From: maro@isl.ntt.co.jp To: AESFirstRound@nist.gov Subject: Software Implementation Results of E2 Date: Fri, 16 Apr 1999 00:29:33 JST Sender: maro@sucaba.isl.ntt.co.jp

Dear Director/ITL,

I submit the report titled Software Implementation Results of E2 using PostScript. The file is generated with gzip and uuencode. If you cannot print the file, please ask me.

Best regards,

/ NTT Laboratories / AOKI, Kazumaro / E-mail: maro@isl.ntt.co.jp

Software Implementation Results of E2

Kazumaro Aoki* and Hiroki Ueda^{\dagger} NTT Laboratories^{\ddagger}

April 15, 1999

1 Implementations on 32- and 64-bit Processors

We updated the software implementation results of E2 [N98a, N98b] using new optimization techniques [AU99]. Table 1 shows the current best results on 32- and 64-bit processors.

Note that as follows:

- The throughput of decryption is the same as that of encryption, since the encryption process and decryption process are identical except for the order of subkeys.
- The impact of NIST API overhead can be considered as small, because we encrypted (decrypted) large data blocks.
- The reason for the dependency of key scheduling time on key length is that we precomputed the values for padding.

At the Second Advanced Encryption Standard Conference (AES2), NIST presented the results of software efficiency tests on each AES candidate [U99]. Since the results included the speeds of small block encryption and large block encryption, we tested our codes using similar scenarios as shown in Table 2. Here, the speed measurements include many overheads; e.g., loop overhead, memory fetch and store operations (for encryption/decryption data), endian conversions, etc. Table 2 shows the averaged clocks per one block encryption or decryption. Note that our measurements are performed on Pentium Pro and Pentium II with 8KB and 16KB of the first level cache, and 256KB and 512KB of the second level cache, respectively.

2 Implementations on Smart Card

E2 can be efficiently implemented on from mid- to high-end smart cards. We implemented E2 on H8/300¹ as an example of a mid-end smart card, and Hachez et al. implemented E2 on ARM as an example of a high-end smart card [HKQ99].

Schneier et al. [SKW⁺99, Section 5.2.5 in p.26(p.12)] and Hachez et al. [HKQ99, Section 5.1.1 in p.100(p.6)] described that E2 implementation requires at least 256 bytes of RAM. However, E2 can be implemented on even low-end smart cards. Actually, we have implemented E2 on a 8052 whose RAM size is 256 bytes; this version takes about 34000 cycles. To implement E2 on such low-memory smart cards, our implementation calls the key-setup

^{*}Email: maro@isl.ntt.co.jp

[†]Email: ueda@isl.ntt.co.jp

[‡]1-1 Hikarinooka, Yokosuka-shi, Kanagawa-ken, 239-0847 Japan

¹Its specification is similar to Motorola 68x.

CPU	Language	Key length	En(De)cryption		Key scheduling ^{a}
		(bit)	(clks/blk)	(bits/s)	(clks/key)
Pentium Pro^b	ANSI C^c	128	655	$39.1 \mathrm{M}$	2076
		192	655	$39.1 \mathrm{M}$	2291
		256	655	$39.1 \mathrm{M}$	2484
	$VC++^d$	128	584	$43.8 \mathrm{M}$	1868
		192	584	$43.8 \mathrm{M}$	2042
		256	584	$43.8 \mathrm{M}$	2278
	Assembly	128/192/256	375	68.3M	
	$Java^e$	128/192/256	2370	$10.8 \mathrm{M}$	
	$Java^{f}$	128/192/256	28800	$0.9 \mathrm{M}$	
Pentium II^g	ANSI C^c	128/192/256	630	$91.4 \mathrm{M}$	
	$VC++^d$	128	561	$102.7 \mathrm{M}$	1804
		192	561	$102.7 \mathrm{M}$	1991
		256	561	$102.7 \mathrm{M}$	2228
	Assembly	128/192/256	355	$162.3 \mathrm{M}$	
$Alpha^h$	Assembly	128/192/256	587	130.8M	

 Table 1: E2 Software Performance on 32- and 64-bit Processors

^aClocks of key scheduling do not include NIST API overhead.

 $^b \rm NIST$ AES Analysis Platform; IBM compatible PC, Pentium Pro (200MHz), MS-Windows95, 64MB RAM $^c \rm Borland$ C++ 5.02

 $^d\mathrm{Microsoft}$ Visual C++ 5.0 Enterprise Edition

 $^e\mathrm{JDK}$ 1.1.6 with JIT compiler

 $^f \rm JDK$ 1.1.6 without JIT compiler

^gIBM compatible PC, Pentium II (450MHz), MS-Windows95, 256MB RAM

^hDEC Alpha 21164A (600MHz), Digital Unix 4.0, 8MB 3rd cache, 256MB main memory

	Data length		En(De)cryption				
Language			Pentium Pro^a	Pentium II^b			
	(bytes)	(blocks)	(clks/block)	(clks/block)			
ANSI C^c	1K	64	654	629			
	128K	$8\mathrm{K}$	676	649			
	$1\mathrm{M}$	64M	680	684			
$VC++^d$	1K	64	586	563			
	128K	$8\mathrm{K}$	601	581			
	$1\mathrm{M}$	64M	612	616			
Assembly	1K	64	375	355			
	128K	$8\mathrm{K}$	386	374			
	1M	64M	397	404			

Table 2: E2 Speed Variations on Pentium Pro/II

^aNIST AES Analysis Platform; IBM compatible PC, Pentium Pro (200MHz), MS-Windows95, 64MB RAM ^bIBM compatible PC, Pentium II (450MHz), MS-Windows95, 256MB RAM

^cBorland C++ 5.02

 $^d \rm Microsoft$ Visual C++ 5.0 Enterprise Edition

routine several times during each encryption or decryption. We believe that this technique is useful in implementing E2 on any low-end smart card. See [AU99, Appendix] for more details. These results are summarized in Table 3 for the case of a 128-bit key.

CPU	RAM usage (bytes)	ROM usage (bytes)	Key scheduling	Encryption				
8051^{a}	105^{b}	1284^{c}	100092 cycles (100 ms)					
8052^{d}	210	1300	34000cycles (34 ms)					
$H8/300^{e}$	686	12929^{f}	14041 cycles (2.81ms)	6370cycles (1.27ms)				
	420	4292^{f}	22422cycles (4.48ms)	7468 cycles (1.49 ms)				
8051^{g}	344^{h}	1444	26147 cycles (44 ms)	9725 cycles (16ms)				
ARM^i	336	1260	8172cycles (0.286ms)	2180 cycles (0.076ms)				

 Table 3: Smart Card Performance of E2

^arunning at 12MHz (1 cycle = 12 oscillator periods). This result is very preliminary. The cycles of key scheduling and encryption will be significantly improved.

^bincluding plaintext, master key, and stack areas.

^cincluding tables.

^{*d*}running at 12MHz (1 cycle = 12 oscillator periods). This result is an estimation based on 8051 results. ^{*e*}running at 5MHz (1 cycle = 1 oscillator period).

^fThis result seems very large because the implementation is optimized for speed.

 g running at 3.57MHz (1 cycle = 6 oscillator periods). [HKQ99]

^husing external RAM.

^{*i*}running at 28.56MHz (1 cycle = 1 oscillator period). [HKQ99]

References

- [AU99] K. Aoki and H. Ueda. Optimized Software Implementations of E2. (http://info. isl.ntt.co.jp/e2/), 1999.
- [HKQ99] G. Hachez, F. Koeune, and J.-J. Quisquater. cAESar results: Implementation of Four AES Candidates on Two Smart Cards. In Second Advanced Encryption Standard Candidate Conference, pp. 95–108, Hotel Quirinale, Rome, Italy, 1999. Information Technology Laboratory, National Institute of Standards and Technology.
- [N98a] Nippon Telegraph and Telephone Corporation. Specification of **E**2 a 128-bit Block Cipher, 1998. (http://info.isl.ntt.co.jp/e2/).
- [N98b] Nippon Telegraph and Telephone Corporation. Supporting Document on **E**2, 1998. (http://info.isl.ntt.co.jp/e2/).
- [SKW⁺99] B. Schneier, J. Kelsey, D. Whiting, D. Wagner, C. Hall, and N. Ferguson. Performance Comparison of the AES Submissions. In Second Advanced Encryption Standard Candidate Conference, pp. 15–34, Hotel Quirinale, Rome, Italy, 1999. Information Technology Laboratory, National Institute of Standards and Technology.
- [U99] U.S. Department of Commerce, National Institute of Standards and Technology. NIST's Efficiency Testing for Round1 AES Candidates, 1999. (http://csrc. nist.gov/encryption/aes/round1/conf2/aes2conf.htm).