begin{array}{l} \underline{\mathsf{MA}} + \mathsf{FE} \\ \hline \mathsf{input} & : r \in \mathbb{N}, P, Q \in E \\ \mathtt{output}: f_{r,P}(Q) \\ T \leftarrow P, f \leftarrow 1; \\ \mathsf{for} & j = t - 2 \dots 0 \ \mathsf{do} \\ & \left| \begin{array}{c} f \leftarrow f^2 \cdot I_{T,T}(Q) / I_{2T,-2T}(Q); \\ T \leftarrow 2T; \\ \mathtt{if} & r_j = 1 \ \mathtt{then} \\ & \left| \begin{array}{c} f \leftarrow f \cdot I_{T,P}(Q) / I_{T+P,-(T+P)}(Q); \\ T \leftarrow T + P; \end{array} \right. \\ \mathsf{return} & f^{(q^k-1)/r}; \end{array} \right. \end{array}$





- 1 Ignore the problem.
- 2 Show that you can use correlated faults to induce faults in Miller's algorithm and skip the final exponentiation.
 → (see Peter's talk)
- 3 Assume that you can induce faults into Miller's algorithm and additional faults into the final exponentiation that facilitate the inversion problem for the exponentiation.
- Use particular curves and pairings for which the inversion problem for the final exponentiation can be solved efficiently.





$$\begin{array}{c|c} \hline \hline \mathbf{MA + FE} \\ \hline \mathbf{input} &: r \in \mathbb{N}, P, Q \in E \\ \mathbf{output}: f_{r,P}(Q) \\ 1 & T \leftarrow P, f \leftarrow 1; \\ 2 & \mathbf{for} \ j = t - 2 \dots 0 \ \mathbf{do} \\ 3 & f \leftarrow f^2 \cdot I_{T,T}(Q) \ / I_{2T,-2T}(Q); \\ 4 & T \leftarrow 2T; \\ 5 & \mathbf{if} \ r_j = 1 \ \mathbf{then} \\ 6 & f \leftarrow f \cdot I_{T,P}(Q) \ / I_{T+P,-(T+P)}(Q); \\ 7 & T \leftarrow T + P; \\ 8 & \mathbf{return} \ f^{(q^k-1)/r}; \end{array}$$





- attack operations in lines 3,4,6,7
 - lines 4 and 7 seem difficult

 $\frac{MA + FE}{input : r \in \mathbb{N}, P, Q \in E}$ output: $f_{r,P}(Q)$ $1 \quad T \leftarrow P, f \leftarrow 1;$ $2 \quad \text{for } j = t - 2 \dots 0 \text{ do}$ $3 \quad \left| \begin{array}{c} f \leftarrow f^2 \cdot I_{T,T}(Q) / I_{2T,-2T}(Q); \\ 4 \quad T \leftarrow 2T; \\ 5 \quad \text{if } r_j = 1 \text{ then} \\ 6 \quad \left| \begin{array}{c} f \leftarrow f \cdot I_{T,P}(Q) / I_{T+P,-(T+P)}(Q); \\ T \leftarrow T + P; \\ 8 \quad \text{return } f^{(q^k-1)/r}; \end{array} \right|$





- attack operations in lines 3,4,6,7
 - lines 4 and 7 seem difficult
 - lines 3,6: attack by Wheelan, Scott and others

 $\begin{array}{c|c} \hline \hline \mathbf{MA + FE} \\ \hline \hline \mathbf{input} & : r \in \mathbb{N}, P, Q \in E \\ \mathbf{output}: f_{r,P}(Q) \\ 1 & T \leftarrow P, f \leftarrow 1; \\ 2 & \mathbf{for} \ j = t - 2 \dots 0 \ \mathbf{do} \\ 3 & \quad f \leftarrow f^2 \cdot I_{T,T}(Q) / I_{2T,-2T}(Q); \\ 4 & \quad T \leftarrow 2T; \\ 5 & \quad \mathbf{if} \ r_j = 1 \ \mathbf{then} \\ 6 & \quad \left| \begin{array}{c} f \leftarrow f \cdot I_{T,P}(Q) / I_{T+P,-(T+P)}(Q); \\ T \leftarrow T + P; \\ 8 & \mathbf{return} \ f^{(q^k-1)/r}; \end{array} \right|$





- attack operations in lines 3,4,6,7
 - lines 4 and 7 seem difficult
 - lines 3,6: attack by Wheelan, Scott and others
- attack loop in lines 2 7 (Page-Vercauteren)

MA + FEinput : $r \in \mathbb{N}, P, Q \in E$ output: $f_{r,P}(Q)$ 1 $T \leftarrow P, f \leftarrow 1;$ 2for $j = t - 2 \dots 0$ do3 $f \leftarrow f^2 \cdot I_{T,T}(Q) / I_{2T,-2T}(Q);$ 4 $T \leftarrow 2T;$ 5if $r_j = 1$ then6 $f \leftarrow f \cdot I_{T,P}(Q) / I_{T+P,-(T+P)}(Q);$ 7 $T \leftarrow T + P;$ 8return $f^{(q^k-1)/r};$





- attack operations in lines 3,4,6,7
 - lines 4 and 7 seem difficult
 - lines 3,6: attack by Wheelan, Scott and others
- attack loop in lines 2 7 (Page-Vercauteren)
 - leave the loop after completing a certain number of iterations

MA + FEinput : $r \in \mathbb{N}, P, Q \in E$ output: $f_{r,P}(Q)$ 1 $T \leftarrow P, f \leftarrow 1;$ for $j = t - 2 \dots 0$ do 3 $f \leftarrow f^2 \cdot I_{T,T}(Q) / I_{2T,-2T}(Q);$ $T \leftarrow 2T$: Δ if $r_i = 1$ then 5 $f \leftarrow f \cdot I_{T,P}(Q) / I_{T+P,-(T+P)}(Q);$ 6 $T \leftarrow T + P;$ 7 8 return $f^{(q^k-1)/r}$:





- attack operations in lines 3,4,6,7
 - lines 4 and 7 seem difficult
 - lines 3,6: attack by Wheelan, Scott and others
- attack loop in lines 2 7 (Page-Vercauteren)
 - leave the loop after completing a certain number of iterations
 - leave the loop within an iteration and before executing the if-instruction in line 5

MA + FEinput : $r \in \mathbb{N}, P, Q \in E$ output: $f_{r,P}(Q)$ 1 $T \leftarrow P, f \leftarrow 1;$ for $j = t - 2 \dots 0$ do $f \leftarrow f^2 \cdot I_{T,T}(Q) / I_{2T,-2T}(Q);$ 3 $T \leftarrow 2T$: Δ if $r_i = 1$ then 5 $f \leftarrow f \cdot I_{T,P}(Q) / I_{T+P,-(T+P)}(Q);$ 6 $T \leftarrow T + P$: 7 8 return $f^{(q^k-1)/r}$:



Skipping iterations with two independent faults



 induce single fault in two independent runs of algorithm MA + FE



Skipping iterations with two independent faults



- induce single fault in two independent runs of algorithm MA + FE
- in first run leave **for**-loop after iteration *s* to obtain $f_s^{(q^k-1)/r}$

 $\begin{array}{l} \underline{\mathsf{MA}} + \underline{\mathsf{FE}} \\ \hline \mathbf{input} & : r \in \mathbb{N}, P, Q \in E \\ \mathbf{output}: f_{r,P}(Q) \\ T \leftarrow P, f \leftarrow 1; \\ \mathbf{for} \ j = t - 2 \dots \mathbf{s} \ \mathbf{do} \\ & \left| \begin{array}{c} f \leftarrow f^2 \cdot I_{T,T}(Q) / I_{2T,-2T}(Q); \\ T \leftarrow 2T; \\ \mathbf{if} \ r_j = 1 \ \mathbf{then} \\ & \left| \begin{array}{c} f \leftarrow f \cdot I_{T,P}(Q) / I_{T+P,-(T+P)}(Q); \\ T \leftarrow T + P; \end{array} \right| \\ \mathbf{return} \ f^{(q^k-1)/r}; \end{array} \right. \end{array}$



Skipping iterations with two independent faults



- induce single fault in two independent runs of algorithm MA + FE
- in first run leave **for**-loop after iteration *s* to obtain $f_s^{(q^k-1)/r}$
- in first run leave **for**-loop after iteration s - 1 to obtain $f_{s-1}^{(q^k-1)/r}$

 $\begin{array}{l} \underline{\mathsf{MA}} + \mathsf{FE} \\ \hline \mathbf{input} : r \in \mathbb{N}, P, Q \in E \\ \mathbf{output}: f_{r,P}(Q) \\ T \leftarrow P, f \leftarrow 1; \\ \mathbf{for} \ j = t - 2 \dots \mathbf{s} - 1 \ \mathbf{do} \\ & \int f \leftarrow f^2 \cdot I_{T,T}(Q) / I_{2T,-2T}(Q); \\ T \leftarrow 2T; \\ \mathbf{if} \ r_j = 1 \ \mathbf{then} \\ & \int f \leftarrow f \cdot I_{T,P}(Q) / I_{T+P,-(T+P)}(Q); \\ T \leftarrow T + P; \\ \mathbf{return} \ f^{(q^k-1)/r}; \end{array}$



Skipping iterations with two independent faults - analysis



• P known, Q secret

•
$$\frac{f_{s-1}}{f_s^2} = \frac{l_{r'P,r'P}(Q) \cdot l_{2r'P,P}(Q)^{r_{s-1}}}{l_{2r'P,-2r'P}(Q) \cdot l_{r''P,-r''P}(Q)^{r_{s-1}}}$$
 low degree function in coordinates of Q

 \Rightarrow determine Q using computer algebra (system)



Skipping iterations with two independent faults - analysis



• P known, Q secret

•
$$\frac{f_{s-1}}{f_s^2} = \frac{I_{r'P,r'P}(Q) \cdot I_{2r'P,P}(Q)^{r_{s-1}}}{I_{2r'P,-2r'P}(Q) \cdot I_{r''P,-r''P}(Q)^{r_{s-1}}}$$
 low degree function in coordinates of Q

- \Rightarrow determine Q using computer algebra (system)
- \odot only get $(f_{s-1}/f_s^2)^{(q^k-1)/r}$ (final exponentiation)



Skipping iterations with two independent faults - analysis



P known, Q secret

•
$$\frac{f_{s-1}}{f_s^2} = \frac{I_{r'P,r'P}(Q) \cdot I_{2r'P,P}(Q)^{r_{s-1}}}{I_{2r'P,-2r'P}(Q) \cdot I_{r''P,-r''P}(Q)^{r_{s-1}}}$$
 low degree function in coordinates of Q

- \Rightarrow determine Q using computer algebra (system)
- \odot only get $(f_{s-1}/f_s^2)^{(q^k-1)/r}$ (final exponentiation)
 - similar analysis for other fault attacks





•
$$(q^k - 1)/r$$
 may be small, i.e. 4

• by choice of q, E, r





- $(q^k 1)/r$ may be small, i.e. 4
- by choice of q, E, r
- $(q^k 1)/r$ may be of special structure, that can be exploited
- due to optimizations of reduced Tate pairing





- $(q^k 1)/r$ may be small, i.e. 4
- by choice of q, E, r
- $(q^k 1)/r$ may be of special structure, that can be exploited
- due to optimizations of reduced Tate pairing
- final exponentiation can be skipped with correlated fault
- exponent can be simplified with correlated fault





- $(q^k 1)/r$ may be small, i.e. 4
- by choice of *q*, *E*, *r*
- $(q^k 1)/r$ may be of special structure, that can be exploited
- due to optimizations of reduced Tate pairing
- final exponentiation can be skipped with correlated fault
- exponent can be simplified with correlated fault
- ⇒ final exponentiation should not be considered a countermeasure against fault attacks



Conclusion



- fault attacks against pairings possible and realistic (see last two talks today)
- but more complex than in ECC, both in realization and in analysis
- combination of Miller algorithm and final exponentiation main difficulty



Conclusion



- fault attacks against pairings possible and realistic (see last two talks today)
- but more complex than in ECC, both in realization and in analysis
- combination of Miller algorithm and final exponentiation main difficulty
- timing and power analysis attacks also possible
- since points not scalars are the secrets need to attack arithmetic/elliptic curve operations



Conclusion

- fault attacks against pairings possible and realistic (see last two talks today)
- but more complex than in ECC, both in realization and in analysis
- combination of Miller algorithm and final exponentiation main difficulty
- timing and power analysis attacks also possible
- since points not scalars are the secrets need to attack arithmetic/elliptic curve operations







Thank you!



 $16 \, / \, 16$