

CFRG
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Informational
Expires: 14 April 2021

A. Faz-Hernandez
Cloudflare
S. Scott
Cornell Tech
N. Sullivan
Cloudflare
R.S. Wahby
Stanford University
C.A. Wood
Cloudflare
11 October 2020

Hashing to Elliptic Curves
draft-irtf-cfrg-hash-to-curve-10

Abstract

This document specifies a number of algorithms for encoding or hashing an arbitrary string to a point on an elliptic curve.

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 14 April 2021.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2020 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	5
1.1.	Requirements Notation	6
2.	Background	6
2.1.	Elliptic curves	6
2.2.	Terminology	7
2.2.1.	Mappings	8
2.2.2.	Encodings	8
2.2.3.	Random oracle encodings	9
2.2.4.	Serialization	9
2.2.5.	Domain separation	9
3.	Encoding byte strings to elliptic curves	10
3.1.	Domain separation requirements	12
4.	Utility functions	13
4.1.	The <code>sgn0</code> function	15
5.	Hashing to a finite field	16
5.1.	Security considerations	17
5.2.	Efficiency considerations in extension fields	17
5.3.	<code>hash_to_field</code> implementation	18
5.4.	<code>expand_message</code>	19
5.4.1.	<code>expand_message_xmd</code>	20
5.4.2.	<code>expand_message_xof</code>	22
5.4.3.	Using DSTs longer than 255 bytes	22
5.4.4.	Defining other <code>expand_message</code> variants	23
6.	Deterministic mappings	24
6.1.	Choosing a mapping function	24
6.2.	Interface	24
6.3.	Notation	25
6.4.	Sign of the resulting point	25
6.5.	Exceptional cases	25
6.6.	Mappings for Weierstrass curves	26
6.6.1.	Shallue-van de Woestijne method	26
6.6.2.	Simplified Shallue-van de Woestijne-Ulas method	27
6.6.3.	Simplified SWU for $AB \neq 0$	28
6.7.	Mappings for Montgomery curves	30
6.7.1.	Elligator 2 method	30
6.8.	Mappings for twisted Edwards curves	31
6.8.1.	Rational maps from Montgomery to twisted Edwards curves	31
6.8.2.	Elligator 2 method	32
7.	Clearing the cofactor	32
8.	Suites for hashing	33
8.1.	Implementing a hash-to-curve suite	35

8.2.	Suites for NIST P-256	36
8.3.	Suites for NIST P-384	37
8.4.	Suites for NIST P-521	38
8.5.	Suites for curve25519 and edwards25519	38
8.6.	Suites for curve448 and edwards448	40
8.7.	Suites for secp256k1	41
8.8.	Suites for BLS12-381	42
8.8.1.	BLS12-381 G1	42
8.8.2.	BLS12-381 G2	43
8.9.	Defining a new hash-to-curve suite	44
8.10.	Suite ID naming conventions	45
9.	IANA considerations	46
10.	Security considerations	46
10.1.	encode_to_curve: output distribution and indifferentiability	48
10.2.	hash_to_field security	49
10.3.	expand_message_xmd security	49
10.4.	Domain separation recommendations	50
10.5.	Target security levels	53
11.	Acknowledgements	53
12.	Contributors	54
13.	References	54
13.1.	Normative References	54
13.2.	Informative References	55
Appendix A.	Related work	63
Appendix B.	Hashing to ristretto255	65
Appendix C.	Hashing to decaf448	66
Appendix D.	Rational maps	68
D.1.	Generic Montgomery to twisted Edwards map	68
D.2.	Weierstrass to Montgomery map	70
Appendix E.	Isogeny maps for suites	70
E.1.	3-isogeny map for secp256k1	71
E.2.	11-isogeny map for BLS12-381 G1	72
E.3.	3-isogeny map for BLS12-381 G2	76
Appendix F.	Straight-line implementations of deterministic mappings	78
F.1.	Shallue-van de Woestijne method	78
F.2.	Simplified SWU method	79
F.3.	Elligator 2 method	80
Appendix G.	Optimized sample code	81
G.1.	Interface and projective coordinate systems	81
G.2.	Simplified SWU	82
G.2.1.	$q = 3 \pmod{4}$	82
G.2.2.	$q = 5 \pmod{8}$	85
G.2.3.	$q = 9 \pmod{16}$	86
G.3.	Elligator 2	88
G.3.1.	curve25519 ($q = 5 \pmod{8}$, $K = 1$)	88
G.3.2.	edwards25519	89

G.3.3.	curve448 ($q = 3 \pmod{4}$, $K = 1$)	90
G.3.4.	edwards448	91
G.3.5.	$q = 3 \pmod{4}$	93
G.3.6.	$q = 5 \pmod{8}$	95
G.4.	Cofactor clearing for BLS12-381 G2	96
Appendix H.	Scripts for parameter generation	98
H.1.	Finding Z for the Shallue-van de Woestijne map	98
H.2.	Finding Z for Simplified SWU	99
H.3.	Finding Z for Elligator 2	100
Appendix I.	sqrt and is_square functions	100
I.1.	$q = 3 \pmod{4}$	101
I.2.	$q = 5 \pmod{8}$	101
I.3.	$q = 9 \pmod{16}$	101
I.4.	Constant-time Tonelli-Shanks algorithm	102
I.5.	is_square for $F = GF(p^2)$	103
Appendix J.	Suite test vectors	104
J.1.	NIST P-256	104
J.1.1.	P256_XMD:SHA-256_SSWU_RO_	104
J.1.2.	P256_XMD:SHA-256_SSWU_NU_	106
J.2.	NIST P-384	108
J.2.1.	P384_XMD:SHA-512_SSWU_RO_	108
J.2.2.	P384_XMD:SHA-512_SSWU_NU_	110
J.3.	NIST P-521	112
J.3.1.	P521_XMD:SHA-512_SSWU_RO_	112
J.3.2.	P521_XMD:SHA-512_SSWU_NU_	115
J.4.	curve25519	117
J.4.1.	curve25519_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_RO_	117
J.4.2.	curve25519_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_NU_	119
J.5.	edwards25519	121
J.5.1.	edwards25519_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_RO_	121
J.5.2.	edwards25519_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_NU_	123
J.6.	curve448	125
J.6.1.	curve448_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_RO_	125
J.6.2.	curve448_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_NU_	128
J.7.	edwards448	130
J.7.1.	edwards448_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_RO_	130
J.7.2.	edwards448_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_NU_	133
J.8.	secp256k1	135
J.8.1.	secp256k1_XMD:SHA-256_SSWU_RO_	135
J.8.2.	secp256k1_XMD:SHA-256_SSWU_NU_	137
J.9.	BLS12-381 G1	139
J.9.1.	BLS12381G1_XMD:SHA-256_SSWU_RO_	139
J.9.2.	BLS12381G1_XMD:SHA-256_SSWU_NU_	141
J.10.	BLS12-381 G2	143
J.10.1.	BLS12381G2_XMD:SHA-256_SSWU_RO_	143
J.10.2.	BLS12381G2_XMD:SHA-256_SSWU_NU_	147
Appendix K.	Expand test vectors	149
K.1.	expand_message_xmd(SHA-256)	150

K.2. expand_message_xmd(SHA-512)	154
K.3. expand_message_xof(SHAKE128)	159
Authors' Addresses	162

1. Introduction

Many cryptographic protocols require a procedure that encodes an arbitrary input, e.g., a password, to a point on an elliptic curve. This procedure is known as hashing to an elliptic curve. Prominent examples of cryptosystems that hash to elliptic curves include password-authenticated key exchanges [BM92] [J96] [BMP00] [p1363.2], Identity-Based Encryption [BF01], Boneh-Lynn-Shacham signatures [BLS01] [I-D.irtf-cfrg-bls-signature], Verifiable Random Functions [MRV99] [I-D.irtf-cfrg-vrf], and Oblivious Pseudorandom Functions [NR97] [I-D.irtf-cfrg-voprf].

Unfortunately for implementors, the precise hash function that is suitable for a given protocol implemented using a given elliptic curve is often unclear from the protocol's description. Meanwhile, an incorrect choice of hash function can have disastrous consequences for security.

This document aims to bridge this gap by providing a comprehensive set of recommended algorithms for a range of curve types. Each algorithm conforms to a common interface: it takes as input an arbitrary-length byte string and produces as output a point on an elliptic curve. We provide implementation details for each algorithm, describe the security rationale behind each recommendation, and give guidance for elliptic curves that are not explicitly covered. We also present optimized implementations for internal functions used by these algorithms.

Readers wishing to quickly specify or implement a conforming hash function should consult Section 8, which lists recommended hash-to-curve suites and describes both how to implement an existing suite and how to specify a new one.

This document does not cover rejection sampling methods, sometimes referred to as "try-and-increment" or "hunt-and-peck," because the goal is to describe algorithms that can plausibly be computed in constant time. Use of these rejection methods is NOT RECOMMENDED, because they have been a perennial cause of side-channel vulnerabilities. See Dragonblood [VR20] as one example of this problem in practice.

1.1. Requirements Notation

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. Background

2.1. Elliptic curves

The following is a brief definition of elliptic curves, with an emphasis on important parameters and their relation to hashing to curves. For further reference on elliptic curves, consult [CFADLNV05] or [W08].

Let F be the finite field $GF(q)$ of prime characteristic $p > 3$. (This document does not consider elliptic curves over fields of characteristic 2 or 3.) In most cases F is a prime field, so $q = p$. Otherwise, F is an extension field, so $q = p^m$ for an integer $m > 1$. This document writes elements of extension fields in a primitive element or polynomial basis, i.e., as a vector of m elements of $GF(p)$ written in ascending order by degree. The entries of this vector are indexed in ascending order starting from 1, i.e., $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m)$. For example, if $q = p^2$ and the primitive element basis is $(1, I)$, then $x = (a, b)$ corresponds to the element $a + b * I$, where $x_1 = a$ and $x_2 = b$. (Note that all choices of basis are isomorphic, but certain choices may result in a more efficient implementation; this document does not make any particular assumptions about choice of basis.)

An elliptic curve E is specified by an equation in two variables and a finite field F . An elliptic curve equation takes one of several standard forms, including (but not limited to) Weierstrass, Montgomery, and Edwards.

The curve E induces an algebraic group of order n , meaning that the group has n distinct elements. (This document uses additive notation for the elliptic curve group operation.) Elements of an elliptic curve group are points with affine coordinates (x, y) satisfying the curve equation, where x and y are elements of F . In addition, all elliptic curve groups have a distinguished element, the identity point, which acts as the identity element for the group operation. On certain curves (including Weierstrass and Montgomery curves), the identity point cannot be represented as an (x, y) coordinate pair.

For security reasons, cryptographic uses of elliptic curves generally require using a (sub)group of prime order. Let G be such a subgroup of the curve of prime order r , where $n = h * r$. In this equation, h is an integer called the cofactor. An algorithm that takes as input an arbitrary point on the curve E and produces as output a point in the subgroup G of E is said to "clear the cofactor." Such algorithms are discussed in Section 7.

Certain hash-to-curve algorithms restrict the form of the curve equation, the characteristic of the field, or the parameters of the curve. For each algorithm presented, this document lists the relevant restrictions.

The table below summarizes quantities relevant to hashing to curves:

Symbol	Meaning	Relevance
F, q, p	A finite field F of characteristic p and $\#F = q = p^m$.	For prime fields, $q = p$; otherwise, $q = p^m$ and $m > 1$.
E	Elliptic curve.	E is specified by an equation and a field F .
n	Number of points on the elliptic curve E .	$n = h * r$, for h and r defined below.
G	A prime-order subgroup of the points on E .	Destination group to which byte strings are encoded.
r	Order of G .	r is a prime factor of n (usually, the largest such factor).
h	Cofactor, $h \geq 1$.	An integer satisfying $n = h * r$.

Table 1

2.2. Terminology

In this section, we define important terms used throughout the document.

2.2.1. Mappings

A mapping is a deterministic function from an element of the field F to a point on an elliptic curve E defined over F .

In general, the set of all points that a mapping can produce over all possible inputs may be only a subset of the points on an elliptic curve (i.e., the mapping may not be surjective). In addition, a mapping may output the same point for two or more distinct inputs (i.e., the mapping may not be injective). For example, consider a mapping from F to an elliptic curve having n points: if the number of elements of F is not equal to n , then this mapping cannot be bijective (i.e., both injective and surjective) since the mapping is defined to be deterministic.

Mappings may also be invertible, meaning that there is an efficient algorithm that, for any point P output by the mapping, outputs an x in F such that applying the mapping to x outputs P . Some of the mappings given in Section 6 are invertible, but this document does not discuss inversion algorithms.

2.2.2. Encodings

Encodings are closely related to mappings. Like a mapping, an encoding is a function that outputs a point on an elliptic curve. In contrast to a mapping, however, the input to an encoding is an arbitrary-length byte string.

This document constructs deterministic encodings by composing a hash function H_f with a deterministic mapping. In particular, H_f takes as input an arbitrary string and outputs an element of F . The deterministic mapping takes that element as input and outputs a point on an elliptic curve E defined over F . Since H_f takes arbitrary-length byte strings as inputs, it cannot be injective: the set of inputs is larger than the set of outputs, so there must be distinct inputs that give the same output (i.e., there must be collisions). Thus, any encoding built from H_f is also not injective.

Like mappings, encodings may be invertible, meaning that there is an efficient algorithm that, for any point P output by the encoding, outputs a string s such that applying the encoding to s outputs P . The instantiation of H_f used by all encodings specified in this document (Section 5) is not invertible. Thus, the encodings are also not invertible.

In some applications of hashing to elliptic curves, it is important that encodings do not leak information through side channels. [VR20] is one example of this type of leakage leading to a security vulnerability. See Section 10 for further discussion.

2.2.3. Random oracle encodings

A random-oracle encoding satisfies a strong property: it can be proved indiffereniable from a random oracle [MRH04] under a suitable assumption.

Both constructions described in Section 3 are indiffereniable from random oracles [MRH04] when instantiated following the guidelines in this document. The constructions differ in their output distributions: one gives a uniformly random point on the curve, the other gives a point sampled from a nonuniform distribution.

A random-oracle encoding with a uniform output distribution is suitable for use in many cryptographic protocols proven secure in the random oracle model. See Section 10 for further discussion.

2.2.4. Serialization

A procedure related to encoding is the conversion of an elliptic curve point to a bit string. This is called serialization, and is typically used for compactly storing or transmitting points. The inverse operation, deserialization, converts a bit string to an elliptic curve point. For example, [SEC1] and [pl363a] give standard methods for serialization and deserialization.

Deserialization is different from encoding in that only certain strings (namely, those output by the serialization procedure) can be deserialized. In contrast, this document is concerned with encodings from arbitrary strings to elliptic curve points. This document does not cover serialization or deserialization.

2.2.5. Domain separation

Cryptographic protocols proven secure in the random oracle model are often analyzed under the assumption that the random oracle only answers queries associated with that protocol (including queries made by adversaries) [BR93]. In practice, this assumption does not hold if two protocols use the same function to instantiate the random oracle. Concretely, consider protocols P1 and P2 that query a random oracle R0: if P1 and P2 both query R0 on the same value x, the security analysis of one or both protocols may be invalidated.

A common way of addressing this issue is called domain separation, which allows a single random oracle to simulate multiple, independent oracles. This is effected by ensuring that each simulated oracle sees queries that are distinct from those seen by all other simulated oracles. For example, to simulate two oracles RO1 and RO2 given a single oracle RO, one might define

$$\begin{aligned} \text{RO1}(x) &:= \text{RO}(\text{"RO1"} \parallel x) \\ \text{RO2}(x) &:= \text{RO}(\text{"RO2"} \parallel x) \end{aligned}$$

where \parallel is the concatenation operator. In this example, "RO1" and "RO2" are called domain separation tags; they ensure that queries to RO1 and RO2 cannot result in identical queries to RO, meaning that it is safe to treat RO1 and RO2 as independent oracles.

In general, domain separation requires defining a distinct injective encoding for each oracle being simulated. In the above example, "RO1" and "RO2" have the same length and thus satisfy this requirement when used as prefixes. The algorithms specified in this document take a different approach to ensuring injectivity; see Section 5.4 and Section 10.4 for more details.

3. Encoding byte strings to elliptic curves

This section presents a general framework and interface for encoding byte strings to points on an elliptic curve. The constructions in this section rely on three basic functions:

- * The function `hash_to_field`, $\{0, 1\}^* \times \{1, 2, \dots\} \rightarrow (F, F, \dots)$, hashes arbitrary-length byte strings to a list of one or more elements of a finite field F ; its implementation is defined in Section 5.
- * The function `map_to_curve`, $F \rightarrow E$, calculates a point on the elliptic curve E from an element of the finite field F over which E is defined. Section 6 describes mappings for a range of curve families.
- * The function `clear_cofactor`, $E \rightarrow G$, sends any point on the curve E to the subgroup G of E . Section 7 describes methods to perform this operation.

The two encodings (Section 2.2.2) defined in this section have the same interface and are both random-oracle encodings (Section 2.2.3). The difference between the two is that their outputs are sampled from different distributions:

- * `encode_to_curve` is a nonuniform encoding from byte strings to points in G . That is, the distribution of its output is not uniformly random in G : the set of possible outputs of `encode_to_curve` is only a fraction of the points in G , and some points in this set are more likely to be output than others. Section 10.1 gives a more precise definition of `encode_to_curve`'s output distribution.

`encode_to_curve(msg)`

Input: `msg`, an arbitrary-length byte string.

Output: P , a point in G .

Steps:

1. $u = \text{hash_to_field}(\text{msg}, 1)$
2. $Q = \text{map_to_curve}(u[0])$
3. $P = \text{clear_cofactor}(Q)$
4. return P

- * `hash_to_curve` is a uniform encoding from byte strings to points in G . That is, the distribution of its output is statistically close to uniform in G .

This function is suitable for most applications requiring a random oracle returning points in G , when instantiated with any of the `map_to_curve` functions described in Section 6. See Section 10 for further discussion.

`hash_to_curve(msg)`

Input: `msg`, an arbitrary-length byte string.

Output: P , a point in G .

Steps:

1. $u = \text{hash_to_field}(\text{msg}, 2)$
2. $Q_0 = \text{map_to_curve}(u[0])$
3. $Q_1 = \text{map_to_curve}(u[1])$
4. $R = Q_0 + Q_1$ # Point addition
5. $P = \text{clear_cofactor}(R)$
6. return P

Each hash-to-curve suite in Section 8 instantiates one of these encoding functions for a specific elliptic curve.

3.1. Domain separation requirements

All uses of the encoding functions defined in this document MUST include domain separation (Section 2.2.5) to avoid interfering with other uses of similar functionality.

Applications that instantiate multiple, independent instances of either `hash_to_curve` or `encode_to_curve` MUST enforce domain separation between those instances. This requirement applies both in the case of multiple instances targeting the same curve and in the case of multiple instances targeting different curves. (This is because the internal `hash_to_field` primitive (Section 5) requires domain separation to guarantee independent outputs.)

Domain separation is enforced with a domain separation tag (DST), which is a byte string constructed according to the following requirements:

1. Tags MUST be supplied as the DST parameter to `hash_to_field`, as described in Section 5.
2. Tags MUST have nonzero length. A minimum length of 16 bytes is RECOMMENDED to reduce the chance of collisions with other applications.
3. Tags SHOULD begin with a fixed identification string that is unique to the application.
4. Tags SHOULD include a version number.
5. For applications that define multiple ciphersuites, each ciphersuite's tag MUST be different. For this purpose, it is RECOMMENDED to include a ciphersuite identifier in each tag.
6. For applications that use multiple encodings, either to the same curve or to different curves, each encoding MUST use a different tag. For this purpose, it is RECOMMENDED to include the encoding's Suite ID (Section 8) in the domain separation tag. For independent encodings based on the same suite, each tag should also include a distinct identifier, e.g., "ENC1" and "ENC2".

As an example, consider a fictional application named Quux that defines several different ciphersuites. A reasonable choice of tag is "QUUX-V<xx>-CS<yy>-<suiteID>", where <xx> and <yy> are two-digit numbers indicating the version and ciphersuite, respectively, and <suiteID> is the Suite ID of the encoding used in ciphersuite <yy>.

As another example, consider a fictional application named Baz that requires two independent random oracles to the same curve. Reasonable choices of tags for these oracles are "BAZ-V<xx>-CS<yy>-<suiteID>-ENC1" and "BAZ-V<xx>-CS<yy>-<suiteID>-ENC2", respectively, where <xx>, <yy>, and <suiteID> are as described above.

The example tags given above are assumed to be ASCII-encoded byte strings without null termination, which is the RECOMMENDED format. Other encodings CAN be used, but in all cases the encoding as a sequence of bytes MUST be specified unambiguously.

4. Utility functions

Algorithms in this document use the utility functions described below, plus standard arithmetic operations (addition, multiplication, modular reduction, etc.) and elliptic curve point operations (point addition and scalar multiplication).

For security, implementations of these functions SHOULD be constant time: in brief, this means that execution time and memory access patterns SHOULD NOT depend on the values of secret inputs, intermediate values, or outputs. For such constant-time implementations, all arithmetic, comparisons, and assignments MUST also be implemented in constant time. Section 10 briefly discusses constant-time security issues.

Guidance on implementing low-level operations (in constant time or otherwise) is beyond the scope of this document; readers should consult standard reference material [MOV96] [CFADLNV05].

- * CMOV(a, b, c): If c is False, CMOV returns a, otherwise it returns b. For constant-time implementations, this operation must run in time independent of the value of c.
- * AND, OR, NOT, and XOR are standard bitwise logical operators. For constant-time implementations, short-circuit operators MUST be avoided.
- * is_square(x): This function returns True whenever the value x is a square in the field F. By Euler's criterion, this function can be calculated in constant time as

```
is_square(x) := { True,  if  $x^{(q-1)/2}$  is 0 or 1 in F;  
                 { False, otherwise.
```

In certain extension fields, `is_square` can be computed in constant time more quickly than by the above exponentiation. [AR13] and [S85] describe optimized methods for extension fields. Appendix I.5 gives an optimized straight-line method for $GF(p^2)$.

- * `sqrt(x)`: The `sqrt` operation is a multi-valued function, i.e., there exist two roots of x in the field F whenever x is square (except when $x = 0$). To maintain compatibility across implementations while allowing implementors leeway for optimizations, this document does not require `sqrt()` to return a particular value. Instead, as explained in Section 6.4, any function that calls `sqrt` also specifies how to determine the correct root.

The preferred way of computing square roots is to fix a deterministic algorithm particular to F . We give several algorithms in Appendix I.

- * `sgn0(x)`: This function returns either 0 or 1 indicating the "sign" of x , where `sgn0(x) == 1` just when x is "negative". (In other words, this function always considers 0 to be positive.) Section 4.1 defines this function and discusses its implementation.
- * `inv0(x)`: This function returns the multiplicative inverse of x in F , extended to all of F by fixing `inv0(0) == 0`. A straightforward way to implement `inv0` in constant time is to compute

`inv0(x) := x^(q - 2)`.

Notice that on input 0, the output is 0 as required. Certain fields may allow faster inversion methods; detailed discussion of such methods is beyond the scope of this document.

- * `I2OSP` and `OS2IP`: These functions are used to convert a byte string to and from a non-negative integer as described in [RFC8017]. (Note that these functions operate on byte strings in big-endian byte order.)
- * `a || b`: denotes the concatenation of byte strings a and b . For example, `"ABC" || "DEF" == "ABCDEF"`.
- * `substr(str, sbegin, slen)`: for a byte string str , this function returns the $slen$ -byte substring starting at position $sbegin$; positions are zero indexed. For example, `substr("ABCDEFGH", 2, 3) == "CDE"`.

- * `len(str)`: for a byte string `str`, this function returns the length of `str` in bytes. For example, `len("ABC") == 3`.
- * `strxor(str1, str2)`: for byte strings `str1` and `str2`, `strxor(str1, str2)` returns the bitwise XOR of the two strings. For example, `strxor("abc", "XYZ") == "9;9"` (the strings in this example are ASCII literals, but `strxor` is defined for arbitrary byte strings). In this document, `strxor` is only applied to inputs of equal length.

4.1. The `sgn0` function

This section defines a generic `sgn0` implementation that applies to any field $F = GF(p^m)$. It also gives simplified implementations for the cases $F = GF(p)$ and $F = GF(p^2)$.

See Section 2.1 for a discussion of representing elements of extension fields as vectors.

`sgn0(x)`

Parameters:

- F , a finite field of characteristic p and order $q = p^m$.
- p , the characteristic of F (see immediately above).
- m , the extension degree of F , $m \geq 1$ (see immediately above).

Input: x , an element of F .

Output: 0 or 1.

Steps:

1. `sign = 0`
2. `zero = 1`
3. for i in $(1, 2, \dots, m)$:
4. `sign_i = x_i mod 2`
5. `zero_i = x_i == 0`
6. `sign = sign OR (zero AND sign_i)` # Avoid short-circuit logic ops
7. `zero = zero AND zero_i`
8. return `sign`

Note that any valid `sgn0` function for extension fields must iterate over the entire vector representation of the input element. To see why, imagine a function `sgn0*` that ignores the final entry in its input vector, and consider a field element $x = (0, x_2)$. Since `sgn0*` ignores x_2 , `sgn0*(x) == sgn0*(-x)`, which is incorrect when $x_2 \neq 0$. A similar argument applies to any entry of the vector representation of x .

When $m == 1$, `sgn0` can be significantly simplified:

`sgn0_m_eq_1(x)`

Input: x , an element of $GF(p)$.

Output: 0 or 1.

Steps:

1. return $x \bmod 2$

The case $m == 2$ is only slightly more complicated:

`sgn0_m_eq_2(x)`

Input: x , an element of $GF(p^2)$.

Output: 0 or 1.

Steps:

1. $sign_0 = x_0 \bmod 2$
2. $zero_0 = x_0 == 0$
3. $sign_1 = x_1 \bmod 2$
4. return $sign_0$ OR ($zero_0$ AND $sign_1$) # Avoid short-circuit logic ops

5. Hashing to a finite field

The `hash_to_field` function hashes a byte string `msg` of arbitrary length into one or more elements of a field F . This function works in two steps: it first hashes the input byte string to produce a uniformly random byte string, and then interprets this byte string as one or more elements of F .

For the first step, `hash_to_field` calls an auxiliary function `expand_message`. This document defines two variants of `expand_message`: one appropriate for hash functions like SHA-2 [FIPS180-4] or SHA-3 [FIPS202], and another appropriate for extensible-output functions such as SHAKE128 [FIPS202]. Security considerations for each `expand_message` variant are discussed below (Section 5.4.1, Section 5.4.2).

Implementors MUST NOT use rejection sampling to generate a uniformly random element of F , to ensure that the `hash_to_field` function is amenable to constant-time implementation. The reason is that rejection sampling procedures are difficult to implement in constant time, and later well-meaning "optimizations" may silently render an implementation non-constant-time. This means that any `hash_to_field` function based on rejection sampling would be incompatible with constant-time implementation.

The `hash_to_field` function is also suitable for securely hashing to scalars. For example, when hashing to scalars for an elliptic curve (sub)group with prime order r , it suffices to instantiate `hash_to_curve` with target field $\text{GF}(r)$.

5.1. Security considerations

The `hash_to_field` function is designed to be indiffereniable from a random oracle [MRH04] when `expand_message` (Section 5.4) is modeled as a random oracle (see Section 10.2). Ensuring indiffereniability requires care; to see why, consider a prime p that is close to $3/4 * 2^{256}$. Reducing a random 256-bit integer modulo this p yields a value that is in the range $[0, p / 3]$ with probability roughly $1/2$, meaning that this value is statistically far from uniform in $[0, p - 1]$.

To control bias, `hash_to_field` instead uses random integers whose length is at least $\text{ceil}(\log_2(p)) + k$ bits, where k is the target security level for the suite in bits. Reducing such integers mod p gives bias at most 2^{-k} for any p ; this bias is appropriate when targeting k -bit security. For each such integer, `hash_to_field` uses `expand_message` to obtain L uniform bytes, where

$$L = \text{ceil}((\text{ceil}(\log_2(p)) + k) / 8)$$

These uniform bytes are then interpreted as an integer via OS2IP [RFC8017]. For example, for a 255-bit prime p , and $k = 128$ -bit security, $L = \text{ceil}((255 + 128) / 8) = 48$ bytes.

Note that k is an upper bound on the security level for the corresponding curve. See Section 10.5 for more details, and Section 8.9 for guidelines on choosing k for a given curve.

5.2. Efficiency considerations in extension fields

The `hash_to_field` function described in this section is inefficient for certain extension fields. Specifically, when hashing to an element of the extension field $\text{GF}(p^m)$, `hash_to_field` requires expanding `msg` into $m * L$ bytes (for L as defined above). For extension fields where $\log_2(p)$ is significantly smaller than the security level k , this approach is inefficient: it requires `expand_message` to output roughly $m * \log_2(p) + m * k$ bits, whereas $m * \log_2(p) + k$ bytes suffices to generate an element of $\text{GF}(p^m)$ with bias at most 2^{-k} . In such cases, an applications MAY use an alternative `hash_to_field` function, provided it meets the following security requirements:

- * The function MUST output field element(s) that are uniformly random except with bias at most 2^{-k} .
- * The function MUST NOT use rejection sampling.
- * The function SHOULD be amenable to straight line implementations.

For example, Pornin [P20] describes a method for hashing to $GF(9767^{19})$ that meets these requirements while using fewer output bits from `expand_message` than `hash_to_field` would for that field.

5.3. `hash_to_field` implementation

The following procedure implements `hash_to_field`.

The `expand_message` parameter to this function MUST conform to the requirements given in Section 5.4. Section 3.1 discusses the REQUIRED method for constructing DST, the domain separation tag.

hash_to_field(msg, count)

Parameters:

- DST, a domain separation tag (see discussion above).
- F, a finite field of characteristic p and order $q = p^m$.
- p , the characteristic of F (see immediately above).
- m , the extension degree of F, $m \geq 1$ (see immediately above).
- $L = \text{ceil}(\text{ceil}(\log_2(p)) + k) / 8$, where k is the security parameter of the suite (e.g., $k = 128$).
- expand_message, a function that expands a byte string and domain separation tag into a uniformly random byte string (see discussion above).

Inputs:

- msg, a byte string containing the message to hash.
- count, the number of elements of F to output.

Outputs:

- (u₀, ..., u_(count - 1)), a list of field elements.

Steps:

1. len_in_bytes = count * m * L
2. uniform_bytes = expand_message(msg, DST, len_in_bytes)
3. for i in (0, ..., count - 1):
4. for j in (0, ..., m - 1):
5. elm_offset = L * (j + i * m)
6. tv = substr(uniform_bytes, elm_offset, L)
7. e_j = OS2IP(tv) mod p
8. u_i = (e₀, ..., e_(m - 1))
9. return (u₀, ..., u_(count - 1))

5.4. expand_message

expand_message is a function that generates a uniformly random byte string. It takes three arguments:

1. msg, a byte string containing the message to hash,
2. DST, a byte string that acts as a domain separation tag, and
3. len_in_bytes, the number of bytes to be generated.

This document defines the following two variants of expand_message:

- * expand_message_xmd (Section 5.4.1) is appropriate for use with a wide range of hash functions, including SHA-2 [FIPS180-4], SHA-3 [FIPS202], BLAKE2 [RFC7693], and others.

- * `expand_message_xof` (Section 5.4.2) is appropriate for use with extensible-output functions (XOFs) including functions in the SHAKE [FIPS202] or BLAKE2X [BLAKE2X] families.

These variants should suffice for the vast majority of use cases, but other variants are possible; Section 5.4.4 discusses requirements.

5.4.1. `expand_message_xmd`

The `expand_message_xmd` function produces a uniformly random byte string using a cryptographic hash function H that outputs b bits. For security, H must meet the following requirements:

- * The number of bits output by H MUST be $b \geq 2 * k$, for k the target security level in bits, and b MUST be divisible by 8. The first requirement ensures k -bit collision resistance; the second ensures uniformity of `expand_message_xmd`'s output.
- * H MAY be a Merkle-Damgaard hash function like SHA-2. In this case, security holds when the underlying compression function is modeled as a random oracle [CDMP05]. (See Section 10.3 for discussion.)
- * H MAY be a sponge-based hash function like SHA-3 or BLAKE2. In this case, security holds when the inner function is modeled as a random transformation or as a random permutation [BDPV08].
- * Otherwise, H MUST be a hash function that has been proved indifferentiable from a random oracle [MRH04] under a reasonable cryptographic assumption.

SHA-2 [FIPS180-4] and SHA-3 [FIPS202] are typical and RECOMMENDED choices. As an example, for the 128-bit security level, $b \geq 256$ bits and either SHA-256 or SHA3-256 would be an appropriate choice.

The hash function H is assumed to work by repeatedly ingesting fixed-length blocks of data. The length of these blocks is called the input block size. As examples, the input block size of SHA-512 [FIPS180-4] is 128 bytes and the input block size of SHA3-512 [FIPS202] is 72 bytes.

The following procedure implements `expand_message_xmd`.

```
expand_message_xmd(msg, DST, len_in_bytes)
```

Parameters:

- H, a hash function (see requirements above).
- b_in_bytes, $b / 8$ for b the output size of H in bits.
For example, for $b = 256$, $b_in_bytes = 32$.
- r_in_bytes, the input block size of H, measured in bytes (see discussion above). For example, for SHA-256, $r_in_bytes = 64$.

Input:

- msg, a byte string.
- DST, a byte string of at most 255 bytes.
See below for information on using longer DSTs.
- len_in_bytes, the length of the requested output in bytes.

Output:

- uniform_bytes, a byte string.

Steps:

1. $ell = \text{ceil}(\text{len_in_bytes} / b_in_bytes)$
2. ABORT if $ell > 255$
3. $DST_prime = DST \parallel I2OSP(\text{len}(DST), 1)$
4. $Z_pad = I2OSP(0, r_in_bytes)$
5. $l_i_b_str = I2OSP(\text{len_in_bytes}, 2)$
6. $msg_prime = Z_pad \parallel msg \parallel l_i_b_str \parallel I2OSP(0, 1) \parallel DST_prime$
7. $b_0 = H(msg_prime)$
8. $b_1 = H(b_0 \parallel I2OSP(1, 1) \parallel DST_prime)$
9. for i in $(2, \dots, ell)$:
10. $b_i = H(\text{strxor}(b_0, b_{(i-1)}) \parallel I2OSP(i, 1) \parallel DST_prime)$
11. $uniform_bytes = b_1 \parallel \dots \parallel b_ell$
12. return $\text{substr}(uniform_bytes, 0, \text{len_in_bytes})$

Note that the string Z_pad is prefixed to msg when computing b_0 (step 7). This is necessary for security when H is a Merkle-Damgaard hash, e.g., SHA-2 (see Section 10.3). Hashing this additional data means that the cost of computing b_0 is higher than the cost of simply computing $H(msg)$. In most settings this overhead is negligible, because the cost of evaluating H is much less than the other costs involved in hashing to a curve.

It is possible, however, to entirely avoid this overhead by taking advantage of the fact that Z_pad depends only on H , and not on the arguments to $\text{expand_message_xmd}$. To do so, first precompute and save the internal state of H after ingesting Z_pad . Then, when computing b_0 , initialize H using the saved state. Further details are implementation dependent, and beyond the scope of this document.

5.4.2. `expand_message_xof`

The `expand_message_xof` function produces a uniformly random byte string using an extensible-output function (XOF) H . For security, H must meet the following criteria:

- * The collision resistance of H MUST be at least k bits.
- * H MUST be an XOF that has been proved indiffereniable from a random oracle under a reasonable cryptographic assumption.

The SHAKE [FIPS202] XOF family is a typical and RECOMMENDED choice. As an example, for 128-bit security, SHAKE128 would be an appropriate choice.

The following procedure implements `expand_message_xof`.

```
expand_message_xof(msg, DST, len_in_bytes)
```

Parameters:

- H , an extensible-output function.
 $H(m, d)$ hashes message m and returns d bytes.

Input:

- `msg`, a byte string.
- `DST`, a byte string of at most 255 bytes.
See below for information on using longer DSTs.
- `len_in_bytes`, the length of the requested output in bytes.

Output:

- `uniform_bytes`, a byte string.

Steps:

1. `DST_prime` = `DST` || `I2OSP(len(DST), 1)`
2. `msg_prime` = `msg` || `I2OSP(len_in_bytes, 2)` || `DST_prime`
3. `uniform_bytes` = $H(\text{msg_prime}, \text{len_in_bytes})$
4. return `uniform_bytes`

5.4.3. Using DSTs longer than 255 bytes

The `expand_message` variants defined in this section accept domain separation tags of at most 255 bytes. If applications require a domain separation tag longer than 255 bytes, e.g., because of requirements imposed by an invoking protocol, implementors MUST compute a short domain separation tag by hashing, as follows:

- * For `expand_message_xmd` using hash function H , `DST` is computed as

```
DST = H("H2C-OVERSIZE-DST-" || a_very_long_DST)
```

- * For `expand_message_xof` using extensible-output function `H`, `DST` is computed as

```
DST = H("H2C-OVERSIZE-DST-" || a_very_long_DST, ceil(2 * k / 8))
```

Here, `a_very_long_DST` is the `DST` whose length is greater than 255 bytes, `"H2C-OVERSIZE-DST-"` is a 17-byte ASCII string literal, and `k` is the target security level in bits.

5.4.4. Defining other `expand_message` variants

When defining a new `expand_message` variant, the most important consideration is that `hash_to_field` models `expand_message` as a random oracle. Thus, implementors SHOULD prove indifferenciability from a random oracle under an appropriate assumption about the underlying cryptographic primitives; see Section 10.2 for more information.

In addition, `expand_message` variants:

- * MUST give collision resistance commensurate with the security level of the target elliptic curve.
- * MUST be built on primitives designed for use in applications requiring cryptographic randomness. As examples, a secure stream cipher is an appropriate primitive, whereas a Mersenne twister pseudorandom number generator [MT98] is not.
- * MUST NOT use rejection sampling.
- * MUST give independent values for distinct (`msg`, `DST`, `length`) inputs. Meeting this requirement is subtle. As a simplified example, hashing `msg || DST` does not work, because in this case distinct (`msg`, `DST`) pairs whose concatenations are equal will return the same output (e.g., ("AB", "CDEF") and ("ABC", "DEF")). The variants defined in this document use a suffix-free encoding of `DST` to avoid this issue.
- * MUST use the domain separation tag `DST` to ensure that invocations of cryptographic primitives inside of `expand_message` are domain separated from invocations outside of `expand_message`. For example, if the `expand_message` variant uses a hash function `H`, an encoding of `DST` MUST be added either as a prefix or a suffix of the input to each invocation of `H`. Adding `DST` as a suffix is the RECOMMENDED approach.
- * SHOULD read `msg` exactly once, for efficiency when `msg` is long.

In addition, each `expand_message` variant MUST specify a unique `EXP_TAG` that identifies that variant in a Suite ID. See Section 8.10 for more information.

6. Deterministic mappings

The mappings in this section are suitable for implementing either nonuniform or uniform encodings using the constructions in Section 3. Certain mappings restrict the form of the curve or its parameters. For each mapping presented, this document lists the relevant restrictions.

Note that mappings in this section are not interchangeable: different mappings will almost certainly output different points when evaluated on the same input.

6.1. Choosing a mapping function

This section gives brief guidelines on choosing a mapping function for a given elliptic curve. Note that the suites given in Section 8 are recommended mappings for the respective curves.

If the target elliptic curve is a Montgomery curve (Section 6.7), the Elligator 2 method (Section 6.7.1) is recommended. Similarly, if the target elliptic curve is a twisted Edwards curve (Section 6.8), the twisted Edwards Elligator 2 method (Section 6.8.2) is recommended.

The remaining cases are Weierstrass curves. For curves supported by the Simplified SWU method (Section 6.6.2), that mapping is the recommended one. Otherwise, the Simplified SWU method for $AB == 0$ (Section 6.6.3) is recommended if the goal is best performance, while the Shallue-van de Woestijne method (Section 6.6.1) is recommended if the goal is simplicity of implementation. (The reason for this distinction is that the Simplified SWU method for $AB == 0$ requires implementing an isogeny map in addition to the mapping function, while the Shallue-van de Woestijne method does not.)

The Shallue-van de Woestijne method (Section 6.6.1) works with any curve, and may be used in cases where a generic mapping is required. Note, however, that this mapping is almost always more computationally expensive than the curve-specific recommendations above.

6.2. Interface

The generic interface shared by all mappings in this section is as follows:


```
(x, y) = map_to_curve(u)
```

The input u and outputs x and y are elements of the field F . The affine coordinates (x, y) specify a point on an elliptic curve defined over F . Note, however, that the point (x, y) is not a uniformly random point.

6.3. Notation

As a rough guide, the following conventions are used in pseudocode:

- * All arithmetic operations are performed over a field F , unless explicitly stated otherwise.
- * u : the input to the mapping function. This is an element of F produced by the `hash_to_field` function.
- * (x, y) , (s, t) , (v, w) : the affine coordinates of the point output by the mapping. Indexed variables (e.g., x_1, y_2, \dots) are used for candidate values.
- * tv_1, tv_2, \dots : reusable temporary variables.
- * c_1, c_2, \dots : constant values, which can be computed in advance.

6.4. Sign of the resulting point

In general, elliptic curves have equations of the form $y^2 = g(x)$. The mappings in this section first identify an x such that $g(x)$ is square, then take a square root to find y . Since there are two square roots when $g(x) \neq 0$, this may result in an ambiguity regarding the sign of y .

When necessary, the mappings in this section resolve this ambiguity by specifying the sign of the y -coordinate in terms of the input to the mapping function. Two main reasons support this approach: first, this covers elliptic curves over any field in a uniform way, and second, it gives implementors leeway in optimizing square-root implementations.

6.5. Exceptional cases

Mappings may have exceptional cases, i.e., inputs u on which the mapping is undefined. These cases must be handled carefully, especially for constant-time implementations.

For each mapping in this section, we discuss the exceptional cases and show how to handle them in constant time. Note that all implementations SHOULD use `inv0` (Section 4) to compute multiplicative inverses, to avoid exceptional cases that result from attempting to compute the inverse of 0.

6.6. Mappings for Weierstrass curves

The mappings in this section apply to a target curve E defined by the equation

$$y^2 = g(x) = x^3 + A * x + B$$

where $4 * A^3 + 27 * B^2 \neq 0$.

6.6.1. Shallue-van de Woestijne method

Shallue and van de Woestijne [SW06] describe a mapping that applies to essentially any elliptic curve. (Note, however, that this mapping is more expensive to evaluate than the other mappings in this document.)

The parameterization given below is for Weierstrass curves; its derivation is detailed in [W19]. This parameterization also works for Montgomery (Section 6.7) and twisted Edwards (Section 6.8) curves via the rational maps given in Appendix D: first evaluate the Shallue-van de Woestijne mapping to an equivalent Weierstrass curve, then map that point to the target Montgomery or twisted Edwards curve using the corresponding rational map.

Preconditions: A Weierstrass curve $y^2 = x^3 + A * x + B$.

Constants:

- * A and B , the parameter of the Weierstrass curve.
- * Z , a non-zero element of F meeting the below criteria. Appendix H.1 gives a Sage [SAGE] script that outputs the RECOMMENDED Z .
 1. $g(Z) \neq 0$ in F .
 2. $-(3 * Z^2 + 4 * A) / (4 * g(Z)) \neq 0$ in F .
 3. $-(3 * Z^2 + 4 * A) / (4 * g(Z))$ is square in F .
 4. At least one of $g(Z)$ and $g(-Z / 2)$ is square in F .

Sign of y : Inputs u and $-u$ give the same x -coordinate for many values of u . Thus, we set $\text{sgn0}(y) == \text{sgn0}(u)$.

Exceptions: The exceptional cases for u occur when $(1 + u^2 * g(Z)) * (1 - u^2 * g(Z)) == 0$. The restrictions on Z given above ensure that implementations that use inv0 to invert this product are exception free.

Operations:

```

1. tv1 = u^2 * g(Z)
2. tv2 = 1 + tv1
3. tv1 = 1 - tv1
4. tv3 = inv0(tv1 * tv2)
5. tv4 = sqrt(-g(Z) * (3 * Z^2 + 4 * A))      # can be precomputed
6. If sgn0(tv4) == 1, set tv4 = -tv4         # sgn0(tv4) MUST equal 0
7. tv5 = u * tv1 * tv3 * tv4
8. tv6 = -4 * g(Z) / (3 * Z^2 + 4 * A)      # can be precomputed
9. x1 = -Z / 2 - tv5
10. x2 = -Z / 2 + tv5
11. x3 = Z + tv6 * (tv2^2 * tv3)^2
12. If is_square(g(x1)), set x = x1 and y = sqrt(g(x1))
13. Else If is_square(g(x2)), set x = x2 and y = sqrt(g(x2))
14. Else set x = x3 and y = sqrt(g(x3))
15. If sgn0(u) != sgn0(y), set y = -y
16. return (x, y)

```

Appendix F.1 gives an example straight-line implementation of this mapping.

6.6.2. Simplified Shallue-van de Woestijne-Ulas method

The function `map_to_curve_simple_swu(u)` implements a simplification of the Shallue-van de Woestijne-Ulas mapping [U07] described by Brier et al. [BCIMRT10], which they call the "simplified SWU" map. Wahby and Boneh [WB19] generalize and optimize this mapping.

Preconditions: A Weierstrass curve $y^2 = x^3 + A * x + B$ where $A != 0$ and $B != 0$.

Constants:

* A and B , the parameters of the Weierstrass curve.

* Z , an element of F meeting the below criteria. Appendix H.2 gives a Sage [SAGE] script that outputs the RECOMMENDED Z . The criteria are:

1. Z is non-square in F ,
2. $Z \neq -1$ in F ,
3. the polynomial $g(x) - Z$ is irreducible over F , and
4. $g(B / (Z * A))$ is square in F .

Sign of y : Inputs u and $-u$ give the same x -coordinate. Thus, we set $\text{sgn0}(y) == \text{sgn0}(u)$.

Exceptions: The exceptional cases are values of u such that $Z^2 * u^4 + Z * u^2 == 0$. This includes $u == 0$, and may include other values depending on Z . Implementations must detect this case and set $x_1 = B / (Z * A)$, which guarantees that $g(x_1)$ is square by the condition on Z given above.

Operations:

1. $tv_1 = \text{inv0}(Z^2 * u^4 + Z * u^2)$
2. $x_1 = (-B / A) * (1 + tv_1)$
3. If $tv_1 == 0$, set $x_1 = B / (Z * A)$
4. $gx_1 = x_1^3 + A * x_1 + B$
5. $x_2 = Z * u^2 * x_1$
6. $gx_2 = x_2^3 + A * x_2 + B$
7. If $\text{is_square}(gx_1)$, set $x = x_1$ and $y = \text{sqrt}(gx_1)$
8. Else set $x = x_2$ and $y = \text{sqrt}(gx_2)$
9. If $\text{sgn0}(u) \neq \text{sgn0}(y)$, set $y = -y$
10. return (x, y)

Appendix F.2 gives an example straight-line implementation of this mapping. Appendix G.2 gives optimized straight-line procedures that apply to specific classes of curves and base fields. For more information on optimizing this mapping, see [WB19] Section 4 or the example code found at [hash2curve-repo].

6.6.3. Simplified SWU for $AB == 0$

Wahby and Boneh [WB19] show how to adapt the simplified SWU mapping to Weierstrass curves having $A == 0$ or $B == 0$, which the mapping of Section 6.6.2 does not support. (The case $A == B == 0$ is excluded because $y^2 = x^3$ is not an elliptic curve.)

This method applies to curves like `secp256k1` [SEC2] and to pairing-friendly curves in the Barreto-Lynn-Scott [BLS03], Barreto-Naehrig [BN05], and other families.

This method requires finding another elliptic curve E' given by the equation

$$y'^2 = g'(x') = x'^3 + A' * x' + B'$$

that is isogenous to E and has $A' \neq 0$ and $B' \neq 0$. (See [WB19], Appendix A, for one way of finding E' using [SAGE].) This isogeny defines a map $\text{iso_map}(x', y')$ given by a pair of rational functions. iso_map takes as input a point on E' and produces as output a point on E .

Once E' and iso_map are identified, this mapping works as follows: on input u , first apply the simplified SWU mapping to get a point on E' , then apply the isogeny map to that point to get a point on E .

Note that iso_map is a group homomorphism, meaning that point addition commutes with iso_map . Thus, when using this mapping in the `hash_to_curve` construction of Section 3, one can effect a small optimization by first mapping u_0 and u_1 to E' , adding the resulting points on E' , and then applying iso_map to the sum. This gives the same result while requiring only one evaluation of iso_map .

Preconditions: An elliptic curve E' with $A' \neq 0$ and $B' \neq 0$ that is isogenous to the target curve E with isogeny map iso_map from E' to E .

Helper functions:

- * `map_to_curve_simple_swu` is the mapping of Section 6.6.2 to E'
- * `iso_map` is the isogeny map from E' to E

Sign of y : for this map, the sign is determined by `map_to_curve_simple_swu`. No further sign adjustments are necessary.

Exceptions: `map_to_curve_simple_swu` handles its exceptional cases. Exceptional cases of `iso_map` are inputs that cause the denominator of either rational function to evaluate to zero; such cases MUST return the identity point on E .

Operations:

1. $(x', y') = \text{map_to_curve_simple_swu}(u)$ # (x', y') is on E'
2. $(x, y) = \text{iso_map}(x', y')$ # (x, y) is on E
3. return (x, y)

See [hash2curve-repo] or [WB19] Section 4.3 for details on implementing the isogeny map.

6.7. Mappings for Montgomery curves

The mapping defined in this section applies to a target curve M defined by the equation

$$K * t^2 = s^3 + J * s^2 + s$$

6.7.1. Elligator 2 method

Bernstein, Hamburg, Krasnova, and Lange give a mapping that applies to any curve with a point of order 2 [BHKL13], which they call Elligator 2.

Preconditions: A Montgomery curve $K * t^2 = s^3 + J * s^2 + s$ where $J \neq 0$, $K \neq 0$, and $(J^2 - 4) / K^2$ is non-zero and non-square in F .

Constants:

- * J and K , the parameters of the elliptic curve.
- * Z , a non-square element of F . Appendix H.3 gives a Sage [SAGE] script that outputs the RECOMMENDED Z .

Sign of t : this mapping fixes the sign of t as specified in [BHKL13]. No additional adjustment is required.

Exceptions: The exceptional case is $Z * u^2 == -1$, i.e., $1 + Z * u^2 == 0$. Implementations must detect this case and set $x1 = -(J / K)$. Note that this can only happen when $q = 3 \pmod{4}$.

Operations:

1. $x1 = -(J / K) * \text{inv0}(1 + Z * u^2)$
2. If $x1 == 0$, set $x1 = -(J / K)$
3. $gx1 = x1^3 + (J / K) * x1^2 + x1 / K^2$
4. $x2 = -x1 - (J / K)$
5. $gx2 = x2^3 + (J / K) * x2^2 + x2 / K^2$
6. If $\text{is_square}(gx1)$, set $x = x1$, $y = \text{sqrt}(gx1)$, and $\text{sgn0}(y) == 1$.
7. Else set $x = x2$, $y = \text{sqrt}(gx2)$, and $\text{sgn0}(y) == 0$.
8. $s = x * K$
9. $t = y * K$
10. return (s, t)

Appendix F.3 gives an example straight-line implementation of this mapping. Appendix G.3 gives optimized straight-line procedures that apply to specific classes of curves and base fields.

6.8. Mappings for twisted Edwards curves

Twisted Edwards curves (a class of curves that includes Edwards curves) are given by the equation

$$a * v^2 + w^2 = 1 + d * v^2 * w^2$$

with $a \neq 0$, $d \neq 0$, and $a \neq d$ [BBJLP08].

These curves are closely related to Montgomery curves (Section 6.7): every twisted Edwards curve is birationally equivalent to a Montgomery curve ([BBJLP08], Theorem 3.2). This equivalence yields an efficient way of hashing to a twisted Edwards curve: first, hash to an equivalent Montgomery curve, then transform the result into a point on the twisted Edwards curve via a rational map. This method of hashing to a twisted Edwards curve thus requires identifying a corresponding Montgomery curve and rational map. We describe how to identify such a curve and map immediately below.

6.8.1. Rational maps from Montgomery to twisted Edwards curves

There are two ways to select a Montgomery curve and rational map for use when hashing to a given twisted Edwards curve. The selected Montgomery curve and rational map **MUST** be specified as part of the hash-to-curve suite for a given twisted Edwards curve; see Section 8.

1. When hashing to a standardized twisted Edwards curve for which a corresponding Montgomery form and rational map are also standardized, the standard Montgomery form and rational map **SHOULD** be used to ensure compatibility with existing software.

In certain cases, e.g., `edwards25519` [RFC7748], the sign of the rational map from the twisted Edwards curve to its corresponding Montgomery curve is not given explicitly. In this case, the sign **MUST** be fixed such that applying the rational map to the twisted Edwards curve's base point yields the Montgomery curve's base point with correct sign. (For `edwards25519`, see [RFC7748] and [EID4730].)

When defining new twisted Edwards curves, a Montgomery equivalent and rational map **SHOULD** also be specified, and the sign of the rational map **SHOULD** be stated explicitly.

2. When hashing to a twisted Edwards curve that does not have a standardized Montgomery form or rational map, the map given in Appendix D **SHOULD** be used.

6.8.2. Elligator 2 method

Preconditions: A twisted Edwards curve E and an equivalent Montgomery curve M meeting the requirements in Section 6.8.1.

Helper functions:

* `map_to_curve_elligator2` is the mapping of Section 6.7.1 to the curve M .

* `rational_map` is a function that takes a point (s, t) on M and returns a point (v, w) on E , as defined in Section 6.8.1.

Sign of t (and v): for this map, the sign is determined by `map_to_curve_elligator2`. No further sign adjustments are required.

Exceptions: The exceptions for the Elligator 2 mapping are as given in Section 6.7.1. The exceptions for the rational map are as given in Section 6.8.1. No other exceptions are possible.

The following procedure implements the Elligator 2 mapping for a twisted Edwards curve. (Note that the output point is denoted (v, w) because it is a point on the target twisted Edwards curve.)

`map_to_curve_elligator2_edwards(u)`

Input: u , an element of F .

Output: (v, w) , a point on E .

```
1. (s, t) = map_to_curve_elligator2(u)      # (s, t) is on M
2. (v, w) = rational_map(s, t)            # (v, w) is on E
3. return (v, w)
```

7. Clearing the cofactor

The mappings of Section 6 always output a point on the elliptic curve, i.e., a point in a group of order $h * r$ (Section 2.1). Obtaining a point in G may require a final operation commonly called "clearing the cofactor," which takes as input any point on the curve and produces as output a point in the prime-order (sub)group G (Section 2.1).

The cofactor can always be cleared via scalar multiplication by h . For elliptic curves where $h = 1$, i.e., the curves with a prime number of points, no operation is required. This applies, for example, to the NIST curves P-256, P-384, and P-521 [FIPS186-4].

In some cases, it is possible to clear the cofactor via a faster method than scalar multiplication by h . These methods are equivalent to (but usually faster than) multiplication by some scalar h_{eff} whose value is determined by the method and the curve. Examples of fast cofactor clearing methods include the following:

- * For certain pairing-friendly curves having subgroup G_2 over an extension field, Scott et al. [SBCKD09] describe a method for fast cofactor clearing that exploits an efficiently-computable endomorphism. Fuentes-Castaneda et al. [FKR11] propose an alternative method that is sometimes more efficient. Budroni and Pintore [BP17] give concrete instantiations of these methods for Barreto-Lynn-Scott pairing-friendly curves [BLS03]. This method is described for the specific case of BLS12-381 in Appendix G.4.
- * Wahby and Boneh ([WB19], Section 5) describe a trick due to Scott for fast cofactor clearing on any elliptic curve for which the prime factorization of h and the structure of the elliptic curve group meet certain conditions.

The `clear_cofactor` function is parameterized by a scalar h_{eff} . Specifically,

$$\text{clear_cofactor}(P) := h_{\text{eff}} * P$$

where $*$ represents scalar multiplication. When a curve does not support a fast cofactor clearing method, $h_{\text{eff}} = h$ and the cofactor MUST be cleared via scalar multiplication.

When a curve admits a fast cofactor clearing method, `clear_cofactor` MAY be evaluated either via that method or via scalar multiplication by the equivalent h_{eff} ; these two methods give the same result. Note that in this case scalar multiplication by the cofactor h does not generally give the same result as the fast method, and SHOULD NOT be used.

8. Suites for hashing

This section lists recommended suites for hashing to standard elliptic curves.

A hash-to-curve suite fully specifies the procedure for hashing byte strings to points on a specific elliptic curve group. Section 8.1 describes how to implement a suite. Applications that require hashing to an elliptic curve should use either an existing suite or a new suite specified as described in Section 8.9.

All applications using a hash-to-curve suite MUST choose a domain separation tag (DST) in accordance with the guidelines in Section 3.1. In addition, applications whose security requires a random oracle that returns uniformly random points on the target curve MUST use a suite whose encoding type is `hash_to_curve`; see Section 3 and immediately below for more information.

A hash-to-curve suite comprises the following parameters:

- * Suite ID, a short name used to refer to a given suite. Section 8.10 discusses the naming conventions for suite IDs.
- * encoding type, either uniform (`hash_to_curve`) or nonuniform (`encode_to_curve`). See Section 3 for definitions of these encoding types.
- * E , the target elliptic curve over a field F .
- * p , the characteristic of the field F .
- * m , the extension degree of the field F .
- * k , the target security level of the suite in bits. (See Section 10.5 for discussion.)
- * L , the length parameter for `hash_to_field` (Section 5.1).
- * `expand_message`, one of the variants specified in Section 5.4 plus any parameters required for the specified variant (for example, H , the underlying hash function).
- * f , a mapping function from Section 6.
- * h_{eff} , the scalar parameter for `clear_cofactor` (Section 7).

In addition to the above parameters, the mapping f may require additional parameters Z , M , `rational_map`, E' , or `iso_map`. When applicable, these MUST be specified.

The below table lists suites RECOMMENDED for some elliptic curves. The corresponding parameters are given in the following subsections. Applications instantiating cryptographic protocols whose security analysis relies on a random oracle that outputs points with a uniform distribution MUST NOT use a nonuniform encoding. Moreover, applications that use a nonuniform encoding SHOULD carefully analyze the security implications of nonuniformity. When the required encoding is not clear, applications SHOULD use a uniform encoding for security.

E	Suites	Section
NIST P-256	P256_XMD:SHA-256_SSWU_RO_ P256_XMD:SHA-256_SSWU_NU_	Section 8.2
NIST P-384	P384_XMD:SHA-512_SSWU_RO_ P384_XMD:SHA-512_SSWU_NU_	Section 8.3
NIST P-521	P521_XMD:SHA-512_SSWU_RO_ P521_XMD:SHA-512_SSWU_NU_	Section 8.4
curve25519	curve25519_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_RO_ curve25519_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_NU_	Section 8.5
edwards25519	edwards25519_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_RO_ edwards25519_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_NU_	Section 8.5
curve448	curve448_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_RO_ curve448_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_NU_	Section 8.6
edwards448	edwards448_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_RO_ edwards448_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_NU_	Section 8.6
secp256k1	secp256k1_XMD:SHA-256_SSWU_RO_ secp256k1_XMD:SHA-256_SSWU_NU_	Section 8.7
BLS12-381 G1	BLS12381G1_XMD:SHA-256_SSWU_RO_ BLS12381G1_XMD:SHA-256_SSWU_NU_	Section 8.8
BLS12-381 G2	BLS12381G2_XMD:SHA-256_SSWU_RO_ BLS12381G2_XMD:SHA-256_SSWU_NU_	Section 8.8

Table 2

8.1. Implementing a hash-to-curve suite

A hash-to-curve suite requires the following functions. Note that some of these require utility functions from Section 4.

1. Base field arithmetic operations for the target elliptic curve, e.g., addition, multiplication, and square root.
2. Elliptic curve point operations for the target curve, e.g., point addition and scalar multiplication.

3. The `hash_to_field` function; see Section 5. This includes the `expand_message` variant (Section 5.4) and any constituent hash function or XOF.
4. The suite-specified mapping function; see the corresponding subsection of Section 6.
5. A cofactor clearing function; see Section 7. This may be implemented as scalar multiplication by `h_eff` or as a faster equivalent method.
6. The desired encoding function; see Section 3. This is either `hash_to_curve` or `encode_to_curve`.

8.2. Suites for NIST P-256

This section defines ciphersuites for the NIST P-256 elliptic curve [FIPS186-4].

`P256_XMD:SHA-256_SSWU_RO_` is defined as follows:

- * encoding type: `hash_to_curve` (Section 3)
- * E: $y^2 = x^3 + A * x + B$, where
 - $A = -3$
 - $B = 0x5ac635d8aa3a93e7b3ebbd55769886bc651d06b0cc53b0f63bce3c3e27d2604b$
- * p: $2^{256} - 2^{224} + 2^{192} + 2^{96} - 1$
- * m: 1
- * k: 128
- * expand_message: `expand_message_xmd` (Section 5.4.1)
- * H: SHA-256
- * L: 48
- * f: Simplified SWU method, Section 6.6.2
- * Z: -10
- * `h_eff`: 1

P256_XMD:SHA-256_SSWU_NU_ is identical to P256_XMD:SHA-256_SSWU_RO_, except that the encoding type is `encode_to_curve` (Section 3).

An optimized example implementation of the Simplified SWU mapping to P-256 is given in Appendix G.2.1.

8.3. Suites for NIST P-384

This section defines ciphersuites for the NIST P-384 elliptic curve [FIPS186-4].

P384_XMD:SHA-512_SSWU_RO_ is defined as follows:

- * encoding type: `hash_to_curve` (Section 3)
- * E: $y^2 = x^3 + A * x + B$, where
 - $A = -3$
 - $B = 0xb3312fa7e23ee7e4988e056be3f82d19181d9c6efe8141120314088f5013875ac656398d8a2ed19d2a85c8edd3ec2aef$
- * p: $2^{384} - 2^{128} - 2^{96} + 2^{32} - 1$
- * m: 1
- * k: 192
- * expand_message: `expand_message_xmd` (Section 5.4.1)
- * H: SHA-512
- * L: 72
- * f: Simplified SWU method, Section 6.6.2
- * Z: -12
- * h_eff: 1

P384_XMD:SHA-512_SSWU_NU_ is identical to P384_XMD:SHA-512_SSWU_RO_, except that the encoding type is `encode_to_curve` (Section 3).

An optimized example implementation of the Simplified SWU mapping to P-384 is given in Appendix G.2.1.

8.4. Suites for NIST P-521

This section defines ciphersuites for the NIST P-521 elliptic curve [FIPS186-4].

P521_XMD:SHA-512_SSWU_RO_ is defined as follows:

- * encoding type: hash_to_curve (Section 3)
- * E: $y^2 = x^3 + A * x + B$, where
 - $A = -3$
 - $B = 0x51953eb9618e1c9a1f929a21a0b68540eea2da725b99b315f3b8b489918ef109e156193951ec7e937b1652c0bd3bb1bf073573df883d2c34f1ef451fd46b503f00$
- * p: $2^{521} - 1$
- * m: 1
- * k: 256
- * expand_message: expand_message_xmd (Section 5.4.1)
- * H: SHA-512
- * L: 98
- * f: Simplified SWU method, Section 6.6.2
- * Z: -4
- * h_eff: 1

P521_XMD:SHA-512_SSWU_NU_ is identical to P521_XMD:SHA-512_SSWU_RO_, except that the encoding type is encode_to_curve (Section 3).

An optimized example implementation of the Simplified SWU mapping to P-521 is given in Appendix G.2.1.

8.5. Suites for curve25519 and edwards25519

This section defines ciphersuites for curve25519 and edwards25519 [RFC7748]. Note that these ciphersuites SHOULD NOT be used when hashing to ristretto255 [I-D.irtf-cfrg-ristretto255-decaf448]. See Appendix B for information on how to hash to that group.

curve25519_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_RO_ is defined as follows:

- * encoding type: hash_to_curve (Section 3)
- * E: $K * t^2 = s^3 + J * s^2 + s$, where
 - $J = 486662$
 - $K = 1$
- * p: $2^{255} - 19$
- * m: 1
- * k: 128
- * expand_message: expand_message_xmd (Section 5.4.1)
- * H: SHA-512
- * L: 48
- * f: Elligator 2 method, Section 6.7.1
- * Z: 2
- * h_eff: 8

edwards25519_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_RO_ is identical to curve25519_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_RO_, except for the following parameters:

- * E: $a * v^2 + w^2 = 1 + d * v^2 * w^2$, where
 - $a = -1$
 - $d = 0x52036cee2b6ffe738cc740797779e89800700a4d4141d8ab75eb4dca135978a3$
- * f: Twisted Edwards Elligator 2 method, Section 6.8.2
- * M: curve25519 defined in [RFC7748], Section 4.1
- * rational_map: the birational map defined in [RFC7748], Section 4.1

curve25519_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_NU_ is identical to curve25519_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_RO_, except that the encoding type is encode_to_curve (Section 3).

edwards25519_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_NU_ is identical to edwards25519_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_RO_, except that the encoding type is encode_to_curve (Section 3).

Optimized example implementations of the above mappings are given in Appendix G.3.1 and Appendix G.3.2.

8.6. Suites for curve448 and edwards448

This section defines ciphersuites for curve448 and edwards448 [RFC7748]. Note that these ciphersuites SHOULD NOT be used when hashing to decaf448 [I-D.irtf-cfrg-ristretto255-decaf448]. See Appendix C for information on how to hash to that group.

curve448_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_RO_ is defined as follows:

- * encoding type: hash_to_curve (Section 3)
- * E: $K * t^2 = s^3 + J * s^2 + s$, where
 - $J = 156326$
 - $K = 1$
- * $p: 2^{448} - 2^{224} - 1$
- * $m: 1$
- * $k: 224$
- * expand_message: expand_message_xmd (Section 5.4.1)
- * H: SHA-512
- * L: 84
- * f: Elligator 2 method, Section 6.7.1
- * Z: -1
- * h_eff: 4

edwards448_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_RO_ is identical to curve448_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_RO_, except for the following parameters:

- * E: $a * v^2 + w^2 = 1 + d * v^2 * w^2$, where
 - $a = 1$

- d = -39081

- * f: Twisted Edwards Elligator 2 method, Section 6.8.2
- * M: curve448, defined in [RFC7748], Section 4.2
- * rational_map: the 4-isogeny map defined in [RFC7748], Section 4.2

curve448_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_NU_ is identical to curve448_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_RO_, except that the encoding type is encode_to_curve (Section 3).

edwards448_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_NU_ is identical to edwards448_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_RO_, except that the encoding type is encode_to_curve (Section 3).

Optimized example implementations of the above mappings are given in Appendix G.3.3 and Appendix G.3.4.

8.7. Suites for secp256k1

This section defines ciphersuites for the secp256k1 elliptic curve [SEC2].

secp256k1_XMD:SHA-256_SSWU_RO_ is defined as follows:

- * encoding type: hash_to_curve (Section 3)
- * E: $y^2 = x^3 + 7$
- * p: $2^{256} - 2^{32} - 2^9 - 2^8 - 2^7 - 2^6 - 2^4 - 1$
- * m: 1
- * k: 128
- * expand_message: expand_message_xmd (Section 5.4.1)
- * H: SHA-256
- * L: 48
- * f: Simplified SWU for $AB == 0$, Section 6.6.3
- * Z: -11
- * E': $y'^2 = x'^3 + A' * x' + B'$, where

- A': 0x3f8731abdd661adca08a5558f0f5d272e953d363cb6f0e5d405447c01a444533

- B': 1771

- * iso_map: the 3-isogeny map from E' to E given in Appendix E.1

- * h_eff: 1

secp256k1_XMD:SHA-256_SSWU_NU_ is identical to secp256k1_XMD:SHA-256_SSWU_RO_, except that the encoding type is encode_to_curve (Section 3).

An optimized example implementation of the Simplified SWU mapping to the curve E' isogenous to secp256k1 is given in Appendix G.2.1.

8.8. Suites for BLS12-381

This section defines ciphersuites for groups G1 and G2 of the BLS12-381 elliptic curve [BLS12-381]. The curve parameters in this section match the ones listed in [I-D.irtf-cfrg-pairing-friendly-curves], Appendix C.

8.8.1. BLS12-381 G1

BLS12381G1_XMD:SHA-256_SSWU_RO_ is defined as follows:

- * encoding type: hash_to_curve (Section 3)

- * E: $y^2 = x^3 + 4$

- * p: 0x1a0111ea397fe69a4b1ba7b6434bacd764774b84f38512bf6730d2a0f6b0f6241eabfffeb153ffffb9fefffffffffaaab

- * m: 1

- * k: 128

- * expand_message: expand_message_xmd (Section 5.4.1)

- * H: SHA-256

- * L: 64

- * f: Simplified SWU for AB == 0, Section 6.6.3

- * Z: 11

- * E' : $y'^2 = x'^3 + A' * x' + B'$, where
 - $A' = 0x144698a3b8e9433d693a02c96d4982b0ea985383ee66a8d8e8981aefd881ac98936f8da0e0f97f5cf428082d584c1d$
 - $B' = 0x12e2908d11688030018b12e8753eee3b2016c1f0f24f4070a0b9c14fcef35ef55a23215a316ceaa5dlcc48e98e172be0$
- * `iso_map`: the 11-isogeny map from E' to E given in Appendix E.2
- * `h_eff`: `0xd201000000010001`

BLS12381G1_XMD:SHA-256_SSWU_NU_ is identical to BLS12381G1_XMD:SHA-256_SSWU_RO_, except that the encoding type is `encode_to_curve` (Section 3).

Note that the `h_eff` values for these suites are chosen for compatibility with the fast cofactor clearing method described by Scott ([WB19] Section 5).

An optimized example implementation of the Simplified SWU mapping to the curve E' isogenous to BLS12-381 G1 is given in Appendix G.2.1.

8.8.2. BLS12-381 G2

BLS12381G2_XMD:SHA-256_SSWU_RO_ is defined as follows:

- * `encoding type`: `hash_to_curve` (Section 3)
- * E : $y^2 = x^3 + 4 * (1 + I)$
- * base field F is $GF(p^m)$, where
 - p : `0x1a0111ea397fe69a4b1ba7b6434bacd764774b84f38512bf6730d2a0f6b0f6241eabfffeb153ffffb9feffffffffffaaab`
 - m : 2
 - $(1, I)$ is the basis for F , where $I^2 + 1 == 0$ in F
- * k : 128
- * `expand_message`: `expand_message_xmd` (Section 5.4.1)
- * H : SHA-256
- * L : 64

- * f : Simplified SWU for $AB == 0$, Section 6.6.3
- * Z : $-(2 + I)$
- * E' : $y'^2 = x'^3 + A' * x' + B'$, where
 - $A' = 240 * I$
 - $B' = 1012 * (1 + I)$
- * iso_map : the isogeny map from E' to E given in Appendix E.3
- * h_eff : 0xbc69f08f2ee75b3584c6a0ea91b352888e2a8e9145ad7689986ff031508ffe1329c2f178731db956d82bf015d1212b02ec0ec69d7477c1ae954cbc06689f6a359894c0adebbf6b4e8020005aaa95551

BLS12381G2_XMD:SHA-256_SSWU_NU_ is identical to BLS12381G2_XMD:SHA-256_SSWU_RO_, except that the encoding type is `encode_to_curve` (Section 3).

Note that the h_eff values for these suites are chosen for compatibility with the fast cofactor clearing method described by Budroni and Pintore ([BP17], Section 4.1), and summarized in Appendix G.4.

An optimized example implementation of the Simplified SWU mapping to the curve E' isogenous to BLS12-381 G2 is given in Appendix G.2.3.

8.9. Defining a new hash-to-curve suite

The RECOMMENDED way to define a new hash-to-curve suite is:

1. E , F , p , and m are determined by the elliptic curve and its base field.
2. k is an upper bound on the target security level of the suite (Section 10.5). A reasonable choice of k is $\text{ceil}(\log_2(r) / 2)$, where r is the order of the subgroup G of the curve E (Section 2.1).
3. Choose encoding type, either `hash_to_curve` or `encode_to_curve` (Section 3).
4. Compute L as described in Section 5.1.
5. Choose an `expand_message` variant from Section 5.4 plus any underlying cryptographic primitives (e.g., a hash function H).

6. Choose a mapping following the guidelines in Section 6.1, and select any required parameters for that mapping.
7. Choose `h_eff` to be either the cofactor of E or, if a fast cofactor clearing method is to be used, a value appropriate to that method as discussed in Section 7.
8. Construct a Suite ID following the guidelines in Section 8.10.

When hashing to an elliptic curve not listed in this section, corresponding hash-to-curve suites SHOULD be fully specified as described above.

8.10. Suite ID naming conventions

Suite IDs MUST be constructed as follows:

```
CURVE_ID || "_" || HASH_ID || "_" || MAP_ID || "_" || ENC_VAR || "_"
```

The fields `CURVE_ID`, `HASH_ID`, `MAP_ID`, and `ENC_VAR` are ASCII-encoded strings of at most 64 characters each. Fields MUST contain only ASCII characters between 0x21 and 0x7E (inclusive) except that underscore (i.e., 0x5f) is not allowed.

As indicated above, each field (including the last) is followed by an underscore ("`_`", ASCII 0x5f). This helps to ensure that Suite IDs are prefix free. Suite IDs MUST include the final underscore and MUST NOT include any characters after the final underscore.

Suite ID fields MUST be chosen as follows:

- * `CURVE_ID`: a human-readable representation of the target elliptic curve.
- * `HASH_ID`: a human-readable representation of the `expand_message` function and any underlying hash primitives used in `hash_to_field` (Section 5). This field MUST be constructed as follows:

```
EXP_TAG || ":" || HASH_NAME
```

`EXP_TAG` indicates the `expand_message` variant:

- "`XMD`" for `expand_message_xmd` (Section 5.4.1).
- "`XOF`" for `expand_message_xof` (Section 5.4.2).

`HASH_NAME` is a human-readable name for the underlying hash primitive. As examples:

1. For `expand_message_xof` (Section 5.4.2) with SHAKE128, `HASH_ID` is `"XOF:SHAKE128"`.
2. For `expand_message_xmd` (Section 5.4.1) with SHA3-256, `HASH_ID` is `"XMD:SHA3-256"`.

Suites that use an alternative `hash_to_field` function that meets the requirements in Section 5.2 MUST indicate this by appending a tag identifying that function to the `HASH_ID` field, separated by a colon (":", ASCII 0x3A).

- * `MAP_ID`: a human-readable representation of the `map_to_curve` function as defined in Section 6. These are defined as follows:
 - `"SVDW"` for or Shallue and van de Woestijne (Section 6.6.1).
 - `"SSWU"` for Simplified SWU (Section 6.6.2, Section 6.6.3).
 - `"ELL2"` for Elligator 2 (Section 6.7.1, Section 6.8.2).
- * `ENC_VAR`: a string indicating the encoding type and other information. The first two characters of this string indicate whether the suite represents a `hash_to_curve` or an `encode_to_curve` operation (Section 3), as follows:
 - If `ENC_VAR` begins with `"RO"`, the suite uses `hash_to_curve`.
 - If `ENC_VAR` begins with `"NU"`, the suite uses `encode_to_curve`.
 - `ENC_VAR` MUST NOT begin with any other string.

`ENC_VAR` MAY also be used to encode other information used to identify variants, for example, a version number. The RECOMMENDED way to do so is to add one or more subfields separated by colons. For example, `"RO:V02"` is an appropriate `ENC_VAR` value for the second version of a uniform encoding suite, while `"RO:V02:FOO01:BAR17"` might be used to indicate a variant of that suite.

9. IANA considerations

This document has no IANA actions.

10. Security considerations

Section 3.1 describes considerations related to domain separation. See Section 10.4 for further discussion.

Section 5 describes considerations for uniformly hashing to field elements; see Section 10.2 and Section 10.3 for further discussion.

Each encoding type (Section 3) accepts an arbitrary byte string and maps it to a point on the curve sampled from a distribution that depends on the encoding type. It is important to note that using a nonuniform encoding or directly evaluating one of the mappings of Section 6 produces an output that is easily distinguished from a uniformly random point. Applications that use a nonuniform encoding SHOULD carefully analyze the security implications of nonuniformity. When the required encoding is not clear, applications SHOULD use a uniform encoding.

When the `hash_to_curve` function (Section 3) is instantiated with a `hash_to_field` function that is indiffereniable from a random oracle (Section 5), the resulting function is indiffereniable from a random oracle ([MRH04], [BCIMRT10], [FFSTV13], [LBB19]). In many cases such a function can be safely used in cryptographic protocols whose security analysis assumes a random oracle that outputs uniformly random points on an elliptic curve. As Ristenpart et al. discuss in [RSS11], however, not all security proofs that rely on random oracles continue to hold when those oracles are replaced by indiffereniable functionalities. This limitation should be considered when analyzing the security of protocols relying on the `hash_to_curve` function.

When hashing passwords using any function described in this document, an adversary who learns the output of the hash function (or potentially any intermediate value, e.g., the output of `hash_to_field`) may be able to carry out a dictionary attack. To mitigate such attacks, it is recommended to first execute a more costly key derivation function (e.g., PBKDF2 [RFC2898], `sCrypt` [RFC7914], or Argon2 [I-D.irtf-cfrg-argon2]) on the password, then hash the output of that function to the target elliptic curve. For collision resistance, the hash underlying the key derivation function should be chosen according to the guidelines listed in Section 5.4.1.

Constant-time implementations of all functions in this document are STRONGLY RECOMMENDED for all uses, to avoid leaking information via side channels. It is especially important to use a constant-time implementation when inputs to an encoding are secret values; in such cases, constant-time implementations are REQUIRED for security against timing attacks (e.g., [VR20]). When constant-time implementations are required, all basic operations and utility functions must be implemented in constant time, as discussed in Section 4. In some applications (e.g., embedded systems), leakage through other side channels (e.g., power or electromagnetic side channels) may be pertinent. Defending against such leakage is outside the scope of this document, because the nature of the leakage and the appropriate defense depend on the application.

10.1. `encode_to_curve`: output distribution and indifferenciability

The `encode_to_curve` function (Section 3) returns points sampled from a distribution that is statistically far from uniform. This distribution is bounded roughly as follows: first, it includes at least one eighth of the points in G , and second, the probability of points in the distribution varies by at most a factor of four. These bounds hold when `encode_to_curve` is instantiated with any of the `map_to_curve` functions in Section 6.

The bounds above are derived from several works in the literature. Specifically:

- * Shallue and van de Woestijne [SW06] and Fouque and Tibouchi [FT12] derive bounds on the Shallue-van de Woestijne mapping (Section 6.6.1).
- * Fouque and Tibouchi [FT10] and Tibouchi [T14] derive bounds for the Simplified SWU mapping (Section 6.6.2, Section 6.6.3).
- * Bernstein et al. [BHKL13] derive bounds for the Elligator 2 mapping (Section 6.7.1, Section 6.8.2).

Indifferenciability of `encode_to_curve` follows from an argument similar to the one given by Brier et al. [BCIMRT10]; we briefly sketch. Consider an ideal random oracle $H_c()$ that samples from the distribution induced by the `map_to_curve` function called by `encode_to_curve`, and assume for simplicity that the target elliptic curve has cofactor 1 (a similar argument applies for non-unity cofactors). Indifferenciability holds just if it is possible to efficiently simulate the "inner" random oracle in `encode_to_curve`, namely, `hash_to_field`. The simulator works as follows: on a fresh query `msg`, the simulator queries $H_c(msg)$ and receives a point P in the image of `map_to_curve` (if `msg` is the same as a prior query, the

simulator just returns the value it gave in response to that query). The simulator then computes the possible preimages of P under `map_to_curve`, i.e., elements u of F such that `map_to_curve(u) == P` (Tibouchi [T14] shows that this can be done efficiently for the Shallue-van de Woestijne and Simplified SWU maps, and Bernstein et al. show the same for Elligator 2). The simulator selects one such preimage at random and returns this value as the simulated output of the "inner" random oracle. By hypothesis, `Hc()` samples from the distribution induced by `map_to_curve` on a uniformly random input element of F , so this value is uniformly random and induces the correct point P when passed through `map_to_curve`.

10.2. `hash_to_field` security

The `hash_to_field` function defined in Section 5 is indiffereniable from a random oracle [MRH04] when `expand_message` (Section 5.4) is modeled as a random oracle. By composability of indiffereniable proofs, this also holds when `expand_message` is proved indiffereniable from a random oracle relative to an underlying primitive that is modeled as a random oracle. When following the guidelines in Section 5.4, both variants of `expand_message` defined in that section meet this requirement (see also Section 10.3).

We very briefly sketch the indiffereniable argument for `hash_to_field`. Notice that each integer mod p that `hash_to_field` returns (i.e., each element of the vector representation of F) is a member of an equivalence class of roughly 2^k integers of length $\log_2(p) + k$ bits, all of which are equal modulo p . For each integer mod p that `hash_to_field` returns, the simulator samples one member of this equivalence class at random and outputs the byte string returned by `I2OSP`. (Notice that this is essentially the inverse of the `hash_to_field` procedure.)

10.3. `expand_message_xmd` security

The `expand_message_xmd` function defined in Section 5.4.1 is indiffereniable from a random oracle [MRH04] when one of the following holds:

1. H is indiffereniable from a random oracle,
2. H is a sponge-based hash function whose inner function is modeled as a random transformation or random permutation [BDPV08], or
3. H is a Merkle-Damgaard hash function whose compression function is modeled as a random oracle [CDMP05].

For cases (1) and (2), the indifferenciability of `expand_message_xmd` follows directly from the indifferenciability of `H`.

For case (3), i.e., for `H` a Merkle-Damgaard hash function, indifferenciability follows from [CDMP05], Theorem 3.5. In particular, `expand_message_xmd` computes `b_0` by prefixing the message with one block of 0-bytes plus auxiliary information (length, counter, and `DST`). Then, each of the output blocks `b_i`, $i \geq 1$ in `expand_message_xmd` is the result of invoking `H` on a unique, prefix-free encoding of `b_0`. This is true, first, because the length of the input to all such invocations is equal and fixed by the choice of `H` and `DST`, and second, because each such input has a unique suffix (because of the inclusion of the counter byte `I2OSP(i, 1)`).

The essential difference between the construction of [CDMP05] and `expand_message_xmd` is that the latter hashes a counter appended to `strxor(b_0, b_(i - 1))` (step 10) rather than to `b_0`. This approach increases the Hamming distance between inputs to different invocations of `H`, which reduces the likelihood that nonidealities in `H` affect the distribution of the `b_i` values.

We note that `expand_message_xmd` can be used to instantiate a general-purpose indifferenciable functionality with variable-length output based on any hash function meeting one of the above criteria. Applications that use `expand_message_xmd` outside of `hash_to_field` should ensure domain separation by picking a distinct value for `DST`.

10.4. Domain separation recommendations

As discussed in Section 2.2.5, the purpose of domain separation is to ensure that security analyses of cryptographic protocols that query multiple independent random oracles remain valid even if all of these random oracles are instantiated based on one underlying function `H`. The `expand_message` variants in this document (Section 5.4) ensure domain separation by appending a suffix-free-encoded domain separation tag `DST_prime` to all strings hashed by `H`, an underlying hash or extensible output function. (Other `expand_message` variants that follow the guidelines in Section 5.4.4 are expected to behave similarly, but these should be analyzed on a case-by-case basis.) For security, applications that use the same function `H` outside of `expand_message` should enforce domain separation between those uses of `H` and `expand_message`, and should separate all of these from uses of `H` in other applications.

This section suggests four methods for enforcing domain separation from `expand_message` variants, explains how each method achieves domain separation, and lists the situations in which each is appropriate. These methods share a high-level structure: the

application designer fixes a tag `DST_ext` distinct from `DST_prime` and augments calls to `H` with `DST_ext`. Each method augments calls to `H` differently, and each may impose additional requirements on `DST_ext`.

These methods can be used to instantiate multiple domain separated functions (e.g., `H1` and `H2`) by selecting distinct `DST_ext` values for each (e.g., `DST_ext1`, `DST_ext2`).

1. (Suffix-only domain separation.) This method is useful when domain separating invocations of `H` from `expand_message_xmd` or `expand_message_xof`. It is not appropriate for domain separating `expand_message` from HMAC-H [RFC2104]; for that purpose, see method 4.

To instantiate a suffix-only domain separated function `Hso`, compute

$$Hso(msg) = H(msg \parallel DST_ext)$$

`DST_ext` should be suffix-free encoded (e.g., by appending one byte encoding the length of `DST_ext`) to make it infeasible to find distinct `(msg, DST_ext)` pairs that hash to the same value.

This method ensures domain separation because all distinct invocations of `H` have distinct suffixes, since `DST_ext` is distinct from `DST_prime`.

2. (Prefix-suffix domain separation.) This method can be used in the same cases as the suffix-only method.

To instantiate a prefix-suffix domain separated function `Hps`, compute

$$Hps(msg) = H(DST_ext \parallel msg \parallel I2OSP(0, 1))$$

`DST_ext` should be prefix-free encoded (e.g., by adding a one-byte prefix that encodes the length of `DST_ext`) to make it infeasible to find distinct `(msg, DST_ext)` pairs that hash to the same value.

This method ensures domain separation because appending the byte `I2OSP(0, 1)` ensures that inputs to `H` inside `Hps` are distinct from those inside `expand_message`. Specifically, the final byte of `DST_prime` encodes the length of `DST`, which is required to be nonzero (Section 3.1, requirement 2), and `DST_prime` is always appended to invocations of `H` inside `expand_message`.

3. (Prefix-only domain separation.) This method is only useful for domain separating invocations of H from `expand_message_xmd`. It does not give domain separation for `expand_message_xof` or HMAC-H.

To instantiate a prefix-only domain separated function `Hpo`, compute

```
Hpo(msg) = H(DST_ext || msg)
```

In order for this method to give domain separation, `DST_ext` should be at least `b` bits long, where `b` is the number of bits output by the hash function `H`. In addition, at least one of the first `b` bits must be nonzero. Finally, `DST_ext` should be prefix-free encoded (e.g., by adding a one-byte prefix that encodes the length of `DST_ext`) to make it infeasible to find distinct `(msg, DST_ext)` pairs that hash to the same value.

This method ensures domain separation as follows. First, since `DST_ext` contains at least one nonzero bit among its first `b` bits, it is guaranteed to be distinct from the value `Z_pad` (Section 5.4.1, step 4), which ensures that all inputs to `H` are distinct from the input used to generate `b_0` in `expand_message_xmd`. Second, since `DST_ext` is at least `b` bits long, it is almost certainly distinct from the values `b_0` and `strxor(b_0, b_(i - 1))`, and therefore all inputs to `H` are distinct from the inputs used to generate `b_i`, $i \geq 1$, with high probability.

4. (XMD-HMAC domain separation.) This method is useful for domain separating invocations of `H` inside HMAC-H (i.e., HMAC [RFC2104] instantiated with hash function `H`) from `expand_message_xmd`. It also applies to HKDF-H [RFC5869], as discussed below.

Specifically, this method applies when HMAC-H is used with a non-secret key to instantiate a random oracle based on a hash function `H` (note that `expand_message_xmd` can also be used for this purpose; see Section 10.3). When using HMAC-H with a high-entropy secret key, domain separation is not necessary; see discussion below.

To choose a non-secret HMAC key `DST_key` that ensures domain separation from `expand_message_xmd`, compute

```
DST_key_preimage = "DERIVE-HMAC-KEY-" || DST_ext || I2OSP(0, 1)
DST_key = H(DST_key_preimage)
```

Then, to instantiate the random oracle `Hro` using HMAC-H, compute

$Hro(msg) = \text{HMAC-H}(DST_key, msg)$

The trailing zero byte in `DST_key_preimage` ensures that this value is distinct from inputs to `H` inside `expand_message_xmd` (because all such inputs have suffix `DST_prime`, which cannot end with a zero byte as discussed above). This ensures domain separation because, with overwhelming probability, all inputs to `H` inside of `HMAC-H` using key `DST_key` have prefixes that are distinct from the values `Z_pad`, `b_0`, and `strxor(b_0, b_(i - 1))` inside of `expand_message_xmd`.

For uses of `HMAC-H` that instantiate a private random oracle by fixing a high-entropy secret key, domain separation from `expand_message_xmd` is not necessary. This is because, similarly to the case above, all inputs to `H` inside `HMAC-H` using this secret key almost certainly have distinct prefixes from all inputs to `H` inside `expand_message_xmd`.

Finally, this method can be used with `HKDF-H` [RFC5869] by fixing the salt input to `HKDF-Extract` to `DST_key`, computed as above. This ensures domain separation for `HKDF-Extract` by the same argument as for `HMAC-H` using `DST_key`. Moreover, assuming that the IKM input to `HKDF-Extract` has sufficiently high entropy (say, commensurate with the security parameter), the `HKDF-Expand` step is domain separated by the same argument as for `HMAC-H` with a high-entropy secret key (since `PRK` is exactly that).

10.5. Target security levels

Each ciphersuite specifies a target security level (in bits) for the underlying curve. This parameter ensures the corresponding `hash_to_field` instantiation is conservative and correct. We stress that this parameter is only an upper bound on the security level of the curve, and is neither a guarantee nor endorsement of its suitability for a given application. Mathematical and cryptographic advancements may reduce the effective security level for any curve.

11. Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Adam Langley for his detailed writeup of Elligator 2 with Curve25519 [L13]; Dan Boneh, Christopher Patton, Benjamin Lipp, and Leonid Reyzin for educational discussions; and David Benjamin, Daniel Bourdrez, Frank Denis, Sean Devlin, Justin Drake, Bjoern Haase, Mike Hamburg, Dan Harkins, Thomas Icart, Andy Polyakov, Mamy Ratsimbazafy, Michael Scott, Filippo Valsorda, and Mathy Vanhoef for helpful feedback.

12. Contributors

* Sharon Goldberg

Boston University

goldbe@cs.bu.edu

* Ela Lee

Royal Holloway, University of London

Ela.Lee.2010@live.rhul.ac.uk

* Michele Orru

michele.orrु@ens.fr

13. References

13.1. Normative References

[EID4730] Langley, A., "RFC 7748, Errata ID 4730", July 2016, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/errata/eid4730>>.

[I-D.irtf-cfrg-pairing-friendly-curves]
Sakemi, Y., Kobayashi, T., Saito, T., and R. Wahby,
"Pairing-Friendly Curves", Work in Progress, Internet-
Draft, draft-irtf-cfrg-pairing-friendly-curves-08, 30
September 2020, <[http://www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/
draft-irtf-cfrg-pairing-friendly-curves-08.txt](http://www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/draft-irtf-cfrg-pairing-friendly-curves-08.txt)>.

[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/info/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/info/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/info/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/info/rfc8174>>.

13.2. Informative References

- [AFQTZ14] Aranha, D.F., Fouque, P.A., Qian, C., Tibouchi, M., and J.C. Zapolowicz, "Binary Elligator squared", DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-13051-4_2, pages 20-37, In Selected Areas in Cryptography - SAC 2014, 2014, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-13051-4_2>.
- [AR13] Adj, G. and F. Rodriguez-Henriquez, "Square Root Computation over Even Extension Fields", DOI 10.1109/TC.2013.145, pages 2829-2841, In IEEE Transactions on Computers. vol 63 issue 11, November 2014, <<https://doi.org/10.1109/TC.2013.145>>.
- [BBJLP08] Bernstein, D.J., Birkner, P., Joye, M., Lange, T., and C. Peters, "Twisted Edwards curves", DOI 10.1007/978-3-540-68164-9_26, pages 389-405, In AFRICACRYPT 2008, 2008, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-68164-9_26>.
- [BCIMRT10] Brier, E., Coron, J-S., Icart, T., Madore, D., Randriam, H., and M. Tibouchi, "Efficient Indifferentiable Hashing into Ordinary Elliptic Curves", DOI 10.1007/978-3-642-14623-7_13, pages 237-254, In Advances in Cryptology - CRYPTO 2010, 2010, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-14623-7_13>.
- [BDPV08] Bertoni, G., Daemen, J., Peeters, M., and G. Van Assche, "On the Indifferentiability of the Sponge Construction", DOI 10.1007/978-3-540-78967-3_11, pages 181-197, In Advances in Cryptology - EUROCRYPT 2008, 2008, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-78967-3_11>.
- [BF01] Boneh, D. and M. Franklin, "Identity-based encryption from the Weil pairing", DOI 10.1007/3-540-44647-8_13, pages 213-229, In Advances in Cryptology - CRYPTO 2001, August 2001, <https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-44647-8_13>.
- [BHKL13] Bernstein, D.J., Hamburg, M., Krasnova, A., and T. Lange, "Elligator: elliptic-curve points indistinguishable from uniform random strings", DOI 10.1145/2508859.2516734, pages 967-980, In Proceedings of the 2013 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, November 2013, <<https://doi.org/10.1145/2508859.2516734>>.

- [BLAKE2X] Aumasson, J-P., Neves, S., Wilcox-O'Hearn, Z., and C. Winnerlein, "BLAKE2X", December 2016, <<https://blake2.net/blake2x.pdf>>.
- [BLMP19] Bernstein, D.J., Lange, T., Martindale, C., and L. Panny, "Quantum circuits for the CSIDH: optimizing quantum evaluation of isogenies", DOI 10.1007/978-3-030-17656-3, In Advances in Cryptology - EUROCRYPT 2019, 2019, <<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-17656-3>>.
- [BLS01] Boneh, D., Lynn, B., and H. Shacham, "Short signatures from the Weil pairing", DOI 10.1007/s00145-004-0314-9, pages 297-319, In Journal of Cryptology, vol 17, July 2004, <<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00145-004-0314-9>>.
- [BLS03] Barreto, P., Lynn, B., and M. Scott, "Constructing Elliptic Curves with Prescribed Embedding Degrees", DOI 10.1007/3-540-36413-7_19, pages 257-267, In Security in Communication Networks, 2003, <https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-36413-7_19>.
- [BLS12-381] Bowe, S., "BLS12-381: New zk-SNARK Elliptic Curve Construction", March 2017, <<https://electriccoin.co/blog/new-snark-curve/>>.
- [BM92] Bellare, S.M. and M. Merritt, "Encrypted key exchange: Password-based protocols secure against dictionary attacks", DOI 10.1109/RISP.1992.213269, pages 72-84, In IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy - Oakland 1992, 1992, <<https://doi.org/10.1109/RISP.1992.213269>>.
- [BMP00] Boyko, V., MacKenzie, P.D., and S. Patel, "Provably secure password-authenticated key exchange using Diffie-Hellman", DOI 10.1007/3-540-45539-6_12, pages 156-171, In Advances in Cryptology - EUROCRYPT 2000, May 2000, <https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-45539-6_12>.
- [BN05] Barreto, P. and M. Naehrig, "Pairing-Friendly Elliptic Curves of Prime Order", DOI 10.1007/11693383_22, pages 319-331, In Selected Areas in Cryptography 2005, 2006, <https://doi.org/10.1007/11693383_22>.
- [BP17] Budroni, A. and F. Pintore, "Efficient hash maps to G2 on BLS curves", ePrint 2017/419, May 2017, <<https://eprint.iacr.org/2017/419>>.

- [BR93] Bellare, M. and P. Rogaway, "Random oracles are practical: a paradigm for designing efficient protocols", DOI 10.1145/168588.168596, pages 62–73, In Proceedings of the 1993 ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security, December 1993, <<https://doi.org/10.1145/168588.168596>>.
- [C93] Cohen, H., "A Course in Computational Algebraic Number Theory", ISBN 9783642081422, publisher Springer-Verlag, 1993, <<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-02945-9>>.
- [CDMP05] Coron, J-S., Dodis, Y., Malinaud, C., and P. Puniya, "Merkle-Damgaard Revisited: How to Construct a Hash Function", DOI 10.1007/11535218_26, pages 430–448, In Advances in Cryptology – CRYPTO 2005, 2005, <https://doi.org/10.1007/11535218_26>.
- [CFADLNV05] Cohen, H., Frey, G., Avanzi, R., Doche, C., Lange, T., Nguyen, K., and F. Vercauteren, "Handbook of Elliptic and Hyperelliptic Curve Cryptography", ISBN 9781584885184, publisher Chapman and Hall / CRC, 2005, <<https://www.crcpress.com/9781584885184>>.
- [CK11] Couveignes, J. and J. Kammerer, "The geometry of flex tangents to a cubic curve and its parameterizations", DOI 10.1016/j.jsc.2011.11.003, pages 266–281, In Journal of Symbolic Computation, vol 47 issue 3, 2012, <<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsc.2011.11.003>>.
- [F11] Farashahi, R.R., "Hashing into Hessian curves", DOI 10.1007/978-3-642-21969-6_17, pages 278–289, In AFRICACRYPT 2011, 2011, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-21969-6_17>.
- [FFSTV13] Farashahi, R.R., Fouque, P.A., Shparlinski, I.E., Tibouchi, M., and J.F. Voloch, "Indifferentiable deterministic hashing to elliptic and hyperelliptic curves", DOI 10.1090/S0025-5718-2012-02606-8, pages 491–512, In Math. Comp. vol 82, 2013, <<https://doi.org/10.1090/S0025-5718-2012-02606-8>>.
- [FIPS180-4] National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), "Secure Hash Standard (SHS)", August 2015, <<https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/FIPS/NIST.FIPS.180-4.pdf>>.

- [FIPS186-4] National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), "FIPS Publication 186-4: Digital Signature Standard", July 2013, <<https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/FIPS/NIST.FIPS.186-4.pdf>>.
- [FIPS202] National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), "SHA-3 Standard: Permutation-Based Hash and Extendable-Output Functions", August 2015, <<https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/FIPS/NIST.FIPS.202.pdf>>.
- [FJT13] Fouque, P-A., Joux, A., and M. Tibouchi, "Injective encodings to elliptic curves", DOI 10.1007/978-3-642-39059-3_14, pages 203-218, In ACISP 2013, 2013, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-39059-3_14>.
- [FKR11] Fuentes-Castaneda, L., Knapp, E., and F. Rodriguez-Henriquez, "Fast Hashing to G2 on Pairing-Friendly Curves", DOI 10.1007/978-3-642-28496-0_25, pages 412-430, In Selected Areas in Cryptography, 2011, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-28496-0_25>.
- [FSV09] Farashahi, R.R., Shparlinski, I.E., and J.F. Voloch, "On hashing into elliptic curves", DOI 10.1515/JMC.2009.022, pages 353-360, In Journal of Mathematical Cryptology, vol 3 no 4, 2009, <<https://doi.org/10.1515/JMC.2009.022>>.
- [FT10] Fouque, P-A. and M. Tibouchi, "Estimating the size of the image of deterministic hash functions to elliptic curves.", DOI 10.1007/978-3-642-14712-8_5, pages 81-91, In Progress in Cryptology - LATINCRYPT 2010, 2010, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-14712-8_5>.
- [FT12] Fouque, P-A. and M. Tibouchi, "Indifferentiable Hashing to Barreto-Naehrig Curves", DOI 10.1007/978-3-642-33481-8_1, pages 1-7, In Progress in Cryptology - LATINCRYPT 2012, 2012, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-33481-8_1>.
- [hash2curve-repo] "Hashing to Elliptic Curves - GitHub repository", 2019, <<https://github.com/cfrg/draft-irtf-cfrg-hash-to-curve>>.
- [I-D.irtf-cfrg-argon2] Biryukov, A., Dinu, D., Khovratovich, D., and S. Josefsson, "The memory-hard Argon2 password hash and proof-of-work function", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft,

draft-irtf-cfrg-argon2-12, 8 September 2020,
<<http://www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/draft-irtf-cfrg-argon2-12.txt>>.

[I-D.irtf-cfrg-bls-signature]

Boneh, D., Gorbunov, S., Wahby, R., Wee, H., and Z. Zhang, "BLS Signatures", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-irtf-cfrg-bls-signature-04, 10 September 2020, <<http://www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/draft-irtf-cfrg-bls-signature-04.txt>>.

[I-D.irtf-cfrg-ristretto255-decaf448]

Valence, H., 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, <<http://www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/draft-irtf-cfrg-ristretto255-decaf448-00.txt>>.

[I-D.irtf-cfrg-voprf]

Davidson, A., Sullivan, N., and C. Wood, "Oblivious Pseudorandom Functions (OPRFs) using Prime-Order Groups", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-irtf-cfrg-voprf-04, 13 July 2020, <<http://www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/draft-irtf-cfrg-voprf-04.txt>>.

[I-D.irtf-cfrg-vrf]

Goldberg, S., Reyzin, L., Papadopoulos, D., and J. Vcelak, "Verifiable Random Functions (VRFs)", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-irtf-cfrg-vrf-07, 18 June 2020, <<http://www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/draft-irtf-cfrg-vrf-07.txt>>.

[Icart09]

Icart, T., "How to Hash into Elliptic Curves", DOI 10.1007/978-3-642-03356-8_18, pages 303-316, In Advances in Cryptology - CRYPTO 2009, 2009, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-03356-8_18>.

[J96]

Jablon, D.P., "Strong password-only authenticated key exchange", DOI 10.1145/242896.242897, pages 5-26, In SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review, vol 26 issue 5, 1996, <<https://doi.org/10.1145/242896.242897>>.

[jubjub-fq]

"zkcrypto/jubjub - fq.rs", 2019, <<https://github.com/zkcrypto/jubjub/blob/master/src/fq.rs>>.

- [KLR10] Kammerer, J., Lercier, R., and G. Renault, "Encoding points on hyperelliptic curves over finite fields in deterministic polynomial time", DOI 10.1007/978-3-642-17455-1_18, pages 278-297, In PAIRING 2010, 2010, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-17455-1_18>.
- [L13] Langley, A., "Implementing Elligator for Curve25519", 2013, <<https://www.imperialviolet.org/2013/12/25/elligator.html>>.
- [LBB19] Lipp, B., Blanchet, B., and K. Bhargavan, "A Mechanised Proof of the WireGuard Virtual Private Network Protocol", In INRIA Research Report No. 9269, April 2019, <<https://hal.inria.fr/hal-02100345/>>.
- [MOV96] Menezes, A.J., van Oorschot, P.C., and S.A. Vanstone, "Handbook of Applied Cryptography", ISBN 9780849385230, publisher CRC Press, 1996, <<http://cacr.uwaterloo.ca/hac/>>.
- [MRH04] Maurer, U., Renner, R., and C. Holenstein, "Indifferentiability, impossibility results on reductions, and applications to the random oracle methodology", DOI 10.1007/978-3-540-24638-1_2, pages 21-39, In TCC 2004: Theory of Cryptography, February 2004, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-24638-1_2>.
- [MRV99] Micali, S., Rabin, M., and S. Vadhan, "Verifiable Random Functions", DOI 10.1109/SFFCS.1999.814584, In Symposium on the Foundations of Computer Science, October 1999, <<https://doi.org/10.1109/SFFCS.1999.814584>>.
- [MT98] Matsumoto, M. and T. Nishimura, "Mersenne twister: A 623-dimensionally equidistributed uniform pseudo-random number generator", DOI 10.1145/272991.272995, pages 3-30, In ACM Transactions on Modeling and Computer Simulation (TOMACS), Volume 8, Issue 1, January 1998, <<https://doi.org/10.1145/272991.272995>>.
- [NR97] Naor, M. and O. Reingold, "Number-theoretic constructions of efficient pseudo-random functions", DOI 10.1109/SFCS.1997.646134, In Symposium on the Foundations of Computer Science, October 1997, <<https://doi.org/10.1109/SFCS.1997.646134>>.

- [p1363.2] IEEE Computer Society, "IEEE Standard Specification for Password-Based Public-Key Cryptography Techniques", September 2008, <https://standards.ieee.org/standard/1363_2-2008.html>.
- [p1363a] IEEE Computer Society, "IEEE Standard Specifications for Public-Key Cryptography---Amendment 1: Additional Techniques", March 2004, <<https://standards.ieee.org/standard/1363a-2004.html>>.
- [P20] Pornin, T., "Efficient Elliptic Curve Operations On Microcontrollers With Finite Field Extensions", 2020, <<https://eprint.iacr.org/2020/009>>.
- [RCB16] Renes, J., Costello, C., and L. Batina, "Complete addition formulas for prime order elliptic curves", DOI 10.1007/978-3-662-49890-3_16, pages 403-428, In Advances in Cryptology - EUROCRYPT 2016, May 2016, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-49890-3_16>.
- [RFC2104] Krawczyk, H., Bellare, M., and R. Canetti, "HMAC: Keyed-Hashing for Message Authentication", RFC 2104, DOI 10.17487/RFC2104, February 1997, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2104>>.
- [RFC2898] Kaliski, B., "PKCS #5: Password-Based Cryptography Specification Version 2.0", RFC 2898, DOI 10.17487/RFC2898, September 2000, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2898>>.
- [RFC5869] Krawczyk, H. and P. Eronen, "HMAC-based Extract-and-Expand Key Derivation Function (HKDF)", RFC 5869, DOI 10.17487/RFC5869, May 2010, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5869>>.
- [RFC7693] Saarinen, M-J., Ed. and J-P. Aumasson, "The BLAKE2 Cryptographic Hash and Message Authentication Code (MAC)", RFC 7693, DOI 10.17487/RFC7693, November 2015, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7693>>.
- [RFC7914] Percival, C. and S. Josefsson, "The scrypt Password-Based Key Derivation Function", RFC 7914, DOI 10.17487/RFC7914, August 2016, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7914>>.

- [RSS11] Ristenpart, T., Shacham, H., and T. Shrimpton, "Careful with Composition: Limitations of the Indifferentiability Framework", DOI 10.1007/978-3-642-20465-4_27, pages 487-506, In Advances in Cryptology - EUROCRYPT 2011, May 2011, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-20465-4_27>.
- [S05] Skalba, M., "Points on elliptic curves over finite fields", DOI 10.4064/aa117-3-7, pages 293-301, In Acta Arithmetica, vol 117 no 3, 2005, <<https://doi.org/10.4064/aa117-3-7>>.
- [S85] Schoof, R., "Elliptic Curves Over Finite Fields and the Computation of Square Roots mod p ", DOI 10.1090/S0025-5718-1985-0777280-6, pages 483-494, In Mathematics of Computation vol 44 issue 170, April 1985, <<https://doi.org/10.1090/S0025-5718-1985-0777280-6>>.
- [SAGE] The Sage Developers, "SageMath, the Sage Mathematics Software System", 2019, <<https://www.sagemath.org>>.
- [SBCKD09] Scott, M., Benger, N., Charlemagne, M., Dominguez Perez, L.J., and E.J. Kachisa, "Fast Hashing to G2 on Pairing-Friendly Curves", DOI 10.1007/978-3-642-03298-1_8, pages 102-113, In Pairing-Based Cryptography - Pairing 2009, 2009, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-03298-1_8>.
- [SEC1] Standards for Efficient Cryptography Group (SECG), "SEC 1: Elliptic Curve Cryptography", May 2009, <<http://www.secg.org/sec1-v2.pdf>>.
- [SEC2] Standards for Efficient Cryptography Group (SECG), "SEC 2: Recommended Elliptic Curve Domain Parameters", January 2010, <<http://www.secg.org/sec2-v2.pdf>>.
- [SS04] Schinzel, A. and M. Skalba, "On equations $y^2 = x^n + k$ in a finite field.", DOI 10.4064/ba52-3-1, pages 223-226, In Bulletin Polish Acad. Sci. Math. vol 52, no 3, 2004, <<https://doi.org/10.4064/ba52-3-1>>.
- [SW06] Shallue, A. and C. van de Woestijne, "Construction of rational points on elliptic curves over finite fields", DOI 10.1007/11792086_36, pages 510-524, In Algorithmic Number Theory. ANTS 2006., 2006, <https://doi.org/10.1007/11792086_36>.

- [T14] Tibouchi, M., "Elligator squared: Uniform points on elliptic curves of prime order as uniform random strings", DOI 10.1007/978-3-662-45472-5_10, pages 139-156, In Financial Cryptography and Data Security - FC 2014, 2014, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-45472-5_10>.
- [TK17] Tibouchi, M. and T. Kim, "Improved elliptic curve hashing and point representation", DOI 10.1007/s10623-016-0288-2, pages 161-177, In Designs, Codes, and Cryptography, vol 82, 2017, <<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10623-016-0288-2>>.
- [U07] Ulas, M., "Rational points on certain hyperelliptic curves over finite fields", DOI 10.4064/ba55-2-1, pages 97-104, In Bulletin Polish Acad. Sci. Math. vol 55, no 2, 2007, <<https://doi.org/10.4064/ba55-2-1>>.
- [VR20] Vanhoef, M. and E. Ronen, "Dragonblood: Analyzing the Dragonfly Handshake of WPA3 and EAP-pwd", In IEEE Symposium on Security & Privacy (SP), 2020, <<https://eprint.iacr.org/2019/383>>.
- [W08] Washington, L.C., "Elliptic curves: Number theory and cryptography", ISBN 9781420071467, publisher Chapman and Hall / CRC, edition 2nd, 2008, <<https://www.crcpress.com/9781420071467>>.
- [W19] Wahby, R.S., "An explicit, generic parameterization for the Shallue--van de Woestijne map", 2019, <https://github.com/cfrg/draft-irtf-cfrg-hash-to-curve/raw/master/doc/svdw_params.pdf>.
- [WB19] Wahby, R.S. and D. Boneh, "Fast and simple constant-time hashing to the BLS12-381 elliptic curve", DOI 10.13154/tches.v2019.i4.154-179, ePrint 2019/403, issue 4, volume 2019, In IACR Trans. CHES, August 2019, <<https://eprint.iacr.org/2019/403>>.

Appendix A. Related work

The problem of mapping arbitrary bit strings to elliptic curve points has been the subject of both practical and theoretical research. This section briefly describes the background and research results that underly the recommendations in this document. This section is provided for informational purposes only.

A naive but generally insecure method of mapping a string msg to a point on an elliptic curve E having n points is to first fix a point P that generates the elliptic curve group, and a hash function H_n

from bit strings to integers less than n ; then compute $H_n(\text{msg}) * P$, where the $*$ operator represents scalar multiplication. The reason this approach is insecure is that the resulting point has a known discrete log relationship to P . Thus, except in cases where this method is specified by the protocol, it must not be used; doing so risks catastrophic security failures.

Boneh et al. [BLS01] describe an encoding method they call `MapToGroup`, which works roughly as follows: first, use the input string to initialize a pseudorandom number generator, then use the generator to produce a value x in F . If x is the x -coordinate of a point on the elliptic curve, output that point. Otherwise, generate a new value x in F and try again. Since a random value x in F has probability about $1/2$ of corresponding to a point on the curve, the expected number of tries is just two. However, the running time of this method depends on the input string, which means that it is not safe to use in protocols sensitive to timing side channels.

Schinzel and Skalba [SS04] introduce a method of constructing elliptic curve points deterministically, for a restricted class of curves and a very small number of points. Skalba [S05] generalizes this construction to more curves and more points on those curves. Shallue and van de Woestijne [SW06] further generalize and simplify Skalba's construction, yielding concretely efficient maps to a constant fraction of the points on almost any curve. Fouque and Tibouchi [FT12] give a parameterization of this mapping for Barreto-Naehrig pairing-friendly curves [BN05].

Ulas [U07] describes a simpler version of the Shallue-van de Woestijne map, and Brier et al. [BCIMRT10] give a further simplification, which the authors call the "simplified SWU" map. That simplified map applies only to fields of characteristic $p = 3 \pmod{4}$; Wahby and Boneh [WB19] generalize to fields of any characteristic, and give further optimizations.

Boneh and Franklin give a deterministic algorithm mapping to certain supersingular curves over fields of characteristic $p = 2 \pmod{3}$ [BF01]. Icart gives another deterministic algorithm which maps to any curve over a field of characteristic $p = 2 \pmod{3}$ [Icart09]. Several extensions and generalizations follow this work, including [FSV09], [FT10], [KLR10], [F11], and [CK11].

Following the work of Farashahi [F11], Fouque et al. [FJT13] describe a mapping to curves over fields of characteristic $p = 3 \pmod{4}$ having a number of points divisible by 4. Bernstein et al. [BHKL13] optimize this mapping and describe a related mapping that they call "Elligator 2," which applies to any curve over a field of odd characteristic having a point of order 2. This includes

Curve25519 and Curve448, both of which are CFRG-recommended curves [RFC7748]. Bernstein et al. [BLMP19] extend the Elligator 2 map to a class of supersingular curves over fields of characteristic $p = 3 \pmod{4}$.

An important caveat regarding all of the above deterministic mapping functions is that none of them map to the entire curve, but rather to some fraction of the points. This means that they cannot be used directly to construct a random oracle that outputs points on the curve.

Brier et al. [BCIMRT10] give two solutions to this problem. The first, which Brier et al. prove applies to Icart's method, computes $f(H_0(\text{msg})) + f(H_1(\text{msg}))$ for two distinct hash functions H_0 and H_1 from bit strings to F and a mapping f from F to the elliptic curve E . The second, which applies to essentially all deterministic mappings but is more costly, computes $f(H_0(\text{msg})) + H_2(\text{msg}) * P$, for P a generator of the elliptic curve group and H_2 a hash from bit strings to integers modulo r , the order of the elliptic curve group. Farashahi et al. [FFSTV13] improve the analysis of the first method, showing that it applies to essentially all deterministic mappings. Tibouchi and Kim [TK17] further refine the analysis and describe additional optimizations.

Complementary to the problem of mapping from bit strings to elliptic curve points, Bernstein et al. [BHKL13] study the problem of mapping from elliptic curve points to uniformly random bit strings, giving solutions for a class of curves including Montgomery and twisted Edwards curves. Tibouchi [T14] and Aranha et al. [AFQTZ14] generalize these results. This document does not deal with this complementary problem.

Appendix B. Hashing to ristretto255

ristretto255 [I-D.irtf-cfrg-ristretto255-decaf448] provides a prime-order group based on Curve25519 [RFC7748]. This section describes `hash_to_ristretto255`, which implements a random-oracle encoding to this group that has a uniform output distribution (Section 2.2.3) and the same security properties and interface as the `hash_to_curve` function (Section 3).

The `ristretto255` API defines a one-way map ([I-D.irtf-cfrg-ristretto255-decaf448], Section 4.3.4); this section refers to that map as `ristretto255_map`.

The `hash_to_ristretto255` function MUST be instantiated with an `expand_message` function that conforms to the requirements given in Section 5.4. In addition, it MUST use a domain separation tag

constructed as described in Section 3.1, and all domain separation recommendations given in Section 10.4 apply when implementing protocols that use `hash_to_ristretto255`.

`hash_to_ristretto255(msg)`

Parameters:

- `DST`, a domain separation tag (see discussion above).
- `expand_message`, a function that expands a byte string and domain separation tag into a uniformly random byte string (see discussion above).
- `ristretto255_map`, the one-way map from the `ristretto255` API.

Input: `msg`, an arbitrary-length byte string.

Output: `P`, an element of the `ristretto255` group.

Steps:

1. `uniform_bytes = expand_message(msg, DST, 64)`
2. `P = ristretto255_map(uniform_bytes)`
3. return `P`

Since `hash_to_ristretto255` is not a hash-to-curve suite, it does not have a Suite ID. If a similar identifier is needed, it MUST be constructed following the guidelines in Section 8.10, with the following parameters:

- * `CURVE_ID: "ristretto255"`
- * `HASH_ID: as described in Section 8.10`
- * `MAP_ID: "R255MAP"`
- * `ENC_VAR: "RO"`

For example, if `expand_message` is `expand_message_xmd` using SHA-512, the REQUIRED identifier is:

`ristretto255_XMD:SHA-512_R255MAP_RO_`

Appendix C. Hashing to `decaf448`

Similar to `ristretto255`, `decaf448`

[I-D.irtf-cfrg-ristretto255-decaf448] provides a prime-order group based on Curve448 [RFC7748]. This section describes `hash_to_decaf448`, which implements a random-oracle encoding to this group that has a uniform output distribution (Section 2.2.3) and the same security properties and interface as the `hash_to_curve` function (Section 3).

The decaf448 API defines a one-way map ([I-D.irtf-cfrg-ristretto255-decaf448], Section 5.3.4); this section refers to that map as `decaf448_map`.

The `hash_to_decaf448` function MUST be instantiated with an `expand_message` function that conforms to the requirements given in Section 5.4. In addition, it MUST use a domain separation tag constructed as described in Section 3.1, and all domain separation recommendations given in Section 10.4 apply when implementing protocols that use `hash_to_decaf448`.

`hash_to_decaf448(msg)`

Parameters:

- `DST`, a domain separation tag (see discussion above).
- `expand_message`, a function that expands a byte string and domain separation tag into a uniformly random byte string (see discussion above).
- `decaf448_map`, the one-way map from the decaf448 API.

Input: `msg`, an arbitrary-length byte string.

Output: `P`, an element of the decaf448 group.

Steps:

1. `uniform_bytes = expand_message(msg, DST, 112)`
2. `P = decaf448_map(uniform_bytes)`
3. return `P`

Since `hash_to_decaf448` is not a hash-to-curve suite, it does not have a Suite ID. If a similar identifier is needed, it MUST be constructed following the guidelines in Section 8.10, with the following parameters:

- * `CURVE_ID`: "decaf448"
- * `HASH_ID`: as described in Section 8.10
- * `MAP_ID`: "D448MAP"
- * `ENC_VAR`: "RO"

For example, if `expand_message` is `expand_message_xmd` using SHA-512, the REQUIRED identifier is:

`decaf448_XMD:SHA-512_D448MAP_RO_`

Appendix D. Rational maps

This section gives rational maps that can be used when hashing to twisted Edwards or Montgomery curves.

Given a twisted Edwards curve, Appendix D.1 shows how to derive a corresponding Montgomery curve and how to map from that curve to the twisted Edwards curve. This mapping may be used when hashing to twisted Edwards curves as described in Section 6.8.

Given a Montgomery curve, Appendix D.2 shows how to derive a corresponding Weierstrass curve and how to map from that curve to the Montgomery curve. This mapping can be used to hash to Montgomery or twisted Edwards curves via the Shallue-van de Woestijne (Section 6.6.1) or Simplified SWU (Section 6.6.2) method, as follows:

- * For Montgomery curves, first map to the Weierstrass curve, then convert to Montgomery coordinates via the mapping.
- * For twisted Edwards curves, compose the Weierstrass to Montgomery mapping with the Montgomery to twisted Edwards mapping (Appendix D.1) to obtain a Weierstrass curve and a mapping to the target twisted Edwards curve. Map to this Weierstrass curve, then convert to Edwards coordinates via the mapping.

D.1. Generic Montgomery to twisted Edwards map

This section gives a generic birational map between twisted Edwards and Montgomery curves.

The map in this section is a simplified version of the map given in [BBJLP08], Theorem 3.2. Specifically, this section's map handles exceptional cases in a simplified way that is geared towards hashing to a twisted Edwards curve's prime-order subgroup.

The twisted Edwards curve

$$a * v^2 + w^2 = 1 + d * v^2 * w^2$$

is birationally equivalent to the Montgomery curve

$$K * t^2 = s^3 + J * s^2 + s$$

which has the form required by the Elligator 2 mapping of Section 6.7.1. The coefficients of the Montgomery curve are

$$* J = 2 * (a + d) / (a - d)$$

$$* K = 4 / (a - d)$$

The rational map from the point (s, t) on the above Montgomery curve to the point (v, w) on the twisted Edwards curve is given by

$$* v = s / t$$

$$* w = (s - 1) / (s + 1)$$

This mapping is undefined when $t == 0$ or $s == -1$, i.e., when the denominator of either of the above rational functions is zero. Implementations MUST detect exceptional cases and return the value $(v, w) = (0, 1)$, which is the identity point on all twisted Edwards curves.

The following straight-line implementation of the above rational map handles the exceptional cases.

```
edw_to_monty_generic(s, t)
```

Input: (s, t) , a point on the curve $K * t^2 = s^3 + J * s^2 + s$.

Output: (v, w) , a point on an equivalent twisted Edwards curve.

```
1. tv1 = s + 1
2. tv2 = tv1 * t           # (s + 1) * t
3. tv2 = inv0(tv2)        # 1 / ((s + 1) * t)
4. v = tv2 * tv1          # 1 / t
5. v = v * s              # s / t
6. w = tv2 * t            # 1 / (s + 1)
7. tv1 = s - 1
8. w = w * tv1            # (s - 1) / (s + 1)
9. e = tv2 == 0
10. w = CMOV(w, 1, e)    # handle exceptional case
11. return (v, w)
```

For completeness, we also give the inverse relations. (Note that this map is not required when hashing to twisted Edwards curves.) The coefficients of the twisted Edwards curve corresponding to the above Montgomery curve are

$$* a = (J + 2) / K$$

$$* d = (J - 2) / K$$

The rational map from the point (v, w) on the twisted Edwards curve to the point (s, t) on the Montgomery curve is given by

$$* s = (1 + w) / (1 - w)$$

$$* \quad t = (1 + w) / (v * (1 - w))$$

The mapping is undefined when $v == 0$ or $w == 1$. When the goal is to map into the prime-order subgroup of the Montgomery curve, it suffices to return the identity point on the Montgomery curve in the exceptional cases.

D.2. Weierstrass to Montgomery map

The rational map from the point (s, t) on the Montgomery curve

$$K * t^2 = s^3 + J * s^2 + s$$

to the point (x, y) on the equivalent Weierstrass curve

$$y^2 = x^3 + A * x + B$$

is given by:

$$* \quad A = (3 - J^2) / (3 * K^2)$$

$$* \quad B = (2 * J^3 - 9 * J) / (27 * K^3)$$

$$* \quad x = (3 * s + J) / (3 * K)$$

$$* \quad y = t / K$$

The inverse map, from the point (x, y) to the point (s, t) , is given by

$$* \quad s = (3 * K * x - J) / 3$$

$$* \quad t = y * K$$

This mapping can be used to apply the Shallue-van de Woestijne (Section 6.6.1) or Simplified SWU (Section 6.6.2) method to Montgomery curves.

Appendix E. Isogeny maps for suites

This section specifies the isogeny maps for the secp256k1 and BLS12-381 suites listed in Section 8.

These maps are given in terms of affine coordinates. Wahby and Boneh ([WB19], Section 4.3) show how to evaluate these maps in a projective coordinate system (Appendix G.1), which avoids modular inversions.

Refer to the draft repository [hash2curve-repo] for a Sage [SAGE] script that constructs these isogenies.

E.1. 3-isogeny map for secp256k1

This section specifies the isogeny map for the secp256k1 suite listed in Section 8.7.

The 3-isogeny map from (x', y') on E' to (x, y) on E is given by the following rational functions:

* $x = x_num / x_den$, where

$$- x_num = k_(1,3) * x'^3 + k_(1,2) * x'^2 + k_(1,1) * x' + k_(1,0)$$

$$- x_den = x'^2 + k_(2,1) * x' + k_(2,0)$$

* $y = y' * y_num / y_den$, where

$$- y_num = k_(3,3) * x'^3 + k_(3,2) * x'^2 + k_(3,1) * x' + k_(3,0)$$

$$- y_den = x'^3 + k_(4,2) * x'^2 + k_(4,1) * x' + k_(4,0)$$

The constants used to compute x_num are as follows:

* $k_(1,0) =$
0x8e38daaaaa8c7

* $k_(1,1) =$
0x7d3d4c80bc321d5b9f315cea7fd44c5d595d2fc0bf63b92dfff1044f17c6581

* $k_(1,2) =$
0x534c328d23f234e6e2a413deca25caece4506144037c40314ecbd0b53d9dd262

* $k_(1,3) =$
0x8e38daaaaa88c

The constants used to compute x_den are as follows:

* $k_(2,0) =$
0xd35771193d94918a9ca34ccbb7b640dd86cd409542f8487d9fe6b745781eb49b

* $k_(2,1) =$
0xedadc6f64383dc1df7c4b2d51b54225406d36b641f5e41bbc52a56612a8c6d14

The constants used to compute y_num are as follows:

```

* k_(3,0) =
  0x4bda12f684bda12f684bda12f684bda12f684bda12f684b8e38e23c

* k_(3,1) =
  0xc75e0c32d5cb7c0fa9d0a54b12a0a6d5647ab046d686da6fdffc90fc201d71a3

* k_(3,2) =
  0x29a6194691f91a73715209ef6512e576722830a201be2018a765e85a9ecee931

* k_(3,3) =
  0x2f684bda12f684bda12f684bda12f684bda12f684bda12f684bda12f38e38d84

```

The constants used to compute y_{den} are as follows:

```

* k_(4,0) =
  0xfffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffeffffff93b

* k_(4,1) =
  0x7a06534bb8bdb49fd5e9e6632722c2989467c1bfc8e8d978dfb425d2685c2573

* k_(4,2) =
  0x6484aa716545ca2cf3a70c3fa8fe337e0a3d21162f0d6299a7bf8192bfd2a76f

```

E.2. 11-isogeny map for BLS12-381 G1

The 11-isogeny map from (x', y') on E' to (x, y) on E is given by the following rational functions:

```

* x = x_num / x_den, where

- x_num = k_(1,11) * x'^11 + k_(1,10) * x'^10 + k_(1,9) * x'^9 +
  ... + k_(1,0)

- x_den = x'^10 + k_(2,9) * x'^9 + k_(2,8) * x'^8 + ... + k_(2,0)

* y = y' * y_num / y_den, where

- y_num = k_(3,15) * x'^15 + k_(3,14) * x'^14 + k_(3,13) * x'^13
  + ... + k_(3,0)

- y_den = x'^15 + k_(4,14) * x'^14 + k_(4,13) * x'^13 + ... +
  k_(4,0)

```

The constants used to compute x_{num} are as follows:

```

* k_(1,0) = 0x11a05f2b1e833340b809101dd99815856b303e88a2d7005ff2627b
  56cdb4e2c85610c2d5f2e62d6eaeac1662734649b7

```


- * $k_{(1,1)} = 0x17294ed3e943ab2f0588bab22147a81c7c17e75b2f6a8417f565e33c70d1e86b4838f2a6f318c356e834eef1b3cb83bb$
- * $k_{(1,2)} = 0xd54005db97678ec1d1048c5d10a9a1bce032473295983e56878e501ec68e25c958c3e3d2a09729fe0179f9dac9edcb0$
- * $k_{(1,3)} = 0x1778e7166fcc6db74e0609d307e55412d7f5e4656a8dbf25f1b33289f1b330835336e25ce3107193c5b388641d9b6861$
- * $k_{(1,4)} = 0xe99726a3199f4436642b4b3e4118e5499db995a1257fb3f086eeb65982fac18985a286f301e77c451154ce9ac8895d9$
- * $k_{(1,5)} = 0x1630c3250d7313ff01d1201bf7a74ab5db3cb17dd952799b9ed3ab9097e68f90a0870d2dcae73d19cd13c1c66f652983$
- * $k_{(1,6)} = 0xd6ed6553fe44d296a3726c38ae652bfb11586264f0f8ce19008e218f9c86b2a8da25128c1052ecadd7f225a139ed84$
- * $k_{(1,7)} = 0x17b81e7701abdbe2e8743884d1117e53356de5ab275b4db1a682c62ef0f2753339b7c8f8c8f475af9ccb5618e3f0c88e$
- * $k_{(1,8)} = 0x80d3cf1f9a78fc47b90b33563be990dc43b756ce79f5574a2c596c928c5d1de4fa295f296b74e956d71986a8497e317$
- * $k_{(1,9)} = 0x169b1f8e1bcfa7c42e0c37515d138f22dd2ecb803a0c5c99676314baf4bb1b7fa3190b2edc0327797f241067be390c9e$
- * $k_{(1,10)} = 0x10321da079ce07e272d8ec09d2565b0dfa7dcccde6787f96d50af36003b14866f69b771f8c285decca67df3f1605fb7b$
- * $k_{(1,11)} = 0x6e08c248e260e70bd1e962381edee3d31d79d7e22c837bc23c0bf1bc24c6b68c24b1b80b64d391fa9c8ba2e8ba2d229$

The constants used to compute x_{den} are as follows:

- * $k_{(2,0)} = 0x8ca8d548cff19ae18b2e62f4bd3fa6f01d5ef4ba35b48ba9c9588617fc8ac62b558d681be343df8993cf9fa40d21b1c$
- * $k_{(2,1)} = 0x12561a5deb559c4348b4711298e536367041e8ca0cf0800c0126c2588c48bf5713daa8846cb026e9e5c8276ec82b3bff$
- * $k_{(2,2)} = 0xb2962fe57a3225e8137e629bff2991f6f89416f5a718cd1fca64e00b11aceacd6a3d0967c94fedcfc239ba5cb83e19$
- * $k_{(2,3)} = 0x3425581a58ae2fec83aafe7c40eb545b08243f16b1655154cca8abc28d6fd04976d5243eecf5c4130de8938dc62cd8$

- * $k_{(2,4)} = 0x13a8e162022914a80a6f1d5f43e7a07dffdfc759a12062bb8d6b44e833b306da9bd29ba81f35781d539d395b3532a21e$
- * $k_{(2,5)} = 0xe7355f8e4e667b955390f7f0506c6e9395735e9ce9cad4d0a43bcef24b8982f7400d24bc4228f11c02df9a29f6304a5$
- * $k_{(2,6)} = 0x772caacf16936190f3e0c63e0596721570f5799af53a1894e2e073062aede9cea73b3538f0de06cec2574496ee84a3a$
- * $k_{(2,7)} = 0x14a7ac2a9d64a8b230b3f5b074cf01996e7f63c21bca68a81996e1cdf9822c580fa5b9489d11e2d311f7d99bbdcc5a5e$
- * $k_{(2,8)} = 0xa10ecf6ada54f825e920b3dafc7a3cce07f8d1d7161366b74100da67f39883503826692abba43704776ec3a79a1d641$
- * $k_{(2,9)} = 0x95fc13ab9e92ad4476d6e3eb3a56680f682b4ee96f7d03776df533978f31c1593174e4b4b7865002d6384d168ecdd0a$

The constants used to compute y_{num} are as follows:

- * $k_{(3,0)} = 0x90d97c81ba24ee0259d1f094980dcfa11ad138e48a869522b52af6c956543d3cd0c7aee9b3ba3c2be9845719707bb33$
- * $k_{(3,1)} = 0x134996a104ee5811d51036d776fb46831223e96c254f383d0f906343eb67ad34d6c56711962fa8bfe097e75a2e41c696$
- * $k_{(3,2)} = 0xcc786baa966e66f4a384c86a3b49942552e2d658a31ce2c344be4b91400da7d26d521628b00523b8dfe240c72de1f6$
- * $k_{(3,3)} = 0x1f86376e8981c217898751ad8746757d42aa7b90eeb791c09e4a3ec03251cf9de405aba9ec61deca6355c77b0e5f4cb$
- * $k_{(3,4)} = 0x8cc03fdefe0ff135caf4fe2a21529c4195536f3ce50b879833fd221351adc2ee7f8dc099040a841b6daecf2e8fedb$
- * $k_{(3,5)} = 0x16603fca40634b6a2211e11db8f0a6a074a7d0d4afadb7bd76505c3d3ad5544e203f6326c95a807299b23ab13633a5f0$
- * $k_{(3,6)} = 0x4ab0b9bcfac1bbcb2c977d027796b3ce75bb8ca2be184cb5231413c4d634f3747a87ac2460f415ec961f8855fe9d6f2$
- * $k_{(3,7)} = 0x987c8d5333ab86fde9926bd2ca6c674170a05bfe3bdd81ffd038da6c26c842642f64550fedfe935a15e4ca31870fb29$
- * $k_{(3,8)} = 0x9fc4018bd96684be88c9e221e4da1bb8f3abd16679dc26c1e8b6e6a1f20cabe69d65201c78607a360370e577bdba587$

- * $k_{(3,9)} = 0xe1bba7a1186bdb5223abde7ada14a23c42a0ca7915af6fe06985e7ed1e4d43b9b3f7055dd4eba6f2bafaaebca731c30$
- * $k_{(3,10)} = 0x19713e47937cd1be0dfd0b8f1d43fb93cd2fcbcb6caf493fd1183e416389e61031bf3a5cce3fbafce813711ad011c132$
- * $k_{(3,11)} = 0x18b46a908f36f6deb918c143fed2edcc523559b8aaf0c2462e6bfe7f911f643249d9cdf41b44d606ce07c8a4d0074d8e$
- * $k_{(3,12)} = 0xb182cac101b9399d155096004f53f447aa7b12a3426b08ec02710e807b4633f06c851c1919211f20d4c04f00b971ef8$
- * $k_{(3,13)} = 0x245a394ad1eca9b72fc00ae7be315dc757b3b080d4c158013e6632d3c40659cc6cf90ad1c232a6442d9d3f5db980133$
- * $k_{(3,14)} = 0x5c129645e44cf1102a159f748c4a3fc5e673d81d7e86568d9ab0f5d396a7ce46ba1049b6579afb7866b1e715475224b$
- * $k_{(3,15)} = 0x15e6be4e990f03ce4ea50b3b42df2eb5cb181d8f84965a3957add4fa95af01b2b665027efec01c7704b456be69c8b604$

The constants used to compute y_{den} are as follows:

- * $k_{(4,0)} = 0x16112c4c3a9c98b252181140fad0eae9601a6de578980be6eec3232b5be72e7a07f3688ef60c206d01479253b03663c1$
- * $k_{(4,1)} = 0x1962d75c2381201e1a0cbd6c43c348b885c84ff731c4d59ca4a10356f453e01f78a4260763529e3532f6102c2e49a03d$
- * $k_{(4,2)} = 0x58df3306640da276faaae7d6e8eb15778c4855551ae7f310c35a5dd279cd2eca6757cd636f96f891e2538b53dbf67f2$
- * $k_{(4,3)} = 0x16b7d288798e5395f20d23bf89edb4d1d115c5dbddbcd30e123da489e726af41727364f2c28297ada8d26d98445f5416$
- * $k_{(4,4)} = 0xbe0e079545f43e4b00cc912f8228ddcc6d19c9f0f69bbb0542eda0fc9dec916a20b15dc0fd2ededda39142311a5001d$
- * $k_{(4,5)} = 0x8d9e5297186db2d9fb266eaac783182b70152c65550d881c5ecd87b6f0f5a6449f38db9dfa9cce202c6477faaf9b7ac$
- * $k_{(4,6)} = 0x166007c08a99db2fc3ba8734ace9824b5eecdafa8d0cf8ef5dd365bc400a0051d5fa9c01a58b1fb93d1a1399126a775c$
- * $k_{(4,7)} = 0x16a3ef08be3ea7ea03bcddfabb6ff6ee5a4375efaf1f4fd7feb34fd206357132b920f5b00801dee460ee415a15812ed9$

- * $k_{(4,8)} = 0x1866c8ed336c61231a1be54fd1d74cc4f9fb0ce4c6af5920abc5750c4bf39b4852cfe2f7bb9248836b233d9d55535d4a$
- * $k_{(4,9)} = 0x167a55cda70a6e1cea820597d94a84903216f763e13d87bb5308592e7ea7d4fbc7385ea3d529b35e346ef48bb8913f55$
- * $k_{(4,10)} = 0x4d2f259eea405bd48f010a01ad2911d9c6dd039bb61a6290e591b36e636a5c871a5c29f4f83060400f8b49cba8f6aa8$
- * $k_{(4,11)} = 0xacccb67481d033ff5852c1e48c50c477f94ff8aefce42d28c0f9a88cea7913516f968986f7ebbea9684b529e2561092$
- * $k_{(4,12)} = 0xad6b9514c767fe3c3613144b45f1496543346d98adf02267d5cee9a00d9b8693000763e3b90ac11e99b138573345cc$
- * $k_{(4,13)} = 0x2660400eb2e4f3b628bdd0d53cd76f2bf565b94e72927c1cb748df27942480e420517bd8714cc80d1fadcd1326ed06f7$
- * $k_{(4,14)} = 0xe0fa1d816ddc03e6b24255e0d7819c171c40f65e273b853324efcd6356caa205ca2f570f13497804415473a1d634b8f$

E.3. 3-isogeny map for BLS12-381 G2

The 3-isogeny map from (x', y') on E' to (x, y) on E is given by the following rational functions:

- * $x = x_{\text{num}} / x_{\text{den}}$, where
 - $x_{\text{num}} = k_{(1,3)} * x'^3 + k_{(1,2)} * x'^2 + k_{(1,1)} * x' + k_{(1,0)}$
 - $x_{\text{den}} = x'^2 + k_{(2,1)} * x' + k_{(2,0)}$
- * $y = y' * y_{\text{num}} / y_{\text{den}}$, where
 - $y_{\text{num}} = k_{(3,3)} * x'^3 + k_{(3,2)} * x'^2 + k_{(3,1)} * x' + k_{(3,0)}$
 - $y_{\text{den}} = x'^3 + k_{(4,2)} * x'^2 + k_{(4,1)} * x' + k_{(4,0)}$

The constants used to compute x_{num} are as follows:

- * $k_{(1,0)} = 0x5c759507e8e333ebb5b7a9a47d7ed8532c52d39fd3a042a88b58423c50ae15d5c2638e343d9c71c6238aaaaaaaa97d6 + 0x5c759507e8e333ebb5b7a9a47d7ed8532c52d39fd3a042a88b58423c50ae15d5c2638e343d9c71c6238aaaaaaaa97d6 * I$

* $k_{(1,1)} = 0x11560bf17baa99bc32126fced787c88f984f87adf7ae0c7f9a208c6b4f20a4181472aaa9cb8d555526a9fffffffffc71a * I$

* $k_{(1,2)} = 0x11560bf17baa99bc32126fced787c88f984f87adf7ae0c7f9a208c6b4f20a4181472aaa9cb8d555526a9fffffffffc71e + 0x8ab05f8bdd54cde190937e76bc3e447cc27c3d6fbd7063fcd104635a790520c0a395554e5c6aaaa9354ffffffffffe38d * I$

* $k_{(1,3)} = 0x171d6541fa38ccfaed6dea691f5fb614cb14b4e7f4e810aa22d6108f142b85757098e38d0f671c7188e2aaaaaaaa5ed1$

The constants used to compute x_{den} are as follows:

* $k_{(2,0)} = 0x1a0111ea397fe69a4b1ba7b6434bacd764774b84f38512bf6730d2a0f6b0f6241eabfffeb153ffffb9feffffffffffaa63 * I$

* $k_{(2,1)} = 0xc + 0x1a0111ea397fe69a4b1ba7b6434bacd764774b84f38512bf6730d2a0f6b0f6241eabfffeb153ffffb9feffffffffffaa9f * I$

The constants used to compute y_{num} are as follows:

* $k_{(3,0)} = 0x1530477c7ab4113b59a4c18b076d11930f7da5d4a07f649bf54439d87d27e500fc8c25ebf8c92f6812cfc71c71c6d706 + 0x1530477c7ab4113b59a4c18b076d11930f7da5d4a07f649bf54439d87d27e500fc8c25ebf8c92f6812cfc71c71c6d706 * I$

* $k_{(3,1)} = 0x5c759507e8e333ebb5b7a9a47d7ed8532c52d39fd3a042a88b58423c50ae15d5c2638e343d9c71c6238aaaaaaaa97be * I$

* $k_{(3,2)} = 0x11560bf17baa99bc32126fced787c88f984f87adf7ae0c7f9a208c6b4f20a4181472aaa9cb8d555526a9fffffffffc71c + 0x8ab05f8bdd54cde190937e76bc3e447cc27c3d6fbd7063fcd104635a790520c0a395554e5c6aaaa9354ffffffffffe38f * I$

* $k_{(3,3)} = 0x124c9ad43b6cf79bfbf7043de3811ad0761b0f37a1e26286b0e977c69aa274524e79097a56dc4bd9e1b371c71c718b10$

The constants used to compute y_{den} are as follows:

* $k_{(4,0)} = 0x1a0111ea397fe69a4b1ba7b6434bacd764774b84f38512bf6730d2a0f6b0f6241eabfffeb153ffffb9feffffffffffa8fb + 0x1a0111ea397fe69a4b1ba7b6434bacd764774b84f38512bf6730d2a0f6b0f6241eabfffeb153ffffb9feffffffffffa8fb * I$

* $k_{(4,1)} = 0x1a0111ea397fe69a4b1ba7b6434bacd764774b84f38512bf6730d2a0f6b0f6241eabfffeb153ffffb9feffffffffffa9d3 * I$

```
* k_(4,2) = 0x12 + 0x1a0111ea397fe69a4b1ba7b6434bacd764774b84f38512b
f6730d2a0f6b0f6241eabfffeb153ffffb9fefffffffffaa99 * I
```

Appendix F. Straight-line implementations of deterministic mappings

This section gives straight-line implementations of the mappings of Section 6. These implementations are generic, i.e., they are defined for any curve and field. Appendix G gives example implementations that are optimized for specific classes of curves and fields.

F.1. Shallue-van de Woestijne method

This section gives a straight-line implementation of the Shallue and van de Woestijne method for any Weierstrass curve of the form given in Section 6.6. See Section 6.6.1 for information on the constants used in this mapping.

```
map_to_curve_svdw(u)
```

Input: u , an element of F .

Output: (x, y) , a point on E .

Constants:

1. $c_1 = g(Z)$
2. $c_2 = -Z / 2$
3. $c_3 = \text{sqrt}(-g(Z) * (3 * Z^2 + 4 * A))$ # $\text{sgn}_0(c_3)$ MUST equal 0
4. $c_4 = -4 * g(Z) / (3 * Z^2 + 4 * A)$

Steps:

1. $tv_1 = u^2$
2. $tv_1 = tv_1 * c_1$
3. $tv_2 = 1 + tv_1$
4. $tv_1 = 1 - tv_1$
5. $tv_3 = tv_1 * tv_2$
6. $tv_3 = \text{inv}_0(tv_3)$
7. $tv_4 = u * tv_1$
8. $tv_4 = tv_4 * tv_3$
9. $tv_4 = tv_4 * c_3$
10. $x_1 = c_2 - tv_4$
11. $gx_1 = x_1^2$
12. $gx_1 = gx_1 + A$
13. $gx_1 = gx_1 * x_1$
14. $gx_1 = gx_1 + B$
15. $e_1 = \text{is_square}(gx_1)$
16. $x_2 = c_2 + tv_4$
17. $gx_2 = x_2^2$
18. $gx_2 = gx_2 + A$
19. $gx_2 = gx_2 * x_2$

```
20. gx2 = gx2 + B
21. e2 = is_square(gx2) AND NOT e1      # Avoid short-circuit logic ops
22. x3 = tv2^2
23. x3 = x3 * tv3
24. x3 = x3^2
25. x3 = x3 * c4
26. x3 = x3 + Z
27.  x = CMOV(x3, x1, e1)                # x = x1 if gx1 is square, else x = x3
28.  x = CMOV(x, x2, e2)                # x = x2 if gx2 is square and gx1 is not
29.  gx = x^2
30.  gx = gx + A
31.  gx = gx * x
32.  gx = gx + B
33.  y = sqrt(gx)
34.  e3 = sgn0(u) == sgn0(y)
35.  y = CMOV(-y, y, e3)                # Select correct sign of y
36. return (x, y)
```

F.2. Simplified SWU method

This section gives a straight-line implementation of the simplified SWU method for any Weierstrass curve of the form given in Section 6.6. See Section 6.6.2 for information on the constants used in this mapping.

Appendix G.2 gives optimized straight-line procedures that apply to specific classes of curves and base fields.

map_to_curve_simple_swu(u)

Input: u, an element of F.

Output: (x, y), a point on E.

Constants:

1. c1 = -B / A
2. c2 = -1 / Z

Steps:

1. tv1 = Z * u²
2. tv2 = tv1²
3. x1 = tv1 + tv2
4. x1 = inv0(x1)
5. e1 = x1 == 0
6. x1 = x1 + 1
7. x1 = CMOV(x1, c2, e1) # If (tv1 + tv2) == 0, set x1 = -1 / Z
8. x1 = x1 * c1 # x1 = (-B / A) * (1 + (1 / (Z² * u⁴ + Z * u²)))
9. gx1 = x1²
10. gx1 = gx1 + A
11. gx1 = gx1 * x1
12. gx1 = gx1 + B # gx1 = g(x1) = x1³ + A * x1 + B
13. x2 = tv1 * x1 # x2 = Z * u² * x1
14. tv2 = tv1 * tv2
15. gx2 = gx1 * tv2 # gx2 = (Z * u²)³ * gx1
16. e2 = is_square(gx1)
17. x = CMOV(x2, x1, e2) # If is_square(gx1), x = x1, else x = x2
18. y2 = CMOV(gx2, gx1, e2) # If is_square(gx1), y2 = gx1, else y2 = gx2
19. y = sqrt(y2)
20. e3 = sgn0(u) == sgn0(y) # Fix sign of y
21. y = CMOV(-y, y, e3)
22. return (x, y)

F.3. Elligator 2 method

This section gives a straight-line implementation of the Elligator 2 method for any Montgomery curve of the form given in Section 6.7. See Section 6.7.1 for information on the constants used in this mapping.

Appendix G.3 gives optimized straight-line procedures that apply to specific classes of curves and base fields, including curve25519 and curve448 [RFC7748].

map_to_curve_elligator2(u)

Input: u, an element of F.

Output: (s, t), a point on M.

Constants:

1. $c1 = J / K$
2. $c2 = 1 / K^2$

Steps:

1. $tv1 = u^2$
2. $tv1 = Z * tv1$ # $Z * u^2$
3. $e1 = tv1 == -1$ # exceptional case: $Z * u^2 == -1$
4. $tv1 = CMOV(tv1, 0, e1)$ # if $tv1 == -1$, set $tv1 = 0$
5. $x1 = tv1 + 1$
6. $x1 = inv0(x1)$
7. $x1 = -c1 * x1$ # $x1 = -(J / K) / (1 + Z * u^2)$
8. $gx1 = x1 + c1$
9. $gx1 = gx1 * x1$
10. $gx1 = gx1 + c2$
11. $gx1 = gx1 * x1$ # $gx1 = x1^3 + (J / K) * x1^2 + x1 / K^2$
12. $x2 = -x1 - c1$
13. $gx2 = tv1 * gx1$
14. $e2 = is_square(gx1)$
15. $x = CMOV(x2, x1, e2)$ # If $is_square(gx1)$, $x = x1$, else $x = x2$
16. $y2 = CMOV(gx2, gx1, e2)$ # If $is_square(gx1)$, $y2 = gx1$, else $y2 = gx2$
17. $y = sqrt(y2)$
18. $e3 = sgn0(y) == 1$
19. $y = CMOV(y, -y, e2 XOR e3)$ # fix sign of y
20. $s = x * K$
21. $t = y * K$
22. return (s, t)

Appendix G. Optimized sample code

This section gives sample implementations optimized for some of the elliptic curves listed in Section 8. Sample Sage [SAGE] code for each algorithm can also be found in the draft repository [hash2curve-repo].

G.1. Interface and projective coordinate systems

The sample code in this section uses a different interface than the mappings of Section 6. Specifically, each mapping function in this section has the following signature:

```
(xn, xd, yn, yd) = map_to_curve(u)
```

The resulting affine point (x, y) is given by $(x_n / x_d, y_n / y_d)$.

The reason for this modified interface is that it enables further optimizations when working with points in a projective coordinate system. This is desirable, for example, when the resulting point will be immediately multiplied by a scalar, since most scalar multiplication algorithms operate on projective points.

Projective coordinates are also useful when implementing random oracle encodings (Section 3). One reason is that, in general, point addition is faster using projective coordinates. Another reason is that, for Weierstrass curves, projective coordinates allow using complete addition formulas [RCB16]. This is especially convenient when implementing a constant-time encoding, because it eliminates the need for a special case when $Q_0 == Q_1$, which incomplete addition formulas usually do not handle.

The following are two commonly used projective coordinate systems and the corresponding conversions:

- * A point (X, Y, Z) in homogeneous projective coordinates corresponds to the affine point $(x, y) = (X / Z, Y / Z)$; the inverse conversion is given by $(X, Y, Z) = (x, y, 1)$. To convert (x_n, x_d, y_n, y_d) to homogeneous projective coordinates, compute $(X, Y, Z) = (x_n * y_d, y_n * x_d, x_d * y_d)$.
- * A point (X', Y', Z') in Jacobian projective coordinates corresponds to the affine point $(x, y) = (X' / Z'^2, Y' / Z'^3)$; the inverse conversion is given by $(X', Y', Z') = (x, y, 1)$. To convert (x_n, x_d, y_n, y_d) to Jacobian projective coordinates, compute $(X', Y', Z') = (x_n * x_d * y_d^2, y_n * y_d^2 * x_d^3, x_d * y_d)$.

G.2. Simplified SWU

G.2.1. $q = 3 \pmod{4}$

The following is a straight-line implementation of the Simplified SWU mapping that applies to any curve over $GF(q)$ where $q = 3 \pmod{4}$. This includes the ciphersuites for NIST curves P-256, P-384, and P-521 [FIPS186-4] given in Section 8. It also includes the curves isogenous to secp256k1 (Section 8.7) and BLS12-381 G1 (Section 8.8.1).

The implementations for these curves differ only in the constants and the base field. The constant definitions below are given in terms of the parameters for the Simplified SWU mapping; for parameter values for the curves listed above, see Section 8.2 (P-256), Section 8.3 (P-384), Section 8.4 (P-521), Section 8.7 (E' isogenous to secp256k1), and Section 8.8.1 (E' isogenous to BLS12-381 G1).

map_to_curve_simple_swu_3mod4(u)

Input: u , an element of F .

Output: (x_n, x_d, y_n, y_d) such that $(x_n / x_d, y_n / y_d)$ is a point on the target curve.

Constants:

1. $c_1 = (q - 3) / 4$ # Integer arithmetic
2. $c_2 = \text{sqrt}(-Z^3)$

Steps:

1. $tv_1 = u^2$
2. $tv_3 = Z * tv_1$
3. $tv_2 = tv_3^2$
4. $x_d = tv_2 + tv_3$
5. $x_{1n} = x_d + 1$
6. $x_{1n} = x_{1n} * B$
7. $x_d = -A * x_d$
8. $e_1 = x_d == 0$
9. $x_d = \text{CMOV}(x_d, Z * A, e_1)$ # If $x_d == 0$, set $x_d = Z * A$
10. $tv_2 = x_d^2$
11. $gxd = tv_2 * x_d$ # $gxd == x_d^3$
12. $tv_2 = A * tv_2$
13. $gx_1 = x_{1n}^2$
14. $gx_1 = gx_1 + tv_2$ # $x_{1n}^2 + A * x_d^2$
15. $gx_1 = gx_1 * x_{1n}$ # $x_{1n}^3 + A * x_{1n} * x_d^2$
16. $tv_2 = B * gxd$
17. $gx_1 = gx_1 + tv_2$ # $x_{1n}^3 + A * x_{1n} * x_d^2 + B * x_d^3$
18. $tv_4 = gxd^2$
19. $tv_2 = gx_1 * gxd$
20. $tv_4 = tv_4 * tv_2$ # $gx_1 * gxd^3$
21. $y_1 = tv_4^{c_1}$ # $(gx_1 * gxd^3)^{((q - 3) / 4)}$
22. $y_1 = y_1 * tv_2$ # $gx_1 * gxd * (gx_1 * gxd^3)^{((q - 3) / 4)}$
23. $x_{2n} = tv_3 * x_{1n}$ # $x_2 = x_{2n} / x_d = Z * u^2 * x_{1n} / x_d$
24. $y_2 = y_1 * c_2$ # $y_2 = y_1 * \text{sqrt}(-Z^3)$
25. $y_2 = y_2 * tv_1$
26. $y_2 = y_2 * u$
27. $tv_2 = y_1^2$
28. $tv_2 = tv_2 * gxd$
29. $e_2 = tv_2 == gx_1$
30. $x_n = \text{CMOV}(x_{2n}, x_{1n}, e_2)$ # If e_2 , $x = x_1$, else $x = x_2$
31. $y = \text{CMOV}(y_2, y_1, e_2)$ # If e_2 , $y = y_1$, else $y = y_2$
32. $e_3 = \text{sgn}_0(u) == \text{sgn}_0(y)$ # Fix sign of y
33. $y = \text{CMOV}(-y, y, e_3)$
34. return $(x_n, x_d, y, 1)$

G.2.2. $q = 5 \pmod{8}$

The following is a straight-line implementation of the Simplified SWU mapping that applied to any curve over $\text{GF}(q)$ where $q = 5 \pmod{8}$.

map_to_curve_simple_sswu_5mod8(u)

Input: u , an element of F .

Output: (x_n, x_d, y_n, y_d) such that $(x_n / x_d, y_n / y_d)$ is a point on the target curve.

Constants:

1. $c_1 = (q - 5) / 8$ # Integer arithmetic
2. $c_2 = \text{sqrt}(-1)$
3. $c_3 = \text{sqrt}(Z^3 / c_2)$

Steps:

1. $tv_1 = u^2$
2. $tv_3 = Z * tv_1$
3. $tv_5 = tv_3^2$
4. $x_d = tv_5 + tv_3$
5. $x_{1n} = x_d + 1$
6. $x_{1n} = x_{1n} * B$
7. $x_d = -A * x_d$
8. $e_1 = x_d == 0$
9. $x_d = \text{CMOV}(x_d, Z * A, e_1)$ # If $x_d == 0$, set $x_d = Z * A$
10. $tv_2 = x_d^2$
11. $g_{xd} = tv_2 * x_d$ # $g_{xd} == x_d^3$
12. $tv_2 = A * tv_2$
13. $g_{x1} = x_{1n}^2$
14. $g_{x1} = g_{x1} + tv_2$ # $x_{1n}^2 + A * x_d^2$
15. $g_{x1} = g_{x1} * x_{1n}$ # $x_{1n}^3 + A * x_{1n} * x_d^2$
16. $tv_2 = B * g_{xd}$
17. $g_{x1} = g_{x1} + tv_2$ # $x_{1n}^3 + A * x_{1n} * x_d^2 + B * x_d^3$
18. $tv_4 = g_{xd}^2$
19. $tv_2 = tv_4 * g_{xd}$ # g_{xd}^3
20. $tv_4 = tv_4^2$ # g_{xd}^4
21. $tv_2 = tv_2 * g_{x1}$ # $g_{x1} * g_{xd}^3$
22. $tv_4 = tv_4 * tv_2$ # $g_{x1} * g_{xd}^7$
23. $y = tv_4^{c_1}$ # $(g_{x1} * g_{xd}^7)^{(q-5)/8}$
24. $y = y * tv_2$ # This is almost $\text{sqrt}(g_{x1})$
25. $tv_4 = y * c_2$ # check the two possible sqrts
26. $tv_2 = tv_4^2$
27. $tv_2 = tv_2 * g_{xd}$
28. $e_2 = tv_2 == g_{x1}$
29. $y = \text{CMOV}(y, tv_4, e_2)$
30. $g_{x2} = g_{x1} * tv_5$
31. $g_{x2} = g_{x2} * tv_3$ # $g_{x2} = g_{x1} * Z^3 * u^6$

```

32. tv1 = y * tv1
33. tv1 = tv1 * u           # This is almost sqrt(gx2)
34. tv1 = tv1 * c3         # check the two possible sqrts
35. tv4 = tv1 * c2
36. tv2 = tv4^2
37. tv2 = tv2 * gxd
38. e3 = tv2 == gx2
39. tv1 = CMOV(tv1, tv4, e3)
40. tv2 = y^2
41. tv2 = tv2 * gxd
42. e4 = tv2 == gx1
43. y = CMOV(tv1, y, e4)   # choose correct y-coordinate
44. tv2 = tv3 * x1n       # x2n = x2n / xd = Z * u^2 * x1n / xd
45. xn = CMOV(tv2, x1n, e4) # choose correct x-coordinate
46. e5 = sgn0(u) == sgn0(y) # Fix sign of y
47. y = CMOV(-y, y, e5)
48. return (xn, xd, y, 1)

```

G.2.3. $q = 9 \pmod{16}$

The following is a straight-line implementation of the Simplified SWU mapping that applies to any curve over $GF(q)$ where $q = 9 \pmod{16}$. This includes the curve isogenous to BLS12-381 G2 (Section 8.8.2).

map_to_curve_simple_swu_9mod16(u)

Input: u, an element of F.

Output: (xn, xd, yn, yd) such that (xn / xd, yn / yd) is a point on the target curve.

Constants:

```

1. c1 = (q - 9) / 16      # Integer arithmetic
2. c2 = sqrt(-1)
3. c3 = sqrt(c2)
4. c4 = sqrt(Z^3 / c3)
5. c5 = sqrt(Z^3 / (c2 * c3))

```

Steps:

```

1. tv1 = u^2
2. tv3 = Z * tv1
3. tv5 = tv3^2
4. xd = tv5 + tv3
5. x1n = xd + 1
6. x1n = x1n * B
7. xd = -A * xd
8. e1 = xd == 0
9. xd = CMOV(xd, Z * A, e1) # If xd == 0, set xd = Z * A
10. tv2 = xd^2

```

```

11. gxd = tv2 * xd          # gxd == xd^3
12. tv2 = A * tv2
13. gx1 = x1n^2
14. gx1 = gx1 + tv2        # x1n^2 + A * xd^2
15. gx1 = gx1 * x1n        # x1n^3 + A * x1n * xd^2
16. tv2 = B * gxd
17. gx1 = gx1 + tv2        # x1n^3 + A * x1n * xd^2 + B * xd^3
18. tv4 = gxd^2
19. tv2 = tv4 * gxd        # gxd^3
20. tv4 = tv4^2            # gxd^4
21. tv2 = tv2 * tv4        # gxd^7
22. tv2 = tv2 * gx1        # gx1 * gxd^7
23. tv4 = tv4^2            # gxd^8
24. tv4 = tv2 * tv4        # gx1 * gxd^15
25.  y = tv4^c1            # (gx1 * gxd^15)^((q - 9) / 16)
26.  y = y * tv2           # This is almost sqrt(gx1)
27. tv4 = y * c2           # check the four possible sqrts
28. tv2 = tv4^2
29. tv2 = tv2 * gxd
30.  e2 = tv2 == gx1
31.  y = CMOV(y, tv4, e2)
32. tv4 = y * c3
33. tv2 = tv4^2
34. tv2 = tv2 * gxd
35.  e3 = tv2 == gx1
36.  y = CMOV(y, tv4, e3)
37. tv4 = tv4 * c2
38. tv2 = tv4^2
39. tv2 = tv2 * gxd
40.  e4 = tv2 == gx1
41.  y = CMOV(y, tv4, e4)  # if x1 is square, this is its sqrt
42. gx2 = gx1 * tv5
43. gx2 = gx2 * tv3        # gx2 = gx1 * Z^3 * u^6
44. tv5 = y * tv1
45. tv5 = tv5 * u          # This is almost sqrt(gx2)
46. tv1 = tv5 * c4        # check the four possible sqrts
47. tv4 = tv1 * c2
48. tv2 = tv4^2
49. tv2 = tv2 * gxd
50.  e5 = tv2 == gx2
51. tv1 = CMOV(tv1, tv4, e5)
52. tv4 = tv5 * c5
53. tv2 = tv4^2
54. tv2 = tv2 * gxd
55.  e6 = tv2 == gx2
56. tv1 = CMOV(tv1, tv4, e6)
57. tv4 = tv4 * c2
58. tv2 = tv4^2

```

```

59. tv2 = tv2 * gxd
60. e7 = tv2 == gx2
61. tv1 = CMOV(tv1, tv4, e7)
62. tv2 = y^2
63. tv2 = tv2 * gxd
64. e8 = tv2 == gx1
65. y = CMOV(tv1, y, e8)      # choose correct y-coordinate
66. tv2 = tv3 * x1n         # x2n = x2n / xd = Z * u^2 * x1n / xd
67. xn = CMOV(tv2, x1n, e8)  # choose correct x-coordinate
68. e9 = sgn0(u) == sgn0(y) # Fix sign of y
69. y = CMOV(-y, y, e9)
70. return (xn, xd, y, 1)

```

G.3. Elligator 2

G.3.1. curve25519 ($q = 5 \pmod{8}$, $K = 1$)

The following is a straight-line implementation of Elligator 2 for curve25519 [RFC7748] as specified in Section 8.5.

This implementation can also be used for any Montgomery curve with $K = 1$ over $\text{GF}(q)$ where $q = 5 \pmod{8}$.

map_to_curve_elligator2_curve25519(u)

Input: u, an element of F .

Output: (xn, xd, yn, yd) such that (xn / xd, yn / yd) is a point on curve25519.

Constants:

```

1. c1 = (q + 3) / 8      # Integer arithmetic
2. c2 = 2^c1
3. c3 = sqrt(-1)
4. c4 = (q - 5) / 8     # Integer arithmetic

```

Steps:

```

1. tv1 = u^2
2. tv1 = 2 * tv1
3. xd = tv1 + 1          # Nonzero: -1 is square (mod p), tv1 is not
4. x1n = -J              # x1 = x1n / xd = -J / (1 + 2 * u^2)
5. tv2 = xd^2
6. gxd = tv2 * xd        # gxd = xd^3
7. gx1 = J * tv1         # x1n + J * xd
8. gx1 = gx1 * x1n       # x1n^2 + J * x1n * xd
9. gx1 = gx1 + tv2       # x1n^2 + J * x1n * xd + xd^2
10. gx1 = gx1 * x1n      # x1n^3 + J * x1n^2 * xd + x1n * xd^2
11. tv3 = gxd^2
12. tv2 = tv3^2          # gxd^4

```



```

13. tv3 = tv3 * gxd          # gxd^3
14. tv3 = tv3 * gx1        # gx1 * gxd^3
15. tv2 = tv2 * tv3        # gx1 * gxd^7
16. y11 = tv2^c4           # (gx1 * gxd^7)^((p - 5) / 8)
17. y11 = y11 * tv3        # gx1 * gxd^3 * (gx1 * gxd^7)^((p - 5) / 8)
18. y12 = y11 * c3
19. tv2 = y11^2
20. tv2 = tv2 * gxd
21. e1 = tv2 == gx1
22. y1 = CMOV(y12, y11, e1) # If g(x1) is square, this is its sqrt
23. x2n = x1n * tv1        # x2 = x2n / xd = 2 * u^2 * x1n / xd
24. y21 = y11 * u
25. y21 = y21 * c2
26. y22 = y21 * c3
27. gx2 = gx1 * tv1        # g(x2) = gx2 / gxd = 2 * u^2 * g(x1)
28. tv2 = y21^2
29. tv2 = tv2 * gxd
30. e2 = tv2 == gx2
31. y2 = CMOV(y22, y21, e2) # If g(x2) is square, this is its sqrt
32. tv2 = y1^2
33. tv2 = tv2 * gxd
34. e3 = tv2 == gx1
35. xn = CMOV(x2n, x1n, e3) # If e3, x = x1, else x = x2
36. y = CMOV(y2, y1, e3)   # If e3, y = y1, else y = y2
37. e4 = sgn0(y) == 1     # Fix sign of y
38. y = CMOV(y, -y, e3 XOR e4)
39. return (xn, xd, y, 1)

```

G.3.2. edwards25519

The following is a straight-line implementation of Elligator 2 for edwards25519 [RFC7748] as specified in Section 8.5. The subroutine `map_to_curve_elligator2_curve25519` is defined in Appendix G.3.1.

Note that the sign of the constant `c1` below is chosen as specified in Section 6.8.1, i.e., applying the rational map to the edwards25519 base point yields the curve25519 base point (see erratum [EID4730]).

map_to_curve_elligator2_edwards25519(u)

Input: u , an element of F .

Output: (x_n, x_d, y_n, y_d) such that $(x_n / x_d, y_n / y_d)$ is a point on edwards25519.

Constants:

1. $c_1 = \text{sqrt}(-486664)$ # $\text{sgn}_0(c_1)$ MUST equal 0

Steps:

1. $(x_{Mn}, x_{Md}, y_{Mn}, y_{Md}) = \text{map_to_curve_elligator2_curve25519}(u)$
2. $x_n = x_{Mn} * y_{Md}$
3. $x_d = x_n * c_1$
4. $x_d = x_{Md} * y_{Mn}$ # $x_n / x_d = c_1 * x_M / y_M$
5. $y_n = x_{Mn} - x_{Md}$
6. $y_d = x_{Mn} + x_{Md}$ # $(n / d - 1) / (n / d + 1) = (n - d) / (n + d)$
7. $tv_1 = x_d * y_d$
8. $e = tv_1 == 0$
9. $x_n = \text{CMOV}(x_n, 0, e)$
10. $x_d = \text{CMOV}(x_d, 1, e)$
11. $y_n = \text{CMOV}(y_n, 1, e)$
12. $y_d = \text{CMOV}(y_d, 1, e)$
13. return (x_n, x_d, y_n, y_d)

G.3.3. curve448 ($q = 3 \pmod{4}$, $K = 1$)

The following is a straight-line implementation of Elligator 2 for curve448 [RFC7748] as specified in Section 8.6.

This implementation can also be used for any Montgomery curve with $K = 1$ over $\text{GF}(q)$ where $q = 3 \pmod{4}$.

map_to_curve_elligator2_curve448(u)

Input: u, an element of F.

Output: (xn, xd, yn, yd) such that (xn / xd, yn / yd) is a point on curve448.

Constants:

1. c1 = (q - 3) / 4 # Integer arithmetic

Steps:

```

1. tv1 = u^2
2. e1 = tv1 == 1
3. tv1 = CMOV(tv1, 0, e1) # If Z * u^2 == -1, set tv1 = 0
4. xd = 1 - tv1
5. x1n = -J
6. tv2 = xd^2
7. gxd = tv2 * xd # gxd = xd^3
8. gx1 = -J * tv1 # x1n + J * xd
9. gx1 = gx1 * x1n # x1n^2 + J * x1n * xd
10. gx1 = gx1 + tv2 # x1n^2 + J * x1n * xd + xd^2
11. gx1 = gx1 * x1n # x1n^3 + J * x1n^2 * xd + x1n * xd^2
12. tv3 = gxd^2
13. tv2 = gx1 * gxd # gx1 * gxd
14. tv3 = tv3 * tv2 # gx1 * gxd^3
15. y1 = tv3^c1 # (gx1 * gxd^3)^((p - 3) / 4)
16. y1 = y1 * tv2 # gx1 * gxd * (gx1 * gxd^3)^((p - 3) / 4)
17. x2n = -tv1 * x1n # x2 = x2n / xd = -1 * u^2 * x1n / xd
18. y2 = y1 * u
19. y2 = CMOV(y2, 0, e1)
20. tv2 = y1^2
21. tv2 = tv2 * gxd
22. e2 = tv2 == gx1
23. xn = CMOV(x2n, x1n, e2) # If e2, x = x1, else x = x2
24. y = CMOV(y2, y1, e2) # If e2, y = y1, else y = y2
25. e3 = sgn0(y) == 1 # Fix sign of y
26. y = CMOV(y, -y, e2 XOR e3)
27. return (xn, xd, y, 1)

```

G.3.4. edwards448

The following is a straight-line implementation of Elligator 2 for edwards448 [RFC7748] as specified in Section 8.6. The subroutine map_to_curve_elligator2_curve448 is defined in Appendix G.3.3.

```
map_to_curve_elligator2_edwards448(u)
```

Input: u , an element of F .

Output: (x_n, x_d, y_n, y_d) such that $(x_n / x_d, y_n / y_d)$ is a point on edwards448.

Steps:

```
1. (xn, xd, yn, yd) = map_to_curve_elligator2_curve448(u)
2. xn2 = xn^2
3. xd2 = xd^2
4. xd4 = xd2^2
5. yn2 = yn^2
6. yd2 = yd^2
7. xEn = xn2 - xd2
8. tv2 = xEn - xd2
9. xEn = xEn * xd2
10. xEn = xEn * yd
11. xEn = xEn * yn
12. xEn = xEn * 4
13. tv2 = tv2 * xn2
14. tv2 = tv2 * yd2
15. tv3 = 4 * yn2
16. tv1 = tv3 + yd2
17. tv1 = tv1 * xd4
18. xEd = tv1 + tv2
19. tv2 = tv2 * xn
20. tv4 = xn * xd4
21. yEn = tv3 - yd2
22. yEn = yEn * tv4
23. yEn = yEn - tv2
24. tv1 = xn2 + xd2
25. tv1 = tv1 * xd2
26. tv1 = tv1 * xd
27. tv1 = tv1 * yn2
28. tv1 = -2 * tv1
29. yEd = tv2 + tv1
30. tv4 = tv4 * yd2
31. yEd = yEd + tv4
32. tv1 = xEd * yEd
33. e = tv1 == 0
34. xEn = CMOV(xEn, 0, e)
35. xEd = CMOV(xEd, 1, e)
36. yEn = CMOV(yEn, 1, e)
37. yEd = CMOV(yEd, 1, e)
38. return (xEn, xEd, yEn, yEd)
```

G.3.5. $q = 3 \pmod{4}$

The following is a straight-line implementation of Elligator 2 that applies to any curve over $GF(q)$ where $q = 3 \pmod{4}$.

For curves where $K = 1$, the implementation given in Appendix G.3.3 gives identical results with slightly reduced cost.

map_to_curve_elligator2_3mod4(u)

Input: u, an element of F.

Output: (xn, xd, yn, yd) such that (xn / xd, yn / yd) is a point on the target curve.

Constants:

```
1. c1 = (q - 3) / 4          # Integer arithmetic
2. c2 = K^2
```

Steps:

```
1. tv1 = u^2
2. e1 = tv1 == 1
3. tv1 = CMOV(tv1, 0, e1)    # If Z * u^2 == -1, set tv1 = 0
4.  xd = 1 - tv1
5.  xd = xd * K
6.  x1n = -J                 # x1 = x1n / xd = -J / (K * (1 + 2 * u^2))
7.  tv2 = xd^2
8.  gxd = tv2 * xd
9.  gxd = gxd * c2          # gxd = xd^3 * K^2
10. gx1 = x1n * K
11. tv3 = xd * J
12. tv3 = gx1 + tv3        # x1n * K + xd * J
13. gx1 = gx1 * tv3       # K^2 * x1n^2 + J * K * x1n * xd
14. gx1 = gx1 + tv2       # K^2 * x1n^2 + J * K * x1n * xd + xd^2
15. gx1 = gx1 * x1n       # K^2 * x1n^3 + J * K * x1n^2 * xd + x1n * xd^2
16. tv3 = gxd^2
17. tv2 = gx1 * gxd       # gx1 * gxd
18. tv3 = tv3 * tv2       # gx1 * gxd^3
19.  y1 = tv3^c1          # (gx1 * gxd^3)^((q - 3) / 4)
20.  y1 = y1 * tv2       # gx1 * gxd * (gx1 * gxd^3)^((q - 3) / 4)
21. x2n = -tv1 * x1n     # x2 = x2n / xd = -1 * u^2 * x1n / xd
22.  y2 = y1 * u
23.  y2 = CMOV(y2, 0, e1)
24. tv2 = y1^2
25. tv2 = tv2 * gxd
26. e2 = tv2 == gx1
27. xn = CMOV(x2n, x1n, e2) # If e2, x = x1, else x = x2
28. xn = xn * K
29.  y = CMOV(y2, y1, e2)  # If e2, y = y1, else y = y2
30. e3 = sgn0(y) == 1    # Fix sign of y
31.  y = CMOV(y, -y, e2 XOR e3)
32.  y = y * K
33. return (xn, xd, y, 1)
```

G.3.6. $q = 5 \pmod{8}$

The following is a straight-line implementation of Elligator 2 that applies to any curve over $\text{GF}(q)$ where $q = 5 \pmod{8}$.

For curves where $K = 1$, the implementation given in Appendix G.3.1 gives identical results with slightly reduced cost.

`map_to_curve_elligator2_5mod8(u)`

Input: u , an element of F .

Output: (x_n, x_d, y_n, y_d) such that $(x_n / x_d, y_n / y_d)$ is a point on the target curve.

Constants:

1. $c_1 = (q + 3) / 8$ # Integer arithmetic
2. $c_2 = 2^{c_1}$
3. $c_3 = \text{sqrt}(-1)$
4. $c_4 = (q - 5) / 8$ # Integer arithmetic
5. $c_5 = K^2$

Steps:

1. $tv_1 = u^2$
2. $tv_1 = 2 * tv_1$
3. $xd = tv_1 + 1$ # Nonzero: -1 is square (mod p), tv_1 is not
4. $xd = xd * K$
5. $x_{1n} = -J$ # $x_1 = x_{1n} / xd = -J / (K * (1 + 2 * u^2))$
6. $tv_2 = xd^2$
7. $gxd = tv_2 * xd$
8. $gxd = gxd * c_5$ # $gxd = xd^3 * K^2$
9. $gx_1 = x_{1n} * K$
10. $tv_3 = xd * J$
11. $tv_3 = gx_1 + tv_3$ # $x_{1n} * K + xd * J$
12. $gx_1 = gx_1 * tv_3$ # $K^2 * x_{1n}^2 + J * K * x_{1n} * xd$
13. $gx_1 = gx_1 + tv_2$ # $K^2 * x_{1n}^2 + J * K * x_{1n} * xd + xd^2$
14. $gx_1 = gx_1 * x_{1n}$ # $K^2 * x_{1n}^3 + J * K * x_{1n}^2 * xd + x_{1n} * xd^2$
15. $tv_3 = gxd^2$
16. $tv_2 = tv_3^2$ # gxd^4
17. $tv_3 = tv_3 * gxd$ # gxd^3
18. $tv_3 = tv_3 * gx_1$ # $gx_1 * gxd^3$
19. $tv_2 = tv_2 * tv_3$ # $gx_1 * gxd^7$
20. $y_{11} = tv_2^{c_4}$ # $(gx_1 * gxd^7)^{((q - 5) / 8)}$
21. $y_{11} = y_{11} * tv_3$ # $gx_1 * gxd^3 * (gx_1 * gxd^7)^{((q - 5) / 8)}$
22. $y_{12} = y_{11} * c_3$
23. $tv_2 = y_{11}^2$
24. $tv_2 = tv_2 * gxd$
25. $e_1 = tv_2 == gx_1$
26. $y_1 = \text{CMOV}(y_{12}, y_{11}, e_1)$ # If $g(x_1)$ is square, this is its sqrt

```

27. x2n = x1n * tv1          # x2 = x2n / xd = 2 * u^2 * x1n / xd
28. y21 = y11 * u
29. y21 = y21 * c2
30. y22 = y21 * c3
31. gx2 = gx1 * tv1        # g(x2) = gx2 / gxd = 2 * u^2 * g(x1)
32. tv2 = y21^2
33. tv2 = tv2 * gxd
34. e2 = tv2 == gx2
35. y2 = CMOV(y22, y21, e2) # If g(x2) is square, this is its sqrt
36. tv2 = y1^2
37. tv2 = tv2 * gxd
38. e3 = tv2 == gx1
39. xn = CMOV(x2n, x1n, e3) # If e3, x = x1, else x = x2
40. xn = xn * K
41. y = CMOV(y2, y1, e3)   # If e3, y = y1, else y = y2
42. e4 = sgn0(y) == 1     # Fix sign of y
43. y = CMOV(y, -y, e3 XOR e4)
44. y = y * K
45. return (xn, xd, y, 1)

```

G.4. Cofactor clearing for BLS12-381 G2

The curve BLS12-381, whose parameters are defined in Section 8.8.2, admits an efficiently-computable endomorphism ψ that can be used to speed up cofactor clearing for G2 [SBCDK09] [FKR11] [BP17] (see also Section 7). This section implements the endomorphism ψ and a fast cofactor clearing method described by Budroni and Pintore [BP17].

The functions in this section operate on points whose coordinates are represented as ratios, i.e., (x_n, x_d, y_n, y_d) corresponds to the point $(x_n / x_d, y_n / y_d)$; see Appendix G.1 for further discussion of projective coordinates. When points are represented in affine coordinates, one can simply ignore the denominators ($x_d == 1$ and $y_d == 1$).

The following function computes the Frobenius endomorphism for an element of $F = GF(p^2)$ with basis $(1, I)$, where $I^2 + 1 == 0$ in F . (This is the base field of the elliptic curve E defined in Section 8.8.2.)

frobenius(x)

Input: x , an element of $\text{GF}(p^2)$.

Output: a , an element of $\text{GF}(p^2)$.

Notation: $x = x_0 + I * x_1$, where x_0 and x_1 are elements of $\text{GF}(p)$.

Steps:

1. $a = x_0 - I * x_1$
2. return a

The following function computes the endomorphism ψ for points on the elliptic curve E defined in Section 8.8.2.

$\psi(x_n, x_d, y_n, y_d)$

Input: P , the point $(x_n / x_d, y_n / y_d)$ on the curve E (see above).

Output: Q , a point on the same curve.

Constants:

1. $c_1 = 1 / (1 + I)^{((p - 1) / 3)}$ # in $\text{GF}(p^2)$
2. $c_2 = 1 / (1 + I)^{((p - 1) / 2)}$ # in $\text{GF}(p^2)$

Steps:

1. $q_{xn} = c_1 * \text{frobenius}(x_n)$
2. $q_{xd} = \text{frobenius}(x_d)$
3. $q_{yn} = c_2 * \text{frobenius}(y_n)$
4. $q_{yd} = \text{frobenius}(y_d)$
5. return $(q_{xn}, q_{xd}, q_{yn}, q_{yd})$

The following function efficiently computes $\psi(\psi(P))$.

$\psi_2(x_n, x_d, y_n, y_d)$

Input: P , the point $(x_n / x_d, y_n / y_d)$ on the curve E (see above).

Output: Q , a point on the same curve.

Constants:

1. $c_1 = 1 / 2^{((p - 1) / 3)}$ # in $\text{GF}(p^2)$

Steps:

1. $q_{xn} = c_1 * x_n$
2. $q_{yn} = -y_n$
3. return $(q_{xn}, x_d, q_{yn}, y_d)$

The following function maps any point on the elliptic curve E (Section 8.8.2) into the prime-order subgroup G_2 . This function returns a point equal to $h_{\text{eff}} * G_2$, where h_{eff} is the parameter given in Section 8.8.2.

```
clear_cofactor_bls12381_g2(P)
```

Input: P , the point $(x_n / x_d, y_n / y_d)$ on the curve E (see above).
Output: Q , a point in the subgroup G_2 of BLS12-381.

Constants:

```
1. c1 = -15132376222941642752      # the BLS parameter for BLS12-381
                                     # i.e., -0xd201000000010000
```

Notation: in this procedure, $+$ and $-$ represent elliptic curve point addition and subtraction, respectively, and $*$ represents scalar multiplication.

Steps:

```
1. t1 = c1 * P
2. t2 = psi(P)
3. t3 = 2 * P
4. t3 = psi2(t3)
5. t3 = t3 - t2
6. t2 = t1 + t2
7. t2 = c1 * t2
8. t3 = t3 + t2
9. t3 = t3 - t1
10. Q = t3 - P
11. return Q
```

Appendix H. Scripts for parameter generation

This section gives Sage [SAGE] scripts used to generate parameters for the mappings of Section 6.

H.1. Finding Z for the Shallue-van de Woestijne map

The below function outputs an appropriate Z for the Shallue and van de Woestijne map (Section 6.6.1).

```
# Arguments:
# - F, a field object, e.g., F = GF(2^521 - 1)
# - A and B, the coefficients of the curve equation  $y^2 = x^3 + A * x + B$ 
def find_z_svdw(F, A, B, init_ctr=1):
    g = lambda x: F(x)^3 + F(A) * F(x) + F(B)
    h = lambda Z: -(F(3) * Z^2 + F(4) * A) / (F(4) * g(Z))
    # NOTE: if init_ctr=1 fails to find Z, try setting it to F.gen()
    ctr = init_ctr
    while True:
        for Z_cand in (F(ctr), F(-ctr)):
            if g(Z_cand) == F(0):
                # Criterion 1:  $g(Z) \neq 0$  in F.
                continue
            if h(Z_cand) == F(0):
                # Criterion 2:  $-(3 * Z^2 + 4 * A) / (4 * g(Z)) \neq 0$  in F.
                continue
            if not h(Z_cand).is_square():
                # Criterion 3:  $-(3 * Z^2 + 4 * A) / (4 * g(Z))$  is square in F.
                continue
            if g(Z_cand).is_square() or g(-Z_cand / F(2)).is_square():
                # Criterion 4: At least one of  $g(Z)$  and  $g(-Z / 2)$  is square in F.
                return Z_cand
        ctr += 1
```

H.2. Finding Z for Simplified SWU

The below function outputs an appropriate Z for the Simplified SWU map (Section 6.6.2).

```

# Arguments:
# - F, a field object, e.g., F = GF(2^521 - 1)
# - A and B, the coefficients of the curve equation y^2 = x^3 + A * x + B
def find_z_sswu(F, A, B):
    R.<xx> = F[] # Polynomial ring over F
    g = xx^3 + F(A) * xx + F(B) # y^2 = g(x) = x^3 + A * x + B
    ctr = F.gen()
    while True:
        for Z_cand in (F(ctr), F(-ctr)):
            if Z_cand.is_square():
                # Criterion 1: Z is non-square in F.
                continue
            if Z_cand == F(-1):
                # Criterion 2: Z != -1 in F.
                continue
            if not (g - Z_cand).is_irreducible():
                # Criterion 3: g(x) - Z is irreducible over F.
                continue
            if g(B / (Z_cand * A)).is_square():
                # Criterion 4: g(B / (Z * A)) is square in F.
                return Z_cand
        ctr += 1

```

H.3. Finding Z for Elligator 2

The below function outputs an appropriate Z for the Elligator 2 map (Section 6.7.1).

```

# Argument:
# - F, a field object, e.g., F = GF(2^255 - 19)
def find_z_ell2(F):
    ctr = F.gen()
    while True:
        for Z_cand in (F(ctr), F(-ctr)):
            if Z_cand.is_square():
                # Z must be a non-square in F.
                continue
            return Z_cand
        ctr += 1

```

Appendix I. sqrt and is_square functions

This section defines special-purpose sqrt functions for the three most common cases, $q = 3 \pmod{4}$, $q = 5 \pmod{8}$, and $q = 9 \pmod{16}$, plus a generic constant-time algorithm that works for any prime modulus.

In addition, it gives an optimized is_square method for $GF(p^2)$.

I.1. $q = 3 \pmod{4}$

`sqrt_3mod4(x)`

Parameters:

- F , a finite field of characteristic p and order $q = p^m$.

Input: x , an element of F .

Output: z , an element of F such that $(z^2) == x$, if x is square in F .

Constants:

1. $c1 = (q + 1) / 4$ # Integer arithmetic

Procedure:

1. return x^{c1}

I.2. $q = 5 \pmod{8}$

`sqrt_5mod8(x)`

Parameters:

- F , a finite field of characteristic p and order $q = p^m$.

Input: x , an element of F .

Output: z , an element of F such that $(z^2) == x$, if x is square in F .

Constants:

1. $c1 = \text{sqrt}(-1)$ in F , i.e., $(c1^2) == -1$ in F

2. $c2 = (q + 3) / 8$ # Integer arithmetic

Procedure:

1. $tv1 = x^{c2}$

2. $tv2 = tv1 * c1$

3. $e = (tv1^2) == x$

4. $z = \text{CMOV}(tv2, tv1, e)$

5. return z

I.3. $q = 9 \pmod{16}$

`sqrt_9mod16(x)`

Parameters:

- F , a finite field of characteristic p and order $q = p^m$.

Input: x , an element of F .

Output: z , an element of F such that $(z^2) == x$, if x is square in F .

Constants:

1. $c1 = \text{sqrt}(-1)$ in F , i.e., $(c1^2) == -1$ in F
2. $c2 = \text{sqrt}(c1)$ in F , i.e., $(c2^2) == c1$ in F
3. $c3 = \text{sqrt}(-c1)$ in F , i.e., $(c3^2) == -c1$ in F
4. $c4 = (q + 7) / 16$ # Integer arithmetic

Procedure:

1. $tv1 = x^{c4}$
2. $tv2 = c1 * tv1$
3. $tv3 = c2 * tv1$
4. $tv4 = c3 * tv1$
5. $e1 = (tv2^2) == x$
6. $e2 = (tv3^2) == x$
7. $tv1 = \text{CMOV}(tv1, tv2, e1)$ # Select $tv2$ if $(tv2^2) == x$
8. $tv2 = \text{CMOV}(tv4, tv3, e2)$ # Select $tv3$ if $(tv3^2) == x$
9. $e3 = (tv2^2) == x$
10. $z = \text{CMOV}(tv1, tv2, e3)$ # Select the sqrt from $tv1$ and $tv2$
11. return z

I.4. Constant-time Tonelli-Shanks algorithm

This algorithm is a constant-time version of the classic Tonelli-Shanks algorithm ([C93], Algorithm 1.5.1) due to Sean Bowe, Jack Grigg, and Eirik Ogilvie-Wigley [jubjub-fq], adapted and optimized by Michael Scott.

This algorithm applies to $\text{GF}(p)$ for any p . Note, however, that the special-purpose algorithms given in the prior sections are faster, when they apply.

`sqrts_ct(x)`

Parameters:

- F , a finite field of characteristic p and order $q = p^m$.

Input x , an element of F .

Output: z , an element of F such that $z^2 == x$, if x is square in F .

Constants:

1. c_1 , the largest integer such that 2^{c_1} divides $q - 1$.

2. $c_2 = (q - 1) / (2^{c_1})$ # Integer arithmetic

3. $c_3 = (c_2 - 1) / 2$ # Integer arithmetic

4. c_4 , a non-square value in F

5. $c_5 = c_4^{c_2}$ in F

Procedure:

1. $z = x^{c_3}$

2. $t = z * z * x$

3. $z = z * x$

4. $b = t$

5. $c = c_5$

6. for i in $(c_1, c_1 - 1, \dots, 2)$:

7. for j in $(1, 2, \dots, i - 2)$:

8. $b = b * b$

9. $z = \text{CMOV}(z, z * c, b \neq 1)$

10. $c = c * c$

11. $t = \text{CMOV}(t, t * c, b \neq 1)$

12. $b = t$

13. return z

I.5. `is_square` for $F = \text{GF}(p^2)$

The following `is_square` method applies to any field $F = \text{GF}(p^2)$ with basis $(1, I)$ represented as described in Section 2.1, i.e., an element $x = (x_1, x_2) = x_1 + x_2 * I$.

Other optimizations of this type are possible in other extension fields; see, e.g., [AR13] for more information.

is_square(x)

Parameters:

- F, an extension field of characteristic p and order $q = p^2$
with basis (1, I).

Input: x, an element of F.

Output: True if x is square in F, and False otherwise.

Constants:

1. c1 = (p - 1) / 2 # Integer arithmetic

Procedure:

1. tv1 = x_1^2
2. tv2 = I * x_2
3. tv2 = tv2^2
4. tv1 = tv1 - tv2
5. tv1 = tv1^c1
6. e1 = tv1 != -1 # Note: -1 in F
7. return e1

Appendix J. Suite test vectors

This section gives test vectors for each suite defined in Section 8. The test vectors in this section were generated using code that is available from [hash2curve-repo].

Each test vector in this section lists values computed by the appropriate encoding function, with variable names defined as in Section 3. For example, for a suite whose encoding type is random oracle, the test vector gives the value for msg, u, Q0, Q1, and the output point P.

J.1. NIST P-256

J.1.1. P256_XMD:SHA-256_SSWU_RO_

```
suite = P256_XMD:SHA-256_SSWU_RO_
dst   = QUUX-V01-CS02-with-P256_XMD:SHA-256_SSWU_RO_

msg   =
P.x   = 2c15230b26dbc6fc9a37051158c95b79656e17a1a920b11394ca91
      c44247d3e4
P.y   = 8a7a74985cc5c776cdf4b1f19884970453912e9d31528c060be9a
      b5c43e8415
u[0]  = ad5342c66a6dd0ff080df1da0ealc04b96e0330dd89406465eeba1
      1582515009
u[1]  = 8c0f1d43204bd6f6ea70ae8013070a1518b43873bcd850aafa0a9e
```


Q.x = 324532006312be4f162614076460315f7a54a6f85544da773dc659
aca0311853
Q.y = 8d8197374bcd52de2acfeffc8a54fe2c8d8bebd2a39f16be9b710e4
blaf6ef883
msg = a512_aa
aa
aa
aa
aa
aa
aa
aa
aa
aa
P.x = 5c4bad52f81f39c8e8de1260e9a06d72b8b00a0829a8ea004a610b
0691bea5d9
P.y = c801e7c0782af1f74f24fc385a8555da0582032a3ce038de637ccd
cb16f7ef7b
u[0] = 0e1527840b9df2dfbef966678ff167140f2b27c4dccc884c25014d
ce0e41dfa3
Q.x = 5c4bad52f81f39c8e8de1260e9a06d72b8b00a0829a8ea004a610b
0691bea5d9
Q.y = c801e7c0782af1f74f24fc385a8555da0582032a3ce038de637ccd
cb16f7ef7b

J.2. NIST P-384

J.2.1. P384_XMD:SHA-512_SSWU_RO_

suite = P384_XMD:SHA-512_SSWU_RO_
dst = QUUX-V01-CS02-with-P384_XMD:SHA-512_SSWU_RO_
msg =
P.x = c3144d47428d071d4169420c91006a0bd48d7259d492af86e7f82d
98e3497519d8550045557b7d55cc2a0f339df088b9
P.y = aa5f165f0146101363d1b34fe65bcf638532e3b2eb1744cdbd60e9
384c6c1838bbaea988963cc9f0f0902798e9f8058a
u[0] = 425c1d0b099ffa6c15069b08299e6e21a204e08c2a0627f5afc242
15d19e45bc47d70da5972ff77e33f176b5e18e8485
u[1] = cbefdd543ed48b5a9bbbd460f559d23b388aa72157279ba0206923
1881eb2a947d887a5b1e0a6173bc92a5700f679a14
Q0.x = 4589af7986491d42b7ee23726c57abeade65c7b8eba12d07fbce48
065a01a78c4b018c739034d9fab2c4ef6176c7c40
Q0.y = 5b2985027c29802bf2afdb8a3c95fa655ad3189a2118209bd285d4
20268bf71e610c9533e3f4f438ba4b64f66f6fbcd9
Q1.x = cbd6c34a12a266b447b444b303d577cd5d61e3c0af19d4676ababb
470bb795741ebf167caa9f0910a4fcc899134596d7


```

aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
P.x      = bc36cda196f8084052fc41a5c4ef5c9e1c724cc0bd83ef8eaf07b
          b2cbc3db99ff5cdb31ba3018a6afe59b0db040c980
P.y      = 5106450163d90d99d3191bc92f8a3d116f15b18b23eff8e9996481
          c6878bd16c8e202f44abc3d09325c2016b5dacc8f0
u[0]    = 99523632b22588d852f02eac546df4a69f966cba55c82937f13cc2
          6b316e561459c5d6ddadac7b782b5ab8d15efe23ee
Q.x      = bc36cda196f8084052fc41a5c4ef5c9e1c724cc0bd83ef8eaf07b
          b2cbc3db99ff5cdb31ba3018a6afe59b0db040c980
Q.y      = 5106450163d90d99d3191bc92f8a3d116f15b18b23eff8e9996481
          c6878bd16c8e202f44abc3d09325c2016b5dacc8f0

```

J.3. NIST P-521

J.3.1. P521_XMD:SHA-512_SSWU_RO_

```

suite    = P521_XMD:SHA-512_SSWU_RO_
dst      = QUUX-V01-CS02-with-P521_XMD:SHA-512_SSWU_RO_

msg      =
P.x      = 00fd767cebb2452030358d0e9cf907f525f50920c8f607889a6a35
          680727f64f4d66b161fafeb2654bea0d35086bec0a10b30b14adef
          3556ed9f7f1bc23cecc9c088
P.y      = 0169ba78d8d851e930680322596e39c78f4fe31b97e57629ef6460
          ddd68f8763fd7bd767a4e94a80d3d21a3c2ee98347e024fc73ee1c
          27166dc3fe5eeef782be411d
u[0]    = 01e5f09974e5724f25286763f00ce76238c7a6e03dc396600350ee
          2c4135fb17dc555be99a4a4bae0fd303d4f66d984ed7b6a3ba3860
          93752a855d26d559d69e7e9e
u[1]    = 00ae593b42ca2ef93ac488e9e09a5fe5a2f6fb330d18913734ff60
          2f2a761fcaaf5f596e790bcc572c9140ec03f6cccc38f767f1c197
          5a0b4d70b392d95a0c7278aa
Q0.x    = 00b70ae99b6339fffac19cb9bfde2098b84f75e50ac1e80d6acb95
          4e4534af5f0e9c4a5b8a9c10317b8e6421574bae2b133b4f2b8c6c
          e4b3063da1d91d34fa2b3a3c
Q0.y    = 007f368d98a4ddb381fb354de40e44b19e43bb11a1278759f4ea7
          b485e1b6db33e750507c071250e3e443c1aaed61f2c28541bb54b1
          b456843eda1eb15ec2a9b36e
Q1.x    = 01143d0e9cddcdac6a9aafe1bcf8d218c0afc45d4451239e821f5
          d2a56df92be942660b532b2aa59a9c635ae6b30e803c45a6ac8714
          32452e685d661cd41cf67214
Q1.y    = 00ff75515df265e996d702a5380defffab1a6d2bc232234c7bcffa

```



```
433cd8aa791fbc8dcf667f08818bffa739ae25773b32073213cae9
a0f2a917a0b1301a242dda0c
```

```
msg      = abc
P.x      = 002f89a1677b28054b50d15e1f81ed6669b5a2158211118ebdef8a
          6efc77f8ccaa528f698214e4340155abc1fa08f8f613ef14a04371
          7503d57e267d57155cf784a4
P.y      = 010e0be5dc8e753da8ce51091908b72396d3deed14ae166f66d8eb
          f0a4e7059ead169ea4bead0232e9b700dd380b316e9361cfdba55a
          08c73545563a80966ecbb86d
u[0]     = 003d00c37e95f19f358adeeaa47288ec39998039c3256e13c2a4c0
          0a7cb61a34c8969472960150a27276f2390eb5e53e47ab193351c2
          d2d9f164a85c6a5696d94fe8
u[1]     = 01f3cbd3df3893a45a2f1fecdac4d525eb16f345b03e2820d69bc5
          80f5cbe9cb89196fdf720ef933c4c0361fcfe29940fd0db0a5da6b
          afb0bee8876b589c41365f15
Q0.x     = 01b254e1c99c835836f0aceebba7d77750c48366ecb07fb658e4f5
          b76e229ae6ca5d271bb0006ffcc42324e15a6d3daae587f9049de2
          dbb0494378ffb60279406f56
Q0.y     = 01845f4af72fc2b1a5a2fe966f6a97298614288b456cfc385a425b
          686048b25c952fbb5674057e1eb055d04568c0679a8e2dda3158dc
          16ac598dbb1d006f5ad915b0
Q1.x     = 007f08e813c620e527c961b717ffc74aac7afccb9158cebc347d57
          15d5c2214f952c97e194f11d114d80d3481ed766ac0a3dba3eb73f
          6ff9ccb9304ad10bbd7b4a36
Q1.y     = 0022468f92041f9970a7cc025d71d5b647f822784d29ca7b3bc3b0
          829d6bb8581e745f8d0cc9dc6279d0450e779ac2275c4c3608064a
          d6779108a7828ebd9954caeb

msg      = abcdef0123456789
P.x      = 006e200e276a4a81760099677814d7f8794a4a5f3658442de63c18
          d2244dcc957c645e94cb0754f95fcf103b2aeaf94411847c24187b
          89fb7462ad3679066337cbc4
P.y      = 001dd8dfa9775b60b1614f6f169089d8140d4b3e4012949b52f98d
          b2deff3e1d97bf73a1fa4d437d1dcdf39b6360cc518d8ebcc0f899
          018206fded7617b654f6b168
u[0]     = 00183ee1a9bbdc37181b09ec336bcaa34095f91ef14b66b1485c16
          6720523dfb81d5c470d44afcb52a87b704dbc5c9bc9d0ef524dec2
          9884a4795f55c1359945baf3
u[1]     = 00504064fd137f06c81a7cf0f84aa7e92b6b3d56c2368f0a08f447
          76aa8930480da1582d01d7f52df31dca35ee0a7876500ece3d8fe0
          293cd285f790c9881c998d5e
Q0.x     = 0021482e8622aac14da60e656043f79a6a110cbae5012268a62dd6
          a152c41594549f373910ebed170ade892dd5a19f5d687fae7095a4
          61d583f8c4295f7aaf8cd7da
Q0.y     = 0177e2d8c6356b7de06e0b5712d8387d529b848748e54a8bc0ef5f
          1475aa569f8f492fa85c3ad1c5edc51faf7911f11359bfa2a12d2e
          f0bd73df9cb5abdlb101c8b1
```



```
P.y      = 01cd287df9a50c22a9231beb452346720bb163344a41c5f5a24e83
          35b6ccc595fd436aea89737b1281aecb411eb835f0b939073fdd1d
          d4d5a2492e91ef4a3c55bcbd
u[0]     = 0033d06d17bc3b9a3efc081a05d65805a14a3050a0dd4dfb488461
          8eb5c73980a59c5a246b18f58ad022dd3630faa22889fbb8ba1593
          466515e6ab4aeb7381c26334
u[1]     = 0092290ab99c3fea1a5b8fb2ca49f859994a04faee3301cefab312
          d34227f6a2d0c3322cf76861c6a3683bdaa2dd2a6daa5d6906c663
          e065338b2344d20e313f1114
Q0.x     = 00041f6eb92af8777260718e4c22328a7d74203350c6c8f5794d99
          d5789766698f459b83d5068276716f01429934e40af3d1111a2278
          0b1e07e72238d2207e5386be
Q0.y     = 001c712f0182813942b87cab8e72337db017126f52ed797dd23458
          4ac9ae7e80dfe7abea11db02cf1855312eae1447dbaecc9d7e8c88
          0a5e76a39f6258074e1bc2e0
Q1.x     = 0125c0b69bcf55eab49280b14f707883405028e05c927cd7625d4e
          04115bd0e0e6323b12f5d43d0d6d2eff16dbcf244542f84ec05891
          1260dc3bb6512ab5db285fbd
Q1.y     = 008bddfb803b3f4c761458eb5f8a0aee3e1f7f68e9d7424405fa69
          172919899317fb6ac1d6903a432d967d14e0f80af63e7035aaae0c
          123e56862ce969456f99f102
```

J.3.2. P521_XMD:SHA-512_SSWU_NU_

```
suite    = P521_XMD:SHA-512_SSWU_NU_
dst      = QUUX-V01-CS02-with-P521_XMD:SHA-512_SSWU_NU_

msg      =
P.x      = 01ec604b4e1e3e4c7449b7a41e366e876655538acf51fd40d08b97
          be066f7d020634e906b1b6942f9174b417027c953d75fb6ec64b8c
          ee2a3672d4f1987d13974705
P.y      = 00944fc439b4aad2463e5c9cfa0b0707af3c9a42e37c5a57bb4ecd
          12fef9fb21508568aedcdd8d2490472df4bbafd79081c81e99f4da
          3286eddf19be47e9c4cf0e91
u[0]     = 01e4947fe62a4e47792cee2798912f672fff820b2556282d9843b4
          b465940d7683a986f93ccb0e9a191fbc09a6e770a564490d2a4ae5
          1b287ca39f69c3d910ba6a4f
Q.x      = 01ec604b4e1e3e4c7449b7a41e366e876655538acf51fd40d08b97
          be066f7d020634e906b1b6942f9174b417027c953d75fb6ec64b8c
          ee2a3672d4f1987d13974705
Q.y      = 00944fc439b4aad2463e5c9cfa0b0707af3c9a42e37c5a57bb4ecd
          12fef9fb21508568aedcdd8d2490472df4bbafd79081c81e99f4da
          3286eddf19be47e9c4cf0e91

msg      = abc
P.x      = 00c720ab56aa5a7a4c07a7732a0a4e1b909e32d063ae1b58db5f0e
          b5e09f08a9884bfff55a2bef4668f715788e692c18c1915cd034a6b
          998311fcf46924ce66a2be9a
```



```

Q1.y    = 76c0fe7fec932aaafb8eefb42d9cbb32eb931158f469ff3050af15
         cfdbbef94

msg      = abc
P.x      = 2b4419f1f2d48f5872de692b0aca72cc7b0a60915dd70bde432e82
         6b6abc526d
P.y      = 1b8235f255a268f0a6fa8763e97eb3d22d149343d495da1160eff9
         703f2d07dd
u[0]     = 49bed021c7a3748f09fa8cdfcac044089f7829d3531066ac9e74e0
         994e05bc7d
u[1]     = 5c36525b663e63389d886105cee7ed712325d5a97e60e140aba7e2
         ce5ae851b6
Q0.x     = 16b3d86e056b7970fa00165f6f48d90b619ad618791661b7b5e1ec
         78be10eac1
Q0.y     = 4ab256422d84c5120b278cbdfc4e1facc5baadfeccecf8ee9bf39
         46106d50ca
Q1.x     = 7ec29ddb34539c40adfa98fcb39ec36368f47f30e8f888cc7e86f
         4d46e0c264
Q1.y     = 10d1abc1cae2d34c06e247f2141ba897657fb39f1080d54f09ce0a
         f128067c74

msg      = abcdef0123456789
P.x      = 68calea5a6acf4e9956daa101709bleee6c1bb0df1de3b90d46023
         82a104c036
P.y      = 2a375b656207123d10766e68b938b1812a4a6625ff83cb8d5e86f5
         8a4be08353
u[0]     = 6412b7485ba26d3d1b6c290a8e1435b2959f03721874939b21782d
         f17323d160
u[1]     = 24c7b46c1c6d9a21d32f5707be1380ab82db1054fde82865d5c9e3
         d968f287b2
Q0.x     = 71de3dadfe268872326c35ac512164850860567aea0e7325e6b91a
         98f86533ad
Q0.y     = 26a08b6e9a18084c56f2147bf515414b9b63f1522e1b6c5649f7d4
         b0324296ec
Q1.x     = 5704069021f61e41779e2ba6b932268316d6d2a6f064f997a22fef
         16dleaeaca
Q1.y     = 50483c7540f64fb4497619c050f2c7fe55454ec0f0e79870bb4430
         2e34232210

msg      = q128_qqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqq
         qqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqq
         qqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqq
P.x      = 096e9c8bae6c06b554c1ee69383bb0e82267e064236b3a30608d4e
         d20b73ac5a
P.y      = 1eb5a62612cafb32b16c3329794645b5b948d9f8ffe501d4e26b07
         3fef6de355
u[0]     = 5e123990f11bbb5586613ffabdb58d47f64bb5f2fa115f8ea8df01
         88e0c9e1b5

```

```

u[1] = 5e8553eb00438a0bbe1e7faa59dec6d8087f9c8011e5fb8ed9df31c
      b6c0d4ac19
Q0.x = 7a94d45a198fb5daa381f45f2619ab279744efdd8bd8ed587fc5b6
      5d6cea1df0
Q0.y = 67d44f85d376e64bb7d713585230cdbfafc8e2676f7568e0b6ee59
      361116a6e1
Q1.x = 30506fb7a32136694abd61b6113770270debe593027a968a01f271
      e146e60c18
Q1.y = 7eeee0e706b40c6b5174e551426a67f975ad5a977ee2f01e8e20a6
      d612458c3b

msg = a512_aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
      aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
      aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
      aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
      aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
      aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
      aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
      aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
      aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
      aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
      aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
      aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
      aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
      aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
      aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa

P.x = 1bc61845a138e912f047b5e70ba9606ba2a447a4dade024c8ef3dd
      42b7bbc5fe
P.y = 623d05e47b70e25f7f1d51dda6d7c23c9a18ce015fe3548df596ea
      9e38c69bf1
u[0] = 20f481e85da7a3bf60ac0fb11ed1d0558fc6f941b3ac5469aa8b56
      ec883d6d7d
u[1] = 017d57fd257e9a78913999a23b52ca988157a81b09c5442501d07f
      ed20869465
Q0.x = 02d606e2699b918ee36f2818f2bc5013e437e673c9f9b9cdc15fd0
      c5ee913970
Q0.y = 29e9dc92297231ef211245db9e31767996c5625dfbf92e1c8107ef
      887365de1e
Q1.x = 38920e9b988d1ab7449c0fa9a6058192c0c797bb3d42ac34572434
      1a1aa98745
Q1.y = 24dcc1be7c4d591d307e89049fd2ed30aae8911245a9d8554bf603
      2e5aa40d3d

```

J.4.2. curve25519_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_NU_

```

suite = curve25519_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_NU_
dst   = QUUX-V01-CS02-with-curve25519_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_NU_

msg =
P.x = 1bb913f0c9daefa0b3375378ffa534bda5526c97391952a7789eb9
      76edfe4d08
P.y = 4548368f4f983243e747b62a600840ae7c1dab5c723991f85d3a97
      68479f3ec4

```



```

aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
P.x      = 5fd892c0958d1a75f54c3182a18d286efab784e774d1e017ba2fb2
          52998b5dc1
P.y      = 750af3c66101737423a4519ac792fb93337bd74ee751f19da4cf1e
          94f4d6d0b8
u[0]    = 1a68a1af9f663592291af987203393f707305c7bac9c8d63d6a729
          bdc553dc19
Q.x      = 3bcd651ee54d5f7b6013898aab251ee8ecc0688166fce6e9548d38
          472f6bd196
Q.y      = 1bb36ad9197299f111b4ef21271c41f4b7ecf5543db8bb5931307e
          bdb2eaa465

```

J.5. edwards25519

J.5.1. edwards25519_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_RO_

```

suite    = edwards25519_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_RO_
dst      = QUUX-V01-CS02-with-edwards25519_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_RO_

msg      =
P.x      = 3c3da6925a3c3c268448dcabb47ccde5439559d9599646a8260e47
          ble4822fc6
P.y      = 09a6c8561a0b22bef63124c588ce4c62ea83a3c899763af26d7953
          02e115dc21
u[0]    = 03fef4813c8cb5f98c6eef88fae174e6e7d5380de2b007799ac7ee
          712d203f3a
u[1]    = 780bddd137290c8f589dc687795aafae35f6b674668d92bf92ae7
          93e6a60c75
Q0.x    = 6549118f65bb617b9e8b438decedc73c496eaed496806d3b2eb9ee
          60b88e09a7
Q0.y    = 7315bcc8cf47ed68048d22bad602c6680b3382a08c7c5d3f439a97
          3fb4cf9feb
Q1.x    = 31dcfc5c58aa1bee6e760bf78cbe71c2bead8cebb2e397ece0f37a
          3da19c9ed2
Q1.y    = 7876d81474828d8a5928b50c82420b2bd0898d819e9550c5c82c39
          fc9bafaf196

msg      = abc
P.x      = 608040b42285cc0d72cbb3985c6b04c935370c7361f4b7fbdb1ae7
          f8cla8ecad
P.y      = 1a8395b88338f22e435bbd301183e7f20a5f9de643f11882fb237f
          88268a5531

```



```

      d774b66bfff
P.y   = 2c90c3d39eb18ff291d33441b35f3262cdd307162cc97c31bfcc7a
      4245891a37
u[0]  = 3cb0178a8137cefa5b79a3a57c858d7eeeea787b2781be4a362a2f
      0750d24fa0
Q.x   = 3e6368cff6e88a58e250c54bd27d2c989ae9b3acb6067f2651ad28
      2ab8c21cd9
Q.y   = 38fb39f1566ca118ae6c7af42810c0bb9767ae5960abb5a8ca7925
      30fbfb9447d
```

J.6. curve448

J.6.1. curve448_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_RO_

```

suite = curve448_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_RO_
dst   = QUUX-V01-CS02-with-curve448_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_RO_

msg   =
P.x   = da2332a516a063fef60267e6d89120bb999247ff7f52b313c8eee2
      777e03320f30996a53280b6d8c3847cfb9ea565f46310e582a3733
      4f69
P.y   = dc7be59148778dbf9fbaeaf2ce578b9b82f8d72fe8e7073ad92f2
      77fb987b34711ba8571b30f89de8049d744ba3107399f2dc3c9d5c
      c8b2
u[0]  = e06d3a0f99597cd9fa6ccb2c3db31d163e50940d2c7504e1bfba16
      ac69c2a7cbb52df77f100c4e6908788b50ebfb7c47b2e96586ca59
      b47b
u[1]  = 88267fb8a9a813556844b3ac7861b380ad7597ed0ef030be490274
      54b83f441e34aee8682afabdae4f3deafaa894b15de9bd6af5059e
      f0ff
Q0.x  = 8219c3ff382cfe2f02a2a20f5fffd54564203edc7336022abc6b397
      3ec7e61fc2d458a81846385080febb458695746c0ffc04e080b2fd
      ecf2
Q0.y  = 9712f659ce8ddb2bc581af3c6c359038d877174805b8772a647b3
      b0bc9d66a579f72bc9ada3b836aaf2642d909ed9b96dc686ae668a
      b5c1
Q1.x  = 2730fc1f5ea277c6ee5096eece84901d42fa3f78c018b1174c4685
      e0be780f769933d28d29b13b330352353b9e1c98bb5ea6dabdf7e5
      8e5a
Q1.y  = 5cb3a598ff66725b74c0e9f33e23b317a82a8bd6d1be02816688ef
      74a5d704c14d09440f123573666e81a01cb19d91e25a4e98bab1f2
      4668

msg   = abc
P.x   = 126bdbaa7d8690fbf97447adf5b0ead68a48e3c75fb49d4ee584d9
      7f08fad3fd00d107455bd5a032c682d8a80b4f796960d61fc01e3
      9faf
P.y   = d973b5f9d4babfb95e1e28484068fdd3314b2e334f8bfcbbcb9878
```



```

      f4c9
Q0.x  = 3d94294cbb050707f5ad5a0dfc596445848c05a81d2a175a05b34e
      409748cbe98970d1a0fd4bcdc030969481d669f0ce8befe72e0e7a
      3506
Q0.y  = 11718321d9ed5ce14aaa7d1d06f6a91ca3875eb2bef70e96b54aa2
      51387629633860898faf3ec18ae47d5a6a0d605536435140d0f8e9
      802d
Q1.x  = b283ab36f5dff4d54dca265e74ca355d751983fb013f458f44dcb6
      b00302569788ed0a3567ca93be803e6a5aa883587e3a9da9368626
      6ecf
Q1.y  = 7bebe0e4520198e026127cf8bd4308db737358afaca143788637c6
      75812282336699de18e4b239e7c5e95797154b8cd00aa51b830993
      9abc

```

J.6.2. curve448_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_NU_

```

suite = curve448_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_NU_
dst   = QUUX-V01-CS02-with-curve448_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_NU_

msg   =
P.x   = ea84fb65c9404271a743b99e734888d7d5170dee33421936180745
      66b8c4faf0d751b46bcdcebbce41e44d101f93b098e150836eeb26
      3d90
P.y   = a8378c8c97c14c4127ebf6b36c9d4a6524be2b85ad76fd195315d3
      d6eecf5147c9d96edb7f574935d0e945f6664040dbe0270d4ae24d
      ab64
u[0]  = 89b0674b247b36697f028e39edb34bd9ee6ba968148447c80773ea
      54650f5f57e005f69898502ea754f3dd710562cf80f347296b15f2
      b040
Q.x   = e57024bb58651499c5e87dfb879b0bd3abfbfa9f5af2962c2597c
      61cc24e2ad7a2802d5f98bc6265ea54e7b83befb8c59afd0854f5e
      bc09
Q.y   = 0f2a66e25fba03deb43daf0dc694d6265e0f426f041a0bc5970206
      871f88a0a09b0463607ff6ac94cb3609ed74d7eb9e7842a7b5f652
      89c2

msg   = abc
P.x   = 2e7014413676426069da399013d0a825ea436f6036fc895099838d
      0c2e047b69a8c98b2b5e5a5e1d203bc58829141bbcc1bbf66d5d7c
      eb85
P.y   = 843b3542bd5c3175fa8a1160b0f5b3ce54f9650a18b0b8f02b83b6
      2f4adfda146b0ab04bf902fb098459d0cf2171c640f003df8d79ee
      e4db
u[0]  = 413957bbc65b091215af8af48ad7e24bf048e9f6d9a73aec17e998
      a2b51cfc4ccdb4c25693e764db7799619f163532ec1ce5692e1753
      0384
Q.x   = 8e4ff7f3bf4e42202441a441da4afaa6d4f32f95d0406742172e88
      af8ffa304022eb3d2fddc5cffbb0241466daf3f152fddc26184074

```



```

aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
P.x    = 1953f9cb8340b7968c1d820fad943cb58d132ec5db85a3bc22a408
        b834f4d14fae0826164d92f285a71977ee1ca21c48fb08ecccf71f
        b43f
P.y    = 2a5ebf1f4082bb8fa4ead0a54bb9b9d820018b06c2a9c81be048bc
        6cae60fb99099cbcb9daf82a88cb177be328283f96f6e623af362a
        6165
u[0]   = 264d09a96a80db8aac3b51d54f7f115dfe3a615e85713f2d4d4bf6
        2c47ce0e8ebe261fc3a281166e9c25ea689010639f8131fffb6d8c0
        d5c9
Q.x    = 62d81718b0b327cf3b0dd77885de6cf3202bc2c0a20bbd3af18127
        16104fb5a39878dbe92862f40c28e1ae078a0b8c25ba23c9bca5fa
        ed8a
Q.y    = 6505d475959b61e33f9e4c2c6d8033b5dbd09432993997c07ae2c2
        4a31d7a35c02e15f357aebf0178b7b8525074b2400ec3d1bb8eda1
        b9ee

```

J.7. edwards448

J.7.1. edwards448_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_RO_

```

suite  = edwards448_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_RO_
dst    = QUUX-V01-CS02-with-edwards448_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_RO_

msg    =
P.x    = 132e90a3f7110a41ad796ef3e83baff6839d5569854f5a11c16b2a
        7a26d86e32a6bc93e954aaea197768d04091aab18f5779ae4f85
        9d18
P.y    = 12165b672a52370f21268ce2c261c3ed32adac6a3404fbd50d31a5
        51a9111d109b0c691868aa6e9d92fd94dfa2a7397a2c111be9c432
        c0cd
u[0]   = 6369f90cf2806a86841398114dccf2ffd06d2d57c782a449df5297
        189de02384b22cf73a0b5f678fe486ad59280d15431f4a65fec93d
        0039
u[1]   = a6b424f6f6c995dec127ac862ebc93b82ab3604087d70a78189054
        b09be6c9e76ab85ee8351870bfd93dca7607fe864dac096e3f333a
        145b
Q0.x   = bb132e877b5fe35b189ee7041c53f03d943d36ea7265dce2c267cc
        5500f281a2f8981c393a05e94962f8d8017ec6ad3a6b34cbad3480
        6c12
Q0.y   = 15e1762b3c85a31ba3a9b7ba52eba6c7f02d5a802068afa8935e4d
        20ffa3e0356cf57398b8b9065554c3036a6f17e48b1f2ee0e5615c
        5d73
Q1.x   = cc44d47637c8fcbelc1020b87eb21205f055d6dec872efcc09b8c
        50935cdb38342340f389d6284a2b4bc5486f8c05a3fec6c7ef59c0
        2e2f

```

Q1.y = c875e0cb547828c2707097c2cb6e3d7f03f92a715d6c66c370b08d
09be11b69cc07c4798ff3ed30e64b5c1742bed375bb51b61963617
9adb

msg = abc
P.x = bdb13f312a5d478f57bc852b743acd3ce51dd2de96f181ff88556f
2b41d568ed64c2b210286be54b7c84d23cbc09a01902172a903b9c
8c1e
P.y = 6165182fc928064e375777e700f44e56b54b5980a42c72f747ba95
829bd8ff80de5fd159e149a8169397029553bd89b5c28df416e10c
b36b
u[0] = 4c3b600dba4a986944840b32e154510af806aa095f856fdf8fe320
1221314704aba830579f3da5e30f3300e89814324a0bef26a9cd3a
b6a0
u[1] = f0ae99c47274ed37fc582a7edc75aa0ddfdb7ed77e7eebbc293dca
8312a6ff43e7c34c6796f9fe2a21c337deab5523d4825aebde5f14
1869
Q0.x = 46b89d09965812c09af0f484a1262246b14f25e8f68a34678302ca
76e461968c61f6ae1d4d7f32d930bbe153f2a02085a12a15e3e11b
5af8
Q0.y = d1cfb0fb4572b51b0c4e27d574adb4fd5a3276e4c59709c732ef1b
7ce9e59fd87df98a79c65fb709110a3922ffdf8b4593c3ed9caf96
6e9e
Q1.x = 94558aaac183cb8f263caa55eb79d1c4d44f681d2c9e2efc23927b
6e272b7e3261f5d178dc166a6724aa2b2b5abfd4a97c6fc38ce423
998f
Q1.y = 1ee82f88f4e0b552b1a2bf048de95f8196d2f565de8edc1ae94d9f
8fc8fd1a0d193f9bd58833b3bbab5ab97e85ae758b5fa01eadcb0b
9ced

msg = abcdef0123456789
P.x = 01a04ed1b758a20245ea227827350eaedef92ef2860e58e5c5a982
0a1fc6157082b3722d25c9754bc2642b126c4a9188a1fe9c8b2b39
6b53
P.y = 88ac7496b9ebc2b446695324e2f76ad54f4b8b21d0077ac15b69ad
7a4abcd00e881cadbd829db2d2d0f28fc84eac4fc59264b2d14063
e770
u[0] = f3c7984b7cbaf248dacc25599c8ac774782c5a3ed7bd24343fb935
602469b76541f8fd54dd78a7c54b6d991e17ec416742f92a18e8e6
805b
u[1] = 98fb498e5f6c40762899444a200e052ab25d336b84571f27670c7b
cea54efc78f167a770275179dad42b6df0e3cc477abdf115f0b5f1
cc49
Q0.x = cc2286ee7e052ffccbc10607bfa8bb7ced94924dfc6fee6f34eedd
fa559000f8d0d238c14cbe2e3509b39843e5711583982a80f652dd
e738
Q0.y = 774c9a9f0f4143ca2779b4bbb4ef397da643db7b74ac8bad1a54fb
c86f728571fc401ca5b2a8432a018a5d545b526387f364701b232e


```

      3201
P.y   = 547c2293a8b8489270957118e69a241227dc32c5587819269630ff
      687bb88284b88376fa8f86e0dbafc09d8dbba49a4a433fbd379d10
      3c5c
u[0]  = 967a9f376c20a33d6a041ed783fd7a6b7fba24ab92029bc69340a2
      6441c287d368b8496fb14d19631ff406e057bcf8e8553660e7e73d
      561d
u[1]  = 78d710dd21fedeb0dc93ec424e17e879935a689aa2c14b207a0055
      f1e57a44d83929731ca74fcca2fd0cb6bbaab12265fe104dd6fae4
      87a5
Q0.x  = 5f238a69135b8207607ea4dcebed925425adb75dfdb86e6e7f1279
      6f2086cbaladd20f36a2e38176dd4fedalad25aa8657728d390ce4
      b818
Q0.y  = 225a31f6a260be2b81b735ea1bdaaa65486a50777e3e3b83265e69
      a572e2054e63f0519a06537fba0d15076c993c6e19121fd077e8e4
      5ee9
Q1.x  = a1d4f1d07717adbcc3926caaf2d731532c2065c191dfca7b60a5e1
      499a1c237985807b441004b5476c896105806f8157e362ef96f16e
      7293
Q1.y  = e320a16c1417d41241f03507ca0ea48d0e494cfd8bb067107bc18a
      939c69581ecaee71a5f656fcd091688391f41calb23b3fad4876e6
      8e01
```

J.7.2. edwards448_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_NU_

```

suite = edwards448_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_NU_
dst   = QUUX-V01-CS02-with-edwards448_XMD:SHA-512_ELL2_NU_

msg   =
P.x   = 9edd52909ac5f8d4506149c30e1ea8709eed77c409d3ba2b3834a9
      18c4d7bf47cb11c464847fc5edfc4ec5dcb6e2e1c4a4bf2cf93914
      44af
P.y   = 6d73a9acd7c51479d59f7aab60bd0090ec44fe64d82ffea0ccff18
      ac5060632be1c44219adef88937e2f28ebab0b4edf16c501b6ae83
      7409
u[0]  = d244401e5d2f510c21944e96203cff15813d57c3f40b1a15bd73e1
      d9ac031966137e39e1111cf46e590ed4726ea9c96616a581a57cb4
      6010
Q.x   = ce981eeb6c73a7edba5c4c29af37010c398f1dbe39fe00be52100e
      b7c107f71793ce5928c2a34ce7fc37e054838d2788c46abad5b1f7
      009f
Q.y   = e822cb7fa3f0e97e1215619f13ed7fde59137dc807a37ffbb7a375
      7f948f3fb50168c7fd6a5077a1fe7e6f484ba4881c964e5fff2b99
      e9af

msg   = abc
P.x   = 2df5a5ee45640cc4e297f969c9771b36e4358463d47a530e375fe1
      3d442a17cc5f27818365eead72adee48c5911eb4ad7ed4e242f81d
```



```

Q1.x    = 44548adb1b399263ded3510554d28b4bead34b8cf9a37b4bd0bd2b
         a4db87ae63
Q1.y    = 96eb8e2faf05e368efe5957c6167001760233e6dd2487516b46ae7
         25c4cce0c6

msg     = abc
P.x     = 3377e01eab42db296b512293120c6cee72b6ecf9f9205760bd9ff1
         1fb3cb2c4b
P.y     = 7f95890f33efebd1044d382a01b1bee0900fb6116f94688d487c6c
         7b9c8371f6
u[0]    = 128aab5d3679a1f7601e3bdf94ced1f43e491f544767e18a4873f3
         97b08a2b61
u[1]    = 5897b65da3b595a813d0fdcc75c895dc531be76a03518b044daaa0
         f2e4689e00
Q0.x    = 07dd9432d426845fb19857d1b3a91722436604ccbbbadad8523b8f
         c38a5322d7
Q0.y    = 604588ef5138cffe3277bbd590b8550bcbe0e523bbaf1bed4014a4
         67122eb33f
Q1.x    = e9ef9794d15d4e77dde751e06c182782046b8dac05f8491eb88764
         fc65321f78
Q1.y    = cb07ce53670d5314bf236ee2c871455c562dd76314aa41f012919f
         e8e7f717b3

msg     = abcdef0123456789
P.x     = bac54083f293f1fe08e4a70137260aa90783a5cb84d3f35848b324
         d0674b0e3a
P.y     = 4436476085d4c3c4508b60fcf4389c40176adce756b398bdee27bc
         a19758d828
u[0]    = ea67a7c02f2cd5d8b87715c169d055a22520f74daeb080e6180958
         380e2f98b9
u[1]    = 7434d0d1a500d38380d1f9615c021857ac8d546925f5f2355319d8
         23a478da18
Q0.x    = 576d43ab0260275adf11af990d130a5752704f7947862876172080
         8862544b5d
Q0.y    = 643c4a7fb68ae6cff55edd66b809087434bbaff0c07f3f9ec4d49b
         b3c16623c3
Q1.x    = f89d6d261a5e00fe5cf45e827b507643e67c2a947a20fd9ad71039
         f8b0e29ff8
Q1.y    = b33855e0cc34a9176ead91c6c3acb1aacb1ce936d563bc1cee1dcf
         fc806caf57

msg     = q128_qqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqq
         qqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqq
         qqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqq
P.x     = e2167bc785333a37aa562f021f1e881defb853839babf52a7f72b1
         02e41890e9
P.y     = f2401dd95cc35867ffed4f367cd564763719fbc6a53e969fb8496a
         1e6685d873

```



```

aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
P.x    = 17d22b867658977b5002dbe8d0ee70a8cfddec3eec50fb93f36136
        070fd9fa6c
P.y    = e9178ff02f4dab73480f8dd590328aea99856a7b6cc8e5a6cdf289
        ecc2a51718
u[0]   = a9ffbbee1d6e41ac33c248fb3364612ff591b502386c1bf6ac4aaf
        1ea51f8c3b
Q.x    = 17d22b867658977b5002dbe8d0ee70a8cfddec3eec50fb93f36136
        070fd9fa6c
Q.y    = e9178ff02f4dab73480f8dd590328aea99856a7b6cc8e5a6cdf289
        ecc2a51718

```

J.9. BLS12-381 G1

J.9.1. BLS12381G1_XMD:SHA-256_SSWU_RO_

```

suite  = BLS12381G1_XMD:SHA-256_SSWU_RO_
dst    = QUUX-V01-CS02-with-BLS12381G1_XMD:SHA-256_SSWU_RO_

msg    =
P.x    = 052926add2207b76ca4fa57a8734416c8dc95e24501772c8142787
        00eed6d1e4e8cf62d9c09db0fac349612b759e79a1
P.y    = 08ba738453bfed09cb546dbb0783dbb3a5f1f566ed67bb6be0e8c6
        7e2e81a4cc68ee29813bb7994998f3eae0c9c6a265
u[0]   = 0ba14bd907ad64a016293ee7c2d276b8eae71f25a4b941eece7b0d
        89f17f75cb3ae5438a614fb61d6835ad59f29c564f
u[1]   = 019b9bd7979f12657976de2884c7cce192b82c177c80e0ec604436
        a7f538d231552f0d96d9f7babe5fa3b19b3ff25ac9
Q0.x   = 11a3cce7e1d90975990066b2f2643b9540fa40d6137780df4e753a
        8054d07580db3b7f1f03396333d4a359d1fe3766fe
Q0.y   = 0eeaf6d794e479e270da10fdaf768db4c96b650a74518fc67b04b0
        3927754bac66f3ac720404f339ecdcc028afa091b7
Q1.x   = 160003aaf1632b13396dbad518effa00fff532f604de1a7fc2082f
        f4cb0afa2d63b2c32da1bef2bf6c5ca62dc6b72f9c
Q1.y   = 0d8bb2d14e20cf9f6036152ed386d79189415b6d015a20133acb4e
        019139b94e9c146aad5817f866c95d609a361735e

msg    = abc
P.x    = 03567bc5ef9c690c2ab2ecdf6a96ef1c139cc0b2f284dca0a9a794
        3388a49a3aee664ba5379a7655d3c68900be2f6903

```



```

P.x      = 0e7a16a975904f131682edbb03d9560d3e48214c9986bd50417a77
          108d13dc957500edf96462a3d01e62dc6cd468ef11
P.y      = 0ae89e677711d05c30a48d6d75e76ca9fb70fe06c6dd6ff988683d
          89ccde29ac7d46c53bb97a59b1901abf1db66052db
u[0]     = 0dd824886d2123a96447f6c56e3a3fa992fbfefdba17b6673f9f63
          0ff19e4d326529db37e1c1be43f905bf9202e0278d
Q.x      = 1775d400a1bacc1c39c355da7e96d2d1c97baa9430c4a3476881f8
          521c09a01f921f592607961efc99c4cd46bd78ca19
Q.y      = 1109b5d59f65964315de65a7a143e86eabc053104ed289cf480949
          317a5685fad7254ff8e7fe6d24d3104e5d55ad6370

```

J.10. BLS12-381 G2

J.10.1. BLS12381G2_XMD:SHA-256_SSWU_RO_

```

suite    = BLS12381G2_XMD:SHA-256_SSWU_RO_
dst      = QUUX-V01-CS02-with-BLS12381G2_XMD:SHA-256_SSWU_RO_

msg      =
P.x      = 0141ebfbdca40eb85b87142e130ab689c673cf60f1a3e98d693352
          66f30d9b8d4ac44c1038e9dcdd5393faf5c41fb78a
+ I *    05cb8437535e20ecffae7752baddf98034139c38452458baeefab
          379ba13dff5bf5dd71b72418717047f5b0f37da03d
P.y      = 0503921d7f6a12805e72940b963c0cf3471c7b2a524950ca195d11
          062ee75ec076daf2d4bc358c4b190c0c98064fdd92
+ I *    12424ac32561493f3fe3c260708a12b7c620e7be00099a974e259d
          dc7d1f6395c3c811cdd19f1e8dbf3e9ecfdcbab8d6
u[0]     = 03dbc2cce174e91ba93cbb08f26b917f98194a2ea08d1cce75b2b9
          cc9f21689d80bd79b594a613d0a68eb807dfdc1cf8
+ I *    05a2acec64114845711a54199ea339abd125ba38253b70a92c876d
          f10598bd1986b739cad67961eb94f7076511b3b39a
u[1]     = 02f99798e8a5acdeed60d7e18e9120521ba1f47ec090984662846b
          c825de191b5b7641148c0dbc237726a334473eee94
+ I *    145a81e418d4010cc027a68f14391b30074e89e60ee7a22f87217b
          2f6eb0c4b94c9115b436e6fa4607e95a98de30a435
Q0.x     = 019ad3fc9c72425a998d7ablea0e646a1f6093444fc6965f1cad5a
          3195a7b1e099c050d57f45e3fa191cc6d75ed7458c
+ I *    171c88b0b0efb5eb2b88913a9e74fe111a4f68867b59db252ce586
          8af4d1254bfab77ebde5d61cd1a86fb2fe4a5a1c1d
Q0.y     = 0ba10604e62bdd9eeeb4156652066167b72c8d743b050fb4c1016c
          31b505129374f76e03fa127d6a156213576910fef3
+ I *    0eb22c7a543d3d376e9716a49b72e79a89c9bfe9feee8533ed931c
          bb5373dde1fbcd7411d8052e02693654f71e15410a
Q1.x     = 113d2b9cd4bd98aee53470b27abc658d91b47a78a51584f3d4b950
          677cfb8a3e99c24222c406128c91296ef6b45608be
+ I *    13855912321c5cb793e9d1e88f6f8d342d49c0b0dbac613ee9e17e
          3c0b3c97dfbb5a49cc3fb45102fdbaf65e0efe2632
Q1.y     = 0fd3def0b7574ald801be44fde617162aa2e89da47f464317d9bb5

```

```

      abc3a7071763ce74180883ad7ad9a723a9afafcdca
+ I * 056f617902b3c0d0f78a9a8cbda43a26b65f602f8786540b9469b0
      60db7b38417915b413ca65f875c130bebf5aa59790c

msg    = abc
P.x    = 02c2d18e033b960562aae3cab37a27ce00d80ccd5ba4b7fe0e7a21
      0245129dbec7780ccc7954725f4168aff2787776e6
+ I * 139cddbccc5e91b9623efd38c49f81a6f83f175e80b06fc374de9
      eb4b41dfe4ca3a230ed250fbc3a2acf73a41177fd8
P.y    = 1787327b68159716a37440985269cf584bcb1e621d3a7202be6ea0
      5c4cfe244aeb197642555a0645fb87bf7466b2ba48
+ I * 00aa65dae3c8d732d10ecd2c50f8a1baf3001578f71c694e03866e
      9f3d49ac1e1ce70dd94a733534f106d4cec0eddd16
u[0]   = 15f7c0aa8f6b296ab5ff9c2c7581ade64f4ee6f1bf18f55179ff44
      a2cf355fa53dd2a2158c5ecb17d7c52f63e7195771
+ I * 01c8067bf4c0ba709aa8b9abc3d1cef589a4758e09ef53732d670f
      d8739a7274e111ba2fcaa71b3d33df2a3a0c8529dd
u[1]   = 187111d5e088b6b9acfdfad078c4dacf72dcd17ca17c82be35e79f
      8c372a693f60a033b461d81b025864a0ad051a06e4
+ I * 08b852331c96ed983e497ebc6dee9b75e373d923b729194af8e72a
      051ea586f3538a6ebb1e80881a082fa2b24df9f566
Q0.x   = 12b2e525281b5f4d2276954e84ac4f42cf4e13b6ac4228624e1776
      0faf94ce5706d53f0ca1952f1c5ef75239aeed55ad
+ I * 05d8a724db78e570e34100c0bc4a5fa84ad5839359b40398151f37
      cff5a51de945c563463c9efbda569850ee5a53e77
Q0.y   = 02eacdc556d0bdb5d18d22f23dcb086dd106cad713777c7e640794
      3edbe0b3d1efe391eedf11e977fac55f9b94f2489c
+ I * 04bbe48bfd5814648d0b9e30f0717b34015d45a861425fabcllee06
      fdfce36384ae2c808185e693ae97dcde118f34de41
Q1.x   = 19f18cc5ec0c2f055e47c802acc3b0e40c337256a208001dde14b2
      5afced146f37ea3d3ce16834c78175b3ed61f3c537
+ I * 15b0dadcc256a258b4c68ea43605df6a6d312eef215c19e6474b3e1
      01d33b661dfce43b51abbbf96fee68fc6043ac56a58
Q1.y   = 05e47c1781286e61c7ade887512bd9c2cb9f640d3be9cf87ea0bad
      24bd0ebfe946497b48a581ab6c7d4ca74b5147287f
+ I * 19f98db2f4a1fcdcf56a9ced7b320ea9deecf57c8e59236b0dc21f6
      ee7229aa9705ce9ac7fe7a31c72edca0d92370c096

msg    = abcdef0123456789
P.x    = 121982811d2491fde9ba7ed31ef9ca474f0e1501297f68c298e9f4
      c0028add35aea8bb83d53c08cfc007c1e005723cd0
+ I * 190d119345b94fbd15497bcba94ecf7db2cbfd1e1fe7da034d26cb
      ba169fb3968288b3fafb265f9ebd380512a71c3f2c
P.y    = 05571a0f8d3c08d094576981f4a3b8eda0a8e771fcdcc8ecceaf13
      56a6acf17574518acb506e435b639353c2e14827c8
+ I * 0bb5e7572275c567462d91807de765611490205a941a5a6af3b169
      1bfe596c31225d3aabdf15faff860cb4ef17c7c3be
u[0]   = 0313d9325081b415bfd4e5364efaef392ecf69b087496973b22930

```



```

+ I * 13103f7aace1ae1420d208a537f7d3a9679c287208026e4e3439ab
8cd534c12856284d95e27f5e1f33eec2ce656533b0
Q1.y = 0958b2c4c2c10fcef5a6c59b9e92c4a67b0fae3e2e0f1b6b5edad9
c940b8f3524ba9ebbc3f2ceb3cfe377655b3163bd7
+ I * 0ccb594ed8bd14ca64ed9cb4e0aba221be540f25dd0d6ba15a4a4b
e5d67bcf35df7853b2d8dad3ba245f1ea3697f66aa

```

J.10.2. BLS12381G2_XMD:SHA-256_SSWU_NU_

```

suite = BLS12381G2_XMD:SHA-256_SSWU_NU_
dst   = QUUX-V01-CS02-with-BLS12381G2_XMD:SHA-256_SSWU_NU_

msg   =
P.x   = 00e7f4568a82b4b7dc1f14c6aaa055edf51502319c723c4dc2688c
7fe5944c213f510328082396515734b6612c4e7bb7
+ I * 126b855e9e69b1f691f816e48ac6977664d24d99f8724868a18418
6469ddfd4617367e94527d4b74fc86413483afb35b
P.y   = 0caead0fd7b6176c01436833c79d305c78be307da5f6af6c133c47
311def6ff1e0babf57a0fb5539fce7ee12407b0a42
+ I * 1498aadcf7ae2b345243e281ae076df6de84455d766ab6fcdaad71
fab60abb2e8b980a440043cd305db09d283c895e3d
u[0]  = 07355d25caf6e7f2f0cb2812ca0e513bd026ed09dda65b177500fa
31714e09ea0ded3a078b526bed3307f804d4b93b04
+ I * 02829ce3c021339ccb5caf3e187f6370e1e2a311dec9b753631170
63ab2015603ff52c3d3b98f19c2f65575e99e8b78c
Q.x   = 18ed3794ad43c781816c523776188deafba67ab773189b8f18c49b
c7aa841cd81525171f7a5203b2a340579192403bef
+ I * 0727d90785d179e7b5732c8a34b660335fed03b913710b60903cf4
954b651ed3466dc3728e21855ae822d4a0f1d06587
Q.y   = 00764a5cf6c5f61c52c838523460eb2168b5a5b43705e19cb612e0
06f29b717897facfd15ddl1c8874c915f6d53d0342d
+ I * 19290bb9797c12c1d275817aa2605e42275b66860f0e4d04487e
bc2e47c50b36edd86c685a60c20a2bd584a82b011a

msg   = abc
P.x   = 108ed59fd9fae381abfd1d6bce2fd2fa220990f0f837fa30e0f279
14ed6e1454db0d1ee957b219f61da6ff8be0d6441f
+ I * 0296238ea82c6d4adb3c838ee3cb2346049c90b96d602d7bb1b469
b905c9228be25c627bffee872def773d5b2a2eb57d
P.y   = 033f90f6057aadacae7963b0a0b379dd46750c1c94a6357c99b65f
63b79e321ff50fe3053330911c56b6ceea08fee656
+ I * 153606c417e59fb331b7ae6bce4fbf7c5190c33ce9402b5ebe2b70
e44fca614f3f1382a3625ed5493843d0b0a652fc3f
u[0]  = 138879a9559e24cecee8697b8b4ad32cced053138ab913b9987277
2dc753a2967ed50aabc907937aefb2439ba06cc50c
+ I * 0a1ae7999ea9bab1dcc9ef8887a6cb6e8f1e22566015428d220b7e
ec90ffa70ad1f624018a9ad11e78d588bd3617f9f2
Q.x   = 0f40e1d5025ecef0d850aa0bb7bbeceab21a3d4e85e6bee857805b

```


Each test vector in this section lists the expand_message name, hash function, and DST, along with a series of tuples of the function inputs (msg and len_in_bytes), output (uniform_bytes), and intermediate values (dst_prime and msg_prime). DST and msg are represented as ASCII strings. Intermediate and output values are represented as byte strings in hexadecimal.

K.1. expand_message_xmd(SHA-256)

```

name      = expand_message_xmd
DST       = QUUX-V01-CS02-with-expander
hash      = SHA256

msg       =
len_in_bytes = 0x20
DST_prime = 515555582d5630312d435330322d776974682d657870616e6465
          721b
msg_prime = 0000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000
          0000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000
          00000000000000000000000002000515555582d5630312d43533032
          2d776974682d657870616e6465721b
uniform_bytes = f659819a6473c1835b25ea59e3d38914c98b374f0970b7e4
               c92181df928fca88

msg       = abc
len_in_bytes = 0x20
DST_prime = 515555582d5630312d435330322d776974682d657870616e6465
          721b
msg_prime = 0000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000
          0000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000
          0000000000000000000000000616263002000515555582d5630312d43
          5330322d776974682d657870616e6465721b
uniform_bytes = 1c38f7c211ef233367b2420d04798fa4698080a8901021a7
               95a1151775fe4da7

msg       = abcdef0123456789
len_in_bytes = 0x20
DST_prime = 515555582d5630312d435330322d776974682d657870616e6465
          721b
msg_prime = 0000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000
          0000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000
          000000000000000000000000061626364656630313233343536373839
          002000515555582d5630312d435330322d776974682d657870616e
          6465721b
uniform_bytes = 8f7e7b66791f0da0dbb5ec7c22ec637f79758c0a48170bfb
               7c4611bd304ece89

msg       = q128_qqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqq

```



```

        6465721b
uniform_bytes = 15733b3fb22fac0e0902c220aeea48e5e47d39f36c2cc03e
                ac34367c48f2a3ebbc3baa8a0cf17ab12fff4defc7ce22aed4718
                8b6c163e828741473bd89cc646a082cb68b8e835b1374ea9a6315d
                61db0043f4abf506c26386e84668e077c85ebd9d632f4390559b97
                9e70e9e7affbd0ac2a212c03b698efbbe940f2d164732b

```

```

msg          = abc
len_in_bytes = 0x80
DST_prime   = 515555582d5630312d435330322d776974682d657870616e6465
              721b
msg_prime   = 6162630080515555582d5630312d435330322d776974682d6578
              70616e6465721b
uniform_bytes = 4ccafb6d95b91537798d1fbb25b9f9be1a5bbe1683f43a4f6
                f03ef540b811235317bfc0aefb217faca055e1b8f32dfde9eb102c
                dc026ed27caa71530e361b3adbb92ccf68da35aed8b9dc7e4e6b5d
                b0666c607a31df05513ddaf4c8ee23b0ee7f395a6e8be32eb13ca9
                7da289f2643616ac30fe9104bb0d3a67a0a525837c2dc6

```

```

msg          = abcdef0123456789
len_in_bytes = 0x80
DST_prime   = 515555582d5630312d435330322d776974682d657870616e6465
              721b
msg_prime   = 616263646566303132333435363738390080515555582d563031
              2d435330322d776974682d657870616e6465721b
uniform_bytes = c8ee0e12736efbc9b47781db9d1e5db9c853684344a6776e
                b362d75b354f4b74cf60ba1373dc2e22c68efb76a022ed5391f67c
                77990802018c8cdc7af6d00c86b66a3b3ccad3f18d90f4437a1651
                86f6601cf0bb281ea5d80d1de20fe22bb2e2d8acab0c043e76e3a0
                f34e0a1e66c9ade4fef9ef3b431130ad6f232babe9fe68

```

```

msg          = q128_qqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqq
                qqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqq
                qqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqqq
                len_in_bytes = 0x80
DST_prime   = 515555582d5630312d435330322d776974682d657870616e6465
              721b
msg_prime   = 713132385f7171717171717171717171717171717171717171717171717171
              71717171717171717171717171717171717171717171717171717171717171
              71717171717171717171717171717171717171717171717171717171717171
              71717171717171717171717171717171717171717171717171717171717171
              71717171717171717171717171717171717171717171717171717171717171
              71717171717171717171717171717171717171717171717171717171717171
              71717171717171717171717171717171717171717171717171717171717171
              80515555582d5630312d435330322d776974682d657870616e6465
              721b
uniform_bytes = 3eebe6721b2ec746629856dc2dd3f03a830dabfe7d7e2d1e
                72aaf2127d6ad17c988b5762f32e6edf61972378a4106dc4b63fa1
                08ad03b793eedf4588f34c4df2a95b30995a464cb3ee31d6dca30a
                dbfc90ffdf5414d7893082c55b269d9ec9cd6d2a715b9c4fad4eb7

```


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

Email: armfazh@cloudflare.com

Sam Scott
Cornell Tech
2 West Loop Rd
New York, New York 10044,
United States of America

Email: sam.scott@cornell.edu

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

Email: nick@cloudflare.com

Riad S. Wahby
Stanford University

Email: rsw@cs.stanford.edu

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

Email: caw@heapingbits.net

Internet Research Task Force (IRTF)
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Informational
Expires: 20 February 2021

C. Cremers
CISPA Helmholtz Center for Information Security
L. Garratt
Cisco Meraki
S. Smyshlyaev
CryptoPro
N. Sullivan
C. Wood
Cloudflare
19 August 2020

Randomness Improvements for Security Protocols
draft-irtf-cfrg-randomness-improvements-14

Abstract

Randomness is a crucial ingredient for Transport Layer Security (TLS) and related security protocols. Weak or predictable "cryptographically-strong" pseudorandom number generators (CSPRNGs) can be abused or exploited for malicious purposes. An initial entropy source that seeds a CSPRNG might be weak or broken as well, which can also lead to critical and systemic security problems. This document describes a way for security protocol implementations to augment their CSPRNGs using long-term private keys. This improves randomness from broken or otherwise subverted CSPRNGs.

This document is a product of the Crypto Forum Research Group (CFRG) in the IRTF.

Note to Readers

Source for this draft and an issue tracker can be found at <https://github.com/chris-wood/draft-irtf-cfrg-randomness-improvements> (<https://github.com/chris-wood/draft-irtf-cfrg-randomness-improvements>).

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 20 February 2021.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2020 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	2
2. Conventions Used in This Document	4
3. Randomness Wrapper	4
4. Tag Generation	5
5. Application to TLS	6
6. Implementation Guidance	6
7. Acknowledgements	6
8. IANA Considerations	6
9. Security Considerations	6
10. Comparison to RFC 6979	7
11. References	8
11.1. Normative References	8
11.2. Informative References	8
Authors' Addresses	9

1. Introduction

Secure and properly implemented random number generators, or "cryptographically-strong" pseudorandom number generators (CSPRNGs), should produce output that is indistinguishable from a random string of the same length. CSPRNGs are critical building blocks for TLS and related transport security protocols. TLS in particular uses CSPRNGs to generate several values, such as ephemeral key shares and ClientHello and ServerHello random values. CSPRNG failures such as the Debian bug described in [DebianBug] can lead to insecure TLS

connections. CSPRNGs may also be intentionally weakened to cause harm [DualEC]. Initial entropy sources can also be weak or broken, and that would lead to insecurity of all CSPRNG instances seeded with them. In such cases where CSPRNGs are poorly implemented or insecure, an adversary Adv may be able to distinguish its output from a random string or predict its output and recover secret key material used to protect the connection.

This document proposes an improvement to randomness generation in security protocols inspired by the "NAXOS trick" [NAXOS]. Specifically, instead of using raw randomness where needed, e.g., in generating ephemeral key shares, a function of a party's long-term private key is mixed into the entropy pool. In the NAXOS key exchange protocol, raw random value x is replaced by $H(x, sk)$, where sk is the sender's private key. Unfortunately, as private keys are often isolated in Hardware Security Modules (HSMs), direct access to compute $H(x, sk)$ is impossible. Moreover, some HSM APIs may only offer the option to sign messages using a private key, yet offer no other operations involving that key. An alternate yet functionally equivalent construction is needed.

The approach described herein replaces the NAXOS hash with a keyed hash, or pseudorandom function (PRF), where the key is derived from a raw random value and a private key signature. Implementations SHOULD apply this technique when indirect access to a private key is available and CSPRNG randomness guarantees are dubious, or to provide stronger guarantees about possible future issues with the randomness. Roughly, the security properties provided by the proposed construction are as follows:

1. If the CSPRNG works fine, that is, in a certain adversary model the CSPRNG output is indistinguishable from a truly random sequence, then the output of the proposed construction is also indistinguishable from a truly random sequence in that adversary model.
2. Adv with full control of a (potentially broken) CSPRNG and ability to observe all outputs of the proposed construction does not obtain any non-negligible advantage in leaking the private key (in the absence of side channel attacks).
3. If the CSPRNG is broken or controlled by Adv, the output of the proposed construction remains indistinguishable from random provided the private key remains unknown to Adv.

This document represents the consensus of the Crypto Forum Research Group (CFRG).

2. Conventions Used in This Document

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.

3. Randomness Wrapper

The output of a properly instantiated CSPRNG should be indistinguishable from a random string of the same length. However, as previously discussed, this is not always true. To mitigate this problem, we propose an approach for wrapping the CSPRNG output with a construction that mixes secret data into a value that may be lacking randomness.

Let $G(n)$ be an algorithm that generates n random bytes, i.e., the output of a CSPRNG. Define an augmented CSPRNG G' as follows. Let $\text{Sig}(sk, m)$ be a function that computes a signature of message m given private key sk . Let H be a cryptographic hash function that produces output of length M . Let $\text{Extract}(\text{salt}, \text{IKM})$ be a randomness extraction function, e.g., HKDF-Extract [RFC5869], which accepts a salt and input keying material (IKM) parameter and produces a pseudorandom key of L bytes suitable for cryptographic use. It must be a secure PRF (for salt as a key of length M) and preserve uniformness of IKM (for details see [SecAnalysis]). L SHOULD be a fixed length. Let $\text{Expand}(k, \text{info}, n)$ be a variable-length output PRF, e.g., HKDF-Expand [RFC5869], that takes as input a pseudorandom key k of L bytes, info string, and output length n , and produces output of n bytes. Finally, let tag1 be a fixed, context-dependent string, and let tag2 be a dynamically changing string (e.g., a counter) of L' bytes. We require that $L \geq n - L'$ for each value of tag2 .

The construction works as follows. Instead of using $G(n)$ when randomness is needed, use $G'(n)$, where

$$G'(n) = \text{Expand}(\text{Extract}(H(\text{Sig}(sk, \text{tag1})), G(L)), \text{tag2}, n)$$

Functionally, this expands n random bytes from a key derived from the CSPRNG output and signature over a fixed string (tag1). See Section 4 for details about how " tag1 " and " tag2 " should be generated and used per invocation of the randomness wrapper. $\text{Expand}()$ generates a string that is computationally indistinguishable from a truly random string of n bytes. Thus, the security of this construction depends upon the secrecy of $H(\text{Sig}(sk, \text{tag1}))$ and $G(L)$.

If the signature is leaked, then security of $G'(n)$ reduces to the scenario wherein randomness is expanded directly from $G(L)$.

If a private key sk is stored and used inside an HSM, then the signature calculation is implemented inside it, while all other operations (including calculation of a hash function, Extract and Expand functions) can be implemented either inside or outside the HSM.

$Sig(sk, tag1)$ need only be computed once for the lifetime of the randomness wrapper, and MUST NOT be used or exposed beyond its role in this computation. Additional recommendations for $tag1$ are given in the following section.

Sig MUST be a deterministic signature function, e.g., deterministic ECDSA [RFC6979], or use an independent (and completely reliable) entropy source, e.g., if Sig is implemented in an HSM with its own internal trusted entropy source for signature generation.

Because $Sig(sk, tag1)$ can be cached, the relative cost of using $G'(n)$ instead of $G(n)$ tends to be negligible with respect to cryptographic operations in protocols such as TLS (the relatively inexpensive computational cost of HKDF-Extract and HKDF-Expand dominates when comparing G' to G). A description of the performance experiments and their results can be found in the appendix of [SecAnalysis].

Moreover, the values of $G'(n)$ may be precomputed and pooled. This is possible since the construction depends solely upon the CSPRNG output and private key.

4. Tag Generation

Both tags MUST be generated such that they never collide with another contender or owner of the private key. This can happen if, for example, one HSM with a private key is used from several servers, or if virtual machines are cloned.

The RECOMMENDED tag construction procedure is as follows:

- * $tag1$: Constant string bound to a specific device and protocol in use. This allows caching of $Sig(sk, tag1)$. Device specific information may include, for example, a MAC address. To provide security in the cases of usage of CSPRNGs in virtual environments, it is RECOMMENDED to incorporate all available information specific to the process that would ensure the uniqueness of each $tag1$ value among different instances of virtual machines (including ones that were cloned or recovered from snapshots). This is needed to address the problem of CSPRNG state cloning (see

[RY2010]). See Section 5 for example protocol information that can be used in the context of TLS 1.3. If `sk` could be used for other purposes, then selecting a value for `tag1` that is different than the form allowed by those other uses ensures that the signature is not exposed.

- * `tag2`: A nonce. That is, a value that is unique for each use of the same combination of `G(L)`, `tag1`, and `sk` values. The `tag2` value can be implemented using a counter, or a timer, provided that the timer is guaranteed to be different for each invocation of `G'(n)`.

5. Application to TLS

The PRF randomness wrapper can be applied to any protocol wherein a party has a long-term private key and also generates randomness. This is true of most TLS servers. Thus, to apply this construction to TLS, one simply replaces the "private" CSPRNG `G(n)`, i.e., the CSPRNG that generates private values, such as key shares, with:

$$G'(n) = \text{HKDF-Expand}(\text{HKDF-Extract}(H(\text{Sig}(sk, \text{tag1})), G(L)), \text{tag2}, n)$$

6. Implementation Guidance

Recall that the wrapper defined in Section 3 requires $L \geq n - L'$, where L is the Extract output length and n is the desired amount of randomness. Some applications may require n to exceed this bound. Wrapper implementations can support this use case by invoking `G'` multiple times and concatenating the results.

7. Acknowledgements

We thank Liliya Akhmetzyanova for her deep involvement in the security assessment in [SecAnalysis]. We thank John Mattsson, Martin Thomson, Rich Salz for their careful readings and useful comments.

8. IANA Considerations

This document makes no request to IANA.

9. Security Considerations

A security analysis was performed in [SecAnalysis]. Generally speaking, the following security theorem has been proven: if Adv learns only one of the signature or the usual randomness generated on one particular instance, then under the security assumptions on our primitives, the wrapper construction should output randomness that is indistinguishable from a random string.

The main reason one might expect the signature to be exposed is via a side-channel attack. It is therefore prudent when implementing this construction to take into consideration the extra long-term key operation if equipment is used in a hostile environment when such considerations are necessary. Hence, it is recommended to generate a key specifically for the purposes of the defined construction and not to use it another way.

The signature in the construction as well as in the protocol itself MUST NOT use randomness from entropy sources with dubious security guarantees. Thus, the signature scheme MUST either use a reliable entropy source (independent from the CSPRNG that is being improved with the proposed construction) or be deterministic: if the signatures are probabilistic and use weak entropy, our construction does not help and the signatures are still vulnerable due to repeat randomness attacks. In such an attack, Adv might be able to recover the long-term key used in the signature.

Under these conditions, applying this construction should never yield worse security guarantees than not applying it assuming that applying the PRF does not reduce entropy. We believe there is always merit in analyzing protocols specifically. However, this construction is generic so the analyses of many protocols will still hold even if this proposed construction is incorporated.

The proposed construction cannot provide any guarantees of security if the CSPRNG state is cloned due to the virtual machine snapshots or process forking (see [MAFS2017]). It is RECOMMENDED that tag1 incorporate all available information about the environment, such as process attributes, virtual machine user information, etc.

10. Comparison to RFC 6979

The construction proposed herein has similarities with that of RFC 6979 [RFC6979]: both of them use private keys to seed a deterministic random number generator. Section 3.3 of RFC 6979 recommends deterministically instantiating an instance of the HMAC_DRBG pseudorandom number generator, described in [SP80090A] and Annex D of [X962], using the private key sk as the `entropy_input` parameter and $H(m)$ as the nonce. The construction $G'(n)$ provided herein is similar, with such difference that a key derived from $G(n)$ and $H(\text{Sig}(sk, \text{tag1}))$ is used as the entropy input and `tag2` is the nonce.

However, the semantics and the security properties obtained by using these two constructions are different. The proposed construction aims to improve CSPRNG usage such that certain trusted randomness would remain even if the CSPRNG is completely broken. Using a signature scheme which requires entropy sources according to RFC 6979

is intended for different purposes and does not assume possession of any entropy source - even an unstable one. For example, if in a certain system all private key operations are performed within an HSM, then the differences will manifest as follows: the HMAC_DRBG construction of RFC 6979 may be implemented inside the HSM for the sake of signature generation, while the proposed construction would assume calling the signature implemented in the HSM.

11. References

11.1. Normative References

- [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/info/rfc2119>>.
- [RFC5869] Krawczyk, H. and P. Eronen, "HMAC-based Extract-and-Expand Key Derivation Function (HKDF)", RFC 5869, DOI 10.17487/RFC5869, May 2010, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5869>>.
- [RFC6979] Pornin, T., "Deterministic Usage of the Digital Signature Algorithm (DSA) and Elliptic Curve Digital Signature Algorithm (ECDSA)", RFC 6979, DOI 10.17487/RFC6979, August 2013, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6979>>.
- [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/info/rfc8174>>.

11.2. Informative References

- [DebianBug] Yilek, Scott, et al, ., "When private keys are public - Results from the 2008 Debian OpenSSL vulnerability", 2009, <<https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/fcf9/fe0946c20e936b507c023bbf89160cc995b9.pdf>>.
- [DualEC] Bernstein, Daniel et al, ., "Dual EC - A standardized back door", 2016, <<https://projectbullrun.org/dual-ec/documents/dual-ec-20150731.pdf>>.
- [MAFS2017] McGrew, Anderson, Fluhrer, Sheneff, ., "PRNG Failures and TLS Vulnerabilities in the Wild", 2017, <<https://rwc.iacr.org/2017/Slides/david.mcgrew.pptx>>.

- [NAXOS] LaMacchia, Brian et al, ., "Stronger Security of Authenticated Key Exchange", 2007, <<https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/strongake-submitted.pdf>>.
- [RY2010] Ristenpart, Yilek, ., "When Good Randomness Goes Bad|:| Virtual Machine Reset Vulnerabilities and Hedging Deployed Cryptography", 2010, <<https://rist.tech.cornell.edu/papers/sslhedge.pdf>>.
- [SecAnalysis] Akhmetzyanova, Cremers, Garratt, Smyshlyaev, Sullivan, ., "Limiting the impact of unreliable randomness in deployed security protocols", 2019, <<https://eprint.iacr.org/2018/1057>>.
- [SP80090A] "Recommendation for Random Number Generation Using Deterministic Random Bit Generators (Revised), NIST Special Publication 800-90A.", January 2012, <National Institute of Standards and Technology>.
- [X962] American National Standards Institute, ., "Public Key Cryptography for the Financial Services Industry -- The Elliptic Curve Digital Signature Algorithm (ECDSA), ANSI X9.62-2005", November 2005, <https://www.techstreet.com/standards/x9-x9-62-2005?product_id=1327225>.

Authors' Addresses

Cas Cremers
CISPA Helmholtz Center for Information Security
Saarland Informatics Campus
Saarbruecken
Germany

Email: cremers@cispa.saarland

Luke Garratt
Cisco Meraki
500 Terry A Francois Blvd
San Francisco,
United States of America

Email: lgarratt@cisco.com

Stanislav Smyshlyaev
CryptoPro
18, Sushevsky val
Moscow
Russian Federation

Email: svs@cryptopro.ru

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

Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Informational
Expires: September 12, 2019

A. Davidson
N. Sullivan
Cloudflare
C. Wood
Apple Inc.
March 11, 2019

Oblivious Pseudorandom Functions (OPRFs) using Prime-Order Groups
draft-sullivan-cfrg-voprf-03

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.

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 September 12, 2019.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2019 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	3
1.1.	Terminology	4
1.2.	Requirements	5
2.	Background	5
3.	Security Properties	6
4.	OPRF Protocol	6
4.1.	Protocol correctness	8
4.2.	Instantiations of GG	8
4.3.	OPRF algorithms	9
4.3.1.	OPRF_Setup	9
4.3.2.	OPRF_Blind	10
4.3.3.	OPRF_Sign	10
4.3.4.	OPRF_Unblind	11
4.3.5.	OPRF_Finalize	11
4.4.	VOPRF algorithms	11
4.4.1.	VOPRF_Setup	12
4.4.2.	VOPRF_Blind	12
4.4.3.	VOPRF_Sign	13
4.4.4.	VOPRF_Unblind	13
4.4.5.	VOPRF_Finalize	13
4.5.	Utility algorithms	14
4.5.1.	bin2scalar	14
4.6.	Efficiency gains with pre-processing and additive blinding	14
4.6.1.	OPRF_Preprocess	15
4.6.2.	OPRF_Blind	15
4.6.3.	OPRF_Unblind	16
5.	NIZK Discrete Logarithm Equality Proof	16
5.1.	DLEQ_Generate	16
5.2.	DLEQ_Verify	17
6.	Batched VOPRF evaluation	17
6.1.	Batched DLEQ algorithms	18
6.1.1.	Batched_DLEQ_Generate	18
6.1.2.	Batched_DLEQ_Verify	19
6.2.	Modified protocol execution	20
6.3.	PRNG and resampling	20

7.	Supported ciphersuites	20
7.1.	ECVOPRF-P256-HKDF-SHA256-SSWU:	20
7.2.	ECVOPRF-RISTRETTO-HKDF-SHA512-Ellicigator2:	21
8.	Security Considerations	21
8.1.	Timing Leaks	21
8.2.	Hashing to curves	22
8.3.	Verifiability (key consistency)	22
9.	Applications	22
9.1.	Privacy Pass	22
9.2.	Private Password Checker	23
9.2.1.	Parameter Commitments	23
10.	Acknowledgements	23
11.	Normative References	23
	Appendix A. Test Vectors	25
	Authors' Addresses	27

1. Introduction

A pseudorandom function (PRF) $F(k, x)$ is an efficiently computable function with secret key k on input x . Roughly, F is pseudorandom if the output $y = F(k, x)$ is indistinguishable from uniformly sampling any element in F 's range for random choice of k . An oblivious PRF (OPRF) is a two-party protocol between a prover P and verifier V where P holds a PRF key k and V holds some input x . The protocol allows both parties to cooperate in computing $F(k, x)$ with P 's secret key k and V 's input x such that: V learns $F(k, x)$ without learning anything about k ; and P does not learn anything about x . A Verifiable OPRF (VOPRF) is an OPRF wherein P can prove to V that $F(k, x)$ was computed using key k , which is bound to a trusted public key $Y = kG$. Informally, this is done by presenting a non-interactive zero-knowledge (NIZK) proof of equality between (G, Y) and (Z, M) , where $Z = kM$ for some point M .

OPRFs have been shown to be useful for constructing: password-protected secret sharing schemes [JKK14]; privacy-preserving password stores [SJKS17]; and password-authenticated key exchange or PAKE [OPAQUE]. VOPRFs are useful for producing tokens that are verifiable by V . This may be needed, for example, if V wants assurance that P did not use a unique key in its computation, i.e., if V wants key consistency from P . This property is necessary in some applications, e.g., the Privacy Pass protocol [PrivacyPass], 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. [JKKX16].

This document introduces an OPRF protocol built in prime-order groups, applying to finite fields of prime-order and also elliptic curve (EC) settings. 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. In the EC setting, we will refer to the protocol as ECOPRF (or ECVOPRF if verifiability is concerned). The document describes the protocol, its security properties, and provides preliminary test vectors for experimentation. The rest of the document is structured as follows:

- o Section Section 2: Describe background, related work, and use cases of OPRF/VOPRF protocols.
- o Section Section 3: Discuss security properties of OPRFs/VOPRFs.
- o Section Section 4: Specify an authentication protocol from OPRF functionality, based in prime-order groups (with an optional verifiable mode). Algorithms are stated formally for OPRFs in Section 4.3 and for VOPRFs in Section 4.4.
- o Section Section 5: Specify the NIZK discrete logarithm equality (DLEQ) construction used for constructing the VOPRF protocol.
- o Section Section 6: Specifies how the DLEQ proof mechanism can be batched for multiple VOPRF invocations, and how this changes the protocol execution.
- o Section Section 7: Considers explicit instantiations of the protocol in the elliptic curve setting.
- o Section Section 8: Discusses the security considerations for the OPRF and VOPRF protocol.
- o Section Section 9: Discusses some existing applications of OPRF and VOPRF protocols.
- o Section Appendix A: Specifies test vectors for implementations in the elliptic curve setting.

1.1. Terminology

The following terms are used throughout this document.

- o PRF: Pseudorandom Function.
- o OPRF: Oblivious PRF.
- o VOPRF: Verifiable Oblivious Pseudorandom Function.

- o ECVOPRF: A VOPRF built on Elliptic Curves.
- o Verifier (V): Protocol initiator when computing $F(k, x)$.
- o Prover (P): Holder of secret key k .
- o NIZK: Non-interactive zero knowledge.
- o DLEQ: Discrete Logarithm Equality.

1.2. Requirements

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [RFC2119].

2. Background

OPRFs are functionally related to RSA-based blind signature schemes, e.g., [ChaumBlindSignature]. Briefly, a blind signature scheme works as follows. Let m be a message to be signed by a server. It is assumed to be a member of the RSA group. Also, let N be the RSA modulus, and e and d be the public and private keys, respectively. A prover P and verifier V engage in the following protocol given input m .

1. V generates a random blinding element r from the RSA group, and compute $m' = m^r \pmod{N}$. Send m' to the P .
2. P uses m' to compute $s' = (m')^d \pmod{N}$, and sends s' to the V .
3. V removes the blinding factor r to obtain the original signature as $s = (s')^{r^{-1}} \pmod{N}$.

By the properties of RSA, s is clearly a valid signature for m . OPRF protocols can be used to provide a symmetric equivalent to blind signatures. Essentially the client learns $y = \text{PRF}(k, x)$ for some input x of their choice, from a server that holds k . Since the security of an OPRF means that x is hidden in the interaction, then the client can later reveal x to the server along with y .

The server can verify that y is computed correctly by recomputing the PRF on x using k . In doing so, the client provides knowledge of a 'signature' y for their value x . However, the verification procedure is symmetric since it requires knowledge of k . This is discussed more in the following section.

3. Security Properties

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

- o Given value x , it is infeasible to compute $y = F(k, x)$ without knowledge of k .
- o The output distribution of $y = F(k, x)$ is indistinguishable from the uniform distribution in the domain of the function F .

Additionally, we require the following additional properties:

- o Non-malleable: Given $(x, y = F(k, x))$, V must not be able to generate (x', y') where $x' \neq x$ and $y' = F(k, x')$.
- o Oblivious: P must learn nothing about V 's input, and V must learn nothing about P 's private key.
- o Unlinkable: If V reveals x to P , P cannot link x to the protocol instance in which $y = F(k, x)$ was computed.

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

- o Verifiable: V must only complete execution of the protocol if it can successfully assert that P used its secret key k .

In practice, the notion of verifiability requires that P commits to the key k before the actual protocol execution takes place. Then V verifies that P has used k in the protocol using this commitment.

4. OPRF Protocol

In this section we describe the OPRF protocol. Let GG be a prime-order additive subgroup, with two distinct hash functions H_1 and H_2 , where H_1 maps arbitrary input onto GG and H_2 maps arbitrary input to a fixed-length output, e.g., SHA256. All hash functions in the protocol are modelled as random oracles. Let L be the security parameter. Let k be the prover's (P) secret key, and $Y = kG$ be its corresponding 'public key' for some generator G taken from the group GG . This public key is also referred to as a commitment to the key k . Let x be the verifier's (V) input to the OPRF protocol. (Commonly, it is a random L -bit string, though this is not required.)

The OPRF protocol begins with V blinding its input for the signer such that it appears uniformly distributed GG . The latter then applies its secret key to the blinded value and returns the result.

To finish the computation, V then removes its blind and hashes the result using H_2 to yield an output. This flow is illustrated below.

```

      Verifier                Prover
      -----
      r <- $ GG
      M = rH_1(x)
                M
                ----->
                Z = kM
                [D = DLEQ_Generate(k, G, Y, M, Z)]
                Z[,D]
                <-----
      [b = DLEQ_Verify(G, Y, M, Z, D)]
      N = Zr^(-1)
      Output H_2(x, N) [if b=1, else "error"]

```

Steps that are enclosed in square brackets (DLEQ_Generate and DLEQ_Verify) are optional for achieving verifiability. These are described in Section Section 5. In the verifiable mode, we assume that P has previously committed to their choice of key k with some values $(G, Y=kG)$ and these are publicly known by V. Notice that revealing (G, Y) does not reveal k by the well-known hardness of the discrete log problem.

Strictly speaking, the actual PRF function that is computed is:

$$F(k, x) = N = kH_1(x)$$

It is clear that this is a PRF $H_1(x)$ maps x to a random element in GG , and GG is cyclic. This output is computed when the client computes Zr^{-1} by the commutativity of the multiplication. The client finishes the computation by outputting $H_2(x, N)$. Note that the output from P is not the PRF value because the actual input x is blinded by r .

This protocol may be decomposed into a series of steps, as described below:

- o OPRF_Setup(l): Generate an integer k of sufficient bit-length l and output k .
- o OPRF_Blind(x): Compute and return a blind, r , and blinded representation of x in GG , denoted M .
- o OPRF_Sign(k, M, h): Sign input M using secret key k to produce Z , the input h is optional and equal to the cofactor of an elliptic curve. If h is not provided then it defaults to 1.

- o `OPRF_Unblind(r,Z)`: Unblind blinded signature Z with blind r , yielding N and output N .
- o `OPRF_Finalize(x,N)`: Finalize N to produce the output $H_2(x, N)$.

For verifiability we modify the algorithms of `VOPRF_Setup`, `VOPRF_Sign` and `VOPRF_Unblind` to be the following:

- o `VOPRF_Setup(l)`: Generate an integer k of sufficient bit-length l and output $(k, (G, Y))$ where $Y = kG$ for some generator G in GG .
- o `VOPRF_Sign(k, (G, Y), M, h)`: Sign input M using secret key k to produce Z . Generate a NIZK proof $D = \text{DLEQ_Generate}(k, G, Y, M, Z)$, and output (Z, D) . The optional cofactor h can also be provided as in `OPRF_Sign`.
- o `VOPRF_Unblind(r, G, Y, M, (Z, D))`: Unblind blinded signature Z with blind r , yielding N . Output N if $1 = \text{DLEQ_Verify}(G, Y, M, Z, D)$. Otherwise, output "error".

We leave the rest of the OPRF algorithms unmodified. When referring explicitly to VOPRF execution, we replace 'OPRF' in all method names with 'VOPRF'.

4.1. Protocol correctness

Protocol correctness requires that, for any key k , input x , and $(r, M) = \text{OPRF_Blind}(x)$, it must be true that:

$$\text{OPRF_Finalize}(x, \text{OPRF_Unblind}(r, M, \text{OPRF_Sign}(k, M))) = H_2(x, F(k, x))$$

with overwhelming probability. Likewise, in the verifiable setting, we require that:

$$\text{VOPRF_Finalize}(x, \text{VOPRF_Unblind}(r, (G, Y), M, (\text{VOPRF_Sign}(k, (G, Y), M)))) = H_2(x, F(k, x))$$

with overwhelming probability, where $(r, M) = \text{VOPRF_Blind}(x)$.

4.2. Instantiations of GG

As we remarked above, GG is a subgroup with associated prime-order p . While we choose to write operations in the setting where GG comes equipped with an additive operation, we could also define the operations in the multiplicative setting. In the multiplicative setting we can choose GG to be a prime-order subgroup of a finite field FF_p . For example, let p be some large prime (e.g. > 2048 bits) where $p = 2q+1$ for some other prime q . Then the subgroup of squares of FF_p (elements u^2 where u is an element of FF_p) is

cyclic, and we can pick a generator of this subgroup by picking g from FF_p (ignoring the identity element).

For practicality of the protocol, it is preferable to focus on the cases where GG is an additive subgroup so that we can instantiate the OPRF in the elliptic curve setting. This amounts to choosing GG to be a prime-order subgroup of an elliptic curve over base field $\text{GF}(p)$ for prime p . There are also other settings where GG is a prime-order subgroup of an elliptic curve over a base field of non-prime order, these include the work of Ristretto [RISTRETTO] and Decaf [DECAF].

We will use $p > 0$ generally for constructing the base field $\text{GF}(p)$, not just those where p is prime. To reiterate, we focus only on the additive case, and so we focus only on the cases where $\text{GF}(p)$ is indeed the base field.

4.3. OPRF algorithms

This section provides algorithms for each step in the OPRF protocol. We describe the VOPRF analogues in Section 4.4. We provide generic utility algorithms in Section 4.5.

1. P samples a uniformly random key $k \leftarrow \{0,1\}^l$ for sufficient length l , and interprets it as an integer.
2. V computes $X = H_1(x)$ and a random element r (blinding factor) from $\text{GF}(p)$, and computes $M = rX$.
3. V sends M to P .
4. P computes $Z = kM = rkX$.
5. In the elliptic curve setting, P multiplies Z by the cofactor (denoted h) of the elliptic curve.
6. P sends Z to V .
7. V unblinds Z to compute $N = r^{-1}Z = kX$.
8. V outputs the pair $H_2(x, N)$.

4.3.1. OPRF_Setup

Input:

l: Some suitable choice of key-length (e.g. as described in {{NIST}}).

Output:

k: A key chosen from $\{0,1\}^l$ and interpreted as an integer value.

Steps:

1. Sample $k_bin \leftarrow \{0,1\}^l$
2. Output $k \leftarrow \text{bin2scalar}(k_bin, l)$

4.3.2. OPRF_Blind

Input:

x: V's PRF input.

Output:

r: Random scalar in $[1, p - 1]$.
M: Blinded representation of x using blind r, an element in GG.

Steps:

1. $r \leftarrow \text{GF}(p)$
2. $M := rH_1(x)$
3. Output (r, M)

4.3.3. OPRF_Sign

Input:

k: Signer secret key.
M: An element in GG.
h: optional cofactor (defaults to 1).

Output:

Z: Scalar multiplication of the point M by k, element in GG.

Steps:

1. $Z := kM$
2. $Z \leftarrow hZ$
3. Output Z

4.3.4. OPRF_Unblind

Input:

r: Random scalar in $[1, p - 1]$.
Z: An element in GG.

Output:

N: Unblinded signature, element in GG.

Steps:

1. $N := (1/r)Z$
2. Output N

4.3.5. OPRF_Finalize

Input:

x: PRF input string.
N: An element in GG.

Output:

y: Random element in $\{0,1\}^L$.

Steps:

1. $y := H_2(x, N)$
2. Output y

4.4. VOPRF algorithms

The steps in the VOPRF setting are written as:

1. P samples a uniformly random key $k \leftarrow \{0,1\}^l$ for sufficient length l , and interprets it as an integer.
2. P commits to k by computing (G,Y) for $Y=kG$ and where G is a generator of GG. P makes (G,Y) publicly available.
3. V computes $X = H_1(x)$ and a random element r (blinding factor) from $GF(p)$, and computes $M = rX$.
4. V sends M to P.
5. P computes $Z = kM = rkX$, and $D = \text{DLEQ_Generate}(k,G,Y,M,Z)$.

6. P sends (Z, D) to V.
7. V ensures that $1 = \text{DLEQ_Verify}(G, Y, M, Z, D)$. If not, V outputs an error.
8. V unblinds Z to compute $N = r^{-1}Z = kX$.
9. V outputs the pair $H_2(x, N)$.

4.4.1. VOPRF_Setup

Input:

G: Public generator of GG.

l: Some suitable choice of key-length (e.g. as described in {{NIST}}).

Output:

k: A key chosen from $\{0,1\}^l$ and interpreted as an integer value.

(G, Y) : A pair of curve points, where $Y=kG$.

Steps:

1. $k \leftarrow \text{OPRF_Setup}(l)$
2. $Y := kG$
3. Output $(k, (G, Y))$

4.4.2. VOPRF_Blind

Input:

x: V's PRF input.

Output:

r: Random scalar in $[1, p - 1]$.

M: Blinded representation of x using blind r, an element in GG.

Steps:

1. $r \leftarrow \$ \text{GF}(p)$
2. $M := rH_1(x)$
3. Output (r, M)

4.4.3. VOPRF_Sign

Input:

k: Signer secret key.
G: Public generator of group GG.
Y: Signer public key (= kG).
M: An element in GG.
h: optional cofactor (defaults to 1).

Output:

Z: Scalar multiplication of the point M by k, element in GG.
D: DLEQ proof that $\log_G(Y) = \log_M(Z)$.

Steps:

1. $Z := kM$
2. $Z \leftarrow hZ$
3. $D = \text{DLEQ_Generate}(k, G, Y, M, Z)$
4. Output (Z, D)

4.4.4. VOPRF_Unblind

Input:

r: Random scalar in $[1, p - 1]$.
G: Public generator of group GG.
Y: Signer public key.
M: Blinded representation of x using blind r, an element in GG.
Z: An element in GG.
D: $D = \text{DLEQ_Generate}(k, G, Y, M, Z)$.

Output:

N: Unblinded signature, element in GG.

Steps:

1. $N := (1/r)Z$
2. If $1 = \text{DLEQ_Verify}(G, Y, M, Z, D)$, output N
3. Output "error"

4.4.5. VOPRF_Finalize

Input:

x: PRF input string.
N: An element in GG, or "error".

Output:

y: Random element in $\{0,1\}^L$, or "error"

Steps:

1. If $N == \text{"error"}$, output "error".
2. $y := H_2(x, N)$
3. Output y

4.5. Utility algorithms

4.5.1. bin2scalar

This algorithm converts a binary string to an integer modulo p.

Input:

s: binary string (little-endian)
l: length of binary string
p: modulus

Output:

z: An integer modulo p

Steps:

1. $sVec \leftarrow \text{vec}(s)$ (converts s to a column vector of dimension l)
2. $p2Vec \leftarrow (2^0, 2^1, \dots, 2^{\{l-1\}})$ (row vector of dimension l)
3. $z \leftarrow p2Vec * sVec \pmod{p}$
4. Output z

4.6. Efficiency gains with pre-processing and additive blinding

In the [OPAQUE] draft, it is noted that it may be more efficient to use additive blinding rather than multiplicative if the client can preprocess some values. For example, computing $rH_1(x)$ is an example of multiplicative blinding. A valid way of computing additive blinding would be to instead compute $H_1(x)+rG$, where G is the common generator for the group.

If the client preprocesses values of the form rG , then computing $H_1(x)+rG$ is more efficient than computing $rH_1(x)$ (one addition against $\log_2(r)$). Therefore, it may be advantageous to define the OPRF and VOPRF protocols using additive blinding rather than multiplicative blinding. In fact the only algorithms that need to change are OPRF_Blind and OPRF_Unblind (and similarly for the VOPRF variants).

We define the additive blinding variants of the above algorithms below along with a new algorithm OPRF_Preprocess that defines how preprocessing is carried out. The equivalent algorithms for VOPRF are almost identical and so we do not redefine them here. Notice that the only computation that changes is for V , the necessary computation of P does not change.

4.6.1. OPRF_Preprocess

Input:

G : Public generator of GG

Output:

r : Random scalar in $[1, p-1]$

rG : An element in GG .

rY : An element in GG .

Steps:

1. $r \leftarrow \$ GF(p)$
2. Output (r, rG, rY)

4.6.2. OPRF_Blind

Input:

x : V 's PRF input.

rG : Preprocessed element of GG .

Output:

M : Blinded representation of x using blind r , an element in GG .

Steps:

1. $M := H_1(x)+rG$
2. Output M

4.6.3. OPRF_Unblind

Input:

rY: Preprocessed element of GG.
M: Blinded representation of x using rG, an element in GG.
Z: An element in GG.

Output:

N: Unblinded signature, element in GG.

Steps:

1. $N := Z - rY$
2. Output N

Notice that OPRF_Unblind computes $(Z - rY) = k(H_1(x) + rG) - rkG = kH_1(x)$ by the commutativity of scalar multiplication in GG. This is the same output as in the original OPRF_Unblind algorithm.

5. NIZK Discrete Logarithm Equality Proof

For the VOPRF protocol we require that V is able to verify that P has used its private key k to evaluate the PRF. We can do this by showing that the original commitment (G, Y) output by VOPRF_Setup(l) satisfies $\log_G(Y) == \log_M(Z)$ where Z is the output of VOPRF_Sign(k, (G, Y), M).

This may be used, for example, to ensure that P uses the same private key for computing the VOPRF output and does not attempt to "tag" individual verifiers with select keys. This proof must not reveal the P's long-term private key to V.

Consequently, this allows extending the OPRF protocol with a (non-interactive) discrete logarithm equality (DLEQ) algorithm built on a Chaum-Pedersen [ChaumPedersen] proof. This proof is divided into two procedures: DLEQ_Generate and DLEQ_Verify. These are specified below.

5.1. DLEQ_Generate

Input:

k: Signer secret key.
 G: Public generator of GG.
 Y: Signer public key (= kG).
 M: An element in GG.
 Z: An element in GG.
 H₃: A hash function from GG to $\{0,1\}^L$, modelled as a random oracle.

Output:

D: DLEQ proof (c, s).

Steps:

1. $r \leftarrow \text{GF}(p)$
2. $A := rG$ and $B := rM$.
3. $c \leftarrow H_3(G, Y, M, Z, A, B)$
4. $s := (r - ck) \pmod{p}$
5. Output D := (c, s)

5.2. DLEQ_Verify

Input:

G: Public generator of GG.
 Y: Signer public key.
 M: An element in GG.
 Z: An element in GG.
 D: DLEQ proof (c, s).

Output:

True if $\log_G(Y) == \log_M(Z)$, False otherwise.

Steps:

1. $A' := (sG + cY)$
2. $B' := (sM + cZ)$
3. $c' \leftarrow H_3(G, Y, M, Z, A', B')$
4. Output c == c'

6. Batched VOPRF evaluation

Common applications (e.g. [PrivacyPass]) require V to obtain multiple PRF evaluations from P. In the VOPRF case, this would also require generation and verification of a DLEQ proof for each Z_i received by V. This is costly, both in terms of computation and

communication. To get around this, applications use a 'batching' procedure for generating and verifying DLEQ proofs for a finite number of PRF evaluation pairs (M_i, Z_i) . For n PRF evaluations:

- o Proof generation is slightly more expensive from $2n$ modular exponentiations to $2n+2$.
- o Proof verification is much more efficient, from $4n$ modular exponentiations to $2n+4$.
- o Communications falls from $2n$ to 2 group elements.

Therefore, since P is usually a powerful server, we can tolerate a slight increase in proof generation complexity for much more efficient communication and proof verification.

In this section, we describe algorithms for batching the DLEQ generation and verification procedure. For these algorithms we require a pseudorandom generator PRNG: $\{0,1\}^a \times \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow (\{0,1\}^b)^n$ that takes a seed of length a and an integer n as input, and outputs n elements in $\{0,1\}^b$.

6.1. Batched DLEQ algorithms

6.1.1. Batched_DLEQ_Generate

Input:

k: Signer secret key.
 G: Public generator of group GG.
 Y: Signer public key (= kG).
 n: Number of PRF evaluations.
 [Mi]: An array of points in GG of length n.
 [Zi]: An array of points in GG of length n.
 PRNG: A pseudorandom generator of the form above.
 salt: An integer salt value for each PRNG invocation
 info: A string value for splitting the domain of the PRNG
 H_4: A hash function from $GG^{(2n+2)}$ to $\{0,1\}^a$, modelled as a random oracle.

Output:

D: DLEQ proof (c, s).

Steps:

1. seed \leftarrow H_4(G, Y, [Mi, Zi])
2. d1, ..., dn \leftarrow PRNG(seed, salt, info, n)
3. c1, ..., cn := (int)d1, ..., (int)dn
4. M := c1M1 + ... + cnMn
5. Z := c1Z1 + ... + cnZn
6. Output D \leftarrow DLEQ_Generate(k, G, Y, M, Z)

6.1.2. Batched_DLEQ_Verify

Input:

G: Public generator of group GG.
 Y: Signer public key.
 [Mi]: An array of points in GG of length n.
 [Zi]: An array of points in GG of length n.
 D: DLEQ proof (c, s).

Output:

True if $\log_G(Y) == \log_{(Mi)}(Zi)$ for each i in $1 \dots n$, False otherwise.

Steps:

1. seed \leftarrow H_4(G, Y, [Mi, Zi])
2. d1, ..., dn \leftarrow PRNG(seed, salt, info, n)
3. c1, ..., cn := (int)d1, ..., (int)dn
4. M := c1M1 + ... + cnMn
5. Z := c1Z1 + ... + cnZn
6. Output DLEQ_Verify(G, Y, M, Z, D)

6.2. Modified protocol execution

The VOPRF protocol from Section Section 4 changes to allow specifying multiple blinded PRF inputs $[M_i]$ for i in $1..n$. Then P computes the array $[Z_i]$ and replaces `DLEQ_Generate` with `Batched_DLEQ_Generate` over these arrays. The same applies to the algorithm `VOPRF_Sign`. The same applies for replacing `DLEQ_Verify` with `Batched_DLEQ_Verify` when V verifies the response from P and during the algorithm `VOPRF_Verify`.

6.3. PRNG and resampling

Any function that satisfies the security properties of a pseudorandom number generator can be used for computing the batched DLEQ proof. For example, SHAKE-256 [SHAKE] or HKDF-SHA256 [RFC5869] would be reasonable choices for groups that have an order of 256 bits.

We note that the PRNG outputs d_1, \dots, d_n must be smaller than the order of the group/curve that is being used. Resampling can be achieved by increasing the value of the iterator that is used in the info field of the PRNG input.

7. Supported ciphersuites

This section specifies supported ECVOPRF group and hash function instantiations. We only provide ciphersuites in the EC setting as these provide the most efficient way of instantiating the OPRF. Our instantiation includes considerations for providing the DLEQ proofs that make the instantiation a VOPRF. Supporting OPRF operations (ECOPRF) alone can be allowed by simply dropping the relevant components. In addition, we currently only support ciphersuites demonstrating 128 bits of security.

7.1. ECVOPRF-P256-HKDF-SHA256-SSWU:

- o GG: SECP256K1 curve [SEC2]
- o H_1: H2C-P256-SHA256-SSWU- [I-D.irtf-cfrg-hash-to-curve]
 - * label: voprf_h2c
- o H_2: SHA256
- o H_3: SHA256
- o H_4: SHA256
- o PRNG: HKDF-SHA256

7.2. ECVOPRF-RISTRETTO-HKDF-SHA512-Elligator2:

- o GG: Ristretto [RISTRETTO]
- o H_1: H2C-Curve25519-SHA512-Elligator2-Clear
[I-D.irtf-cfrg-hash-to-curve]
 - * label: voprf_h2c
- o H_2: SHA512
- o H_3: SHA512
- o H_4: SHA512
- o PRNG: HKDF-SHA512

In the case of Ristretto, internal point representations are represented by Ed25519 [RFC7748] points. As a result, we can use the same hash-to-curve encoding as we would use for Ed25519 [I-D.irtf-cfrg-hash-to-curve]. We remark that the 'label' field is necessary for domain separation of the hash-to-curve functionality.

8. Security Considerations

Security of the protocol depends on P's secrecy of k. Best practices recommend P regularly rotate k so as to keep its window of compromise small. Moreover, it each key should be generated from a source of safe, cryptographic randomness.

Another critical aspect of this protocol is reliance on [I-D.irtf-cfrg-hash-to-curve] for mapping arbitrary inputs x to points on a curve. Security requires this mapping be pre-image and collision resistant.

8.1. Timing Leaks

To ensure no information is leaked during protocol execution, all operations that use secret data MUST be constant time. Operations that SHOULD be constant time include: H_1() (hashing arbitrary strings to curves) and DLEQ_Generate(). [I-D.irtf-cfrg-hash-to-curve] describes various algorithms for constant-time implementations of H_1.

8.2. Hashing to curves

We choose different encodings in relation to the elliptic curve that is used, all methods are illuminated precisely in [I-D.irtf-cfrg-hash-to-curve]. In summary, we use the simplified Shallue-Woestijne-Ulas algorithm for hashing binary strings to the P-256 curve; the Icart algorithm for hashing binary strings to P384; the Elligator2 algorithm for hashing binary strings to CURVE25519 and CURVE448.

8.3. Verifiability (key consistency)

DLEQ proofs are essential to the protocol to allow V to check that P's designated private key was used in the computation. A side effect of this property is that it prevents P from using a unique key for select verifiers as a way of "tagging" them. If all verifiers expect use of a certain private key, e.g., by locating P's public key published from a trusted registry, then P cannot present unique keys to an individual verifier.

For this side effect to hold, P must also be prevented from using other techniques to manipulate their public key within the trusted registry to reduce client anonymity. For example, if P's public key is rotated too frequently then this may stratify the user base into small anonymity groups (those with VOPRF_Sign outputs taken from a given key epoch). In this case, it may become practical to link VOPRF sessions for a given user and thus compromises their privacy.

Similarly, if P can publish N public keys to a trusted registry then P may be able to control presentation of these keys in such a way that V is retroactively identified by V's key choice across multiple requests.

9. Applications

This section describes various applications of the VOPRF protocol.

9.1. Privacy Pass

This VOPRF protocol is used by Privacy Pass system to help Tor users bypass CAPTCHA challenges. Their system works as follows. Client C connects - through Tor - to an edge server E serving content. Upon receipt, E serves a CAPTCHA to C, who then solves the CAPTCHA and supplies, in response, n blinded points. E verifies the CAPTCHA response and, if valid, signs (at most) n blinded points, which are then returned to C along with a batched DLEQ proof. C stores the tokens if the batched proof verifies correctly. When C attempts to connect to E again and is prompted with a CAPTCHA, C uses one of the

unblinded and signed points, or tokens, to derive a shared symmetric key sk used to MAC the CAPTCHA challenge. C sends the CAPTCHA, MAC, and token input x to E , who can use x to derive sk and verify the CAPTCHA MAC. Thus, each token is used at most once by the system.

The Privacy Pass implementation uses the P-256 instantiation of the VOPRF protocol. For more details, see [DGSTV18].

9.2. Private Password Checker

In this application, let D be a collection of plaintext passwords obtained by prover P . For each password p in D , P computes $VOPRF_Sign$ on $H_1(p)$, where H_1 is as described above, and stores the result in a separate collection D' . P then publishes D' with Y , its public key. If a client C wishes to query D' for a password p' , it runs the VOPRF protocol using p as input x to obtain output y . By construction, y will be the signature of p hashed onto the curve. C can then search D' for y to determine if there is a match.

Examples of such password checkers already exist, for example: [JKKX16], [JKK14] and [SJKS17].

9.2.1. Parameter Commitments

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

10. Acknowledgements

This document resulted from the work of the Privacy Pass team [PrivacyPass]. The authors would also like to acknowledge the helpful conversations with Hugo Krawczyk. Eli-Shaoul Khedouri provided additional review and comments on key consistency.

11. Normative References

[ChaumBlindSignature]

"Blind Signatures for Untraceable Payments", n.d.,
<<http://sceweb.sce.uhcl.edu/yang/teaching/csci5234WebSecurityFall2011/Chaum-blind-signatures.PDF>>.

[ChaumPedersen]

"Wallet Databases with Observers", n.d.,
<https://chaum.com/publications/Wallet_Databases.pdf>.

- [DECAF] "Decaf, Eliminating cofactors through point compression", n.d., <<https://www.shiftleft.org/papers/decaf/decaf.pdf>>.
- [DGSTV18] "Privacy Pass, Bypassing Internet Challenges Anonymously", n.d., <<https://www.degruyter.com/view/j/popets.2018.2018.issue-3/popets-2018-0026/popets-2018-0026.xml>>.
- [I-D.irtf-cfrg-hash-to-curve]
Scott, S., Sullivan, N., and C. Wood, "Hashing to Elliptic Curves", draft-irtf-cfrg-hash-to-curve-02 (work in progress), October 2018.
- [JKK14] "Round-Optimal Password-Protected Secret Sharing and T-PAKE in the Password-Only model", n.d., <<https://eprint.iacr.org/2014/650.pdf>>.
- [JKKX16] "Highly-Efficient and Composable Password-Protected Secret Sharing (Or, How to Protect Your Bitcoin Wallet Online)", n.d., <<https://eprint.iacr.org/2016/144>>.
- [NIST] "Keylength - NIST Report on Cryptographic Key Length and Cryptoperiod (2016)", n.d., <<https://www.keylength.com/en/4/>>.
- [OPAQUE] "The OPAQUE Asymmetric PAKE Protocol", n.d., <<https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-krawczyk-cfrg-opaque-01>>.
- [PrivacyPass]
"Privacy Pass", n.d., <<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/info/rfc2119>>.
- [RFC5869] Krawczyk, H. and P. Eronen, "HMAC-based Extract-and-Expand Key Derivation Function (HKDF)", RFC 5869, DOI 10.17487/RFC5869, May 2010, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5869>>.
- [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/info/rfc7748>>.

- [RFC8032] Josefsson, S. and I. Liusvaara, "Edwards-Curve Digital Signature Algorithm (EdDSA)", RFC 8032, DOI 10.17487/RFC8032, January 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8032>>.
- [RISTRETTO] "The ristretto255 Group", n.d., <<https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-hdevalence-cfrg-ristretto-00>>.
- [SEC2] Standards for Efficient Cryptography Group (SECG), ., "SEC 2: Recommended Elliptic Curve Domain Parameters", n.d., <<http://www.secg.org/sec2-v2.pdf>>.
- [SHAKE] "SHA-3 Standard, Permutation-Based Hash and Extendable-Output Functions", n.d., <https://www.nist.gov/publications/sha-3-standard-permutation-based-hash-and-extendable-output-functions?pub_id=919061>.
- [SJKS17] "SPHINX, A Password Store that Perfectly Hides from Itself", n.d., <<http://webee.technion.ac.il/%7Ehugo/sphinx.pdf>>.

Appendix A. Test Vectors

This section includes test vectors for the ECVOPRF-P256-HKDF-SHA256 VOPRF ciphersuite, including batched DLEQ output.

P-256

X: 04b14b08f954f5b6ab1d014b1398f03881d70842acdf06194eb96a6d08186f8cb985c1c5521 \\
f4ee19e290745331f7eb89a4053de0673dc8ef14cfe9bf8226c6b31
r: b72265c85b1ba42cfed7caaf00d2ccac0b1a99259ba0dbb5a1fc2941526a6849
M: 046025a41f81a160c648cfe8fdcaa42e5f7da7a71055f8e23f1dc7e4204ab84b705043ba5c7 \\
000123e1fd058150a4d3797008f57a8b2537766d9419c7396ba5279
k: f84e197c8b712cdf452d2cff52dec1bd96220ed7b9a6f66ed28c67503ae62133
Z: 043ab5ccb690d844dcb780b2d9e59126d62bc853ba01b2c339ba1c1b78c03e4b6adc5402f77 \\
9fc29f639edc138012f0e61960e1784973b37f864e4dc8abbc68e0b
N: 04e8aa6792d859075821e2fba28500d6974ba776fe230ba47ef7e42be1d967654ce776f889e \\
e1f374ffa0bce904408aaa4ed8a19c6cc7801022b7848031f4e442a
D: { s: faddfaf6b5d6b4b6357adf856fc1e0044614ebf9dafdb4c6541c1c9e61243c5b,
c: 8b403e170b56c915cc18864b3ab3c2502bd8f5ca25301bc03ab5138343040c7b }

P-256

X: 047e8d567e854e6bdc95727d48b40cbb5569299e0a4e339b6d707b2da3508eb6c238d3d4cb4 \\
68afc6ffc82fccbda8051478d1d2c9b21ffdfd628506c873ebb1249
r: f222dfe530fdbfcb02eb851867bfa8a6da1664dfc7cee4a51eb6ff83c901e15e
M: 04e2efdc73747e15e38b7a1bb90fe5e4ef964b3b8dccfda428f85a431420c84efca02f0f09c \\
83a8241b44572a059ab49c080a39d0bce2d5d0b44ff5d012b5184e7
k: fb164de0a87e601fd4435c0d7441ff822b5fa5975d0c68035beac05a82c41118
Z: 049d01e1c555bd3324e8ce93a13946b98bdcc765298e6d60808f93c00bdfba2ebf48eef8f28 \\
d8c91c903ad6bea3d840f3b9631424a6cc543a0a0e1f2d487192d5b
N: 04723880e480b60b4415ca627585d1715ab5965570d30c94391a8b023f8854ac26f76c1d6ab \\
bb38688a5affbcadad50ecbf7c93ef33ddfd735003b5a4b1a21ba14
D: { s: dfdf6ae40d141b61d5b2d72cf39c4a6c88db6ac5b12044a70c212e2bf80255b4,
c: 271979a6b51d5f71719127102621fe250e3235867cfcf8dea749c3e253b81997 }

Batched DLEQ (P256)

M_0: 046025a41f81a160c648cfe8fdcaa42e5f7da7a71055f8e23f1dc7e4204ab84b705043ba5c \\
7000123e1fd058150a4d3797008f57a8b2537766d9419c7396ba5279
M_1: 04e2efdc73747e15e38b7a1bb90fe5e4ef964b3b8dccfda428f85a431420c84efca02f0f09 \\
c83a8241b44572a059ab49c080a39d0bce2d5d0b44ff5d012b5184e7
Z_0: 043ab5ccb690d844dcb780b2d9e59126d62bc853ba01b2c339ba1c1b78c03e4b6adc5402f7 \\
79fc29f639edc138012f0e61960e1784973b37f864e4dc8abbc68e0b
Z_1: 04647e1ab7946b10c1c92dd333e2fc9e93e85fdef5939bf2f376ae859248513e0cd91115 \\
e48c6852d8dd173956aec7a81401c3f63a133934898d177f2a237eeb
k: f84e197c8b712cdf452d2cff52dec1bd96220ed7b9a6f66ed28c67503ae62133
PRNG: HKDF-SHA256
salt: "DLEQ_PROOF"
info: an iterator i for invoking the PRNG on M_i and Z_i
D: { s: b2123044e633d4721894d573decebc9366869fe3c6b4b79a00311ecfa46c9e34,
c: 3506df9008e60130fcddf86fdb02cbfe4ceb88ff73f66953b1606f6603309862 }

Authors' Addresses

Alex Davidson
Cloudflare
County Hall
London, SE1 7GP
United Kingdom

Email: adavidson@cloudflare.com

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

Email: nick@cloudflare.com

Christopher A. Wood
Apple Inc.
One Apple Park Way
Cupertino, California 95014
United States of America

Email: cawood@apple.com