

Computing the Theoretical Cost of the Optimal Ate Pairing on Elliptic Curves with Embedding Degrees 54 and 48 at the 256-bits security level

Narcisse Bang Mbiang · Emmanuel
Fouotsa · Celestin Lele

Received: / Accepted:

Abstract Efficient computation of pairings with Miller algorithm has recently received a great attention due to many applications in cryptography. In this work, we give formulae for the optimal Ate pairing in terms of elliptic nets associated to twisted Barreto-Naehrig (BN) curve, Barreto-Lynn-Scott(BLS) curves and Kachisa-Schaefer-Scott(KSS) curves considered at the 128, 192 and 256-bit security levels. We show how to parallelize the computation of these pairings when the elliptic net approach is used and we obtain more efficient theoretical results with 8 processors compared to the Miller loop approach for each corresponding case.

1 Introduction

Many new protocols such as the Identity-Based Encryption [1], the tripartite Diffie-Hellman key exchange [2] and short signatures [3] are based on pairings and so the efficiency of pairing computation has become a field of active research. The classical method for computing pairings is the Miller's algorithm [4]. In 2007, Katherine Stange [5] introduced a new algorithm to

Narcisse Bang Mbiang
Department of Mathematics and Computer Science,
Faculty of Sciences, University of Dschang (Cameroon)
E-mail: *bang_narcisse@yahoo.fr*

Emmanuel Fouotsa
Department of Mathematics, Higher Teacher Training College,
The University of Bamenda P.O BOX 39 Bambili, Cameroon.
E-mail: *emmanuel Fouotsa@yahoo.fr*

Celestin Lele
Department of Mathematics and Computer Science,
Faculty of Sciences, University of Dschang (Cameroon)
E-mail: *celestinlele@yahoo.fr*

evaluate pairings. The algorithm is based on elliptic nets which is the generalization of elliptic divisibility sequences to a higher rank. Both methods compute pairings using $\mathcal{O}(\log_2(r))$ field operations over an r -torsion subgroup. Based on present results, the Miller algorithm remains the fastest method for computing pairings. However, one can observe that formulae for the Doubling and Addition steps in the elliptic nets algorithm are suitable for parallel calculations. This work aims at parallelizing elliptic net algorithms for the optimal Ate pairing on Barreto-Naehrig(BN) curve, Barreto-Lynn-Scott(BLS) curves with embedding degree 12, 24 and 48 ([6]) and Kachisa-Schaefer-Scott(KSS) curves with embedding degree 16 ([7]), in order to compare their computational costs to the Miller loop ones.

Our contribution.

1. We give explicit formulae for computing the optimal Ate pairing on the above mentioned curves in terms of elliptic nets associated the twisted curves.
2. We provide algorithms to parallelize the computation of the obtained elliptic net formulae.
3. We give the computational cost for the part without the final exponentiation of optimal Ate pairing on each chosen curve in this work, and we compare these costs to those for the corresponding Miller loops.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 summarizes notions on elliptic nets and elliptic curves, Section 3 gives calculations of the optimal Ate pairing on twisted elliptic curve in terms of elliptic nets, Section 4 provides parallel algorithms for 4 and 8 processors, the computational costs for the step without the final exponentiation of optimal Ate pairings, and their comparisons to those for the corresponding Miller loop, Section 5 concludes the work.

2 Elliptic nets and elliptic curves.

In this section, we define an elliptic net, we state the theorem which gives the bijection among elliptic nets and elliptic curves and we express pairings in terms of elliptic nets.

Definition 1 ([5]) Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a finite generated free abelian group and $\mathcal{R}$ an integral domain. An elliptic net is a map $W : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ which satisfies the recurrence relation

$$\begin{aligned} &W(p+q+s)W(p-q)W(r+s)W(r)+ \\ &W(q+r+s)W(q-r)W(p+s)W(p)+ \\ &W(r+p+s)W(r-p)W(q+s)W(q) = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

for $p, q, r, s \in \mathcal{A}$

Let $\{e_i\}_{i \in \{1, \dots, n\}}$, be the natural basis of $\mathcal{A}$. W is normalized if $W(e_i) = 1$ for all i and $W(e_i + e_j) = 1$ for all $1 \leq i < j \leq n$.
 W is non-degenerate if $W(e_i) \neq 0$, $W(e_i + e_j) \neq 0$, $W(e_i - e_j) \neq 0$, $W(2e_i) \neq 0$.

Theorem 1 [8, Page 54] *Let $W : \mathbb{Z}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ be a normalized non-degenerate elliptic net. Then there is a curve E given by*

$$E : Y^2 + a_1XY + a_3Y = X^3 + a_2X^2 + a_4X + a_6$$

where

$$a_1 = \frac{W(2, 0) - W(0, 2)}{W(2, 1) - W(1, 2)}$$

$$a_2 = 2W(2, 1) - W(1, 2)$$

$$a_3 = W(2, 0), \quad a_4 = (W(2, 1) - W(1, 2))W(2, 1), \quad a_6 = 0$$

with $\psi(P, Q, \mathcal{C}_{ns}) = W$, where $P = (0, 0)$ and $Q = (W(1, 2) - W(2, 1), 0)$ are non-singular points and $\mathcal{C}_{ns}$ the non-singular part of the curve E .

Theorem 2 [5] *Let E be an elliptic curve defined over $\mathbb{C}$, and let Γ be its corresponding lattice. Let P_1 and P_2 be two points in $E(\mathbb{C})$ such that $P_1, P_2 \neq \mathcal{O}$ and $P_1 \pm P_2 \neq \mathcal{O}$. Let $z = (z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ be such that z_1 and z_2 correspond to P_1 and P_2 respectively, under the isomorphism $\mathbb{C}/\Gamma \cong E(\mathbb{C})$. For $v(v_1, v_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, define a function $\psi_{(v_1, v_2)}$ on $\mathbb{C}^2$ in variables $z = (z_1, z_2)$ as follows:*

$$\psi_{(v_1, v_2)}(z_1, z_2; \Gamma) = \frac{\sigma(v_1 z_1 + v_2 z_2; \Gamma)}{\sigma(z_1; \Gamma)^{v_1^2 - v_1 v_2} \sigma(z_1 + z_2; \Gamma)^{v_1 v_2} \sigma(z_2; \Gamma)^{v_2^2 - v_1 v_2}},$$

we have

$$\psi_v(P_1, P_2; E(\mathbb{C})) = \psi_{(v_1, v_2)}(z_1, z_2; \Gamma)$$

and

$$W : \mathbb{Z}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \\ (v_1, v_2) \mapsto \psi_{(v_1, v_2)}(z_1, z_2; \Gamma),$$

is an elliptic net associated to the curve E and the points P_1 and P_2 .

Stange proved this result to any field $\mathbb{K}$ [5]. In this work, we consider an elliptic curve E in the reduced form $y^2 = x^3 + Ax + B$, $P(x_1, y_1)$, $Q = (x_2, y_2) \in E(\mathbb{F}_{p^k})$. Initial values of the elliptic nets $W(i, 0)$ and $W(i, 1)$ associated to E, P, Q are:

$$W(1, 0) = 1, \tag{2}$$

$$W(2, 0) = 2y_1, \tag{3}$$

$$W(3, 0) = 3x_1^3 + 6Ax_1^2 + 12Bx_1 - A^2, \tag{4}$$

$$W(4, 0) = 4y_1(x_1^6 + 5Ax_1^4 + 20Bx_1^3 - 5A^2x_1^2 - 4ABx_1 - 8B^2 - A^3), \quad (5)$$

$$W(0, 1) = W(1, 1) = 1, \quad (6)$$

$$W(2, 1) = 2x_1 + x_2 - \left(\frac{y_2 - y_1}{x_2 - x_1}\right)^2 \quad (7)$$

$$W(-1, 1) = x_1 - x_2, \quad (8)$$

$$W(2, -1) = (y_1 + y_2)^2 - (2x_1 + x_2)(x_1 - x_2)^2. \quad (9)$$

There is a bijection between the set of elliptic curves and two points P and Q with $P, Q, P+Q$ and $P-Q \neq \mathcal{O}$, and the set of elliptic nets $W(n, m)$ associated to E, P, Q , such that $W(1, 0) = W(0, 1) = W(1, 1) = 1$ and $W(1, -1) \neq 0$. This works for higher ranks. Since pairings are classically defined on elliptic curves, one can then express pairings in terms of elliptic nets.

2.1 Tate Pairing in terms of Elliptic Nets.

In this subsection, we are summarizing Stange construction of the Tate pairing via elliptic net and also the double-and-add algorithm for its computation [5].

Let E be an elliptic curve defined over a finite field $\mathbb{F}_p$, with p a prime number greater than 3. Let r be a large prime dividing the order of the elliptic curve group such that $\gcd(p, r) = 1$. Let k be the smallest positive integer and also called an embedding degree of the curve with respect to r . Let $P \in E(\mathbb{F}_p)[r]$ and $Q \in E(\mathbb{F}_{p^k})[r]$. The Tate pairing is

$$T_{r,P} = \frac{W_{P,Q}(r+1, 1)W_{P,Q}(1, 0)}{W_{P,Q}(r+1, 0)W_{P,Q}(1, 1)} \quad (10)$$

where $W_{P,Q}$ is the elliptic net associated to E, P and Q .

One can show from Definition 1 that $W_{P,Q}(0, 0) = 0$ and $W_{P,Q}(-a, -b) = -W_{P,Q}(a, b)$. Since elliptic nets which are in bijection with elliptic curves satisfy $W_{P,Q}(1, 0) = W_{P,Q}(1, 1) = W_{P,Q}(1, 1) = 1$, the Tate pairing is then

$$T_{r,P} = \frac{W_{P,Q}(r+1, 1)}{W_{P,Q}(r+1, 0)} \quad (11)$$

Stange provided a double-and-add algorithm for computing $W_{P,Q}(r+1, 0)$ and $W_{P,Q}(r+1, 1)$ in $\log_2(r+1) - 1$ steps.

The method consists on defining an initial block V (Table 1) with a first vector of 8 consecutive terms of the sequence $W(i, 0)$ centered on $W(k, 0)$ and $W(k+1, 0)$ and a second vector of 3 consecutive terms of the sequence $W(i, 1)$ centered on the term $W(k, 1)$. Two functions **Double(V)** and **DoubleAdd(V)**

		(k-1,1)	(k,1)	(k+1,1)			
(k-3,0)	(k-2,0)	(k-1,0)	(k,0)	(k+1,0)	(k+2,0)	(k+3,0)	(k+4,0)

Table 1 Block V centered at k

are provided and described as follows:

Double(V): given a block V centered at k , returns the block centered at $2k$.

DoubleAdd(V): given a block V centered at k , returns the block centred at $2k + 1$.

Based on Definition 1, **Double(V)** and **DoubleAdd(V)** can be obtained from the following proposition:

Proposition 1 [5] *Let W be an elliptic net associated to an elliptic curve E and 2 rational points. We then have the following relations:*

$$W(2i - 1, 0) = W(i + 1, 0)W(i - 1, 0)^3 - W(i - 2, 0)W(i, 0)^3,$$

$$W(2i, 0) = \frac{1}{W(2, 0)}(W(i, 0)W(i + 2, 0)W(i - 1, 0)^2 - W(i, 0)W(i - 2, 0)W(i + 1, 0)^2),$$

for $i = k - 1 \dots, k + 3$ and

$$W(2k - 1, 1) = \frac{1}{W(1, 1)}(W(k + 1, 1)W(k - 1, 1)W(k - 1, 1)^2 - W(k, 0)W(k - 2, 0)W(k, 1)^2),$$

$$W(2k, 1) = W(k - 1, 1)W(k + 1, 1)W(k, 0)^2 - W(k - 1, 0)W(k + 1, 0)W(k, 1)^2,$$

$$W(2k + 1, 1) = \frac{1}{W(-1, 1)}(W(k - 1, 1)W(k + 1, 1)W(k + 1, 0)^2 - W(k, 0)W(k + 2, 0)W(k, 1)^2),$$

$$W(2k + 2, 1) = \frac{1}{W(-2, 1)}(W(k - 1, 1)W(k + 1, 1)W(k + 2, 0)^2 - W(k + 1, 0)W(k + 3, 0)W(k, 1)^2).$$

2.2 A Simplified Tate pairing in terms of Elliptic Net.

N. Ogura, N. Kanayama, S. Uchiyama, and E. Okamoto [9] have expressed the reduced Tate pairing in term of elliptic net. They used a process of normalization for elliptic net function to simplify the Tate pairing as it is given in the following definition.

Definition 2 ([9]) Let E be an elliptic curve defined over a finite field $\mathbb{F}_p$, r a large prime number such that r divides $\#E(\mathbb{F}_p)$ and $\gcd(r, p) = 1$. k the embedding degree of the curve E . Let $P \in E(\mathbb{F}_p)[r]$ and $Q \in E(\mathbb{F}_{p^k})[r]$,

$$T_{r,P}^{Red}(P, Q) = f_{r,P}(Q)^{\frac{p^k-1}{r}} = W_{P,Q}(r, 1)^{\frac{p^k-1}{r}} \quad (12)$$

where $W_{P,Q}$ is an elliptic net associated to E , P and Q .

3 Computation of the Optimal Ate Pairings on Twisted elliptic Curves in terms of Elliptic Nets

Pairing-friendly curves are generally parameterized as (p, r, t) where p, r are given as polynomials in a variable x and t is the trace of the Frobenius of the curve. A value of x gives the suitable primes p and r defining an elliptic curve with cardinality $p + 1 - t$ divisible by r at the corresponding security level. This section describes optimal ate pairing on pairing-friendly elliptic curves in terms of elliptic nets.

3.1 The Optimal Ate Pairing

The method for the construction of the optimal Ate pairing is given in [10]. Let π_p be the Frobenius map on an elliptic curve defined by $\pi_p(x, y) = (x^p, y^p)$. Let t be the trace of the Frobenius on $E(\mathbb{F}_p)$ and $T = t - 1$. Let $P \in \mathbb{G}_1 = E(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)[r] \cap \text{Ker}(\pi_p - [1])$ and $Q \in \mathbb{G}_2 = E(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)[r] \cap \text{Ker}(\pi_p - [p])$, that means Q satisfies $\pi_p(Q) = [p]Q$.

Let $\ell = mr$ be a multiple of r such that $r \nmid m$ and write $\ell = \sum_{i=0}^l c_i p^i = h(p)$, ($h(z) \in \mathbb{Z}[z]$). Recall that $h_{R,S}$ is the Miller function [4]. For $i = 0, \dots, l$ set $s_i = \sum_{j=i}^l c_j p^j$; then the map

$$e_o : \mathbb{G}_2 \times \mathbb{G}_1 \rightarrow \frac{\mu_r}{\left(\prod_{i=0}^l f_{c_i, Q}^{p^i}(P) \cdot \prod_{i=0}^{l-1} h_{[s_{i+1}]Q, [c_i p^i]Q}(P) \right)^{\frac{p^k-1}{r}}} \quad (13)$$

defines a bilinear pairing and non degenerate if $mkp^k \neq ((p^k - 1)/r) \cdot \sum_{i=0}^l i c_i p^{i-1} \pmod{r}$. The coefficients $c_i : i = 0, \dots, l$ can be obtained from the short vectors obtained from the lattice

$$L = \begin{pmatrix} r & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ -p & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ -p^2 & 0 & 1 & \dots & 0 \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ -p^{\varphi(k)-1} & 0 & 0 & \dots & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (14)$$

Theorem 3 [8, Page 71]. Let E be an elliptic curve defined over a field $\mathbb{F}_{p^k}$. Let E_θ be the twist curve of E defined over $\mathbb{F}_{p^{k/\delta}}$, where δ is the degree of twist, θ a generator of the basis of $\mathbb{F}_{p^k}$, seen as a $\mathbb{F}_{p^{k/\delta}}$ -vector space. Let $\sigma_\theta : E_\theta \rightarrow E$ be the twisting isomorphism such that $(x, y) \mapsto (x\theta^2, y\theta^3)$, $E : y^2 = x^3 + b$ and $E_\theta : y^2 = x^3 + b\theta^{-6}$. Let $W_{\tilde{Q}, \tilde{P}}$ be the elliptic net associated to a twist curve E_θ and the points $\tilde{Q}, \tilde{P}$, such that $\sigma_\theta(\tilde{P}) = P$ and $\sigma_\theta(\tilde{Q}) = Q$ respectively. We then have the following relations:

$$W_{Q,P}(n, 0) = \theta^{1-n^2} W_{\tilde{Q}, \tilde{P}}(n, 0) \quad (15)$$

$$W_{Q,P}(n, 1) = \theta^{n-n^2} W_{\tilde{Q}, \tilde{P}}(n, 1) \quad (16)$$

One can prove Theorem 3 by induction.

We can now express the optimal Ate pairing in terms of elliptic nets associated to the twist curves.

In the following, $\widetilde{W}$ denotes $W_{\widetilde{Q}, \widetilde{P}}$ and W denotes $W_{Q, P}$.

3.2 Pairing on Twisted BN-Curves

The family of BN-curves [11] has embedding degree $k = 12$ and is given by the following parametrization:

$$\begin{aligned} p &= 36x^4 + 36x^3 + 24x^2 + 6x + 1, \\ r &= 36x^4 + 36x^3 + 18x^2 + 6x + 1 \\ t &= 6x^2 + 1 \end{aligned}$$

The optimal Ate pairing for BN-curves is given in [10] by:

$$\begin{aligned} e_1 : \mathbb{G}_2 \times \mathbb{G}_1 &\rightarrow \mu_r \\ (Q, P) &\mapsto (f_{6x+2, Q} \cdot \ell_{[6x+2]Q, [p]Q} \cdot \ell_{[6x+2+p]Q, [-p^2]Q}(P))^{\frac{p^{12}-1}{r}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $f_{n, Q}$ is the Miller function [4] and $\ell_{R, S}$, the line passing through R and S . The optimal Ate pairing in terms of elliptic nets associated to twisted BN-curve is already calculated in [12]. The costs of the Double and DoubleAdd steps for the parallelization of the Elliptic Net Algorithm is given for 1, 4, 6, 8 and 10 processors. We are focus on 4 and 8 processors in this work. We little bit improve the costs of the **Double** and **DoubleAdd** steps for 4 and 8 processors compared to theirs and we also noticed that one can appreciate the importance of the parallelization of the Elliptic Net Algorithm compared to the Miller loop from these numbers of processors. We will give the cost of the part without the final exponentiation of the optimal Ate pairing in terms of elliptic nets which is not yet given.

The BN-curve j -invariant 0 has a twist of order $\delta = 6$. Let W be the elliptic net associated to the BN-curve E and the points Q, P , and $\widetilde{W}$ the elliptic net associated to the twist curve as considered in [12].

Using (16) and the fact that the final exponentiation eliminate θ , The optimal Ate pairing is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} e_1 : \mathbb{G}_2 \times \mathbb{G}_1 &\rightarrow \mu_r \\ (Q, P) &\mapsto (\widetilde{W}(6x+2, 1) \cdot \mathbb{L}_1 \cdot \mathbb{L}_2)^{\frac{p^{12}-1}{r}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{L}_1 = \ell_{[6x+2]\widetilde{Q}, [p]\widetilde{Q}}$ and $\mathbb{L}_2 = \ell_{[6x+2+p]\widetilde{Q}, [-p^2]\widetilde{Q}}$ are the line evaluations. The following theorem helps to compute the coordinates in terms of elliptic nets for a multiple point.

Theorem 4 [9, page 11] Let $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $S = (x, y)$, a point on an elliptic curve E . The multiple point $[n]S$ in terms of elliptic nets is given by:

$$[n]S = (x - \frac{\Psi_{n-1}\Psi_{n+1}}{\Psi_n^2}(x, y), \frac{\Psi_{n-1}^2\Psi_{n+2} - \Psi_{n+1}^2\Psi_{n-2}}{4y\Psi_n^3}(x, y)), \quad (17)$$

where $\Psi_n(x, y)$ is the elliptic net of rank 1 associated to $[n]S$

These lines are calculated as follow:

Coordinates of $[6x+2]\tilde{Q}$:

$$x_{[6x+2]\tilde{Q}} = \frac{S}{\widetilde{W}(6x+2, 0)^2} \text{ where } S = x_{\tilde{Q}}\widetilde{W}(6x+2, 0)^2 - \widetilde{W}(6x+1, 0)\widetilde{W}(6x+3, 0)$$

$$y_{[6x+2]\tilde{Q}} = \frac{T}{\widetilde{W}(6x+2, 0)^3} \text{ where } T = \frac{\widetilde{W}(6x+1, 0)^2\widetilde{W}(6x+4, 0) - \widetilde{W}(6x+3, 0)^2\widetilde{W}(6x, 0)}{4y_{\tilde{Q}}}.$$

Coordinates of $[p]\tilde{Q}$:

$$x_{[p]\tilde{Q}} = \theta^{2(p-1)}x_{\tilde{Q}}^p, \quad y_{[p]\tilde{Q}} = \theta^{3(p-1)}y_{\tilde{Q}}^p.$$

$$\frac{y_{[6x+2]\tilde{Q}} - y_{[p]\tilde{Q}}}{x_{[6x+2]\tilde{Q}} - x_{[p]\tilde{Q}}} = \frac{T - \theta^{3(p-1)}\widetilde{W}(6x+2, 0)^3 y_{\tilde{Q}}^p}{S - \theta^{2(p-1)}\widetilde{W}(6x+2, 0)^2 x_{\tilde{Q}}^p} \times \frac{1}{\widetilde{W}(6x+2, 0)},$$

$$\frac{y_{\tilde{P}} - y_{[6x+2]\tilde{Q}}}{x_{\tilde{P}} - x_{[6x+2]\tilde{Q}}} = \frac{y_{\tilde{P}}\widetilde{W}(6x+2, 0)^3 - T}{x_{\tilde{P}}\widetilde{W}(6x+2, 0)^2 - S} \times \frac{1}{\widetilde{W}(6x+2, 0)}$$

Equation of the line evaluation $\mathbb{L}_1$ is then :

$$\mathbb{L}_1 : (S - \theta^{2(p-1)}\widetilde{W}(6x+2, 0)^2 x_{\tilde{Q}}^p)(y_{\tilde{P}}\widetilde{W}(6x+2, 0)^3 - T) - (T - \theta^{3(p-1)}\widetilde{W}(6x+2, 0)^3 y_{\tilde{Q}}^p)(x_{\tilde{P}}\widetilde{W}(6x+2, 0)^2 - S)$$

Coordinates of $[6x+2+p]\tilde{Q}$:

$$[6x+2+p]\tilde{Q} = [6x+2]\tilde{Q} + [p]\tilde{Q} = (\frac{S}{\widetilde{W}(6x+2, 0)^2}, \frac{T}{\widetilde{W}(6x+2, 0)^3}) + (\theta^{2(p-1)}x_{\tilde{Q}}^p, \theta^{3(p-1)}y_{\tilde{Q}}^p)$$

The calculation with good reduction using the equation of the twisted curve gives:

$$x_{[6x+2+p]\tilde{Q}} = \frac{U}{Z^2} \text{ where } U = 2b\theta^{-6}\widetilde{W}(6x+2, 0)^6 + S\tilde{S}(S + \tilde{S}) - 2T\tilde{T}.$$

$$\tilde{S} = \theta^{-2(p-1)}\widetilde{W}(6x+2, 0)^2 x_{\tilde{Q}}^p, \quad \tilde{T} = \theta^{-3(p-1)}\widetilde{W}(6x+2, 0)^3 y_{\tilde{Q}}^p, \quad Z = (S - \tilde{S})\widetilde{W}(6x+2, 0).$$

$$y_{[6x+2+p]\tilde{Q}} = \frac{V}{Z^3} \text{ where } V = (T - \tilde{T})(T\tilde{T} - 3\theta^{-6}\widetilde{W}(6x+2, 0)^6 b) + 3S\tilde{S}(S\tilde{T} - T\tilde{S}).$$

The terms $\tilde{S}$, $\tilde{T}$ and Z are as defined above.

Coordinates of $[-p^2]\tilde{Q}$:

$$x_{[-p^2]\tilde{Q}} = \theta^{2(p^2-1)}x_{\tilde{Q}}^{p^2} = \theta^{2(p^2-1)}x_{\tilde{Q}} \quad , \quad y_{[-p^2]\tilde{Q}} = -\theta^{3(p^2-1)}y_{\tilde{Q}}^{p^2} = -\theta^{3(p^2-1)}y_{\tilde{Q}}.$$

Since the coordinates of $\tilde{Q}$ are in $\mathbb{F}_{p^2}$.

Equation of the line evaluation $\mathbb{L}_2$ with good simplification is then :

$$\mathbb{L}_2 : (y_{\tilde{P}}Z^3 - V)(U - \theta^{2(p^2-1)}x_{\tilde{Q}}Z^2) - (x_{\tilde{P}}Z^2 - U)(V + \theta^{3(p^2-1)}y_{\tilde{Q}}Z^3)$$

3.3 Pairing on Twisted BLS-Curves of Embedding degrees 12, 24 and 48

The *BLS12* family of elliptic curves [6] are parameterized by:

$$\begin{aligned} p &= (x-1)^2(x^4 - x^2 + 1)/3 + x, \\ r &= x^4 - x^2 + 1 \\ t &= x + 1 \end{aligned}$$

The *BLS24* family of elliptic curves [6] are parameterized by:

$$\begin{aligned} p &= (x-1)^2(x^8 - x^4 + 1)/3 + x, \\ r &= x^8 - x^4 + 1 \\ t &= x + 1 \end{aligned}$$

The *BLS48* family of elliptic curves [6] are parameterized by:

$$\begin{aligned} p &= (x-1)^2(x^{16} - x^8 + 1)/3 + x, \\ r &= x^{16} - x^8 + 1 \\ t &= x + 1 \end{aligned}$$

The optimal Ate pairing for *BLS12*, *BLS24* and *BLS48* curves is given in [13] by:

$$\begin{aligned} e_2 : \mathbb{G}_2 \times \mathbb{G}_1 &\rightarrow \mu_r \\ (Q, P) &\mapsto f_{x,Q}(P)^{\frac{p^k-1}{r}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $f_{x,Q}$ is the Miller function [4] and $k = 12$, $k = 24$ and $k = 48$ respectively.

The *BLS12*, *BLS24* and *BLS48* curves with j -invariant 0 have a twists of order $\delta = 6$. From the isomorphism described in theorem 3, let W be the elliptic net associated to the *BLS12*, *BLS24* or *BLS48* curve and the points Q, P , and $\widetilde{W}$ the elliptic net associated to the twist E_θ and the points $\tilde{Q}, \tilde{P}$, where $\tilde{Q}, \tilde{P}$ correspond to Q, P via σ_θ respectively. Using (16) and the fact that the final exponentiation eliminates θ , we have

$$e_2 = f_{x,Q}(P)^{\frac{p^k-1}{r}} = \widetilde{W}(x, 1)^{\frac{p^k-1}{r}},$$

where $k = 12, 24$ or 48 respectively.

3.4 Pairing on Twisted KSS Curves of Embedding Degree 16

The *KSS16* family of elliptic curves [7] are parameterized by:

$$\begin{aligned} p &= \frac{1}{980}(x^{10} + 2x^9 + 5x^8 + 48x^6 + 152x^5 + 240x^4 + 625x^2 + 2398x + 3125), \\ r &= \frac{1}{61250}(x^8 + 48x^4 + 625) \\ t &= \frac{1}{35}(2x^5 + 41x + 35) \end{aligned}$$

The optimal Ate pairing for KSS16 curves is given in [10] by:

$$\begin{aligned} e_3 : \mathbb{G}_2 \times \mathbb{G}_1 &\rightarrow \mu_r \\ (Q, P) &\mapsto ((f_{x,Q}(P) \cdot \ell_{[x]Q,[p]Q}(P))^{p^3} \cdot \ell_{Q,Q}(P))^{\frac{p^{16}-1}{r}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $f_{x,Q}$ is the Miller function [4], and where $\ell_{[x]Q,[p]Q}$ is the line through $[x]Q$ and $[p]Q$, and $\ell_{Q,Q}(P)$, the tangent line through Q .

The j -invariant is 1728 for KSS16-curve and then has a twist of order 4. Let W be the elliptic net associated to the KSS16-curve $E : y^2 = x^3 + ax$ and the points Q, P , and $\tilde{W}$ the elliptic net associated to the quartic twist $E_\eta : y^2 = x^3 + \eta^{-4}ax$ where $\eta \in \mathbb{F}_{p^{16}}^*$, $(1, \eta, \eta^2, \eta^3)$, a basis of the $\mathbb{F}_{p^4}$ -vector space $\mathbb{F}_{p^{16}}$, and the points $\tilde{Q}, \tilde{P}$, where $\tilde{Q}, \tilde{P}$ correspond to Q, P respectively, via the isomorphism $\sigma_\eta : E_\eta(\mathbb{F}_{p^4}) \rightarrow E(\mathbb{F}_{p^{16}})$, $(x, y) \mapsto (\eta^2 x, \eta^3 y)$.

Using (16) and the fact that the final exponentiation eliminates θ , we have

$$f_{x,Q}(P)^{\frac{p^{16}-1}{r}} = \tilde{W}(x, 1)^{\frac{p^{16}-1}{r}}$$

Let's compute ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 the values $\ell_{[x]\tilde{Q},[p]\tilde{Q}}(\tilde{P})$ and $\ell_{\tilde{Q},\tilde{Q}}(\tilde{P})$ respectively: Based on Theorem 4, we then have:

Coordinates of $[x]\tilde{Q}$:

$$x_{[x]\tilde{Q}} = \frac{A}{\tilde{W}(x,0)^2} \text{ where } A = x_{\tilde{Q}}\tilde{W}(x,0)^2 - \tilde{W}(x-1,0)\tilde{W}(x+1,0).$$

$$y_{[x]\tilde{Q}} = \frac{B}{\tilde{W}(x,0)^3} \text{ where } B = \frac{\tilde{W}(x-1,0)^2\tilde{W}(x+2,0) - \tilde{W}(x+1,0)^2\tilde{W}(x-2,0)}{4y_{\tilde{Q}}}.$$

Coordinates of $[p]\tilde{Q}$:

$$x_{[p]Q} = \eta^{2(p-1)}x_{\tilde{Q}}^p, \quad y_{[p]Q} = \eta^{3(p-1)}y_{\tilde{Q}}^p.$$

Equations of the line evaluations ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 :

$$\ell_1 : (A - \eta^{2(p-1)}\tilde{W}(x,0)^2x_{\tilde{Q}}^p)(\tilde{W}(x,0)^3y_P - B) - (B - \eta^{3(p-1)}\tilde{W}(x,0)^3y_{\tilde{Q}}^p)(\tilde{W}(x,0)^2x_P - A)$$

Sec. level	Curve	Curve Eq.	k	Parameter x	$\lceil \log_2 r \rceil$	$\lceil \log_2 p \rceil$
128-bit	BN[14]	$y^2 = x^3 - 4$	12	$x = 2^{114} + 2^{101} - 2^{14} - 1$	280	280
	BLS12[14]	$y^2 = x^3 + 4$	12	$x = -2^{77} + 2^{50} + 2^{33}$	273	616
	KSS16[14]	$y^2 = x^3 + x$	16	$x = 2^{35} - 2^{32} - 2^{18} + 2^8 + 1$	281	340
192-bit	BLS24[14]	$y^2 = x^3 - 2$	24	$x = -2^{56} - 2^{43} + 2^9 - 2^6$	427	558
256-bit	BLS24[14]	$y^2 = x^3 - 2$	24	$x = -2^{103} - 2^{101} + 2^{68} + 2^{50}$	581	1028
	BLS48	$y^2 = x^3 + 11$	48	$x = 2^{32} - 2^{18} - 2^{10} - 2^4$	512	575

Table 2 Selected Parameters for our chosen curves.

$$\ell_2 : (3\eta^4 x_{\bar{Q}}^2 + a)x_{\bar{P}} - 2\eta^4 y_{\bar{Q}} y_{\bar{P}} + 2\eta^4 y_{\bar{Q}}^2 - 3\eta^4 x_{\bar{Q}}^3 - ax_{\bar{Q}}.$$

We then have

$$e_3 : \mathbb{G}_2 \times \mathbb{G}_1 \rightarrow \mu_r$$

$$(Q, P) \mapsto ((\widetilde{W}(x, 1) \cdot \ell_1)^{p^3} \cdot \ell_2)^{\frac{p^{16}-1}{r}},$$

In Table 2, we give some good parameters collected from [14] for the chosen BN, BLS12, KSS16, and BLS24 curves and we also provide a good parameter for BLS48 curve in order to give the computational cost of the Miller loop for each corresponding optimal Ate pairing.

3.5 Computational Costs of the Miller Loop for the Studied curves

In this section, we give the computational costs for the Miller loop [4] using the selected parameters in Table 2. Computational costs at 128-bit security level are given in [14]. That's, BN-curve (12068M), BLS12-curve (7708M) and KSS16-curve (7534M). The remaining computational costs for 192-bit security level and 256-bit security level will be provided in this work.

The most efficient formulae for the doubling steps (doubling of points and line evaluations) and the addition steps (addition of points and line evaluations) for curves with sextic twists are given in [15]. The doubling step costs 53M and the addition step is 76M.

The best choice for the parameters x at 192-bit and 256-bit security levels for BLS24-curves given in [14] are $x = -2^{56} - 2^{43} + 2^9 - 2^6$ and $x = -2^{103} - 2^{101} + 2^{68} + 2^{50}$ respectively. The doubling step costs 68M and the addition step is 110M. For the parameter $x = -2^{56} - 2^{43} + 2^9 - 2^6$, the computational cost for the Miller loop is 56 doubling steps, 3 addition steps, 55 squarings and 58 multiplications in $\mathbb{F}_{p^{18}}$. That is, $56(68M) + 55S_{24} + 3(110M) + 58M_{24}$. That's 19474M. For the parameter $x = -2^{103} - 2^{101} + 2^{68} + 2^{50}$, the computational cost for the Miller loop is 103 doubling steps, 3 addition steps, 102 squarings and 105 multiplications in $\mathbb{F}_{p^{18}}$. That is, $103(68M) + 102(108M) + 3(110M) + 105(162) = 35360M$. In the same consideration, the computational costs of the Miller loop using BLS48-curve is 34778M [16].

4 Computational costs of the optimal Ate pairing using parallelizing elliptic net algorithm

In this section, we parallelize the computation of the optimal Ate pairing on the studied curves. The method we used is stated in [12, Section 4]. This method helps to save one multiplication in the addition step when a modified elliptic net is considered. The method consists of defining a modified elliptic net $\widetilde{W}^{(1)}$ of $\widetilde{W}$ as

$$W^{(1)}(u, v) = \widetilde{W}(-1, 1)^{uv} \widetilde{W}(u, v) \quad \forall u, \forall v \in \mathbb{Z}. \quad (18)$$

For simplicity, we generalize the study by considering a field $\mathbb{F}_{p^k}$. We set $e = k/\delta$, where δ denotes the degree of the twisted curve. We then have, $\widetilde{W}(1, 1) = 1$, $\widetilde{W}(-1, 1) \in \mathbb{F}_{p^{k/2}}$, $W^{(1)}(1, 1) \in \mathbb{F}_{p^{k/2}}$, $W^{(1)}(2, -1) \in \mathbb{F}_{p^k}$, $W^{(1)}(-1, 1) = 1$.

A modified elliptic net is an elliptic net. One can see this from Definition 1. The elliptic net $W^{(1)}$ satisfies the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned} L_1 &:= W^{(1)}(2k-3, 0) = W^{(1)}(k, 0)W^{(1)}(k-2, 0)^3 - W^{(1)}(k-3, 0)W^{(1)}(k-1, 0)^3, \\ L_2 &:= W^{(1)}(2k-2, 0) = \frac{W^{(1)}(k-1, 0)W^{(1)}(k+1, 0)W^{(1)}(k-2, 0)^2 - W^{(1)}(k-1, 0)W^{(1)}(k-3, 0)W^{(1)}(k, 0)^2}{W^{(1)}(2, 0)}, \\ L_3 &:= W^{(1)}(2k-1, 0) = W^{(1)}(k+1, 0)W^{(1)}(k-1, 0)^3 - W^{(1)}(k-2, 0)W^{(1)}(k, 0)^3, \\ L_4 &:= W^{(1)}(2k, 0) = \frac{W^{(1)}(k, 0)W^{(1)}(k+2, 0)W^{(1)}(k-1, 0)^2 - W^{(1)}(k, 0)W^{(1)}(k-2, 0)W^{(1)}(k+1, 0)^2}{W^{(1)}(2, 0)}, \\ L_5 &:= W^{(1)}(2k+1, 0) = W^{(1)}(k+2, 0)W^{(1)}(k, 0)^3 - W^{(1)}(k-1, 0)W^{(1)}(k+1, 0)^3, \\ L_6 &:= W^{(1)}(2k+2, 0) = \frac{W^{(1)}(k+1, 0)W^{(1)}(k+3, 0)W^{(1)}(k, 0)^2 - W^{(1)}(k+1, 0)W^{(1)}(k-1, 0)W^{(1)}(k+2, 0)^2}{W^{(1)}(2, 0)}, \\ L_7 &:= W^{(1)}(2k+3, 0) = W^{(1)}(k+3, 0)W^{(1)}(k+1, 0)^3 - W^{(1)}(k, 0)W^{(1)}(k+2, 0)^3, \\ L_8 &:= W^{(1)}(2k+4, 0) = \frac{W^{(1)}(k+2, 0)W^{(1)}(k+4, 0)W^{(1)}(k+1, 0)^2 - W^{(1)}(k+2, 0)W^{(1)}(k, 0)W^{(1)}(k+3, 0)^2}{W^{(1)}(2, 0)}, \\ L_9 &:= W^{(1)}(2k+5, 0) = W^{(1)}(k+4, 0)W^{(1)}(k+2, 0)^3 - W^{(1)}(k+1, 0)W^{(1)}(k+3, 0)^3, \\ T_1 &:= W^{(1)}(2k-1, 1) = \frac{W^{(1)}(k+1, 1)W^{(1)}(k-1, 1)W^{(1)}(k-1, 1)^2 - W^{(1)}(k, 0)W^{(1)}(k-2, 0)W^{(1)}(k, 1)^2}{W^{(1)}(1, 1)}, \\ T_2 &:= W^{(1)}(2k, 1) = W^{(1)}(k-1, 1)W^{(1)}(k+1, 1)W^{(1)}(k, 0)^2 - W^{(1)}(k-1, 0)W^{(1)}(k+1, 0)W^{(1)}(k, 1)^2, \\ T_3 &:= W^{(1)}(2k+1, 1) = W^{(1)}(k-1, 1)W^{(1)}(k+1, 1)W^{(1)}(k+1, 0)^2 - W^{(1)}(k, 0)W^{(1)}(k+2, 0)W^{(1)}(k, 1)^2, \\ T_4 &:= W^{(1)}(2k+2, 1) = \frac{W^{(1)}(k-1, 1)W^{(1)}(k+1, 1)W^{(1)}(k+2, 0)^2 - W^{(1)}(k+1, 0)W^{(1)}(k+3, 0)W^{(1)}(k, 1)^2}{W^{(1)}(-2, 1)}. \end{aligned}$$

The **doubling step** consists of calculating $L_1, L_2, L_2, L_4, L_5, L_6, L_7, L_8, T_1, T_2$ and T_3 whereas the addition step consists of calculating $L_2, L_3, L_4, L_5, L_6, L_7, L_8, L_9, T_2, T_3$ and T_4 . The **doubling step** in terms of $W^{(1)}$ and the **doubling step** in terms of $\widetilde{W}$ have the same computational costs whereas the **addition step** in terms of $W^{(1)}$ entirely has 1 multiplication cost less than the computational cost of the **addition step** in terms of $\widetilde{W}$. That

Operations	Values	Costs
$U_1 := W^{(1)}(k, 0)W^{(1)}(k - 2, 0)$	$U_1 = W^{(1)}(k, 0)W^{(1)}(k - 2, 0)$	M_e
$U_2 := W^{(1)}(k - 2, 0)^2$	$U_2 = W^{(1)}(k - 2, 0)^2$	S_e
$U_3 := W^{(1)}(k - 3, 0)W^{(1)}(k - 1, 0)^3$	$U_3 = W^{(1)}(k - 3, 0)W^{(1)}(k - 1, 0)$	M_e
$U_4 := W^{(1)}(k - 1, 0)^2$	$U_4 = W^{(1)}(k - 1, 0)^2$	S_e
$U_5 := W^{(1)}(k - 1, 0)W^{(1)}(k + 1, 0)$	$U_5 = W^{(1)}(k - 1, 0)W^{(1)}(k + 1, 0)$	M_e
$U_6 := W^{(1)}(k, 0)^2$	$U_6 = W^{(1)}(k, 0)^2$	S_e
$U_7 := W^{(1)}(k, 0)W^{(1)}(k + 2, 0)$	$U_7 = W^{(1)}(k, 0)W^{(1)}(k + 2, 0)$	M_e
$U_8 := W^{(1)}(k + 1, 0)^2$	$U_8 = W^{(1)}(k + 1, 0)^2$	S_e
$U_9 := W^{(1)}(k + 1, 0)W^{(1)}(k + 3, 0)$	$U_9 = W^{(1)}(k + 1, 0)W^{(1)}(k + 3, 0)$	M_e
$U_{10} := W^{(1)}(k + 2, 0)^2$	$U_{10} = W^{(1)}(k + 2, 0)^2$	S_e
$U_{11} := W^{(1)}(k + 2, 0)W^{(1)}(k + 4, 0)$	$U_{11} = W^{(1)}(k + 2, 0)W^{(1)}(k + 4, 0)$	M_e
$U_{12} := W^{(1)}(k + 3, 0)^2$	$U_{12} = W^{(1)}(k + 3, 0)^2$	S_e
$L_1 := U_1U_2 - U_3U_4$	$L_1 = U_1U_2 - U_3U_4$	$2M_e$
$L_2 := \frac{1}{W^{(2,0)}}(U_5U_2 - U_3U_6)$	$L_2 = \frac{1}{W^{(2,0)}}(U_5U_2 - U_3U_6)$	$2M_e$
$L_3 := U_5U_4 - U_1U_6$	$L_3 = U_5U_4 - U_1U_6$	$2M_e$
$L_4 := \frac{1}{W^{(2,0)}}(U_7U_4 - U_1U_8)$	$L_4 = \frac{1}{W^{(2,0)}}(U_7U_4 - U_1U_8)$	$2M_e$
$L_5 := U_7U_6 - U_5U_8$	$L_5 = U_7U_6 - U_5U_8$	$2M_e$
$L_6 := \frac{1}{W^{(2,0)}}(U_9U_6 - U_5U_{10})$	$L_6 = \frac{1}{W^{(2,0)}}(U_9U_6 - U_5U_{10})$	$2M_e$
$L_7 := U_9U_8 - U_7U_{10}$	$L_7 = U_9U_8 - U_7U_{10}$	$2M_e$
$L_8 := \frac{1}{W^{(2,0)}}(U_{11}U_8 - U_7U_{12})$	$L_8 = \frac{1}{W^{(2,0)}}(U_{11}U_8 - U_7U_{12})$	$2M_e$
$L_9 := U_{11}U_{10} - U_9U_{12}$	$L_9 = U_{11}U_{10} - U_9U_{12}$	$2M_e$
$V_1 := W^{(1)}(k + 1, 1)W^{(1)}(k - 1, 1)$	$V_1 = W^{(1)}(k + 1, 1)W^{(1)}(k - 1, 1)$	M_k
$V_2 := W^{(1)}(k, 1)^2$	$V_2 = W^{(1)}(k, 1)^2$	S_k
$X_0 := V_1U_4$	$X_0 = V_1U_4$	δM_e
$X_1 := V_2U_1$	$X_1 = V_2U_1$	δM_e
$X_2 := V_1U_6$	$X_2 = V_1U_6$	δM_e
$X_3 := V_2U_5$	$X_3 = V_2U_5$	δM_e
$X_4 := V_1U_8$	$X_4 = V_1U_8$	δM_e
$X_5 := V_2U_7$	$X_5 = V_2U_7$	δM_e
$X_6 := V_2U_9$	$X_6 = V_2U_9$	δM_e
$X_7 := V_1U_{10}$	$X_7 = V_1U_{10}$	δM_e
$Y_1 := X_0 - X_1$	$Y_1 = X_0 - X_1$	$\dots$
$Y_4 := X_6 - X_7$	$Y_4 = X_6 - X_7$	$\dots$
$T_1 := \frac{1}{W^{(1)}(1,1)}Y_1$	$T_1 = \frac{1}{W^{(1)}(1,1)}Y_1$	$2M_{k/2}$
$T_2 := X_2 - X_3$	$T_2 = X_2 - X_3$	$\dots$
$T_3 := X_4 - X_5$	$T_3 = X_4 - X_5$	$\dots$
$T_4 := \frac{1}{W^{(1)}(2,-1)}Y_4$	$T_4 = \frac{1}{W^{(1)}(2,-1)}Y_4$	M_k

Table 3 Computational costs for some factors and terms in the doubling and addition steps formulae

is, with the new elliptic net, one multiplication is save.

In this work, we study the computational cost for elliptic net algorithm with 4 and 8 processors.

Table 3 gives some notations and computational costs for elementary factors and terms in the doubling and addition steps formulae, in order to clearly present our parallel executions of optimal Ate pairings.

Table 4, Table 5, Table 6 and Table 7 give details for algorithm with 4 and 8 processors respectively. For an embedding degree k and a twist δ of a curve, we set $e = k/\delta$.

processor 1		Processor 2	
Operations U_1, U_3, U_5 U_2, U_4, U_6 V_1 $L_1 := U_1U_2 - U_3U_4$ $L_2 := \frac{1}{W^{(1)}(2,0)}(U_5U_2 - U_3U_6)$ $X_0 := V_1U_4$ $X_2 := V_1U_6$	Costs $3(M_e)$ $3(S_e)$ M_k $2M_e$ $2M_e$ δM_e δM_e	Operations U_1, U_5, U_6 $U_7 // U_8$ V_2 $L_3 := U_5U_4 - U_1U_6$ $L_4 := \frac{1}{W^{(1)}(2,0)}(U_7U_4 - U_1U_8)$ $X_1 := V_2U_1$ $X_3 := V_2U_5$	Costs $\dots$ $M_e // S_e$ S_k $2M_e$ $2M_e$ δM_e δM_e
	$(7 + 2\delta)M_e + 3S_e + M_k$		$(5 + 2\delta)M_e + S_e + S_k$
processor 3		Processor 4	
Operations U_5, U_6, U_7, U_8 $U_9 // U_{10}$ V_1 $L_5 := U_7U_6 - U_5U_8$ $L_6 := \frac{1}{W^{(1)}(2,0)}(U_9U_6 - U_5U_{10})$ $X_4 := V_1U_8$ X_0, X_1, X_2, X_4 Y_1, T_2	Costs $\dots$ $M_e // S_e$ $\dots$ $2M_e$ $2M_e$ δM_e $\dots$ $\dots$	Operations U_7, U_8, U_9, U_{10} $U_{11} // U_{12}$ V_2 $L_7 := U_9U_8 - U_7U_{10}$ $L_8 := \frac{1}{W^{(1)}(2,0)}(U_{11}U_8 - U_7U_{12})$ $X_5 := V_2U_7$ X_4, Y_1, T_3 $T_1 := \frac{1}{W^{(1)}(1,1)}Y_1$	Costs $\dots$ $M_e // S_e$ $\dots$ $2M_e$ $2M_e$ δM_e $\dots$ $2M_{k/2}$
	$(5 + \delta)M_e + S_e$		$(5 + \delta)M_e + S_e + 2M_{k/2}$
Computational cost of the longest path $(7 + 2\delta)M_e + 3S_e + M_k$			

Table 4 Computational costs of the Doubling step for algorithm with 4 processors

processor 1		Processor 2	
Operations U_1, U_3, U_5 U_2, U_4, U_6, U_8 V_1 $L_2 := \frac{1}{W^{(1)}(2,0)}(U_5U_2 - U_3U_6)$ $L_3 := U_5U_4 - U_1U_6$ $X_2 := V_1U_6$ $X_4 := V_1U_8$	Costs $3(M_e)$ $4(S_e)$ M_k $2M_e$ $2M_e$ δM_e δM_e	Operations U_1, U_4, U_5, U_6, U_8 U_7 V_2 $L_4 := \frac{1}{W^{(1)}(2,0)}(U_7U_4 - U_1U_8)$ $L_5 := U_7U_6 - U_5U_8$ $X_3 := V_2U_5$ $X_5 := V_2U_7$ X_2, X_4 T_2, T_3	Costs $\dots$ M_e S_k $2M_e$ $2M_e$ δM_e δM_e $\dots$ $\dots$
	$(7 + 2\delta)M_e + 4S_e + M_k$		$(5 + 2\delta)M_e + S_k$
processor 3		Processor 4	
Operations U_5, U_6, U_7, U_8 $U_9 // U_{10}$ V_1 $L_6 := \frac{1}{W^{(1)}(2,0)}(U_9U_6 - U_5U_{10})$ $L_7 := U_9U_8 - U_7U_{10}$ $X_6 := V_2U_9$ X_7, Y_4 $T_4 := \frac{1}{W^{(1)}(-2,1)}Y_4$	Costs $\dots$ $M_e // S_e$ $\dots$ $2M_e$ $2M_e$ δM_e $\dots$ $2M_{k/2}$	Operations U_7, U_8, U_9, U_{10} $U_{11} // U_{12}$ V_1 $L_8 := \frac{1}{W^{(1)}(2,0)}(U_{11}U_8 - U_7U_{12})$ $L_9 := U_{11}U_{10} - U_9U_{12}$ $X_7 := V_1U_{10}$	Costs $\dots$ $M_e // S_e$ $\dots$ $2M_e$ $2M_e$ δM_e
	$(5 + \delta)M_e + S_e + 2M_{k/2}$		$(5 + \delta)M_e + S_e$
Computational cost of the longest path $(7 + 2\delta)M_e + 4S_e + M_k$			

Table 5 Computational costs of the Addition step for algorithm with 4 processors

processor 1		Processor 2	
Operations U_1, U_3 U_2, U_4 V_1 $L_1 := U_1U_2 - U_3U_4$ $X_0 := V_1U_4$	Costs $2(M_e)$ $2(S_e)$ M_k $2M_e$ δM_e	Operations U_2, U_3 $U_5 // U_6$ V_1 $L_2 := \frac{1}{w^{(1)}(2,0)}(U_5U_2 - U_3U_6)$ $X_2 := V_1U_6$	Costs $\dots$ $M_e // S_e$ $\dots$ $2M_e$ δM_e
	$(4 + \delta)M_e + 2S_e + M_k$		$(3 + \delta)M_e + S_e$
processor 3		Processor 4	
Operations U_1, U_4, U_5, U_6 V_2 $L_3 := U_5U_4 - U_1U_6$ $X_1 := V_2U_1$ X_4, X_5 Y_3	Costs $\dots$ S_k $2M_e$ δM_e $\dots$ $\dots$	Operations U_1, U_4 $U_7 // U_8$ $L_4 := \frac{1}{w^{(1)}(2,0)}(U_7U_4 - U_1U_8)$ X_0, X_1 Y_1 $T_1 := \frac{1}{w^{(1)}(1,1)}Y_1$	Costs $\dots$ $M_e // S_e$ $2M_e$ $\dots$ $\dots$ $2M_{k/2}$
	$(2 + \delta)M_e + S_k$		$3M_e + S_e + 2M_{k/2}$
processor 5		Processor 6	
Operations U_5, U_6, U_7, U_8 $L_5 := U_7U_6 - U_5U_8$ V_2 $X_3 := V_2U_5$	Costs $\dots$ $2M_e$ $\dots$ δM_e	Operations U_5, U_6 $U_9 // U_{10}$ $L_6 := \frac{1}{w^{(1)}(2,0)}(U_9U_6 - U_5U_{10})$	Costs $\dots$ $M_e // S_e$ $2M_e$
	$(2 + \delta)M_e$		$3M_e + S_e$
processor 7		Processor 8	
Operations U_7, U_8, U_9, U_{10} $L_7 := U_9U_8 - U_7U_{10}$ V_1 $X_4 := V_1U_8$	Costs $\dots$ $2M_e$ $\dots$ δM_e	Operations U_7, U_8 $U_{11} // U_{12}$ $L_8 := \frac{1}{w^{(1)}(2,0)}(U_{11}U_8 - U_7U_{12})$ V_2 X_2, X_3 T_2	Costs $\dots$ $M_e // S_e$ $2M_e$ $\dots$ $\dots$ $\dots$
	$(2 + \delta)M_e$		$3M_e + S_e$
Computational cost of the longest path $(4 + \delta)M_e + 2S_e + M_k$			

Table 6 Computational costs of the Doubling step for algorithm with 8 processors

4.1 Notation and cost of the arithmetic in finite field

In this work, M, S and I denote the cost of one multiplication, one squaring, one inversion in the finite field $\mathbb{F}_p$ respectively. M_i, S_i and I_i denote the computation costs for one multiplication, one squaring and one inversion in the finite extension field $\mathbb{F}_{p^i}$ of $\mathbb{F}_p$.

From [17], one can have the following costs:

$M_2 = 3M, S_2 = \frac{2}{3}M_2, M_3 = 6M, S_3 = 5M, M_4 = 9M, S_4 = 6M, M_6 = 18M, M_8 = 27M, S_8 = 18M, M_9 = 36M, S_9 = 25M, M_{16} = 81M, S_{16} = 54M, M_{18} = 108M, S_{18} = 55M, M_{24} = 162M, S_{24} = 108M, M_{48} = 486M, S_{48} = 324M, I_6 = 37M + I, 1 p$ and p^2 - Frobenius in $\mathbb{F}_{p^{12}}$ are respectively $10M$ and $15M, 1 p$ and p^3 - Frobenius in $\mathbb{F}_{p^{16}}$ are $15M$ each.

processor 1		Processor 2	
Operations U_3, U_5 U_2, U_6 V_1 $L_2 := \frac{1}{W^{(1)}(2,0)} U_5 U_2 - U_3 U_6$ $X_2 := V_1 U_6$	Costs $2(M_e)$ $2(S_e)$ M_k $2M_e$ δM_e	Operations U_5, U_6 $U_1 // U_4$ V_2 $L_3 := U_5 U_4 - U_1 U_6$ $X_3 := V_2 U_5$	Costs $\dots$ $M_e // S_e$ S_k $2M_e$ δM_e
	$(4 + \delta)M_e + 2S_e + M_k$		$(3 + \delta)M_e + S_e + S_k$
processor 3		Processor 4	
Operations U_1, U_4 $U_7 // U_8$ $L_4 := \frac{1}{W^{(1)}(2,0)} (U_7 U_4 - U_1 U_8)$ V_1 $X_4 := V_1 U_8$	Costs $\dots$ $M_e // S_e$ $2M_e$ $\dots$ δM_e	Operations U_5, U_6, U_7, U_8 $L_5 := U_7 U_6 - U_5 U_8$ V_2 $X_5 := V_2 U_7$	Costs $\dots$ $2M_e$ $\dots$ δM_e
	$(3 + \delta)M_e + S_e$		$(2 + \delta)M_e$
processor 5		Processor 6	
Operations U_5, U_6 $U_9 // U_{10}$ $L_6 := \frac{1}{W^{(1)}(2,0)} (U_9 U_6 - U_5 U_{10})$ V_2 $X_6 := V_2 U_9$	Costs $\dots$ $M_e // S_e$ $2M_e$ $\dots$ δM_e	Operations U_7, U_8, U_9, U_{10} $L_7 := U_9 U_8 - U_7 U_{10}$ V_1 $X_7 := V_1 U_{10}$	Costs $\dots$ $2M_e$ $\dots$ δM_e
	$(3 + \delta)M_e + S_e$		$(2 + \delta)M_e$
processor 7		Processor 8	
Operations U_7, U_8 $U_{11} // U_{12}$ $L_8 := \frac{1}{W^{(1)}(2,0)} (U_{11} U_8 - U_7 U_{12})$ $X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5, X_6, X_7$ T_2, T_3, Y_4	Costs $\dots$ $M_e // S_e$ $2M_e$ $\dots$ $\dots$	Operations $U_9, U_{10}, U_{11}, U_{12}$ $L_9 := U_{11} U_{10} - U_9 U_{12}$ Y_4 $T_4 := \frac{1}{W^{(1)}(2,-1)} Y_4$ V_2	Costs $\dots$ $2M_e$ $\dots$ M_k $\dots$
	$3M_e + S_e$		$2M_e + M_k$
Computational cost of the longest path $(4 + \delta)M_e + 2S_e + M_k$			

Table 7 Computational costs of the Addition step for algorithm with 8 processors

4.2 Computational costs of optimal Ate pairing on the studied curves.

In this subsection, we provide the computational costs of the part without the final exponentiation of the optimal Ate pairing at 128, 192 and 256-bit security level on our chosen curves.

4.2.1 Computational costs at 128-bit security level.

- Case of BN-curve. Let $f_1 = \widetilde{W}(6x + 2, 1) \cdot \mathbb{L}_1 \cdot \mathbb{L}_2$ be the part without the final exponentiation of the optimal Ate pairing on a BN-curve. Then the value $x = 2^{114} + 2^{101} - 2^{14} - 1$ from Table 2 gives $6x + 2 = 2^{116} + 2^{115} + 2^{103} + 2^{102} - 2^{16} - 2^{15} - 2^2$. $\widetilde{W}(6x + 2, 1)$ costs 116 Doubling steps and 6 addition steps.

1. For 4 processors, the doubling step costs $(7 + 2 \times 6)M_2 + 3S_2 + M_{12}$ and the addition step costs $(7 + 2 \times 6)M_2 + 4S_2 + M_{12}$, that is $117M$ and $119M$ respectively, contrary to $108M$ and $126M$ from [12].
Then, $\widetilde{W}(6x+2, 1)$ costs 116 Doubling steps and 6 addition steps, that is $116(117M) + 6(119M) = 14286M$. $[6x+2]Q$, $[p]Q$ and $\mathbb{L}_1$ together cost $2M_2 + 2I_2$, 2 p -Frobenius in $\mathbb{F}_{p^{12}}$ and $76M$, that is $100M + I$. $[6x+2+p]Q$, $[-p^2]Q$ and $\mathbb{L}_2$ cost $340M + 2I$, 2 p^2 -Frobenius in $\mathbb{F}_{p^{12}}$ and $222M$, that is $577M + 2I$. f_1 costs $14286M + (100M + I) + (577M + 2I) + 2M_{12}$, that $15071M + 3I$.
 2. For 8 processors, the doubling step and addition step cost $(4 + 6)M_2 + 2S_2 + M_{12}$ and $(4 + 6)M_2 + 2S_2 + M_{12}$ respectively. That is $88M$ and $88M$ respectively, contrary to $90M$ and $90M$ from [12]. $\widetilde{W}(6x + 2, 1)$ costs $116(88M) + 6(88M) = 10736M$. f_1 then costs $11521M + 3I$.
- Case of BLS12-curve. Let $f_2 = \widetilde{W}(x, 1)$ be the part without the final exponentiation of the optimal Ate pairing on a BLS12-curve. For the selected parameter $x = -2^{77} + 2^{50} + 2^{33}$, $\widetilde{W}(x, 1)$ costs 77 Doubling steps and 2 addition steps.
1. For 4 processors, the doubling step and the addition step cost $(7 + 2 \times 6)M_2 + 3S_2 + M_{12}$ and $(7 + 2 \times 6)M_2 + 4S_2 + M_{12}$ respectively, that is $117M$ and $119M$. $\widetilde{W}(x, 1)$ then costs $77(117M) + 2(119M) = 9247M$.
 2. For 8 processors, the doubling step and addition step cost $(4 + 6)M_2 + 2S_2 + M_{12}$ and $(4 + 6)M_2 + 2S_2 + M_{12}$. That is $88M$ and $88M$ respectively, contrary to $90M$ and $90M$ from [12]. $\widetilde{W}(x, 1)$ costs $77(88M) + 2(88M) = 6952M$. f_2 then costs $6952M$.
- Case of KSS16-curve. Let $f_3 = (\widetilde{W}(x, 1) \cdot \ell_1)^{p^3} \cdot \ell_2$ be the part without the final exponentiation of the optimal Ate pairing on a KSS16-curve. For the selected parameter $x = 2^{35} - 2^{32} - 2^{18} + 2^8 + 1$, $\widetilde{W}(x, 1)$ costs 35 Doubling steps and 4 addition steps.
1. For 4 processors, the doubling step and the addition step cost $(7 + 2 \times 4)M_4 + 3S_4 + M_{16}$ and $(7 + 2 \times 4)M_4 + 4S_4 + M_{16}$ respectively, that is $234M$ and $240M$. $\widetilde{W}(x, 1)$ costs $35(234M) + 4(240M) = 9150M$. $[x]Q$, $[p]Q$, ℓ_1 and $(\widetilde{W}(x, 1) \cdot \ell_1)^{p^3}$ together cost $395M + 2I$. ℓ_2 costs $92M$ and f_3 then costs $9637M + 2I$.
 2. For 8 processors, the doubling step and addition step cost $(4 + 4)M_4 + 2S_4 + M_{16}$ and $(4 + 4)M_4 + 2S_4 + M_{16}$. That is $165M$ and $165M$ respectively. $\widetilde{W}(x, 1)$ costs $35(165M) + 4(165M) = 6435M$. f_3 then costs $6922M + 2I$.

4.2.2 Computational costs at 192-bit security level.

- Case of BLS24-curve. Let $f_5 = \widetilde{W}(x, 1)$ be the part without the final exponentiation of the optimal Ate pairing on a BLS24-curve. For the selected parameter $x = -2^{56} - 2^{43} + 2^9 - 2^6$, $\widetilde{W}(x, 1)$ costs 56 Doubling steps and 3 addition steps.
 1. For 4 processors, the doubling step and the addition step cost $(7 + 2 \times 6)M_4 + 3S_4 + M_{24}$ and $(7 + 2 \times 6)M_4 + 4S_4 + M_{24}$ respectively. That is $351M$ and $357M$ respectively. $f_5 = \widetilde{W}(x, 1)$ costs $56(351M) + 3(357M) = 20727M$.
 2. For 8 processors, the doubling step and addition step cost $(4 + 6)M_4 + 2S_4 + M_{24}$ and $(4 + 6)M_4 + 2S_4 + M_{24}$ respectively $264M$ and $264M$ respectively. $f_5 = \widetilde{W}(x, 1)$ costs $56(264M) + 3(264M) = 15576M$.

4.2.3 Computational costs at 256-bit security level.

- Case of BLS24-curve. Let $f_5 = \widetilde{W}(x, 1)$ be the part without the final exponentiation of the optimal Ate pairing on a BLS24-curve. For the selected parameter $x = -2^{103} - 2^{101} + 2^{68} + 2^{50}$, $\widetilde{W}(x, 1)$ costs 103 Doubling steps and 3 addition steps.
 1. For 4 processors, the doubling step and the addition step cost $351M$ and $357M$ respectively. $f_5 = \widetilde{W}(x, 1)$ costs $103(351M) + 3(357M) = 37224M$.
 2. For 8 processors, the doubling step and addition step cost $264M$ and $264M$ respectively. $f_5 = \widetilde{W}(x, 1)$ costs $103(264M) + 3(264M) = 27984M$.
- Case of BLS48-curve. Let $f_6 = \widetilde{W}(x, 1)$ be the part without the final exponentiation of the optimal Ate pairing on a BLS48-curve. For the selected parameter $x = 2^{32} - 2^{18} - 2^{10} - 2^4$, $\widetilde{W}(x, 1)$ costs 32 Doubling steps and 3 addition steps.
 1. For 4 processors, the doubling step and the addition step cost $(7 + 2 \times 6)M_8 + 3S_8 + M_{48}$ and $(7 + 2 \times 6)M_8 + 4S_8 + M_{48}$ respectively. That is $1053M$ and $1071M$ respectively. $f_6 = \widetilde{W}(x, 1)$ costs $32(1053M) + 3(1071M) = 36909M$.
 2. For 8 processors, the doubling step and addition step cost $(4 + 6)M_8 + 2S_8 + M_{48}$ and $(4 + 6)M_8 + 2S_8 + M_{48}$ respectively $264M$ and $264M$ respectively. $f_6 = \widetilde{W}(x, 1)$ costs $32(264M) + 3(264M) = 27720M$.

Level 128				
//////////	Type of comp.	f_1 (BN-curve)	f_2 (BLS12-curve)	f_3 (KSS16-curve)
Number of Proc.	Miller loop [14]	12068 <i>M</i>	7708 <i>M</i>	7534 <i>M</i>
4	Elliptic net	15071 <i>M</i> + 3 <i>I</i>	9247 <i>M</i>	9637 <i>M</i> + 2 <i>I</i>
8	Elliptic net	11521 <i>M</i> + 3 <i>I</i>	6952 <i>M</i>	6922 <i>M</i> + 2 <i>I</i>

Table 8 Computational costs of the path without the final exponentiation of the optimal Ate pairing for the BN, BLS12 and KSS16 curves for 4 and 8 processors

Level 192		
//////////	Type of comp.	f_5 (BLS24-curve)
Number of Proc.	Miller loop	19474 <i>M</i>
4	Elliptic net	20727 <i>M</i>
8	Elliptic net	15576 <i>M</i>

Table 9 Computational costs of the path without the final exponentiation of the optimal Ate pairing for BLS24 curves with 4 and 8 processors.

Level 256			
//////////	Type of comp.	f_5 (BLS24-curve)	f_6 (BLS48-curve)
Number of Proc.	Miller loop	35360 <i>M</i>	34778 <i>M</i>
4	Elliptic net	37224 <i>M</i>	36909 <i>M</i>
8	Elliptic net	27984 <i>M</i>	27720 <i>M</i>

Table 10 Computational costs of the path without the final exponentiation of the optimal Ate pairing for the BLS24 and BLS48 curves for 4 and 8 processors.

4.3 Comparison

One can see from Table 8, 9 and 10 that our parallel execution of the Elliptic Net Algorithm with 4 processors is less faster than the Miller method. But, for parallel execution with 8 processors, the elliptic net method becomes more faster. The parallel execution of BLS48-curve with 8 processors is more faster than the Miller method and when observing the results in the last line of Table 10, the parallel execution of the optimal Ate pairing on BLS48-curves is more faster than the one on BLS24 curves.

5 Conclusion

In this work, we have computed the optimal Ate pairing on BN, BLS12, KSS16, BLS24 and BLS48 curves in terms of elliptic nets associated twisted corresponding curves. We have given the computational costs of the path without the final exponentiation of the optimal Ate pairings with 4 and 8 processors. We have seen that the parallel execution with 8 processors give faster results with elliptic nets, compared to Miller method.

Acknowledgment

After the review

References

1. Dan Boneh and Matthew K. Franklin. Identity-based encryption from the Weil pairing. In *Advances in Cryptology - CRYPTO 2001, 21st Annual International Cryptology Conference, Santa Barbara, California, USA, August 19-23, 2001, Proceedings*, pages 213–229, 2001.
2. Antoine Joux. A one round protocol for tripartite diffie-hellman. In *Algorithmic Number Theory, 4th International Symposium, ANTS-IV, Leiden, The Netherlands, July 2-7, 2000, Proceedings*, pages 385–394, 2000.
3. Dan Boneh, Ben Lynn, and Hovav Shacham. Short signatures from the weil pairing. *J. Cryptology*, 17(4):297–319, 2004.
4. Victor S. Miller. The weil pairing, and its efficient calculation. *J. Cryptology*, 17(4):235–261, 2004.
5. Katherine E. Stange. The tate pairing via elliptic nets. In *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Pairing-Based Cryptography, Pairing'07*, pages 329–348, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2007. Springer-Verlag.
6. Paulo S. L. M. Barreto, Ben Lynn, and Michael Scott. Constructing elliptic curves with prescribed embedding degrees. In Stelvio Cimato, Giuseppe Persiano, and Clemente Galdi, editors, *Security in Communication Networks*, pages 257–267, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2003. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
7. Ezekiel J. Kachisa, Edward F. Schaefer, and Michael Scott. Constructing brezing-weng pairing-friendly elliptic curves using elements in the cyclotomic field. In *Proceedings of the 2Nd International Conference on Pairing-Based Cryptography, Pairing '08*, pages 126–135, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2008. Springer-Verlag.
8. Katherine E. Stange. Elliptic nets and elliptic curves. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:0710.1316, Oct 2007.
9. Naoki Ogura, Naoki Kanayama, Shigenori Uchiyama, and Eiji Okamoto. Cryptographic pairings based on elliptic nets. In Tetsu Iwata and Masakatsu Nishigaki, editors, *Advances in Information and Computer Security*, pages 65–78, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2011. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
10. Frederik Vercauteren. Optimal pairings. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 56(1):455–461, 2010.
11. Paulo S. L. M. Barreto and Michael Naehrig. Pairing-friendly elliptic curves of prime order. In *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Selected Areas in Cryptography, SAC'05*, pages 319–331, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2006. Springer-Verlag.
12. Hiroshi Onuki, Tadanori Teruya, Naoki Kanayama, and Shigenori Uchiyama. The optimal ate pairing over the barreto-naehrig curve via parallelizing elliptic nets. *JSIAM Letters*, 8:9–12, 2016.
13. Florian Hess, Nigel P. Smart, and Frederik Vercauteren. The eta pairing revisited. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 52(10):4595–4602, 2006.
14. Razvan Barbulescu and Sylvain Duquesne. Updating key size estimations for pairings. *Journal of Cryptology*, 2018.
15. Craig Costello, Tanja Lange, and Michael Naehrig. Faster pairing computations on curves with high-degree twists. In *Public Key Cryptography - PKC 2010, 13th International Conference on Practice and Theory in Public Key Cryptography, Paris, France, May 26-28, 2010. Proceedings*, pages 224–242, 2010.
16. Narcisse Mbiang, Diego Aranha, and Fouotsa Emmanuel. Computing the optimal ate pairing over elliptic curves with embedding degrees 54 and 48 at the 256-bit security level, 11 2019.
17. Diego F. Aranha, Koray Karabina, Patrick Longa, Catherine H. Gebotys, and Julio López. Faster explicit formulas for computing pairings over ordinary curves. In *Advances in Cryptology - EUROCRYPT 2011 - 30th Annual International Conference on the*

Theory and Applications of Cryptographic Techniques, Tallinn, Estonia, May 15-19, 2011. Proceedings, pages 48–68, 2011.