

# Monerokon Madness: Schnorr Schnadness

Andrew Poelstra  
Director of Research, Blockstream

June 20, 2019

- ▶ **Schnorr signatures** are an alternate signature scheme to ECDSA
- ▶ Proposed for Bitcoin as part of **Taproot**
- ▶ Used in Monero since the Cryptonote days, courtesy of **ed25519**

Schnorr signatures have an especially simple formulation for single signers:

$$k \leftarrow \$$$

$$e \leftarrow H(\dots)$$

$$s \leftarrow k - xe$$

Schnorr signatures have an especially simple formulation for multi-signers:

$$k_i \leftarrow \$$$

$$e \leftarrow H(\dots)$$

$$s_i \leftarrow k_i - x_i e$$

- ▶ Like ECDSA, Schnorr signatures require an **uniformly random nonce**
- ▶ Any bias is deadly
- ▶ Publicly verifying unbiasedness is hard

- ▶ Idea: use **RFC6979** to deterministically generate nonces.
- ▶ Great idea. But totally unverifiable.

- ▶ Idea: use **sign to contract** to mix randomness into an untrusted device's nonce
- ▶  $R \rightarrow R + H(R\|\$)$

- ▶ But naively combining RFC6979 with s2c will lead to **trivial secret key extraction**
- ▶ (We all know “never reuse nonces”. But also, never use **related nonces**.)
- ▶ (Even on the same message.)



- ▶ Schnorr multisignatures are easy!
- ▶  $s_i = k_i + x_i e$
- ▶ 1. Add the nonces. 2. Add the signatures.

- ▶ **Rogue-key attacks** require you randomize the keys and signatures
- ▶ **Wagner's algorithm** requires you mix randomness from every key into every key
- ▶ It also requires **precommitting to nonces** before adding them (MuSig)

- ▶ Again, **mixing RFC6979 and multisignatures** will lead to key extraction
- ▶ Naive or not. No way to do it
- ▶ Heh, well, maybe with sufficiently powerful ZKPs

- ▶ Need **fresh randomness** for every signature. No RFC6979.
- ▶ Can we at least share nonces before choosing the message?
- ▶ **No.** Wagner again. (Jonas Nick, 2 days ago)

- ▶ Schnorr threshold signatures are easy!
- ▶ Secret-share the keys. Replace keys with sums of shares.
- ▶ 1. Add the nonces. 2. Add the signatures.

- ▶ First, all of the above problems apply.
- ▶ Then, make sure you have a **new nonce** for every signature, even for the same sig with same (combined) key

- ▶ If you need  $k$  honest participants, have  $k$  honest participants, but **also have some dishonest ones**, can you recover? (Looks like it. But no.)
- ▶ Can you at least determine **who** was dishonest? (Not easy.)
- ▶ What if “dishonest” just means **timing out**? (Still not easy. Harder actually.)

- ▶ Unrelatedly, **provable security** is much harder (public key biasing)



Thank You

Andrew Poelstra  
monerokon@wpsoftware.net