

Classic McEliece on the ARM Cortex-M4

(ia.cr/2021/492)

Ming-Shing Chen, Tung Chou

Ruhr University Bochum, Germany

Academia Sinica, Taiwan

9 June, 2021

Cycle counts on stm32f4-discovery (at 168 MHz)

parameter set	level	decap.	encap.	key generation
mceliece348864f	1	2 706 681	582 199	1 430 811 294
mceliece348864	1			2 146 932 033
mceliece460896*	3	6 535 186	1 081 335	
mceliece6688128*	5	7 412 111		
mceliece8192128*	5	7 481 747		

- Our implementation is constant-time.

Cycle counts on stm32f4-discovery (at 168 MHz)

parameter set	level	decap.	encap.	key generation
mceliece348864f	1	2 706 681	582 199	1 430 811 294
mceliece348864	1			2 146 932 033
mceliece460896*	3	6 535 186	1 081 335	
mceliece6688128*	5	7 412 111		
mceliece8192128*	5	7 481 747		

- Our implementation is constant-time.
- We put the public keys in flash, the cycle counts include time to read/write pk from/to flash.
- All optimizations work when streaming is used.

Cycle counts on stm32f4-discovery (at 168 MHz)

parameter set	level	decap.	encap.	key generation
mceliece348864f	1	2 706 681	582 199	1 430 811 294
mceliece348864	1			2 146 932 033
mceliece460896*	3	6 535 186	1 081 335	
mceliece6688128*	5	7 412 111		
mceliece8192128*	5	7 481 747		

- Our implementation is constant-time.
- We put the public keys in flash, the cycle counts include time to read/write pk from/to flash.
- All optimizations work when streaming is used.
- With a bit more effort, should be able to do key generation for mceliece460896*.
- Should be able to run all operations of all parameter sets on larger M4 boards (e.g., Giant Gecko).

Cycle counts on stm32f4-discovery (at 168 MHz)

parameter set	level	decap.	encap.	key generation
mceliece348864f	1	2 706 681	582 199	1 430 811 294
mceliece348864	1			2 146 932 033
mceliece460896*	3	6 535 186	1 081 335	
mceliece6688128*	5	7 412 111		
mceliece8192128*	5	7 481 747		

- Our implementation is constant-time.
- We put the public keys in flash, the cycle counts include time to read/write pk from/to flash.
- All optimizations work when streaming is used.
- With a bit more effort, should be able to do key generation for mceliece460896*.
- Should be able to run all operations of all parameter sets on larger M4 boards (e.g., Giant Gecko).
- Encapsulation time is close to that of lattice-based finalists.
- Decapsulation time is 4–7 times as slow but still reasonably efficient.
- Can trade decapsulation speed for key generation speed by omitting control-bit generation.

Public key generation: previous implementations

- For non-f parameter sets, the task is to convert $H = [M \mid T]$ into $[I \mid M^{-1}T]$.

1. Previous AVX/SSE implementations mostly by Chou

- `supercop-20200531` and later versions.
- 3rd-round submission package of Classic McEliece.

2. “Classic McEliece implementation with low memory footprint” by Roth, Karatsiolis and Krämer

Public key generation: previous implementations

- For non-f parameter sets, the task is to convert $H = [M | T]$ into $[I | M^{-1}T]$.
- The implementations below
 - use almost-inplace LUP decompositions (with $PM = LU$) and
 - generate column blocks T_i 's on demandto save time and space.

1. Previous AVX/SSE implementations mostly by Chou

- supercop-20200531 and later versions.
- 3rd-round submission package of Classic McEliece.

2. "Classic McEliece implementation with low memory footprint" by Roth, Karatsiolis and Krämer

Public key generation: previous implementations

- For non-f parameter sets, the task is to convert $H = [M | T]$ into $[I | M^{-1}T]$.
- The implementations below
 - use almost-inplace LUP decompositions (with $PM = LU$) and
 - generate column blocks T_i 's on demandto save time and space.

1. Previous AVX/SSE implementations mostly by Chou

- supercop-20200531 and later versions.
- 3rd-round submission package of Classic McEliece.

$$\boxed{M} \longrightarrow \begin{array}{|c|} \hline U \\ \hline L^{-1} \\ \hline \end{array} \boxed{P} \quad pk_i \leftarrow (U^{-1}(L^{-1}(PT_i)))$$

2. "Classic McEliece implementation with low memory footprint" by Roth, Karatsiolis and Krämer

$$\boxed{M} \longrightarrow \begin{array}{|c|} \hline U \\ \hline L \\ \hline \end{array} \boxed{P} \quad \text{Compute } U^{-1} \text{ and } L^{-1}, M^{-1} \leftarrow U^{-1}L^{-1}P, pk_i \leftarrow M^{-1}T_i$$

Public key generation: our implementation

- (RKK) $M \rightarrow L, U, P$

Public key generation: our implementation

- (RKK) $M \rightarrow L, U, P$
- (C) Apply P to T_i using a sorting network.
 - Represent P^{-1} as an array of indices p_1, \dots, p_{n-k} .
 - Sort $(p_1, \text{row}_1), \dots, (p_{n-k}, \text{row}_{n-k})$ based on p_i .

Public key generation: our implementation

- (RKK) $M \rightarrow L, U, P$
- (C) Apply P to T_i using a sorting network.
 - Represent P^{-1} as an array of indices p_1, \dots, p_{n-k} .
 - Sort $(p_1, \text{row}_1), \dots, (p_{n-k}, \text{row}_{n-k})$ based on p_i .
- (C) Multiply by L^{-1} or U^{-1} without computing the inverse matrices.

$$L = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \ell_0 & 1 & 0 \\ \ell_1 & \ell_2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad L^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \ell_0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \ell_1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \ell_2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Public key generation: our implementation

- (RKK) $M \rightarrow L, U, P$
- (C) Apply P to T_i using a sorting network.
 - Represent P^{-1} as an array of indices p_1, \dots, p_{n-k} .
 - Sort $(p_1, \text{row}_1), \dots, (p_{n-k}, \text{row}_{n-k})$ based on p_i .
- (C) Multiply by L^{-1} or U^{-1} without computing the inverse matrices.

$$L = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \ell_0 & 1 & 0 \\ \ell_1 & \ell_2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad L^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \ell_0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \ell_1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \ell_2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Public key generation: our implementation

- (RKK) $M \rightarrow L, U, P$
- (C) Apply P to T_i using a sorting network.
 - Represent P^{-1} as an array of indices p_1, \dots, p_{n-k} .
 - Sort $(p_1, \text{row}_1), \dots, (p_{n-k}, \text{row}_{n-k})$ based on p_i .
- (C) Multiply by L^{-1} or U^{-1} without computing the inverse matrices.

$$L = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \ell_0 & 1 & 0 \\ \ell_1 & \ell_2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad L^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \ell_0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \ell_1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \ell_2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

- (new) Makes use of blocking to optimize multiplications by L^{-1} and U^{-1} .
- We use T_i 's with 32/640 columns.
- Our implementation and (C) both support f parameter sets and decapsulation, while (RKK) does not.

Encapsulation

- Generation of the error vector e
- Matrix vector product $[I \mid pk] \cdot e^T$

Encapsulation

- Generation of the error vector e
 - Implementation strategy: generate indices of 1's and sort the indices to check for repetition.
 - Sorting must be constant-time: sorting networks are safe.
 - Observation: information of e only lies in the **set** of indices.
 - Actually any comparison-based sorting algorithm can be used: we use quicksort.
 - Might be useful for other code-based cryptosystems (e.g., BIKE and HQC).
- Matrix vector product $[I \mid pk] \cdot e^T$

Encapsulation

- Generation of the error vector e
 - Implementation strategy: generate indices of 1's and sort the indices to check for repetition.
 - Sorting must be constant-time: sorting networks are safe.
 - Observation: information of e only lies in the **set** of indices.
 - Actually any comparison-based sorting algorithm can be used: we use quicksort.
 - Might be useful for other code-based cryptosystems (e.g., BIKE and HQC).
- Matrix vector product $[I | pk] \cdot e^T$
 - Want to reduce the number of memory accesses.
 - Divide pk into 4×96 blocks so that each piece of e can be reused.



<https://github.com/pqcryptotw/mceliece-arm-m4>