

Workgroup: Network Working Group
Internet-Draft: draft-irtf-cfrg-voprf-07
Published: 6 July 2021
Intended Status: Informational
Expires: 7 January 2022
Authors: A. Davidson A. Faz-Hernandez N. Sullivan
 Brave Software Cloudflare Cloudflare
 C.A. Wood
 Cloudflare

Oblivious Pseudorandom Functions (OPRFs) using Prime-Order Groups

Abstract

An Oblivious Pseudorandom Function (OPRF) is a two-party protocol for computing the output of a PRF. One party (the server) holds the PRF secret key, and the other (the client) holds the PRF input. The 'obliviousness' property ensures that the server does not learn anything about the client's input during the evaluation. The client should also not learn anything about the server's secret PRF key. Optionally, OPRFs can also satisfy a notion 'verifiability' (VOPRF). In this setting, the client can verify that the server's output is indeed the result of evaluating the underlying PRF with just a public key. This document specifies OPRF and VOPRF constructions instantiated within prime-order groups, including elliptic curves.

Discussion Venues

This note is to be removed before publishing as an RFC.

Source for this draft and an issue tracker can be found at <https://github.com/cfrg/draft-irtf-cfrg-voprf>.

Status of This Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of BCP 78 and BCP 79.

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <https://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on 7 January 2022.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2021 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to BCP 78 and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<https://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

Table of Contents

- [1. Introduction](#)
 - [1.1. Change log](#)
 - [1.2. Requirements](#)
- [2. Preliminaries](#)
 - [2.1. Prime-Order Group Dependency](#)
 - [2.2. Conventions and Terminology](#)
- [3. \(V\)OPRF Protocol](#)
 - [3.1. Overview](#)
 - [3.2. Context Setup](#)
 - [3.3. Context APIs](#)
 - [3.3.1. Server Context](#)
 - [3.3.2. VerifiableServerContext](#)
 - [3.3.3. Client Context](#)
 - [3.3.4. VerifiableClientContext](#)
- [4. Ciphersuites](#)
 - [4.1. OPRF\(ristretto255, SHA-512\)](#)
 - [4.2. OPRF\(decaf448, SHAKE-256\)](#)
 - [4.3. OPRF\(P-256, SHA-256\)](#)
 - [4.4. OPRF\(P-384, SHA-512\)](#)
 - [4.5. OPRF\(P-521, SHA-512\)](#)
- [5. API Considerations](#)
- [6. Security Considerations](#)
 - [6.1. Security Properties](#)
 - [6.2. Cryptographic Security](#)
 - [6.2.1. Computational Hardness Assumptions](#)
 - [6.2.2. Protocol Security](#)
 - [6.2.3. Q-Strong-DH Oracle](#)
 - [6.2.4. Implications for Ciphersuite Choices](#)
 - [6.3. Domain Separation](#)
 - [6.4. Element and Scalar Validation](#)
 - [6.5. Hashing to Group](#)
 - [6.6. Blinding Considerations](#)

6.7.	Timing Leaks
6.8.	Key Rotation
6.8.1.	Parameter Commitments
7.	Acknowledgements
8.	References
8.1.	Normative References
8.2.	Informative References
Appendix A.	Test Vectors
A.1.	OPRF(ristretto255, SHA-512)
A.1.1.	Base Mode
A.1.2.	Verifiable Mode
A.2.	OPRF(decaf448, SHAKE-256)
A.2.1.	Base Mode
A.2.2.	Verifiable Mode
A.3.	OPRF(P-256, SHA-256)
A.3.1.	Base Mode
A.3.2.	Verifiable Mode
A.4.	OPRF(P-384, SHA-512)
A.4.1.	Base Mode
A.4.2.	Verifiable Mode
A.5.	OPRF(P-521, SHA-512)
A.5.1.	Base Mode
A.5.2.	Verifiable Mode
Authors' Addresses	

1. Introduction

A pseudorandom function (PRF) $F(k, x)$ is an efficiently computable function taking a private key k and a value x as input. This function is pseudorandom if the keyed function $K(_) = F(K, _)$ is indistinguishable from a randomly sampled function acting on the same domain and range as $K()$. An oblivious PRF (OPRF) is a two-party protocol between a server and a client, where the server holds a PRF key k and the client holds some input x . The protocol allows both parties to cooperate in computing $F(k, x)$ such that: the client learns $F(k, x)$ without learning anything about k ; and the server does not learn anything about x or $F(k, x)$. A Verifiable OPRF (VOPRF) is an OPRF wherein the server can prove to the client that $F(k, x)$ was computed using the key k .

The usage of OPRFs has been demonstrated in constructing a number of applications: password-protected secret sharing schemes [[JKKX16](#)]; privacy-preserving password stores [[SJKS17](#)]; and password-authenticated key exchange or PAKE [[I-D.irtf-cfrg-opaque](#)]. A VOPRF is necessary in some applications, e.g., the Privacy Pass protocol [[I-D.davidson-pp-protocol](#)], wherein this VOPRF is used to generate one-time authentication tokens to bypass CAPTCHA challenges. VOPRFs have also been used for password-protected secret sharing schemes e.g. [[JKK14](#)].

This document introduces an OPRF protocol built in prime-order groups, applying to finite fields of prime-order and also elliptic curve (EC) groups. The protocol has the option of being extended to a VOPRF with the addition of a NIZK proof for proving discrete log equality relations. This proof demonstrates correctness of the computation, using a known public key that serves as a commitment to the server's secret key. The document describes the protocol, the public-facing API, and its security properties.

1.1. Change log

[draft-07](#):

- *Bind blinding mechanism to mode (additive for verifiable mode and multiplicative for base mode).
- *Add explicit errors for deserialization.
- *Document explicit errors and API considerations.
- *Adopt SHAKE-256 for decaf448 ciphersuite.
- *Normalize HashToScalar functionality for all ciphersuites.
- *Refactor and generalize DLEQ proof functionality and domain separation tags for use in other protocols.
- *Update test vectors.
- *Apply various editorial changes.

[draft-06](#):

- *Specify of group element and scalar serialization.
- *Remove info parameter from the protocol API and update domain separation guidance.
- *Fold Unblind function into Finalize.
- *Optimize ComputeComposites for servers (using knowledge of the private key).
- *Specify deterministic key generation method.
- *Update test vectors.
- *Apply various editorial changes.

[draft-05:](#)

- *Move to ristretto255 and decaf448 ciphersuites.
- *Clean up ciphersuite definitions.
- *Pin domain separation tag construction to draft version.
- *Move key generation outside of context construction functions.
- *Editorial changes.

[draft-04:](#)

- *Introduce Client and Server contexts for controlling verifiability and required functionality.
- *Condense API.
- *Remove batching from standard functionality (included as an extension)
- *Add Curve25519 and P-256 ciphersuites for applications that prevent strong-DH oracle attacks.
- *Provide explicit prime-order group API and instantiation advice for each ciphersuite.
- *Proof-of-concept implementation in sage.
- *Remove privacy considerations advice as this depends on applications.

[draft-03:](#)

- *Certify public key during VerifiableFinalize.
- *Remove protocol integration advice.
- *Add text discussing how to perform domain separation.
- *Drop OPRF_/VOPRF_ prefix from algorithm names.
- *Make prime-order group assumption explicit.
- *Changes to algorithms accepting batched inputs.
- *Changes to construction of batched DLEQ proofs.
- *Updated ciphersuites to be consistent with hash-to-curve and added OPRF specific ciphersuites.

[draft-02](#):

- *Added section discussing cryptographic security and static DH oracles.

- *Updated batched proof algorithms.

[draft-01](#):

- *Updated ciphersuites to be in line with <https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-irtf-cfrg-hash-to-curve-04>.

- *Made some necessary modular reductions more explicit.

1.2. Requirements

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "NOT RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in BCP 14 [[RFC2119](#)] [[RFC8174](#)] when, and only when, they appear in all capitals, as shown here.

2. Preliminaries

The (V)OPRF protocol in this document has two primary dependencies:

- *GG: A prime-order group implementing the API described below in [Section 2.1](#), with base point defined in the corresponding reference for each group. (See [Section 4](#) for these base points.)

- *Hash: A cryptographic hash function that is indiffereniable from a Random Oracle, whose output length is N_h bytes long.

[Section 4](#) specifies ciphersuites as combinations of GG and Hash.

2.1. Prime-Order Group Dependency

In this document, we assume the construction of an additive, prime-order group GG for performing all mathematical operations. Such groups are uniquely determined by the choice of the prime p that defines the order of the group. We use $\text{GF}(p)$ to represent the finite field of order p . For the purpose of understanding and implementing this document, we take $\text{GF}(p)$ to be equal to the set of integers defined by $\{0, 1, \dots, p-1\}$.

The fundamental group operation is addition $+$ with identity element I . For any elements A and B of the group GG, $A + B = B + A$ is also a member of GG. Also, for any A in GG, there exists an element $-A$ such that $A + (-A) = (-A) + A = I$. Scalar multiplication is equivalent to the repeated application of the group operation on an element A with

itself $r-1$ times, this is denoted as $r*A = A + \dots + A$. For any element A , $p*A=I$. We denote G as the fixed generator of the group. Scalar base multiplication is equivalent to the repeated application of the group operation G with itself $r-1$ times, this is denoted as `ScalarBaseMult(r)`. The set of scalars corresponds to $GF(p)$. This document uses types `Element` and `Scalar` to denote elements of the group GG and its set of scalars, respectively.

We now detail a number of member functions that can be invoked on a prime-order group GG .

`*Order()`: Outputs the order of GG (i.e. p).

`*Identity()`: Outputs the identity element of the group (i.e. I).

`*HashToGroup(x)`: A member function of GG that deterministically maps an array of bytes x to an element of GG . The map must ensure that, for any adversary receiving $R = \text{HashToGroup}(x)$, it is computationally difficult to reverse the mapping. This function is optionally parameterized by a domain separation tag (DST); see [Section 4](#).

`*HashToScalar(x)`: A member function of GG that deterministically maps an array of bytes x to an element in $GF(p)$. This function is optionally parameterized by a DST; see [Section 4](#).

`*RandomScalar()`: A member function of GG that chooses at random a non-zero element in $GF(p)$.

`*SerializeElement(A)`: A member function of GG that maps a group element A to a unique byte array `buf` of fixed length N_e . The output type of this function is `SerializedElement`.

`*DeserializeElement(buf)`: A member function of GG that maps a byte array `buf` to a group element A , or fails if the input is not a valid byte representation of an element. This function can raise a `DeserializeError` if deserialization fails or A is the identity element of the group; see [Section 6.4](#).

`*SerializeScalar(s)`: A member function of GG that maps a scalar element s to a unique byte array `buf` of fixed length N_s . The output type of this function is `SerializedScalar`.

`*DeserializeScalar(buf)`: A member function of GG that maps a byte array `buf` to a scalar s , or fails if the input is not a valid byte representation of a scalar. This function can raise a `DeserializeError` if deserialization fails; see [Section 6.4](#).

Two functions can be used for generating a (V)OPRF key pair (sk_S , pk_S) where sk_S is a non-zero integer less than p and $pk_S =$

`ScalarBaseMult(skS)`: `GenerateKeyPair` and `DeriveKeyPair`. `GenerateKeyPair` is a randomized function that outputs a fresh key pair (`skS`, `pkS`) upon ever invocation. `DeriveKeyPair` is a deterministic function that generates private key `skS` from a random byte string seed, which SHOULD have at least `Ns` bytes of entropy, and then computes `pkS = ScalarBaseMult(skS)`.

It is convenient in cryptographic applications to instantiate such prime-order groups using elliptic curves, such as those detailed in [SEC2]. For some choices of elliptic curves (e.g. those detailed in [RFC7748], which require accounting for cofactors) there are some implementation issues that introduce inherent discrepancies between standard prime-order groups and the elliptic curve instantiation. In this document, all algorithms that we detail assume that the group is a prime-order group, and this MUST be upheld by any implementation. That is, any curve instantiation should be written such that any discrepancies with a prime-order group instantiation are removed. See [Section 4](#) for advice corresponding to the implementation of this interface for specific definitions of elliptic curves.

2.2. Conventions and Terminology

The following conventions are used throughout the document.

*For any object `x`, we write `len(x)` to denote its length in bytes.

*For two byte arrays `x` and `y`, write `x || y` to denote their concatenation.

*I2OSP and OS2IP: Convert a byte array to and from a non-negative integer as described in [RFC8017]. Note that these functions operate on byte arrays in big-endian byte order.

Data structure descriptions use TLS notation [RFC8446], [Section 3](#).

All algorithm descriptions are written in a Python-like pseudocode. We also use the `CT_EQUAL(a, b)` function to represent constant-time byte-wise equality between byte arrays `a` and `b`. This function returns true if `a` and `b` are equal, and false otherwise.

The following terms are used throughout this document.

*PRF: Pseudorandom Function.

*OPRF: Oblivious Pseudorandom Function.

*VOPRF: Verifiable Oblivious Pseudorandom Function.

- *Client: Protocol initiator. Learns pseudorandom function evaluation as the output of the protocol.
- *Server: Computes the pseudorandom function over a secret key. Learns nothing about the client's input.
- *NIZK: Non-interactive zero knowledge.
- *DLEQ: Discrete Logarithm Equality.

3. (V)OPRF Protocol

In this section, we define two OPRF variants: a base mode and verifiable mode. In the base mode, a client and server interact to compute $y = F(skS, x)$, where x is the client's input, skS is the server's private key, and y is the OPRF output. The client learns y and the server learns nothing. In the verifiable mode, the client also gets proof that the server used skS in computing the function.

To achieve verifiability, as in the original work of [JKK14], we provide a zero-knowledge proof that the key provided as input by the server in the Evaluate function is the same key as it used to produce their public key. As an example of the nature of attacks that this prevents, this ensures that the server uses the same private key for computing the VOPRF output and does not attempt to "tag" individual servers with select keys. This proof must not reveal the server's long-term private key to the client.

The following one-byte values distinguish between these two modes:

Mode	Value
modeBase	0x00
modeVerifiable	0x01

Table 1

3.1. Overview

Both participants agree on the mode and a choice of ciphersuite that is used before the protocol exchange. Once established, the base mode of the protocol runs to compute $output = F(skS, input)$ as follows:

Client(input)	Server(skS)
---------------	-------------

```

blind, blindedElement = Blind(input)

                                blindedElement
                                ----->

evaluatedElement, proof = Evaluate(skS, blindedElement)

                                evaluatedElement
                                <-----

output = Finalize(input, blind, evaluatedElement, blindedElement)

```

In Blind the client generates a token and blinding data. The server computes the (V)OPRF evaluation in Evaluate over the client's blinded token. In Finalize the client unblinds the server response and produces a byte array corresponding to the output of the OPRF protocol.

In the verifiable mode of the protocol, the server additionally computes a proof in Evaluate. The client verifies this proof using the server's expected public key before completing the protocol and producing the protocol output.

3.2. Context Setup

Both modes of the OPRF involve an offline setup phase. In this phase, both the client and server create a context used for executing the online phase of the protocol. The key pair (skS, pkS) should be generated by calling either GenerateKeyPair or DeriveKeyPair.

The base mode setup functions for creating client and server contexts are below:

```

def SetupBaseServer(suite, skS):
    contextString =
        "VOPRF07-" || I2OSP(modeBase, 1) || I2OSP(suite.ID, 2)
    return ServerContext(contextString, skS)

def SetupBaseClient(suite):
    contextString =
        "VOPRF07-" || I2OSP(modeBase, 1) || I2OSP(suite.ID, 2)
    return ClientContext(contextString)

```

The verifiable mode setup functions for creating client and server contexts are below:

```

def SetupVerifiableServer(suite, skS, pkS):
    contextString =
        "VOPRF07-" || I2OSP(modeVerifiable, 1) || I2OSP(suite.ID, 2)
    return VerifiableServerContext(contextString, skS)

def SetupVerifiableClient(suite, pkS):
    contextString =
        "VOPRF07-" || I2OSP(modeVerifiable, 1) || I2OSP(suite.ID, 2)
    return VerifiableClientContext(contextString, pkS)

```

Each setup function takes a ciphersuite from the list defined in [Section 4](#). Each ciphersuite has a two-byte field ID used to identify the suite.

[[RFC editor: please change "VOPRF07" to "RFCXXXX", where XXXX is the final number, here and elsewhere before publication.]]

3.3. Context APIs

In this section, we detail the APIs available on the client and server (V)OPRF contexts. Each API has the following implicit parameters:

- *GG, a prime-order group implementing the API described in [Section 2.1](#).
- *contextString, a domain separation tag taken from the client or server context.

The data type ClientInput is an opaque byte string of arbitrary length no larger than 2^{13} octets. Proof is a concatenated sequence of two SerializedScalar values, as shown below.

```
SerializedScalar Proof[2*Ns];
```

3.3.1. Server Context

The ServerContext encapsulates the context string constructed during setup and the (V)OPRF key pair. It has three functions, Evaluate, FullEvaluate and VerifyFinalize described below. Evaluate takes serialized representations of blinded group elements from the client as inputs.

FullEvaluate takes ClientInput values, and it is useful for applications that need to compute the whole OPRF protocol on the server side only.

VerifyFinalize takes ClientInput values and their corresponding output digests from Finalize as input, and returns true if the inputs match the outputs.

Note that `VerifyFinalize` and `FullEvaluate` are not used in the main OPRF protocol. They are exposed as an API for building higher-level protocols.

3.3.1.1. Evaluate

Input:

Scalar `skS`
SerializedElement `blindedElement`

Output:

SerializedElement `evaluatedElement`

Errors: `DeserializeError`

```
def Evaluate(skS, blindedElement):  
    R = GG.DeserializeElement(blindedElement)  
    Z = skS * R  
    evaluatedElement = GG.SerializeElement(Z)  
  
    return evaluatedElement
```

3.3.1.2. FullEvaluate

Input:

Scalar `skS`
ClientInput `input`

Output:

opaque `output[Nh]`

```
def FullEvaluate(skS, input):  
    P = GG.HashToGroup(input)  
    T = skS * P  
    issuedElement = GG.SerializeElement(T)  
  
    finalizeDST = "Finalize-" || contextString  
    hashInput = I2OSP(len(input), 2) || input ||  
                I2OSP(len(issuedElement), 2) || issuedElement ||  
                I2OSP(len(finalizeDST), 2) || finalizeDST  
  
    return Hash(hashInput)
```

3.3.1.3. VerifyFinalize

Input:

```
Scalar skS
ClientInput input
opaque output[Nh]
```

Output:

```
boolean valid
```

```
def VerifyFinalize(skS, input, output):
    T = GG.HashToGroup(input)
    element = GG.SerializeElement(T)
    issuedElement = Evaluate(skS, [element])
    E = GG.SerializeElement(issuedElement)

    finalizedDST = "Finalize-" || contextString
    hashInput = I2OSP(len(input), 2) || input ||
                I2OSP(len(E), 2) || E ||
                I2OSP(len(finalizedDST), 2) || finalizedDST

    digest = Hash(hashInput)

    return CT_EQUAL(digest, output)
```

3.3.2. VerifiableServerContext

The VerifiableServerContext extends the base ServerContext with an augmented Evaluate() function. This function produces a proof that skS was used in computing the result. It makes use of the helper functions GenerateProof and ComputeComposites, described below.

3.3.2.1. Evaluate

Input:

```
Scalar skS
Element pkS
SerializedElement blindedElement
```

Output:

```
SerializedElement evaluatedElement
Proof proof
```

Errors: DeserializeError

```
def Evaluate(skS, pkS, blindedElement):
    R = GG.DeserializeElement(blindedElement)
    Z = skS * R
    evaluatedElement = GG.SerializeElement(Z)

    proof = GenerateProof(skS, G, pkS, R, Z)

    return evaluatedElement, proof
```

The helper functions `GenerateProof` and `ComputeComposites` are defined below.

3.3.2.2. GenerateProof

Input:

Scalar k
Element A
Element B
Element C
Element D

Output:

Proof proof

```
def GenerateProof(k, A, B, C, D)
  Cs = [C]
  Ds = [D]
  a = ComputeCompositesFast(k, B, Cs, Ds)

  r = GG.RandomScalar()
  M = a[0]
  Z = a[1]
  t2 = r * A
  t3 = r * M

  Bm = GG.SerializeElement(B)
  a0 = GG.SerializeElement(M)
  a1 = GG.SerializeElement(Z)
  a2 = GG.SerializeElement(t2)
  a3 = GG.SerializeElement(t3)

  challengeDST = "Challenge-" || contextString
  h2Input = I2OSP(len(Bm), 2) || Bm ||
    I2OSP(len(a0), 2) || a0 ||
    I2OSP(len(a1), 2) || a1 ||
    I2OSP(len(a2), 2) || a2 ||
    I2OSP(len(a3), 2) || a3 ||
    I2OSP(len(challengeDST), 2) || challengeDST

  c = GG.HashToScalar(h2Input)
  s = (r - c * k) mod p
  proof = [GG.SerializeScalar(c), GG.SerializeScalar(s)]

  return proof
```

3.3.2.2.1. Batching inputs

Unlike other functions, `ComputeComposites` takes lists of inputs, rather than a single input. Applications can take advantage of this functionality by invoking `GenerateProof` on batches of inputs to

produce a combined, constant-size proof. (In the pseudocode above, the single inputs `blindedElement` and `evaluatedElement` are passed as one-item lists to `ComputeComposites`.)

In particular, servers can produce a single, constant-sized proof for N client inputs sent in a single request, rather than one proof per client input. This optimization benefits clients and servers since it amortizes the cost of proof generation and bandwidth across multiple requests.

3.3.2.2.2. Fresh Randomness

We note here that it is essential that a different r value is used for every invocation. If this is not done, then this may leak sk_S as is possible in Schnorr or (EC)DSA scenarios where fresh randomness is not used.

3.3.2.3. ComputeComposites

The definition of `ComputeComposites` is given below. This function is used both on generation and verification of the proof.

Input:

```
Element B
Element Cs[m]
Element Ds[m]
```

Output:

```
Element composites[2]
```

```
def ComputeComposites(B, Cs, Ds):
    Bm = GG.SerializeElement(B)
    seedDST = "Seed-" || contextString
    compositeDST = "Composite-" || contextString

    h1Input = I2OSP(len(Bm), 2) || Bm ||
               I2OSP(len(seedDST), 2) || seedDST
    seed = Hash(h1Input)

    M = GG.Identity()
    Z = GG.Identity()
    for i = 0 to m-1:
        Ci = GG.SerializeElement(Cs[i])
        Di = GG.SerializeElement(Ds[i])
        h2Input = I2OSP(len(seed), 2) || seed || I2OSP(i, 2) ||
                  I2OSP(len(Ci), 2) || Ci ||
                  I2OSP(len(Di), 2) || Di ||
                  I2OSP(len(compositeDST), 2) || compositeDST
        di = GG.HashToScalar(h2Input)
        M = di * Cs[i] + M
        Z = di * Ds[i] + Z

    return [M, Z]
```

If the private key is known, as is the case for the server, this function can be optimized as shown in ComputeCompositesFast below.

Input:

```
Scalar k
Element B
Element Cs[m]
Element Ds[m]
```

Output:

```
Element composites[2]
```

```
def ComputeCompositesFast(k, B, Cs, Ds):
    Bm = GG.SerializeElement(B)
    seedDST = "Seed-" || contextString
    compositeDST = "Composite-" || contextString

    h1Input = I2OSP(len(Bm), 2) || Bm ||
               I2OSP(len(seedDST), 2) || seedDST
    seed = Hash(h1Input)

    M = GG.Identity()
    for i = 0 to m-1:
        Ci = GG.SerializeElement(Cs[i])
        Di = GG.SerializeElement(Ds[i])
        h2Input = I2OSP(len(seed), 2) || seed || I2OSP(i, 2) ||
                  I2OSP(len(Ci), 2) || Ci ||
                  I2OSP(len(Di), 2) || Di ||
                  I2OSP(len(compositeDST), 2) || compositeDST
        di = GG.HashToScalar(h2Input)
        M = di * Cs[i] + M

    Z = k * M

    return [M, Z]
```

3.3.3. Client Context

The `ClientContext` encapsulates the context string constructed during setup. It has two functions, `Blind()` and `Finalize()`, as described below. It also has an internal function, `Unblind()`, which is used by `Finalize`. The implementation of these functions varies depending on the mode.

3.3.3.1. Blind

In this mode, blinding is done multiplicatively. Under certain application circumstances, the more optimal additive blinding mechanism described in [Section 3.3.4.2](#) can be used. See [Section 6.6](#) for more details.

Blind is implemented as follows.

Input:

ClientInput input

Output:

Scalar blind
SerializedElement blindedElement

```
def Blind(input):  
    blind = GG.RandomScalar()  
    P = GG.HashToGroup(input)  
    blindedElement = GG.SerializeElement(blind * P)  
  
    return blind, blindedElement
```

The inverse Unblind is implemented as follows.

Input:

Scalar blind
SerializedElement evaluatedElement

Output:

SerializedElement unblindedElement

Errors: DeserializationError

```
def Unblind(blind, evaluatedElement, ...):  
    Z = GG.DeserializeElement(evaluatedElement)  
    N = (blind-1) * Z  
    unblindedElement = GG.SerializeElement(N)  
  
    return unblindedElement
```

3.3.3.2. Finalize

Finalize depends on the internal Unblind function. In this mode, Finalize and does not include all inputs listed in [Section 3.1](#). These additional inputs are only useful for the verifiable mode, described in [Section 3.3.4.3](#).

Input:

```
ClientInput input
Scalar blind
SerializedElement evaluatedElement
```

Output:

```
opaque output[Nh]
```

```
def Finalize(input, blind, evaluatedElement):
    unblindedElement = Unblind(blind, evaluatedElement)

    finalizedDST = "Finalize-" || contextString
    hashInput = I2OSP(len(input), 2) || input ||
                I2OSP(len(unblindedElement), 2) || unblindedElement ||
                I2OSP(len(finalizedDST), 2) || finalizedDST
    return Hash(hashInput)
```

3.3.4. VerifiableClientContext

The VerifiableClientContext extends the base ClientContext with the desired server public key pkS with an augmented Unblind() function. This function verifies an evaluation proof using pkS. It makes use of the helper function ComputeComposites described above. It has one helper function, VerifyProof(), defined below.

3.3.4.1. VerifyProof

This algorithm outputs a boolean verified which indicates whether the proof inside of the evaluation verifies correctly, or not.

Input:

```
Element A
Element B
Element C
Element D
Proof proof
```

Output:

```
boolean verified
```

```
def VerifyProof(A, B, C, D, proof):
    Cs = [C]
    Ds = [D]

    a = ComputeComposites(B, Cs, Ds)
    c = GG.DeserializeScalar(proof[0])
    s = GG.DeserializeScalar(proof[1])

    M = a[0]
    Z = a[1]
    t2 = ((s * A) + (c * B))
    t3 = ((s * M) + (c * Z))

    Bm = GG.SerializeElement(B)
    a0 = GG.SerializeElement(M)
    a1 = GG.SerializeElement(Z)
    a2 = GG.SerializeElement(t2)
    a3 = GG.SerializeElement(t3)

    challengeDST = "Challenge-" || contextString
    h2Input = I2OSP(len(Bm), 2) || Bm ||
              I2OSP(len(a0), 2) || a0 ||
              I2OSP(len(a1), 2) || a1 ||
              I2OSP(len(a2), 2) || a2 ||
              I2OSP(len(a3), 2) || a3 ||
              I2OSP(len(challengeDST), 2) || challengeDST

    expectedC = GG.HashToScalar(h2Input)

    return CT_EQUAL(expectedC, c)
```

3.3.4.2. Verifiable Blind

In this mode, where the server public key is available for proof verification, blinding is done additively. This variant is named VerifiableBlind and VerifiableUnblind. It takes two inputs: the client input and a blinded version of the group generator. The

latter is computed using a function called VerifiablePreprocess, also described below.

VerifiableBlind is implemented as follows.

Input:

ClientInput input
Element blindedGenerator

Output:

SerializedElement blindedElement

```
def VerifiableBlind(input, blindedGenerator):  
    P = GG.HashToGroup(input)  
    blindedElement = GG.SerializeElement(P + blindedGenerator)  
  
    return blindedElement
```

The inverse VerifiableUnblind is implemented as follows. This function can raise an exception if element deserialization or proof verification fails.

Input:

Element blindedPublicKey
SerializedElement evaluatedElement
SerializedElement blindedElement
Element pkS
Scalar proof

Output:

SerializedElement unblindedElement

Errors: DeserializeError, VerifyError

```
def VerifiableUnblind(blindedPublicKey, evaluatedElement,  
                      blindedElement, pkS, proof):  
    Z = GG.DeserializeElement(evaluatedElement)  
    R = GG.DeserializeElement(blindedElement)  
    if VerifyProof(G, pkS, R, Z, proof) == false:  
        raise VerifyError  
  
    N := Z - blindedPublicKey  
    unblindedElement = GG.SerializeElement(N)  
  
    return unblindedElement
```

The internal VerifiablePreprocess function computes a blind and uses it to compute a corresponding blinded version of the group generator and server public key. This function can be used to pre-compute tables of values for future invocations of the protocol, or it can be computed only when needed for a single invocation of the protocol.

Input:

Element pkS

Output:

Element blindedGenerator

Element blindedPublicKey

Scalar blind

```
def Preprocess(pkS):
    blind = GG.RandomScalar()
    blindedGenerator = ScalarBaseMult(blind)
    blindedPublicKey = pkS * blind

    return blindedGenerator, blindedPublicKey, blind
```

3.3.4.3. Verifiable Finalize

Input:

ClientInput input
Element blindedPublicKey
SerializedElement evaluatedElement
SerializedElement blindedElement
Element pkS
Scalar proof

Output:

opaque output[Nh]

```
def Finalize(input, blindedPublicKey, evaluatedElement,
             blindedElement, pkS, proof):
    unblindedElement =
        VerifiableUnblind(blindedPublicKey, evaluatedElement,
                           blindedElement, pkS, proof)

    finalizedDST = "Finalize-" || contextString
    hashInput = I2OSP(len(input), 2) || input ||
                I2OSP(len(unblindedElement), 2) || unblindedElement ||
                I2OSP(len(finalizedDST), 2) || finalizedDST
    return Hash(hashInput)
```

4. Ciphersuites

A ciphersuite (also referred to as 'suite' in this document) for the protocol wraps the functionality required for the protocol to take place. This ciphersuite should be available to both the client and server, and agreement on the specific instantiation is assumed throughout. A ciphersuite contains instantiations of the following functionalities:

*GG: A prime-order group exposing the API detailed in [Section 2.1](#), with base point defined in the corresponding reference for each group. Each group also specifies HashToGroup, HashToScalar, and serialization functionalities. For HashToGroup, the domain separation tag (DST) is constructed in accordance with the recommendations in [\[I-D.irtf-cfrg-hash-to-curve\]](#), Section 3.1. For HashToScalar, each group specifies an integer order that is used in reducing integer values to a member of the corresponding scalar field.

*Hash: A cryptographic hash function that is indifferentiable from a Random Oracle, whose output length is N_h bytes long.

This section specifies ciphersuites with supported groups and hash functions. For each ciphersuite, contextString is that which is computed in the Setup functions.

Applications should take caution in using ciphersuites targeting P-256 and ristretto255. See [Section 6.2](#) for related discussion.

4.1. OPRF(ristretto255, SHA-512)

*Group: ristretto255 [[RISTRETTO](#)]

-HashToGroup(): Use hash_to_ristretto255 [[I-D.irtf-cfrg-hash-to-curve](#)] with DST = "HashToGroup-" || contextString, and expand_message = expand_message_xmd using SHA-512.

-HashToScalar(): Compute uniform_bytes using expand_message = expand_message_xmd, DST = "HashToScalar-" || contextString, and output length 64, interpret uniform_bytes as a 512-bit integer in little-endian order, and reduce the integer modulo Order().

-Serialization: Both group elements and scalars are encoded in $N_e = N_s = 32$ bytes. For group elements, use the 'Encode' and 'Decode' functions from [[RISTRETTO](#)]. For scalars, ensure they are fully reduced modulo Order() and in little-endian order.

*Hash: SHA-512, and $N_h = 64$.

*ID: 0x0001

4.2. OPRF(dec448, SHAKE-256)

*Group: dec448 [[RISTRETTO](#)]

-HashToGroup(): Use hash_to_dec448 [[I-D.irtf-cfrg-hash-to-curve](#)] with DST = "HashToGroup-" || contextString, and expand_message = expand_message_xof using SHAKE-256.

-HashToScalar(): Compute uniform_bytes using expand_message = expand_message_xof, DST = "HashToScalar-" || contextString, and output length 64, interpret uniform_bytes as a 512-bit integer in little-endian order, and reduce the integer modulo Order().

-Serialization: Both group elements and scalars are encoded in Ne = Ns = 56 bytes. For group elements, use the 'Encode' and 'Decode' functions from [[RISTRETTO](#)]. For scalars, ensure they are fully reduced modulo Order() and in little-endian order.

*Hash: SHAKE-256, and Nh = 64.

*ID: 0x0002

4.3. OPRF(P-256, SHA-256)

*Group: P-256 (secp256r1) [[x9.62](#)]

-HashToGroup(): Use hash_to_curve with suite P256_XMD:SHA-256_SSWU_RO_ [[I-D.irtf-cfrg-hash-to-curve](#)] and DST = "HashToGroup-" || contextString.

-HashToScalar(): Use hash_to_field from [[I-D.irtf-cfrg-hash-to-curve](#)] using L = 48, expand_message_xmd with SHA-256, DST = "HashToScalar-" || contextString, and prime modulus equal to Order().

-Serialization: Elements are serialized as Ne = 33 byte strings using compressed point encoding for the curve [[SEC1](#)]. Scalars are serialized as Ns = 32 byte strings by fully reducing the value modulo Order() and in big-endian order.

*Hash: SHA-256, and Nh = 32.

*ID: 0x0003

4.4. OPRF(P-384, SHA-512)

*Group: P-384 (secp384r1) [[x9.62](#)]

-HashToGroup(): Use hash_to_curve with suite P384_XMD:SHA-512_SSWU_RO_ [[I-D.irtf-cfrg-hash-to-curve](#)] and DST = "HashToGroup-" || contextString.

-HashToScalar(): Use hash_to_field from [[I-D.irtf-cfrg-hash-to-curve](#)] using L = 72, expand_message_xmd with SHA-512, DST = "HashToScalar-" || contextString, and prime modulus equal to Order().

-Serialization: Elements are serialized as Ne = 49 byte strings using compressed point encoding for the curve [[SEC1](#)]. Scalars are serialized as Ns = 48 byte strings by fully reducing the value modulo Order() and in big-endian order.

*Hash: SHA-512, and Nh = 64.

*ID: 0x0004

4.5. OPRF(P-521, SHA-512)

*Group: P-521 (secp521r1) [[x9.62](#)]

-HashToGroup(): Use hash_to_curve with suite P521_XMD:SHA-512_SSWU_RO_ [[I-D.irtf-cfrg-hash-to-curve](#)] and DST = "HashToGroup-" || contextString.

-HashToScalar(): Use hash_to_field from [[I-D.irtf-cfrg-hash-to-curve](#)] using L = 98, expand_message_xmd with SHA-512, DST = "HashToScalar-" || contextString, and prime modulus equal to Order().

-Serialization: Elements are serialized as Ne = 67 byte strings using compressed point encoding for the curve [[SEC1](#)]. Scalars are serialized as Ns = 66 byte strings by fully reducing the value modulo Order() and in big-endian order.

*Hash: SHA-512, and Nh = 64.

*ID: 0x0005

5. API Considerations

Some VOPRF APIs specified in this document are fallible. For example, Finalize and Evaluate can fail if any element received from the peer fails deserialization. The explicit errors generated

throughout this specification, along with the conditions that lead to each error, are as follows:

*VerifyError: VOPRF proof verification failed; [Section 3.3.4.2](#).

*DeserializeError: Group element or scalar deserialization failure; [Section 2.1](#).

The errors in this document are meant as a guide to implementors. They are not an exhaustive list of all the errors an implementation might emit. For example, implementations might run out of memory and return a corresponding error.

6. Security Considerations

This section discusses the cryptographic security of our protocol, along with some suggestions and trade-offs that arise from the implementation of an OPRF.

6.1. Security Properties

The security properties of an OPRF protocol with functionality $y = F(k, x)$ include those of a standard PRF. Specifically:

*Pseudorandomness: F is pseudorandom if the output $y = F(k, x)$ on any input x is indistinguishable from uniformly sampling any element in F 's range, for a random sampling of k .

In other words, consider an adversary that picks inputs x from the domain of F and evaluates F on (k, x) (without knowledge of randomly sampled k). Then the output distribution $F(k, x)$ is indistinguishable from the output distribution of a randomly chosen function with the same domain and range.

A consequence of showing that a function is pseudorandom, is that it is necessarily non-malleable (i.e. we cannot compute a new evaluation of F from an existing evaluation). A genuinely random function will be non-malleable with high probability, and so a pseudorandom function must be non-malleable to maintain indistinguishability.

An OPRF protocol must also satisfy the following property:

*Oblivious: The server must learn nothing about the client's input or the output of the function. In addition, the client must learn nothing about the server's private key.

Essentially, obliviousness tells us that, even if the server learns the client's input x at some point in the future, then the server

will not be able to link any particular OPRF evaluation to x . This property is also known as unlinkability [[DGSTV18](#)].

Optionally, for any protocol that satisfies the above properties, there is an additional security property:

*Verifiable: The client must only complete execution of the protocol if it can successfully assert that the OPRF output it computes is correct. This is taken with respect to the OPRF key held by the server.

Any OPRF that satisfies the 'verifiable' security property is known as a verifiable OPRF, or VOPRF for short. In practice, the notion of verifiability requires that the server commits to the key before the actual protocol execution takes place. Then the client verifies that the server has used the key in the protocol using this commitment. In the following, we may also refer to this commitment as a public key.

6.2. Cryptographic Security

Below, we discuss the cryptographic security of the (V)OPRF protocol from [Section 3](#), relative to the necessary cryptographic assumptions that need to be made.

6.2.1. Computational Hardness Assumptions

Each assumption states that the problems specified below are computationally difficult to solve in relation to a particular choice of security parameter sp .

Let $GG = GG(sp)$ be a group with prime-order p , and let $GF(p)$ be a finite field of order p .

6.2.1.1. Discrete-log (DL) Problem

Given G , a generator of GG , and $H = hG$ for some h in $GF(p)$; output h .

6.2.1.2. Decisional Diffie-Hellman (DDH) Problem

Sample uniformly at random d in $\{0,1\}$. Given (G, aG, bG, C) , where

* G is a generator of GG ;

* a, b are elements of $GF(p)$;

*if $d == 0$: $C = abG$; else: C is sampled uniformly at random from GG .

Output $d' == d$.

6.2.2. Protocol Security

Our OPRF construction is based on the VOPRF construction known as 2HashDH-NIZK given by [JKK14]; essentially without providing zero-knowledge proofs that verify that the output is correct. Our VOPRF construction is identical to the [JKK14] construction, except that we can optionally perform multiple VOPRF evaluations in one go, whilst only constructing one NIZK proof object. This is enabled using an established batching technique.

Consequently, the cryptographic security of our construction is based on the assumption that the One-More Gap DH is computationally difficult to solve.

The (N, Q) -One-More Gap DH (OMDH) problem asks the following.

Given:

- G , $k * G$, and $(G_1, \dots, G_N)$, all elements of GG ;
- oracle access to an OPRF functionality using the key k ;
- oracle access to DDH solvers.

Find $Q+1$ pairs of the form below:

$(G_{j_s}, k * G_{j_s})$

where the following conditions hold:

- s is a number between 1 and $Q+1$;
- j_s is a number between 1 and N for each s ;
- Q is the number of allowed queries.

The original paper [JKK14] gives a security proof that the 2HashDH-NIZK construction satisfies the security guarantees of a VOPRF protocol [Section 6.1](#) under the OMDH assumption in the universal composability (UC) security model.

6.2.3. Q-Strong-DH Oracle

A side-effect of our OPRF design is that it allows instantiation of an oracle for constructing Q -strong-DH (Q -sDH) samples. The Q -Strong-DH problem asks the following.

Given $G_1, G_2, h * G_2, (h^2) * G_2, \dots, (h^Q) * G_2$; for G_1 and G_2 generators of GG .

Output $((1/(k+c)) * G_1, c)$ where c is an element of $GF(p)$

The assumption that this problem is hard was first introduced in [BB04]. Since then, there have been a number of cryptanalytic

studies that have reduced the security of the assumption below that implied by the group instantiation (for example, [BG04] and [Cheon06]). In summary, the attacks reduce the security of the group instantiation by $\log_2(Q)/2$ bits. Note that the attacks only work in situations where Q divides $p-1$ or $p+1$, where p is the order of the prime-order group used to instantiate the OPRF.

As an example, suppose that a group instantiation is used that provides 128 bits of security against discrete log cryptanalysis. Then an adversary with access to a Q -SDH oracle and makes $Q=2^{20}$ queries can reduce the security of the instantiation by $\log_2(2^{20})/2 = 10$ bits. Launching an attack would require $2^{(p/2-\log_2(Q)/2)}$ bits of memory.

Notice that it is easy to instantiate a Q -SDH oracle using the OPRF functionality that we provide. A client can just submit sequential queries of the form $(G, k * G, (k^2)G, \dots, (k^{(Q-1)})G)$, where each query is the output of the previous interaction. This means that any client that submits Q queries to the OPRF can use the aforementioned attacks to reduce the security of the group instantiation by $(\log_2(Q)/2)$ bits.

Recall that from a malicious client's perspective, the adversary wins if they can distinguish the OPRF interaction from a protocol that computes the ideal functionality provided by the PRF.

6.2.4. Implications for Ciphersuite Choices

The OPRF instantiations that we recommend in this document are informed by the cryptanalytic discussion above. In particular, choosing elliptic curves configurations that describe 128-bit group instantiations would appear to in fact instantiate an OPRF with $128 - (\log_2(Q)/2)$ bits of security. Moreover, such attacks are only possible for those certain applications where the adversary can query the OPRF directly. In applications where such an oracle is not made available this security loss does not apply.

In most cases, it would require an informed and persistent attacker to launch a highly expensive attack to reduce security to anything much below 100 bits of security. We see this possibility as something that may result in problems in the future. For applications that admit the aforementioned oracle functionality, and that cannot tolerate discrete logarithm security of lower than 128 bits, we recommend only implementing ciphersuites with IDs 0x0002, 0x0004, and 0x0005.

6.3. Domain Separation

Applications SHOULD construct input to the protocol to provide domain separation. Any system which has multiple (V)OPRF

applications should distinguish client inputs to ensure the OPRF results are separate. Guidance for constructing info can be found in [[I-D.irtf-cfrg-hash-to-curve](#)]; Section 3.1.

6.4. Element and Scalar Validation

The `DeserializeElement` function recovers a group element from an arbitrary byte array. This function validates that the element is a proper member of the group and is not the identity element, and returns an error if either condition is not met.

For P-256, P-384, and P-521 ciphersuites, this function performs partial public-key validation as defined in Section 5.6.2.3.4 of [[keyagreement](#)]. This includes checking that the coordinates are in the correct range, that the point is on the curve, and that the point is not the point at infinity. If these checks fail, deserialization returns an error.

For ristretto255 and decaf448, elements are deserialized by invoking the `Decode` function from [[RISTRETTO](#)], [Section 4.3.1](#) and [[RISTRETTO](#)], [Section 5.3.1](#), respectively, which returns false if the element is invalid. If this function returns false, deserialization returns an error.

The `DeserializeScalar` function recovers a scalar field element from an arbitrary byte array. Like `DeserializeElement`, this function validates that the element is a member of the scalar field and returns an error if this condition is not met.

For P-256, P-384, and P-521 ciphersuites, this function ensures that the input, when treated as a big-endian integer, is a value between 0 and `Order()`. For ristretto255 and decaf448, this function ensures that the input, when treated as a little-endian integer, is a value between 0 and `Order()`.

6.5. Hashing to Group

A critical requirement of implementing the prime-order group using elliptic curves is a method to instantiate the function `GG.HashToGroup`, that maps inputs to group elements. In the elliptic curve setting, this deterministically maps inputs x (as byte arrays) to uniformly chosen points on the curve.

In the security proof of the construction Hash is modeled as a random oracle. This implies that any instantiation of `GG.HashToGroup` must be pre-image and collision resistant. In [Section 4](#) we give instantiations of this functionality based on the functions described in [[I-D.irtf-cfrg-hash-to-curve](#)]. Consequently, any OPRF implementation must adhere to the implementation and security

considerations discussed in [[I-D.irtf-cfrg-hash-to-curve](#)] when instantiating the function.

6.6. Blinding Considerations

This document makes use of two types of blinding variants: multiplicative and additive. The advantage of additive blinding is that it allows the client to pre-process tables of blinded scalar multiplications for the group generator and server public key. This can provide a computational efficiency advantage (due to the fact that a fixed-base multiplication can be calculated faster than a variable-base multiplication). Pre-processing also reduces the amount of computation that needs to be done in the online exchange.

However, the choice of blinding mechanism has security implications. [[JKX21](#)] analyze the security properties of both blinding mechanisms used in this document. The results can be summarized as follows:

- *Multiplicative blinding is safe for all applications.

- *Additive blinding is possibly unsafe, unless one of the following conditions are met:

- The client has a certified copy of the server public key (as is the case in the verifiable mode);
- The client input has high entropy; and
- The client mixes the public key into the OPRF evaluation.

To avoid security issues with the base mode, where some of the above conditions may not be met, this specification RECOMMENDS use of multiplicative blinding. This is because it is not known if the server public key is available or if the client input has high entropy. Applications wherein either of these conditions are true MAY use additive blinding.

The verifiable mode always makes use of the more efficient additive blinding variant, as the public key is always available for verifying the proof.

6.7. Timing Leaks

To ensure no information is leaked during protocol execution, all operations that use secret data MUST run in constant time. Operations that SHOULD run in constant time include all prime-order group operations and proof-specific operations (`GenerateProof()` and `VerifyProof()`).

6.8. Key Rotation

Since the server's key is critical to security, the longer it is exposed by performing (V)OPRF operations on client inputs, the longer it is possible that the key can be compromised. For example, if the key is kept in circulation for a long period of time, then it also allows the clients to make enough queries to launch more powerful variants of the Q-sDH attacks from [Section 6.2.3](#).

To combat attacks of this nature, regular key rotation should be employed on the server-side. A suitable key-cycle for a key used to compute (V)OPRF evaluations would be between one week and six months.

6.8.1. Parameter Commitments

For some applications, it may be desirable for the server to bind tokens to certain parameters, e.g., protocol versions, ciphersuites, etc. To accomplish this, the server should use a distinct scalar for each parameter combination. Upon redemption of a token T from the client, the server can later verify that T was generated using the scalar associated with the corresponding parameters.

7. Acknowledgements

This document resulted from the work of the Privacy Pass team [[PrivacyPass](#)]. The authors would also like to acknowledge helpful conversations with Hugo Krawczyk. Eli-Shaoul Khedouri provided additional review and comments on key consistency. Daniel Bourdrez, Tatiana Bradley, Sofia Celi, Frank Denis, and Bas Westerbaan also provided helpful input and contributions to the document.

8. References

8.1. Normative References

- [BB04] "Short Signatures Without Random Oracles", <<http://ai.stanford.edu/~xb/eurocrypt04a/bbsigs.pdf>>.
- [BG04] "The Static Diffie-Hellman Problem", <<https://eprint.iacr.org/2004/306>>.
- [Cheon06] "Security Analysis of the Strong Diffie-Hellman Problem", <<https://www.iacr.org/archive/eurocrypt2006/40040001/40040001.pdf>>.
- [DGSTV18] "Privacy Pass, Bypassing Internet Challenges Anonymously", <<https://www.degruyter.com/view/j/popets.2018.2018.issue-3/popets-2018-0026/popets-2018-0026.xml>>.

[I-D.davidson-pp-protocol]

Davidson, A., "Privacy Pass: The Protocol", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-davidson-pp-protocol-01, 13 July 2020, <<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-davidson-pp-protocol-01>>.

[I-D.irtf-cfrg-hash-to-curve] Faz-Hernandez, A., Scott, S.,

Sullivan, N., Wahby, R. S., and C. A. Wood, "Hashing to Elliptic Curves", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-irtf-cfrg-hash-to-curve-11, 13 April 2021, <<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-irtf-cfrg-hash-to-curve-11>>.

[I-D.irtf-cfrg-opaque] Krawczyk, H., Bourdrez, D., Lewi, K., and C.

A. Wood, "The OPAQUE Asymmetric PAKE Protocol", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-irtf-cfrg-opaque-05, 7 June 2021, <<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-irtf-cfrg-opaque-05>>.

[JKK14]

"Round-Optimal Password-Protected Secret Sharing and T-PAKE in the Password-Only model", <<https://eprint.iacr.org/2014/650>>.

[JKKX16]

"Highly-Efficient and Composable Password-Protected Secret Sharing (Or, How to Protect Your Bitcoin Wallet Online)", <<https://eprint.iacr.org/2016/144>>.

[PrivacyPass] "Privacy Pass", <<https://github.com/privacypass/challenge-bypass-server>>.

[RFC2119]

Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2119>>.

[RFC7748]

Langley, A., Hamburg, M., and S. Turner, "Elliptic Curves for Security", RFC 7748, DOI 10.17487/RFC7748, January 2016, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc7748>>.

[RFC8017]

Moriarty, K., Ed., Kaliski, B., Jonsson, J., and A. Rusch, "PKCS #1: RSA Cryptography Specifications Version 2.2", RFC 8017, DOI 10.17487/RFC8017, November 2016, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc8017>>.

[RFC8174]

Leiba, B., "Ambiguity of Uppercase vs Lowercase in RFC 2119 Key Words", BCP 14, RFC 8174, DOI 10.17487/RFC8174, May 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc8174>>.

[RISTRETTO]

Valence, H. D., Grigg, J., Tankersley, G., Valsorda, F., Lovecruft, I., and M. Hamburg, "The ristretto255 and

decaf448 Groups", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-irtf-cfrg-ristretto255-decaf448-00, 5 October 2020, <<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-irtf-cfrg-ristretto255-decaf448-00>>.

- [SEC1] Standards for Efficient Cryptography Group (SECG), ., "SEC 1: Elliptic Curve Cryptography", <<https://www.secg.org/sec1-v2.pdf>>.
- [SEC2] Standards for Efficient Cryptography Group (SECG), ., "SEC 2: Recommended Elliptic Curve Domain Parameters", <<http://www.secg.org/sec2-v2.pdf>>.
- [SJKS17] "SPHINX, A Password Store that Perfectly Hides from Itself", <<https://eprint.iacr.org/2018/695>>.
- [x9.62] ANSI, "Public Key Cryptography for the Financial Services Industry: the Elliptic Curve Digital Signature Algorithm (ECDSA)", ANSI X9.62-1998, September 1998.

8.2. Informative References

- [JKX21] Jarecki, S., Krawczyk, H., and J. Xu, "On the (In)Security of the Diffie-Hellman Oblivious PRF with Multiplicative Blinding", PKC'21 , March 2021, <<https://eprint.iacr.org/2021/273>>.
- [keyagreement] Barker, E., Chen, L., Roginsky, A., Vassilev, A., and R. Davis, "Recommendation for pair-wise key-establishment schemes using discrete logarithm cryptography", National Institute of Standards and Technology report, DOI 10.6028/nist.sp.800-56ar3, April 2018, <<https://doi.org/10.6028/nist.sp.800-56ar3>>.
- [RFC8446] Rescorla, E., "The Transport Layer Security (TLS) Protocol Version 1.3", RFC 8446, DOI 10.17487/RFC8446, August 2018, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc8446>>.

Appendix A. Test Vectors

This section includes test vectors for the (V)OPRF protocol specified in this document. For each ciphersuite specified in [Section 4](#), there is a set of test vectors for the protocol when run in the base mode and verifiable mode. Each test vector lists the batch size for the evaluation. Each test vector value is encoded as a hexadecimal byte string. The label for each test vector value is described below.

*"Input": The client input, an opaque byte string.


```
Input = 00
Blind = ed8366feb6b1d05d1f46acb727061e43aadfafe9c10e5a64e7518d63e326
3503
BlindedElement = 66a2835d9da73ecf1ea433bca7ae2b887995cf4b1ffc14f77de
0a417e880a534
EvaluationElement = 8ac09f2a720b3ff03373776edaff052ac4cbe685737df20b
82f6ae1829b21f25
EvaluationProofC = a82634a5381954a31a2f537f76a6765ed6965ed5a48599b41
064d213b06e4b0f
EvaluationProofS = 4b8e4ce683fdc433965db51efb9573a669e83ed5982b05a48
3b71fa181179e0c
Output = e694146179b874ff64f0c9ec59c292031e7d3386703d0ed129cfee98eec
eeb184c0335c7c28be75f7298a33a48c05b2acbd36169a075e495f710c490b404ce3
0
```

```
Input = 5a5a5a5a5a5a5a5a5a5a5a5a5a5a5a5a  
Blind = e6d0f1d89ad552e383d6c6f4e8598cc3037d6e274d22da3089e7afbd4171  
ea02  
BlindedElement = 122d4446e76662865ff48a7f1117eab928cfdaafcaca237e3b424  
7cb9c6761fd0f  
EvaluationElement = 6438480e8cbff8afbcd23f8655910388a9251874b008e1aa  
9ff36f3f89c0e02a  
EvaluationProofC = c7a18f8d95aceb7f5948cb3c8747b3d33900a6f3d7ccb9236  
5860da919ebd705  
EvaluationProofS = 67e02e92883fa976ca171b87807450af9ac638581311bd5bc  
cc9efa8ddae020a  
Output = aa5475f7d60613eab56bf317ea10340ed26be9cbea9685f2617f5a68d55  
09a485a15d4db1b41c3ef0f68dd54cc3a4a53d92813797babbb0683b71263f5e63b3f
```

A.1.2.3. Test Vector 3, Batch Size 2

[illegible]

A.2. OPRF(decaf448, SHAKE-256)

A.2.1. Base Mode

[illegible]

A.2.1.1. Test Vector 1, Batch Size 1

```
Input = 00
Blind = d1080372f0fcf8c5eace50914e7127f576725f215cc7c111673c635ce668
bbbb9b50601ad89b358ab8c23ed0b6c9d040365ec9d060868714
BlindedElement = 984e0a443ee194090737df4afb402253f216b77650c91d252b6
638e1179723d51a4154b88eae396f1320f5df3c4b17f779516c456e364bd1
EvaluationElement = ec07794d109d5dd976bac4f23a4d041f4abd17017af78add
5dd87c66db44590131e23dd3e30310f43284b9e0b874041105eb8201ad584830
Output = e2d48872c64bd0e62cd6165c0a75399bbf6cecf39b85230c2748ccf7ebf
376d28394ac0b9518e1adb070c6952b5ab897e1cbce5f9d78ec8935de59f58210321
a
```

A.2.1.2. Test Vector 2, Batch Size 1

```
Input = 5a5a5a5a5a5a5a5a5a5a5a5a5a5a5a5a5a
Blind = aed1ffa44fd8f0ed16373606a3cf7df589cca86d8ea1abbf5768771dbef3
d401c74ae55ba1e28b9565e1e4018eb261a14134a4ce60c1c718
BlindedElement = 4aa751f84b2634b73efa364b03e60b92b84f457576e6b369eea
b76140e3859d10d2e98174f13f5a2c70670529ccf093d5f1aaf355b4f830b
EvaluationElement = 429e9d382354f8079cc1e353ef431243cdfca5ec35eb662f
2214b96483e5e6392f15734dd56d65c0c1600d7fd685315831d11f3c33e7230d
Output = b57a408fa6dafе00091e6f6b3d0086bc21ae9c4ead173987672e92f7116
2fea3970341cd63bc33ca442302474bbf95db41cd2b9fa0f2a607b6b4f57443a2f4b
5
```

A.2.2. Verifiable Mode

[illegible]

A.2.2.1. Test Vector 1, Batch Size 1

```
Input = 00
Blind = 4c936db1779a621b6c71475ac3111fd5703a59b713929f36dfd1e892a7fe
814479c93d8b4b6e11d1f6fe5351e51457b665fa7b76074e531f
BlindedElement = c0c9b0d321c4e7c8c13b910428196af3f36d5dae4796e2577fb
51493d3204cc1ee7732d81e0429195e4ad9226b84797feb261bfb2dbe48e9
EvaluationElement = a8f7614c46fb27a49f22fd3d3795d4f96667dfa075d967d7
3e32e9eb0e6705055dfc4446b20c8600cb1a6e636b9066217690c9ee9cd509c0
EvaluationProofC = 199a534bc888fb31dc08a1a1374c669ae61578ba7d51c0d40
f5169e35f95eda58fa7801d30593206b4df72de0680956dff2d8ded5b56e324
EvaluationProofS = 91370471e63326a97f0b2830c4caf95129ac603fd504496fc
cb559c9109e079c49a504acbef4dd6e64ef2f429286f40fff00f4c6a7a57a107
Output = 31c251b66b1fafa46519252c9fc018dd117f219697f45e38bda7253d9cd
02d5a631600387c4863139ea79b3c036c706e70040d2148c43fa2fd47ea3d1d6f42e
5
```

A.2.2.2. Test Vector 2, Batch Size 1

[illegible]

A.2.2.3. Test Vector 3, Batch Size 2

[illegible]

A.3. OPRF(P-256, SHA-256)

A.3.1. Base Mode

```
seed = a3a3a3a3a3a3a3a3a3a3a3a3a3a3a3a3a3a3a3a3a3a3a3a3a3a3a3a3a3a3a3  
skSm = a1b2355828f2c76de6749af9d093bd9fe0f2cada3ec653cd9a6d3126a7a78  
27b
```

A.3.1.1. Test Vector 1, Batch Size 1

```
Input = 00
Blind = 5d9e7f6efd3093c32ecceabd57fb03cf760c926d2a7bfa265babf29ec98a
f0d0
BlindedElement = 03e3c379698da853d9844098fa0ac676970d5ec24167b598714
cd2ee188604ddd2
EvaluationElement = 03ea54e8d095332d1a601a3f8a5013188aea036bf9b56323
6f7fd3b046908b42fd
Output = 464e3e51e4086a824d9a2f939524d7069ae4072a788bc9d5daa0762b258
26437
```

A.3.1.2. Test Vector 2, Batch Size 1

[illegible]

A.3.2. Verifiable Mode

[illegible]

A.3.2.1. Test Vector 1, Batch Size 1

```
Input = 00
Blind = cee64d86fd20ab4caa264a26c0e3d42fb773b3173ba76f9588c9b14779bd
8d91
BlindedElement = 03a734663e3eb29474c79996fe1d0662071594ed7a27832e214
9bad364e44784c5
EvaluationElement = 022ca51b981dd6bd5e08ad7f16ed0e08e67270fe2fc0df76
0be8f95019ffba50c6
EvaluationProofC = d7403f40351dc210d55b78ee34671b2f239faf264b5af8aec
a3101ada4ff8643
EvaluationProofS = 6d7cb0e2697bf197578e6dde7abf09d31cf782260e471c930
e79acc6949df83e
Output = 63e261480afa379117f23016997d6c8558262407d54c588881b74650a7c
cdfd1
```

A.3.2.2. Test Vector 2, Batch Size 1

```
Input = 5a5a5a5a5a5a5a5a5a5a5a5a5a5a5a  
Blind = 5c4b401063eff0bf242b4cd534a79bacfc2e715b2db1e7a3ad4ff8af1b24daa2  
BlindedElement = 03b6bc0a56d6ed8461a06605c1b293e768d418dc9c42b8851c1a49292456dd1dad  
EvaluationElement = 0349529dc853a564345aa04a9512a088ad69c5064b1108f8edfe914c5b74e03f58  
EvaluationProofC = 88185c7c3a5fdbef24fc37c39925d745b4a286ec9234f32a3dbf36c5b5261230  
EvaluationProofS = aac945f48e297e4d70ed819688176030ffe370bfe2292a12c4570b83ba7912a0  
Output = 1232618e21b6c287ac80fcbe3fbcb5013d6ec858a1529abf628514c0c19c16570
```

A.3.2.3. Test Vector 3, Batch Size 2

[illegible]

A.4. OPRF(P-384, SHA-512)

A.4.1. Base Mode

[illegible]

[illegible]

A.5.1. Base Mode

[illegible]

```
Input = 00
Blind = 01b983705fcc9a39607288b935b0797ac6b3c4b2e848823ac9ae16b3a3b5
816be03432370deb7c3c17d9fc7cb4e0ce646e04e42d638e0fa7a434ed340772a8b5
d626
BlindedElement = 0301f0a8c68e58f5571bd39fe3b0b2aa055a8c34e3d68ba0d2e
d177db0bc7575d477ed8f557596feb5ac568fe738eee8cff7dcb56dc78f52bf381c0
912e0e84b5a3f5b
EvaluationElement = 0200babff80ca9060825acc2e53da599016aa4685f3c3f38
ad71dafe4200b26a588cd040fb56947c78929fc1bc56075bedbb363f28bcf65e33c6
fe7f938783a2dfa97e
Output = da67996ac63b34db17ae15c98edd21565286d7549970f260c2f1360c62e
418c3695fa61e50c39df59be2e14376abb6732c07a627a7b49ac4615544e95b47afa
c
```



```
Input = 5a5a5a5a5a5a5a5a5a5a5a5a5a5a5a5a5a5a
Blind = 009055c99bf9591cb0eab2a72d044c05ca2cc2ef9b609a38546f74b6d688
f70cf205f782fa11a0d61b2f5a8a2a1143368327f3077c68a1545e9aafbbba6a90dc0
d40a
BlindedElement = 0201a8d0747e840cedd4586ca5382ef51031c9fb7074fcf6c9b
7acd6c74ee80dd33efa01f91cd3f50c9685fdea84c8a779cf8a3a6caedeb8050a782
241f8469d641d1a
EvaluationElement = 0200470a42df4d40ddaebb7e4a3e308c09396e4f0217fb62
ffd1aad6f35449c41e655a0b073a82003b192685dc5567096a2ad690128dfdd62693
c97cd54e536b044ad5
EvaluationProofC = 01c01a155fd0c0e690f44cd2e4771b9c4cbc95d84e517f103
79b5e59e643c4c28b480b2a582e8dc03f1fb1f9dd26b73a7fbc9443c5cf543d288d4
3d078fe9db1f3a1
EvaluationProofS = 01bb2e45130b23cf6af1ac7777ac1c6189d0b3740c6fb1130
69bed943fd19d4093c6c1ffd872964189a02f5948d7f06d2090321510a46beabe6b6
19d84d4c23065f5
Output = 93d48a50859a56aabe4d19f4517eff37494959536381b8c072f7d968335
dae63d62b98b448160be9559c680a4bb2aee54acd8f26fd2ce6d6e7f714124a5c56b
5
```

[illegible]

Alex Davidson
Brave Software

Armando Faz-Hernandez
Cloudflare
101 Townsend St
San Francisco,
United States of America

Nick Sullivan
Cloudflare
101 Townsend St
San Francisco,
United States of America

Email: nick@cloudflare.com

Christopher A. Wood
Cloudflare
101 Townsend St
San Francisco,
United States of America

Email: caw@heapingbits.net