

Walnut Digital Signature Algorithm (WalnutDSA)

NIST Post Quantum Standardization Conference

Derek Atkins,
Chief Technology Officer



April 11, 2018



WalnutDSA Method Overview

- ▶ Group-theoretic digital signature method based on:
 - ▶ Infinite group theory
 - ▶ Matrices over small finite fields
 - ▶ Permutations
- ▶ Built on *E*-Multiplication, one-way function published in 2005
- ▶ Key generation and signature verification are very fast
- ▶ Key and signature size (and therefore signature validation time) scales linearly with security – counteracts Grover
- ▶ Non-cyclic and non-abelian; HSP does not apply – not subject to Shor
- ▶ All known attacks are exponential and blocked by parameter-only changes



WalnutDSA Structure

▶ Systemwide Data:

- ▶ Braid Group: N
- ▶ Finite Field: q
- ▶ Encoder function: $E()$ – converts a hash string to a braid

▶ Public Key:

- ▶ T-Values: $\{\tau_1 \cdots \tau_N\}$ (non-zero entries in F_q)
- ▶ $\text{Pub}(S)$: Matrix + Permutation: $(1,1) \star \text{Priv}(S)$
- ▶ $\text{Pub}(S')$: MatrixPart of $(1,1) \star \text{Priv}(S')$

▶ Signature over hashed message \mathcal{M} :

- ▶ Sig: $\mathcal{R}(v_3 \cdot \text{Priv}(S)^{-1} \cdot v_1 \cdot E(\mathcal{M}) \cdot \text{Priv}(S') \cdot v_2) \in B_N$, where \mathcal{R} is a rewriting method and the v_i (cloaking elements) disappear under \star

▶ Verification:

- ▶ Verify signature length (2^{14} generator limit)
- ▶ Compute $M_1 = \text{MatrixPart}((\text{Id}_N, \text{Id}_{S_N}) \star E(\mathcal{M})) \cdot \text{Pub}(S')$
- ▶ Compute $(M_2, \sigma_2) = \text{Pub}(S) \star \text{Sig}$
- ▶ Compare M_1 and M_2 for equality

▶ Private Key:

- ▶ Braid Pair: $\text{Priv}(S), \text{Priv}(S')$



Issues Found

Factoring Attack(s)

- ▶ **Oxford Attack (prior to NIST):** Hart *et al* found a way to factor public keys and generate extremely long forged signatures when the private braids are the same. The shortest forgery they created was 2^{35} Artin generators.

REFUTED: Maximum allowed signature length is 2^{16} generators. Conjectured shortest forgery is still 2^{20} generators ($> 2^{16}$).

- ▶ **Modifications:** It was shown by W. Beullens how to extend the Oxford factoring attack even when the private braids are different. Resulting forgeries are double the Oxford length.

REFUTED: Conjectured shortest forgery is still 2^{21} , which is much longer than the allowed maximum of 2^{16} . We propose to further reduce the maximum to 2^{14} .



Issues Found

Pollard-rho Attack

- ▶ **Pollard-rho Attack:** A Pollard-rho attack (found by S. Blackburn) showed that the parameters were too small resulting in an insufficient number of public keys. Specifically, N and q must satisfy the inequality $q^{N(N-3)-1} > 2^{2*SecurityLevel}$.

ANSWERED: Increasing parameter N from 8 to 10 (without modifying q) defeats this attack.



Issues Found

Encoder Issues

- ▶ **Non-Injective Encoder:** It was pointed out by W. Beullens that the encoder, as specified, was non-injective which reduced the space of possible signatures.

ANSWERED: Use a two-bit encoder to create an injective map from hash output to braid word.

- ▶ **Encoder Dimension** It was pointed out by Beullens that the message encoder generated a vector space with a dimension that was too small. Specifically, vector dimension must satisfy the inequality $q^{\text{dimension}} > 2^{2 * \text{SecurityLevel}}$.

ANSWERED: Change encoding parameters to injectively leverage the full space; results in dimension 66 for $N = 10$ which is sufficiently large to defeat these attacks without modifying q .



Issues Found

Exponential Factoring Attack

- ▶ **Exponential Attack** Beullens and Blackburn found another exponential factoring attack that leveraged $t_1 = t_2 = 1$ and was able to produce forged private keys resulting in signatures short enough to be considered valid. The attack runs in $q^{N-5/2}$ time, but they claim they can reduce that to $q^{N/2-1}$.

ANSWERED: Assuming their worst-case can be verified, increasing parameters N and q to 11 and $2^{31} - 1$ (M31) achieves 128-bit security (and B11M61 achieves 256-bit).

With q prime we can also tweak cloaking elements and no longer require $t_1 = t_2 = 1$, further complicating this type of attack, increasing work to $q^{(N-1)/2} \sqrt{60}$, allowing us to reduce to B10. Performance impact is minimal (e.g. 175,285 cycles to verify a signature – still #1).



Performance

- ▶ Small implementation of verification function (~3000 bytes of code)
- ▶ 7 of the 8 submitted WalnutDSA implementations were the FASTEST signature verifications as reported by NIST:

	Submission	Specific Implementation	KeyPair Med	KeyPair Ave	Sign Median	Sign Average	Open Med	Open Average	sk	pk	bytes
1	WalnutDSA	walnut128-bkl	1782814	2086564	126822981	137691863	92699	96962	136	83	1100
2	WalnutDSA	walnut128-stochasticrewrite	1905902	2271199	45760337	51244842	95682	101529	136	83	1200
3	WalnutDSA	walnut128-stochasticrewrite	1935044	2574824	43111043	48246052	133359	147948	136	83	2000
4	WalnutDSA	walnut128-ref	1135380	1225046	2039841350	2071390234	166520	175770	136	83	1100
5	WalnutDSA	walnut256-ref	1162870	1255020	2026491143	2084771866	168897	193637	291	128	1800
6	WalnutDSA	walnut256-stochasticrewrite	4164257	4519863	127413278	134509781	181122	194916	291	128	2100
7	WalnutDSA	walnut256-bkl	4149445	4456087	454977624	472468875	179665	197243	291	128	1800

- ▶ The proposed increases in parameters still keeps WalnutDSA #1 (175,285 cycles)



Summary

- ▶ Small code implementation
- ▶ Fast runtime
- ▶ Lots of analysis since this process began
- ▶ All attacks identified have been exponential and handled with parameter-only changes, typically within hours or days of notification
- ▶ Analysis has identified notable improvements we will include in the next round
- ▶ We feel WalnutDSA is an innovative alternative to Lattice/Hash methods and should continue to be studied in this process



Thank You!

Any Questions?

Derek Atkins, CTO

Phone: +1 203.227.3151

Email: DAtkins@SecureRF.com

