INRIA

INSTITUT NATIONAL DE RECHERCHE EN INFORMATIQUE ET EN AUTOMATIQUE

Project-Team SPACES

Solving Problems through Algebraic Computation and Efficient Software

Lorraine

THEME SYM

Table of contents

1. Team

Team Leader
Paul Zimmermann [research director, INRIA]

Administrative Assistant
Céline Simon [INRIA]

Staff member (CNRS or INRIA)
Pierrick Gaudry [research scientist, CNRS, from Sep. 1st]
Guillaume Hanrot [research scientist, INRIA]
Vincent Lefèvre [research scientist, INRIA]
Emmanuel Thomé [research scientist, INRIA]

Technical staff
Patrick Pélissier [junior technical staff, INRIA, until Aug. 31st]

Ph. D. student
Jean-Paul Cerri [IUFM Lorraine, defense on Nov. 18th, 2005]
Laurent Fousse [MESR grant, UHP, defense planned in 2006]
Thomas Houtmann [DGA grant, DGA, from Sep. 1st, defense planned in 2007]
Damien Stehlé [MESR grant, UHP, defense on Dec. 2nd, 2005]

Student intern
Jean-Yves Degos [until July 8th]

2. Overall Objectives

2.1. Overall Objectives

Until the beginning of 2004, the Spaces project-team was a joint project-team of INRIA Lorraine and INRIA Rocquencourt. The main objective of this team was to solve systems of polynomial equations and inequations. The focus was on algebraic methods which are more robust and frequently more efficient than purely numerical tools. The Paris part was mostly working on the algebraic aspects, whereas the task of the Nancy part of the team was to devise arithmetic tools which could enhance the efficiency of the formal method (mainly real arithmetic, but also more exotic ones, like modular or p-adics).

Since the beginning of 2004, the Paris part has decided to create their own project team. In the same time, due to several arrivals in the project-team, the main interest of the Nancy part has somewhat shifted towards arithmetics, algorithmic number theory and their application in cryptology. A new project-team which will be named CACAO is under creation, but for various reasons has still no concrete existence at the time being. However, since from the beginning of 2004, all work done in the Nancy part of the SPACES project should be thought of as being related to the goals of the CACAO project team, we chose to present the objectives of the latter project, and results obtained with respect to them.

The objectives of Spaces for year 2005 were thus along the following lines:

- Studying the arithmetic of curves of small genus > 1, having in mind applications to cryptology,
- Improving the efficiency and the reliability of arithmetics in a very broad sense (i.e., the arithmetics of a wide variety of objects).

These two objectives strongly interplay. Arithmetics are, of course, at the core of optimizing algorithms on curves, starting evidently with the arithmetic of curves themselves. On the other hand, curves can sometimes be a tool for some arithmetical problems like integer factorization.

To reach those objectives, we have isolated three key axes of work:

- **Algebraic Curves**: the main issue here is to investigate curves of small genus > 1 over finite fields (base field $\mathbb{F}_{p^n}$, for various p and n), i.e., mainly: to compute in the Jacobian of a given curve, to be able to check that this variety is suitable for cryptography (cardinality, smoothness test) and to solve problems in those structures (discrete logarithm). Applications go from number theory (integer factorization) to cryptography (an alternative to RSA).
- **Arithmetics**: we consider here algorithms working on multiple-precision integers, floating-points numbers, p-adic numbers and finite fields. For such basic data structures, we do not expect new algorithms with better asymptotic behavior to be discovered; however, since those are first-class objects in all our computations, every speedup is most welcome, even by a factor of 2
- **Linear Algebra and Lattices**: Solving large linear systems is a key point of factoring and discrete logarithm algorithms, which we need to investigate if curves are to be applied in cryptology. And lattices are central points of the new ideas that have emerged over the very last years for several problems in computer arithmetic or discrete logarithms algorithms.

3. Scientific Foundations

3.1. Introduction

3.1.1. Algebraic Curves

Though we are interested in curves by themselves, the applications to cryptology remain a motivation to our research. Therefore, we start by introducing these applications, since they may serve as a guideline to the reader in this sometimes technical section.

3.1.1.1. Curves and Cryptology

The RSA cryptosystem — the *de facto* standard in public-key cryptography — requires large keys, at least 1024 bits currently. Algebraic curves offer a better level of security for a smaller key size, say 160 bits currently for elliptic curves. They are not specifically used as curves. In practice, a very general construction due to El Gamal associates to any group a cryptosystem, this cryptosystem being secure as soon as the so-called *Diffie-Hellman* problem (or its decision variant) is difficult:

Given $g \in G$, g^a and g^b for some integers a and b, compute g^{ab}.

Currently, the only way to attack this problem is to tackle the more difficult *discrete logarithm problem*:

Given $g \in G$ and g^a, find a,

which, in the case of the El Gamal system, is equivalent to the so-called attack on the key (given the public part of the key, recover the secret part). We shall only discuss the discrete logarithm problem in this document, since it is widely believed that the two problems are in fact equivalent.

This problem is easy when the underlying group is $\mathbb{Z}$ or $(\mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z}, +)$. Classically, multiplicative groups of finite fields are used; however, they can be attacked by algorithms very similar to those existing for factoring, and thus require the same key-size to ensure security.

A trend initiated by Koblitz and Miller and followed by many others is to use as "cryptographic groups" the group ("Jacobian") associated by classical arithmetical geometry to a given algebraic curve.

To use such a group for cryptographic applications, the key algorithmic points are the following:

- have an explicit description of the group and the group operation, as efficient as possible (the speed of ciphering and deciphering being directly linked to the efficiency of the group operation);
- undertake an as thorough as possible study of the security offered by those groups.

The second point should again be split in two steps: study of the behavior of the group under "generic attacks" (avoiding small cardinality, avoiding cardinalities with no large prime factor), and trying to devise "ad hoc" attacks. The first step amounts more or less to being able to compute the cardinality of the group; the second one to try as hard as possible to find a way to compute discrete logarithms in this group.

This section now proceeds as follows; we introduce the basic objects (curves and Jacobians) and their properties relevant to the following problems: group structure and arithmetic, cardinality, discrete logarithm.

Finally, and in a somewhat independent way, curves and their Jacobians can be used for integer factorization; we shall also review that point.

3.1.1.2. Jacobian

A central role is played by a certain algebraic variety of higher dimension associated to a given curve C, its Jacobian $J(C)$, which comes with a natural group structure. We shall not define it, but rather state its most important properties:

1. C embeds as a sub-variety of $J(C)$,
2. $J(C)$ is an abelian variety, i.e., has an (abelian) group structure such that group operations (addition, inversion) can be written as rational functions of the coordinates.
3. if C has genus g, $J(C)$ is a variety of dimension g (note that in full generality one only knows how to embed it in a space of dimension 2^{2g}, i.e. to give many equations in 2^{2g} variables rather than, for instance, one equation in $g+1$ variables).

The most important feature of the Jacobian is the fact that it comes with a natural group structure, which is the key point for its uses in applications to primality, factorization, and cryptology.

3.1.1.3. Curves over Finite Fields

We intend to focus on the case $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{F}_q$ and its extensions, with subsidiarily a study of the cases where $\mathbb{K}$ is a number field or a completion of a number field, since those happen to be related to the previous one by reduction/lifting techniques.

In this setting, the situation is rather rigid; the cardinality of the curve over any g extension fields of the base field determines the cardinality over all extensions, and the cardinality of the Jacobian. We also have sharp estimates for the cardinality, namely $|\sharp C(\mathbb{F}_q^k) - (q^k+1)| \leq 2g\sqrt{q^k}$ and $(\sqrt{q}-1)^g \leq \sharp J(\mathbb{F}_q) \leq (\sqrt{q}+1)^g$ (the so-called Weil bounds).

The cardinalities have several interpretations, which usually yield different strategies for computing them. We shall review them in an informal way in section 3.1.1.5.

3.1.1.4. Discrete Logarithm

In this part, we generalize slightly the setting, since we shall also discuss later some aspects on discrete logarithms over finite fields. We shall hence assume that G is an abelian group, where we want to solve the equation

$$g^x = h$$

where g, h are given elements from G, and the unknown x is an integer. This is known as the *discrete logarithm* problem (DL for short). A first remark, due to Nechaev [59], is that if one uses only operations in the group, one needs at least $(\sharp G)^{1/2}$ operations to compute a discrete logarithm. One of the quests of cryptology is finding a so-called "Nechaev group", for which there are provably no algorithms for computing discrete logarithms faster than $(\sharp G)^{1/2}$; it currently appears that elliptic curves are the best candidates to be Nechaev groups, hence the interest in cryptology.

On the other hand, two classical algorithms (Pollard's ρ method and Shanks' baby-step giant-step) allow one to compute a discrete logarithm in any group G in time $O(\sharp G^{1/2})$. The complexity of the "general discrete logarithm" is thus completely known. However, for a family of groups or even a specific group, faster algorithms might exist. We shall discuss some of those algorithms in the sequel.

3.1.1.5. State of the art

3.1.1.5.1. Arithmetic in the Jacobian

As a group, the Jacobian is defined as a quotient of the free group generated by points; as any definition based on a quotient, it is not very tractable for explicit computations. It is necessary to devise a specific representation of elements and specific algorithms to deal with computations in the Jacobian. Though general methods exist [49], the most interesting methods usually take advantage of the specific curve one is dealing with, or even of the specific model of the curve to get a more efficient algorithm.

In the case of elliptic curves, the problem is quite easy; the classical chord-and-tangent rule yields by simple calculations easy-to-implement formulas. One can still improve somewhat upon those formulas. The situation however is quite different as soon as higher genus curves are involved.

In the case of hyperelliptic curves, a now classical algorithm due to Cantor [37] explains how to implement efficiently arithmetic in their Jacobian; numerous improvements have been obtained since, including explicit formulas [53], [60] which are more efficient in practice than Cantor's algorithm.

Another family of curves has received interest from the cryptology community in recent years, namely the C_{ab} family. In that case, algorithms have been obtained by Arita [32] using Gröbner bases computations, then for a sub-family, a more efficient method was devised by Galbraith, Paulus and Smart [41] and a common setting was then found by Harasawa and Suzuki [48]. Since then, more efficient algorithms were obtained by using suitable orderings for the Gröbner basis computation in Arita's method, and explicit formulas derived in some cases [35]. However, recent work by Diem and Thomé almost completely dismisses non-hyperelliptic C_{ab} curves, as far as cryptology is concerned.

3.1.1.5.2. Computing the Cardinality

The question of point counting over finite fields is of central importance for applications to cryptography, see Section 4.1. Recall that we are given an algebraic curve C of genus g, over a finite field $\mathbb{F}_q$, and we would like to count the number of points of the Jacobian of this curve.

First, for the sake of completeness, we should mention two classical ways to somewhat reverse the problem, i.e., to construct the curve and its number of points at the same time: using *Koblitz curves* and *complex multiplication*.

Those two methods are extremely efficient, especially the first one, but the main drawback is that they introduce some unnecessary structure in the curves they construct; in particular, Koblitz's method yields curves with a large ring of automorphisms. This can be used to speed up discrete logarithm computations, and should thus be considered as a weakness from the cryptographic point of view.

Let us now turn to actual point counting algorithms. Hasse-Weil's theorem states that computing a certain polynomial $P(t)$ is enough to obtain the cardinality (in particular, the cardinality of the jacobian over the base field is exactly $P(1)$). There are several interpretations for the polynomial $P(t)$, which yield different strategies for computing it:

- ℓ-adic characterization: Schoof's algorithm [65] and its improvements and extensions, is especially suitable in large characteristic. It is well understood for elliptic curves; the hyperelliptic case, though already studied [44], [43], would still benefit from significant improvement.
- p-adic characterization: Lift the curve to an extension of $\mathbb{Q}_p$, and compute $P(t)$ over this extension. This is the core of Satoh's method and its AGM variants. This method is the most efficient in small characteristic.
- Monsky-Washnitzer characterization and Kedlaya's algorithm. Again, this is suitable for small or medium primes. This method is interesting by its generality.

3.1.1.5.3. Discrete Logarithm

In the case of Jacobians of curves, at the time being, no other general algorithm is known. This is the key interest of curves for cryptology, and the reason for which rather small key give the same level of security that much larger keys in the case of RSA.

However, many ad hoc methods, which exploit (or demonstrate) the weakness of certain families of curves, exist. Let us quote Pohlig-Hellman method (if the cardinality of the group is smooth, hence the interest in computing the cardinality!), Index calculus (for discrete logarithms over finite fields, leading to subexponential complexities), and some weaker instances of curves (trace 0, supersingular, Weil descent, small extension fields). For curves, higher genus have been showed to be weaker than generic groups for $g \geq 5$ by Gaudry [42] and then by further work for $g \geq 3$, see Section 6.3.

3.2. Linear Algebra

3.2.1. Huge Linear Systems

Huge linear systems are frequently encountered as last steps of "index-calculus" based algorithms. Those systems correspond to a particular presentation of the underlying group by generators and relations; they are thus always defined on a base ring which is $\mathbb{Z}$ modulo the exponent of the group, typically $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ in the case of factorization, $\mathbb{Z}/(q^n-1)\mathbb{Z}$ when trying to solve a discrete logarithm problem over $\mathbb{F}_{q^n}^*$.

Those systems are often extremely sparse, meaning that they have a very small number of non-zero coefficients.

The classical, naive elimination algorithm of Gauss yields a complexity of $O(n^3)$, when the matrix considered has size $n \times n$. However, if we assume that we can perform a matrix multiplication in time $O(n^\omega)$, algorithms exist which lower this complexity to $O(n^\omega)$. Furthermore, if we make assumptions on our matrix (mainly that it is sparse, meaning that a matrix-vector product can be computed in time $O(n^\theta)$ for some $\theta < 2$), then specialized algorithms (Lanczós, Wiedemann [70]) relying only on evaluation of matrix-vector products yield a complexity of $O(n^{1+\theta})$, typically $O(n^2)$ for the very sparse matrices ($\theta = 1$) that we often encounter.

3.2.2. Lattices

Many problems described in the other sections, but also numerous problems in computer algebra or algorithmic number theory, involve at some step the solution of a linear problem or the search for a short linear combination of vectors lying in a finite-dimensional Euclidean space. As examples of this, we could cite factoring and discrete logarithms methods for the former, finding worst cases for the Table Maker's Dilemma in computer arithmetic for the latter (see Section 3.3.5).

The important problem in that setting is, given a "bad" basis of a lattice, to find a "good" one. By good, we mean that it consists of short, almost orthogonal vectors. This is a difficult problem in general, since finding the shortest nonzero vector is already NP-hard, under probabilistic reductions.

In 1982, Lenstra, Lenstra, and Lovász [56] defined the notion of a LLL-reduced basis and described an algorithm to compute such a basis in polynomial time, namely $O(n^2 \log M)$ linear algebra steps (of type matrix-vector multiplication), or $O(n^4 \log M)$ operations [66] on coefficients at most $O(n \log M)$, therefore giving a $O(n^6 \log^3 M)$ bit complexity if the underlying arithmetic is naive.

3.2.3. State of the art

3.2.3.1. Large Linear Systems

Recall that the systems we are dealing with are usually systems with coefficients in a finite ring, which can be either small ($\mathbb{F}_2$), or quite a large ring.

3.2.3.2. Lanczós' method

Given a symmetric matrix A and a vector x, Lanczós' method computes, using Gram-Schmidt process, an orthogonal basis $(w_1, \cdots, w_n)$ of the subspace generated by $\{x, Ax, \cdots, A^n x\}$ for the scalar product $[x, y] = (x|Ay)$. As soon as one finds an isotropic vector w_i, i.e., $[w_i, w_i] = 0$, one has $w_i^t A w_i = 0$. In our

situation, we take $A = B^tB$, where we want to find a vector in the kernel of B; we thus have $(w_iB)^tBw_i = 0$. Over a finite field this does not always imply $Bw_i = 0$, but this remains true with probability close to 1 over a finite ring of large characteristic. This approach works over $\mathbb{F}_2$ as well, but with some caution.

3.2.3.3. Wiedemann's method

Given a matrix A (not necessarily symmetric) and a vector x, Wiedemann's algorithm looks for a trivial linear combination of the vectors A^ix, $i \geq 1$. Such a relation can be written as $\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_iA^ix = 0$. Now, if $u = \sum_{i=1}^{n} A^{i-1}x$ is a nonzero vector, we have $Au = 0$, and u is a vector of the kernel of A. The linear combination, in turn, is searched by choosing a random vector y and computing the elements $\alpha_i = yA^ix$. If a relation of the type we are looking for exists, then α_i is a linear recurring sequence of order n. Given $2n$ elements of the sequence, Berlekamp-Massey's algorithm allows one to compute the coefficients of the recurrence. Thus, with $O(n)$ matrix-vectors and $O(n)$ vector-vector products, one hopes to recover a vector of the kernel. The overall complexity is thus, on average, $O(n^{1+\theta})$, as announced.

3.2.3.4. Parallel and distributed algorithms

Algorithms for solving large sparse linear systems have been designed with implementation, and parallelism or distribution in mind, or both. The Lanczós and Wiedemann algorithms have "block" versions [57], [39], which one can use in order to take advantage of an advanced computing facility, like a massively parallel computer, or a much cheaper resource like a computer cluster, which can be turned into an effective task force. A key problem is therefore the identification of the computational tasks which either can, or cannot be effectively spanned across many processors or machines. In the case of a computer cluster, evaluating the cost of communications between nodes taking part to the computation is of course very important. To this regard, the different algorithms (block or non-block versions, Lanczós or Wiedemann) do not compare equally. A variety of running times can be obtained depending on the exact characteristics of the input system (size, density, definition field), the number of computing nodes, and on the choice of certain parameters of the algorithms (for the block versions).

The block Wiedemann algorithm has been used by Thomé [67], [68] in the course of solving a $500,000 \times 500,000$ linear system defined over $\mathbb{F}_p$, where p is a prime of 183 decimal digits. This computation was made feasible using an algorithm based on the Fast Fourier Transform (FFT), which permitted broader distribution of the computation [69].

Today, block versions of the Lanczós and Wiedemann algorithms are a necessity for who wants to solve linear systems encountered in record-size factoring problems, discrete logarithm problems, or in some other cases. Yet, a precise account on the positive and negative sides of both block algorithms, and a formulation of their preferred setting, seems to be missing.

3.2.3.5. Algorithms for Lattices

Many fundamental problems concerning the LLL algorithm remain open. The most stringent of those is the use of intermediate floating-point computations. The problem is the following: the LLL algorithm starts by computing a QR decomposition of its input, and mostly works on the upper triangular matrix R. In most applications, the input has coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}$, so that the matrix R has huge rational coefficients, which means huge arithmetical cost. However, replacing rationals by floating-point approximations is at best a difficult matter since the basic operation (size-reduction) can be written as $r_{ij} \longleftarrow r_{ij} - \lfloor r_{ij} \rceil$ which is numerically highly unstable. The main idea is then [61] to detect huge precision loss and recompute exactly the corresponding coefficients, doing this the least possible number of times. Various papers also deal with this problem, but mostly suggesting heuristics [33], or sometimes (subtly) flawed solutions [51].

We describe in more detail an application of LLL that has important relevance for our objectives but also has become an important tool in cryptanalysis over the last years, namely Coppersmith's method [38]. Let $P(x_1, \cdots, x_n)$ be a polynomial defined over $\mathbb{Z}$, and let N be an integer. Given bounds $(U_1, \cdots, U_n)$ and M, we would like to find all n-uples $(u_1, \cdots, u_n)$ with $|u_i| \leq U_i$ and $P(u_1, \cdots, u_n) = 0 \mod N$. Coppersmith answers this question in polynomial time under some restriction on $(U_1, \cdots, U_n, N)$; to do this, he constructs a sublattice of the ideal $I_\ell = (N\mathbb{Z}[x_1, \cdots, x_n] + P\mathbb{Z}[x_1, \cdots, x_n])^\ell$, and looks for short vectors in this lattice. If we obtain $n' \geq n$ vectors Q_j small enough so as

to guarantee that $Q_j(x_1, \cdots, x_n) < N^\ell$ for all j and all n-uples x_i with $|x_i| \leq U_i$, we then have $P(x_1, \cdots, x_n) = 0 \mod N \Rightarrow Q_j(x_1, \cdots, x_n) = 0 \mod N^\ell \Rightarrow Q_j(x_1, \cdots, x_n) = 0$.

Thus we get a (hopefully) zero-dimensional polynomial system over $\mathbb{Q}$ which can be reduced to a univariate equation over $\mathbb{Q}$ by one's favorite elimination technique. A useful variant deals with the problem where $P(x_1, \cdots, x_n)$ is no longer $0 \mod N$ but instead has a large common factor with N.

The LLL algorithm is involved in the search for n small vectors in a lattice. We know that it is guaranteed to yield at least one, hopefully n short vectors smaller than (up to small factors) $\det(L)^{1/\dim(L)}$. This implies in particular that the choice of the sublattice should be especially careful, so as to yield a smallest possible determinant for the dimension. This choice has been made completely explicit in the univariate case ($n = 1$); even the bivariate case still needs some fine hand-tuning very specific to the underlying polynomial, not speaking of the higher dimensional case.

3.3. Arithmetics

We consider here the following arithmetics: integers, rational numbers, integers modulo a fixed modulus n, finite fields, floating-point numbers and p-adic numbers. We can divide those numbers in two classes: *exact numbers* (integers, rationals, modular computations or finite fields), and *inexact numbers* (floating-point and p-adic numbers).

Algorithms on integers (respectively floating-point numbers) are very similar to those on polynomials (respectively Taylor or Laurent series). The main objective in that domain is to find new algorithms that make operations on those numbers more efficient. These new algorithms may use an alternate number representation.

3.3.1. Integers

The integral types of the current processors have a width w of either 32 or 64 bits. This means that, using hardware instructions, one is only able to compute modulo 2^{32} or 2^{64}. An arbitrary precision integer is then usually represented under the form $n = \sum_{i=0}^{l} n_i 2^{iw}$, with n_i a machine integer. In algorithmic terms, it means that a multiprecision integer is an array of machine integers. Naive operations can then be defined by using the classical "schoolbook methods" in base 2^w, with linear complexity in the case of addition and subtraction, and quadratic complexity in the case of division and multiplication.

3.3.2. Integers Modulo n and Finite Fields

Integers modulo n are usually represented by the representative of their class in the interval $[0, n-1]$ or sometimes $]-n/2, n/2]$.

Addition, subtraction and multiplication are obtained from the corresponding operation over the integers, after reduction modulo n. This means that after each operation, a reduction modulo n must be performed. This is not very costly in the case of addition and subtraction (where it implies a single test and half the time another addition of subtraction), but implies a division in the case of multiplication.

The modular division is a completely different operation, and amounts to compute a so-called extended gcd of x and n, i.e., a pair a, b with $ax + bn = 1$. This is classically performed by the Euclidean algorithm or one of its variants, and is thus, in practice, by far the most costly operation. Many improvements in low-level algorithms are obtained by choosing suitable representations of objects which avoid divisions modulo n.

Finite fields can be separated in two types. Prime fields correspond to the integers modulo n for prime n. Extension fields are algebraic extensions of those prime fields, i.e., $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}[X]$ modulo an irreducible polynomial $P(X)$. Elements of a non-prime finite field are thus often represented as polynomials of elements of a prime field. This means that ideas from polynomial arithmetic can, and should be used.

A difficult case is the case when $p^{\deg P}$ (the cardinality of the field) is large whereas neither p nor $\deg P$ really are. The case where p is large is indeed a classical case where we have to deal with arithmetic with large integers, and fast algorithms exist in that case. The case where p is small and $\deg P$ large corresponds to the realm of fast polynomial arithmetic. However, in the "middle range", neither p nor $\deg P$ are large enough to justify the use of fast techniques. This is also at the core of some technical theoretical difficulties.

3.3.3. p-adic Numbers

A p-adic number is defined as the formal limit of a sequence (x_n) of integers such that $x_i = x_{i+1} \mod p^i$. One could think of it as a formal series $\sum_{n\geq 0} a_n p^n$, with $a_n \in \{0, \cdots, p-1\}$, though alternative representations are sometimes more efficient for some computations. In particular, a p-adic number given to the precision n is simply an element of $\mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z}$.

The p-adic numbers offer the capability of lifting information known in a finite field to a field of characteristic zero, keeping some structure information at the same time. They are extensively used by many algorithms in computer algebra and algorithms related to algebraic curves, together with their extensions.

When we are trying to lift information from a nonprime finite field, say $\mathbb{F}_q$ for $q = p^n$, we are led to introduce algebraic extensions of $\mathbb{Z}_p$; algebraic extensions of the p-adics can be of two types, *unramified extensions* and *ramified extensions*; roughly speaking, ramified extensions contain fractional powers of p.

In practice, we are mostly interested in the case of small p and unramified extensions. Of lesser importance are p-adic integers for large p, and extensions of these, because the algorithms we have in mind are generally not practical for large p. Yet, this is not necessarily the case for any possible p-adic algorithm, hence this point of view may change. At present, our application realms do not call for p-adic arithmetic requiring computations in ramified extensions, but this may change in the future as well.

3.3.4. Floating-point Numbers and the IEEE-754 Standard

When discussing inexact types, one stumbles very quickly on two critical difficulties:

- since approximation is inherent to the manipulation of inexact types, how should approximation be performed? This amounts to defining the (necessarily) finite set of numbers that can be exactly represented (format),
- even if the two operands of an operation can be exactly represented, in general the result cannot be. How should one define the result of an operation (rounding)? This is the key for a precise and portable semantics of floating-point computations.

From now on, we shall focus on the floating-point numbers, which are the main inexact data type, at least from the practical point of view.

3.3.4.1. Formats.

A floating-point format is a quadruple $(\beta, n, E_{min}, E_{max})$; a floating-point number in that format is of the form

$$\pm(b_0.b_1...b_{n-1})\cdot\beta^e,$$

where β is the *base* — usually 2 or 10 —, n is the *significand width*, $e \in [E_{min}, E_{max}]$ is the *exponent*, and the b_i are the *digits*, $0 \leq b_i < \beta$. The IEEE-754 standard defines four binary floating-point formats (single precision, single-extended, double precision, double-extended), the single-extended format being obsolete:

format	total width	β	significand width	E_{min}	E_{max}
single	32	2	24	-126	$+127$
double	64	2	53	-1022	$+1023$
double-extended	≥ 79	2	≥ 64	≤ -16382	$\geq +16383$

The on-going revision (754r) forgets about the single-extended and double-extended formats, and defines a new quadruple precision format (binary128). It also defines new decimal formats:

format	total width	β	significand width	E_{min}	E_{max}
binary128	128	2	113	-16382	$+16383$
decimal32	32	10	7	-95	$+96$
decimal64	64	10	16	-383	$+384$

decimal128	128	10	34	-6143	$+6144$

3.3.4.2. Rounding.

The IEEE-754 standard defines four rounding modes: rounding to zero, to $+\infty$, to $-\infty$, and to nearest-even. It requires that any of the four basic arithmetic operations ($+, -, \times, \div$), and the square root, must be *correctly rounded*, i.e., the rounded value of $a \diamond b$ for $\diamond \in \{+, -, \times, \div\}$ must be the closest one to the exact value (assuming that the inputs are exact) — as if one were using infinite precision — according to the rounding direction. (In case of an exact result lying exactly in the middle of two consecutive machine numbers, the nearest-even mode chooses that with an even mantissa, i.e., ending with $b_{n-1} = 0$ in binary.)

3.3.5. The Table Maker's Dilemma

Let f be a mathematical function (for example the exponential, the logarithm, or a trigonometric function), and a given floating-point format $(\beta, n, E_{min}, E_{max})$. Assume $\beta = 2$, i.e., a binary format for simplicity. Given a floating-point number x in that format, we want to determine the floating-point number y in that format — or in another output format — that is closest to $f(x)$ for a given rounding mode. In that case, we say that $y \longleftarrow f(x)$ is *correctly rounded*. The problem here is that we cannot compute an infinite number of bits of $f(x)$. All we can do is to compute an approximation z to $f(x)$ on $m > n$ bits, with an error bounded by one *ulp* (unit in last place). Consider for example the arc-tangent function, with the double-precision number $x = 4621447055448553 \cdot 2^{-11}$, and rounding to nearest. We have in binary:

$$\begin{aligned} \arctan x &= 1.10010010000111111011010101000100010000100101010011 00 \\ &\quad 0000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000111011..., \end{aligned}$$

where the first line contains 53 significant bits, and the second one has 45 consecutive zeros. If $m \leq 99$, we'll get as approximation $z = \underbrace{1.100...100}_{53}\ 1000...000$, which is exactly the middle of two double-precision numbers, and therefore we will not be able to determine the correct rounding of $\arctan x$. We say that x is a *worst case* for the $\arctan$ function and rounding to nearest. Since a given format contains a finite number of numbers — at most 2^{64} for double-precision —, the maximal working precision m required for any x in that format is finite. The Table Maker's Dilemma (TMD for short) consists in determining that maximal working precision m_{max} needed, which depends on f, the format and the rounding mode, and possibly the corresponding worst cases x. Once we know m_{max}, we can design an efficient routine to correctly round f as follows: (i) compute a m_{max}-bit approximation z to $f(x)$, with an error of at most one ulp, (ii) round z.

3.3.6. State of the art

3.3.6.1. Integers

Most basic algorithms for integers are believed to be optimal, up to constant factors. The main goal here is thus to save on those constant factors. For the multiplication, one challenge is to find the best algorithm for each input size; since the thresholds between the different algorithms (naive, Karatsuba, Toom-Cook, FFT) are machine-dependent, there is no theoretical answer to that question. The same holds for the problem of finding which kind of FFT (Mersenne, Fermat, complex, Discrete Weighted Transform or DWT) is the fastest one for a given application or input size.

For the division, it is well known that it can be performed — as any algebraic operation — in a constant times that of the corresponding multiplication: for example, a $n \times n$ product corresponds to a $(2n)/n$ division. One main challenge is to decrease that constant factor, say d. In the naive (quadratic) range, we have $d = 1$, but already in the Karatsuba range, the best known implementation has $d = 2$ [36]. (Van der Hoeven [71] gives an algorithm with $d = 1$, however its implementation seems tricky, and its memory usage is superlinear.)

3.3.6.2. Floating-point numbers

Algorithms for floating-point numbers make great use from those for integers. Indeed, a binary floating-point number may be represented as an integer significand multiplied by 2^e. Multiplication of two floating-point numbers therefore reduces to the product of their significands; this product is in fact a *short product*, since only the high part is needed (assuming all numbers have the same precision). Despite some recent theoretical

advances [47] [58], no great practical speedup has been obtained so far for the computation of a short product with respect to the corresponding plain product. The same holds for division, though extension of the ideas of the middle-product [46] to floating-point numbers might allow one to gain somewhat on division.

3.3.6.3. Integers modulo n.

A special case of integer division is when the divisor n is constant. This happens in particular in modular or finite field computations (discrete logarithm and factorization via ECM for instance). There are basically two kinds of algorithms in that case: (i) Barrett's division [34] precomputes an approximation to $1/n$, which is used to get an approximation to the quotient, which after a second product yields an approximate remainder, (ii) Montgomery's reduction precomputes $-1/n \mod \beta^k$ (where the input n has k words in base β) which gives in two products the value of $c\beta^{-k} \mod n$, for c having $2k$ words in base β. Both algorithms perform two products with operands of size equal to the size of n. These products are in fact short products, but according to the above remark, the global cost is close to that of two plain products. A speedup can be obtained in the FFT range, where the second product (to obtain the remainder) produces a known high part (resp. low part) in Barrett's division (resp. Montgomery's reduction); using the fact that the FFT computes that product modulo $2^m \pm 1$, one can save a factor of two for that product, with a global gain of 25%. Together with caching the transform of the input n and of its approximate inverse, one approaches $d = 1$. These ideas still need to be implemented in common multiple-precision software.

3.3.6.4. p-adic numbers.

Recently, a large number of new "p-adic" algorithms for solving very concrete problems have been designed, notably for counting points on algebraic varieties defined over finite fields. The application of such algorithms to coding theory or cryptology is immediate, as this is a considerable aid for quickly setting up elliptic curve cryptosystems, or for finding good codes. Some of these algorithms have been listed in Section 3.1.1.5.2.

In such algorithms, computations are carried out in "p-adic structures", but this vague wording reflects a relatively wide variety of mathematical structures (not unrelated to the underlying finite field, of course). We are frequently led to computing in the ring of 2-adic integers, which can be regarded as the integers modulo 2^n for some variable precision n. Also, just as extensions of $\mathbb{F}_2$ are very common in computer algebra in general, the ring of integers of unramified extensions of 2-adic numbers plays an important role.

3.3.6.5. The Table Maker's dilemma.

Some instances of the TMD are easy. For example, for an algebraic function of total degree d, we get an upper bound of $m_{max} \leq dn + O(1)$ [52], which is attained when $d = 2$. Another easy case is the base conversion, where the TMD reduces to $O(E_{max} - E_{min})$ computations of continued fractions [45].

However, in general, and especially for non-algebraic functions, the TMD is a difficult problem, because we know no rigorous upper bound for m, or the corresponding upper bound is much too large. However, a quick-and-dirty statistical analysis shows that for a n-bit input format (including the exponent bits if needed), the worst case is about $m \approx 2n$. But to determine a rigorous bound, the only known methods are based on exhaustive search. Basically, they compute a $2n$-bit approximation to $f(x)$ for every x in the given format, and see how many consecutive zeros or ones appear after (or from) the round bit. This naive approach has complexity $\Theta(2^n)$. Fortunately, faster — but still exponential — methods do exist. The first one is Lefèvre's algorithm [55], [54], with a complexity of $2^{2n/3+\epsilon}$. An improved algorithm of complexity $2^{4n/7+\epsilon}$ is given in [16].

4. Application Domains

4.1. Cryptology

The main application domain of our project is cryptology. As it has been mentioned several times in this document, curves have taken an increasing importance in cryptology over the last ten years. Various works have shown the usability and the usefulness of elliptic curves in cryptology, standards [50] and real-world applications.

We collaborate with the TANC project-team from INRIA Futurs and École polytechnique on the study of the suitability of higher genus curves to cryptography (mainly hyperelliptic curves of genus two, three) This implies some work on three concrete objectives, which are of course highly linked with our main theoretical objectives:

1. improvement of the arithmetic of those curves, so as to guarantee fast enough ciphering-deciphering;
2. fast key generation. This rests on fast computations in the curve and in the ability to quickly compute the cardinality. Another approach (complex multiplication) is followed by TANC.
3. study of the security of the algorithmic primitives relying on curves. This implies attempts at solving discrete logarithms problems in Jacobians using the best known techniques, so as to determine the right key-size.

We also have connections to cryptology through the study and development of the integer LLL algorithm, which is one of the favourite tools to cryptanalyse public-key cryptosystems. For example, we can mention the cryptanalysis of knapsack-based cryptosystems, the cryptanalyses of some fast variants of RSA, the cryptanalyses of fast variants of signature schemes such as DSA or Elgamal, or the attacks against lattice based cryptosystems like NTRU. The use of floating-point arithmetic within this algorithm dramatically speeds it up, which renders the afore-mentioned cryptanalyses more feasible.

4.2. Computational Number Theory Systems

We have strong ties with several computational number theory systems, and code written by members of the project-team can be found in the Magma software and in the Pari/GP software.

4.2.1. Magma

Magma (http://magma.maths.usyd.edu.au/magma/) is the leading computational number theory software. It also has some features of computer algebra (algebraic geometry, polynomial system solving) but not all of what is expected of a computer algebra system. It is developed by the team of John Cannon in Sydney, and while it describes itself as a non-commercial system, it is sold to cover the development cost, porting and maintaining.

In many areas, programs originating from very specialized research works are ported into MAGMA by their authors, who are invited to Sydney for this purpose. Several members of our project-team have already visited Sydney; there has even been an official collaboration supported by the French embassy in Sydney involving people from 3 groups in France (Toulouse, Palaiseau, Nancy) in 2000-2002. Gaudry, Thomé, and Zimmermann have had the occasion to visit the MAGMA group in Sydney in 2001 in order to implement within MAGMA some code they had written for their personal research (on computing the cardinality of Jacobians of hyperelliptic curves, on computing discrete logarithms in $\mathbb{F}_{2^n}$, and on the ECM factorization algorithm, respectively). Zimmermann visited again the MAGMA group in April 2005 to help integrating MPFR and LIBECM into MAGMA.

The Magma system now uses MPFR (see Section 5.2) for its multiple-precision floating-point arithmetic.[1].

4.2.2. Pari/GP

Pari/GP is a computational number theory system which comes with a library which can be used to access Pari functions within a C program. It has originally been developed at the Bordeaux 1 university, and is currently maintained (and expanded) by Karim Belabas, from Bordeaux University. It is free (GPL) software. We sometimes use it for validation of our algorithms.

Again, some code written by members of the project has been incorporated into Pari.

[1] https://magma.maths.usyd.edu.au/magma/export/mpfr_gmp.shtml

4.3. Arithmetics

Another indirect transfer is the usage of MPFR in GCC (*Gnu Compiler Collection*) for the GFORTRAN compiler[2]. MPFR is currently used at compile-time, to convert expressions like $\sin(3.1416)$ into binary double-precision, when the rounding mode can be statically determined. Finally, we should mention another usage of our software by the GCC team: GMP-ECM is used as efficiency test for release candidates of the gcc compiler, up from version 3.3.

The MPFR library is also used by the **CGAL** software, a library for computational geometry developed at INRIA Sophia-Antipolis. The **CGAL**[3] group is currenly only using it for converting rationals to multi-precision floating-point numbers, but plans to write its own interval arithmetic atop of MPFR in the near future, since double-precision interval arithmetic quickly fails for its problems (e.g. circle intersections).

5. Software

5.1. Introduction

An important part of the research done in the SPACES project is published within software.

5.2. MPFR

Keywords: *IEEE 754*, *arbitrary precision*, *correct rounding*, *floating-point number*.

Participants: Laurent Fousse, Guillaume Hanrot, Vincent Lefèvre, Patrick Pélissier, Paul Zimmermann [contact].

MPFR is one of the main software developed by the SPACES team. MPFR is a library for computing with arbitrary precision floating-point numbers, together with well-defined semantics, distributed under the LGPL license. In particular, all arithmetic operations are performed according to a rounding mode provided by the user, and all results are guaranteed correct to the last bit, according to the given rounding mode.

From September 2003 to August 2005, P. Pélissier joined the MPFR team, as a Junior technical staff, to help improve the efficiency of MPFR for small precision (up to 200 bits, in particular in double, double extended and quadruple precision). He also greatly improved the portability of the library, and added the use of LIBTOOL to enable dynamic libraries. P. Pélissier is now working for SopraGroup — a small company near Toulouse, subcontractor for Airbus Industry — on the validation of A380 commands.

In October 2005, the MPFR team took part in the “many digits” friendly competition organized by the group of Henk Barendregt at the University of Nijmegen, Netherlands[4]. The competition consisted in 24 real values, that had to be computed with the largest possible precision (up to one million digits) in the least possible time. The MPFR team won that competition, where commercial software like Maple or Mathematica were also represented.

Several software systems use MPFR, for example: the KDE calculator Abakus by Michael Pyne; CGAL (Computational Geometry Algorithms Library) developed by the Geometrica team (INRIA Sophia-Antipolis); Genius Math Tool and the GEL language, by Jiri Lebl; GFortran, the GNU Fortran 95 compiler, part of GCC; Giac/Xcas, a free computer algebra system, by Bernard Parisse; the iRRAM exact arithmetic implementation from Norbert Müller (University of Trier, Germany); the Magma computational algebra system; and the Wcalc calculator by Kyle Wheeler.

Finally, a paper has been recently submitted [25] summarizing the objectives, architecture, and features of MPFR.

5.3. MPC

Keywords: *IEEE 754*, *arbitrary precision*, *complex floating-point number*, *correct rounding*.

[2] Cf. thread *Remove GMP in favor of MPFR* at http://gcc.gnu.org/ml/fortran/2004-07/msg00005.html.
[3] http://www.cgal.org
[4] http://www.cs.ru.nl/~milad/manydigits/

Participants: Andreas Enge, Paul Zimmermann [contact].

MPC is a complex floating-point library developed on top of the MPFR library, and distributed under the LGPL license. It is co-written with Andreas Enge (TANC team, INRIA Futurs). A complex floating-point number is represented by $x + iy$, where x and y are real floating-point numbers, represented using the MPFR library. The MPC library currently implements all basic arithmetic operations, and the exponential function, all with correct rounding on both the real part x and the imaginary part y of any result.

5.4. GMP-ECM

Participants: Laurent Fousse, Paul Zimmermann [contact].

A new major release of GMP-ECM, version 6.0.1, was made on April 1st, 2005. GMP-ECM is a program to factor integers using the Elliptic Curve Method. Its efficiency comes both from the use of the GNU MP library, and from the implementation of state-of-the-art algorithms. One of the main changes in ecm-6.0.1 is that it now contains a library (LIBECM) in addition of the binary program (ECM). The binary program is distributed under GPL, while the library is distributed under LGPL, to allow its integration into other non-GPL software. For example, the Magma computational number theory software uses LIBECM, up from version V2.12 of Magma.

5.5. Exhaustive Tests of the Mathematical Functions

Participant: Vincent Lefèvre.

The tests of the mathematical functions ($\exp$, $\log$, $\sin$, $\cos$, etc.) have been partially rewritten. In particular, all the low-level routines were rewritten in ISO C in order to be portable, using the MPN layer of GMP for speed reasons. The code was also improved from the algorithmic point of view, in particular to reduce the number of iterations from several thousands to two or three in some intervals; one third of the intervals that were too long to test previously could now be tested very quickly. A variant of the algorithm, which is much faster in some cases, can also be used. Some of these improvements are described in [20].

The algorithm has also been reimplemented in C and the underlying arithmetic can be chosen at compile time: basic integers, IEEE-754 floating-point arithmetic (using the results from [27]) and the MPN layer of GMP.

The results are used:

- by us, to detect bugs in MPFR and in the GNU C library (glibc);
- by the ARENAIRE team, for their implementation of the mathematical functions with correct rounding.

6. New Results

6.1. Integer and Polynomial Arithmetic

Participants: Jean-Paul Cerri, Guillaume Hanrot, Paul Zimmermann.

Several articles describing fundamental work done in the last years finally appeared in 2005. The article describing the search for primitive trinomials of degree 6972593 over $\mathrm{GF}(2)$ appeared in *Mathematics of Computation* [11].

G. Hanrot has written a joint paper [26] with G. Tenenbaum and J. Wu, from the mathematics laboratory of University Henri-Poincaré Nancy 1, about average values of multiplicative functions on smooth integers. The main result is an asymptotic expansion of quantities of the form

$$\sum_{n \leq x, P^+(n) \leq y} f(n),$$

where f is a multiplicative function, under natural but technical assumptions on the Dirichlet series $\sum_{n\geq 1} f(n)n^{-s}$.

This is a first step toward a joint study on finer questions regarding the distribution of smooth integers, with in mind applications to the rigorous analysis of factorization or discrete logarithms algorithms.

Building on previous work, Jean-Paul Cerri has given a general method allowing one to compute the Euclidian minimum of a number field. As a corollary, one can decide in most cases whether the ring of integers of a number field is Euclidean. This result has been accepted for publication [13]. During this work, he was led to study a more general question, using techniques from topological dynamics and in particular a deep result by Berend. This led him to the proof of a set of old conjectures, mostly made by Barnes and Swinnerton-Dyer, in the case where the rank of the unit group is at least 2; another byproduct is the fact that the norm-euclidianity is decidable in that case, and that the algorithm proposed always terminates under the same assumption on the unit rank. These results will be published in another paper [12].

6.2. Floating-Point Arithmetic

Participants: Laurent Fousse, Guillaume Hanrot, Vincent Lefèvre, Damien Stehlé, Paul Zimmermann.

The journal version of the article describing how to find worst-cases of mathematical functions using lattice reduction finally appeared in 2005 in *IEEE Transactions on Computers* [16]. We completed in 2005 our search for worst cases of the 2^x function in double-extended precision (mantissa of 64 bits). The detailed results are available on http://www.loria.fr/equipes/spaces/slz.en.html. The worst-case is

$$2^{1/2+\frac{3990454322510295554}{2^{64}}} = 2^{-64}\cdot 1515390028021457566 9.0000000000000000000036\ldots$$

This is the first exhaustive search ever completed in double-extended precision (previous searches by Lefèvre and Muller were in double precision, i.e., with a mantissa of 53 bits).

Following the effort towards a standardization of mathematical functions in the IEEE 754 standard [40], we propose an extension of Gal's "accurate table" method [22]. This paper contains two main ideas. For one function, we use "worst-case" inputs as distinguished points, which provide the arguably best set of values for Gal's method. For two functions, for example $\sin$ and $\cos$, we present a new algorithm, using a variant of that from [16], which finds all simultaneous n-bit worst cases in $O(2^{n/2})$, instead of $O(2^n)$ for the naive method. Using this work, we designed a very efficient implementation of the `exp2` function in double precision[5]. On a 3Ghz Pentium 4, for 10^5 random tests, our code takes 461ms, whereas the `libm` function takes 890ms. On 10^7 random tests, our code gives only 4 incorrect roundings, whereas the `libm` function gives 563 incorrect roundings.

A study of two frequently used numerical integration schemes was conducted by Fousse. Given a smooth function f over a finite domain $[a, b]$, the process of computing numerically the value of $I = \int_a^b f(x)\mathrm{d}x$ involves a significant number of floating-point operations. Although the truncation error that comes from the integration method itself is often well studied, the roundoff errors are mostly neglected in available numerical software, leading to incorrect results. In [23] the Newton-Cotes family of numerical integration methods are studied and a numerical integration algorithm is described along with a complete error analysis. A similar work was done for the Gauss-Legendre integration scheme in [24]. The algorithms are written in the Correctly Rounded Quadrature library (CRQ) which will be available soon. It was possible using these results to compute the value of $\int_0^1 \sin(\sin(\sin(x)))\mathrm{d}x$ with 1000 significant digits in 5.3s on an 2.4GHz AMD Opteron.

Together with Richard Brent (Australian National University, Canberra) and Colin Percival (Simon Fraser University, Vancouver), we analyzed the maximal roundoff error possible in complex multiplication. We showed the classical bound of $\sqrt{8}\cdot 2^{-p}$ for a working precision of p bits can be improved to $\sqrt{5}\cdot 2^{-p}$. This result holds for any base β. In addition, for $\beta = 2$, we exhibit the worst-case for single-precision ($p = 24$) and double-precision ($p = 53$), and we conjecture a general form for large enough p, depending only on the parity of p.

[5] http://www.loria.fr/~zimmerma/free/exp2-7.c

6.3. Cryptology

Participants: Pierrick Gaudry, Emmanuel Thomé.

Pierrick Gaudry and Emmanuel Thomé have continued work on a new algorithm for computing discrete logarithms in hyperelliptic curves in genus 3 (this work was started in 2004). This algorithm improves on the previously best known algorithms, since the complexity drops from $O(q^{2-\frac{2}{g+1/2}})$ to $O(q^{2-\frac{2}{g}})$, for computing discrete logarithms in hyperelliptic curves of genus 3 defined over $\mathrm{GF}(q)$. The important part of the present work is the fact that a proof is given. A fair amount of time has been spent on making this proof rigorous, and avoiding heuristic arguments. Two authors have joined us, Nicolas Thériault (University of Waterloo, Canada) and Claus Diem (Universität Leipzig, Germany). An updated version of the paper will be submitted soon.

Emmanuel Thomé has implemented a new algorithm by Claus Diem (Universität Leipzig, Germany), in turn based on the former work cited above. The new algorithm practically dismisses a special class of algebraic curves known as $C_{a,b}$ curves for cryptographic applications, as the discrete logarithm problem, while still exponential, has been considerably eased. The benefits of using such curves in comparison to hyperelliptic curves of genus 2 have vanished. The implementation has shown that group sizes around 2^{100} are definitely attackable. A conference paper by Claus Diem and Emmanuel Thomé will report this work.

6.4. Lattices

Participant: Damien Stehlé.

Damien Stehlé and Phong Q. Nguyễn (École Normale Supérieure, Paris) [21] have designed a variant of the LLL algorithm that uses floating-point arithmetic. This variant, called L^2, improves the previous floating-point LLL algorithms described in [64], [62], [63]. More precisely, the L^2 algorithm requires far lower precisions than theses variants. Moreover, its complexity bound is the first that is only quadratic in $\log B$ where B is the maximum of the lengths of the input vectors, whereas all other LLL algorithms have a cubic dependance in $\log B$. Since the LLL algorithm can be seen as a vectorial generalisation of the well-known euclidean algorithm, this quadratic complexity bound seems to be the correct one.

This algorithmic improvement helped understanding more precisely the numerical behaviour of the LLL algorithm. In this direction, Damien Stehlé wrote an efficient code for lattice reduction. A classical application of the LLL algorithm is the search of small integer relations between numbers. As an example of the efficiency of the code, it can find such a relation between 121 numbers of 30,000 bits each in less than 9 minutes.

7. Contracts and Grants with Industry

7.1. MPQS

Participant: Paul Zimmermann.

MPQS is a program that factors integers using the Multiple Polynomial Quadratic Sieve, developed by Scott Contini and Paul Zimmermann. It is distributed under GPL from http://www.loria.fr/~zimmerma/free/. A license agreement is under discussion with Waterloo Maple Inc. (WMI), to enable the use of a fixed version of the MPQS software within the Maple computer algebra software.

7.2. European Initiatives

7.2.1. PAI with Berlin

Participant: Pierrick Gaudry.

We have a grant from the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs in the PAI program (Programme d'Actions Intégrées) with Germany. This is an exchange research program with Florian Heß and the "Algebra und Zahlentheorie" group in the TU Berlin. The topic fits with our overall objectives, since the goal is to investigate new methods in number theory and geometry with a view towards cryptology.

8. Dissemination

8.1. Scientific Animation

8.1.1. RNC'7 Conference

The members of the project are organizing the 7th Real Numbers and Computers conference (RNC'7) that will take place in Nancy in 2006 (http://rnc7.loria.fr). E. Thomé is publicity chair, L. Fousse and V. Lefèvre are organizing a "friendly competition", C. Simon is in charge of the invited speakers and the conference budget, and G. Hanrot, P. Zimmermann are co-chairs of the program committee.

8.2. Leadership within Scientific Community

G. Hanrot and P. Zimmermann are program co-chairs of the RNC'7 conference, that will take place in Nancy in July 2006. P. Zimmermann was member of the program committee of the Arith'17 conference (June 2005, Cape Cod, USA).

8.3. Committees memberships

G. Hanrot is vice-head of the Project Committee of INRIA Lorraine. He is also an appointed member of the INRIA Commission d'Évaluation, of the Mathematics "Commissions de Spécialistes" from Universités Montpellier 2, Henri-Poincaré Nancy 1-Nancy 2-INPL, Jean-Monnet Saint-Étienne. He was a member of the hiring committee for CR2 at INRIA Futurs and INRIA Lorraine in 2005.

P. Zimmermann is also an elected member from the INRIA Evaluation Committee, and of the Computer Science "Commission de Spécialistes" from University Henri Poincaré Nancy 1.

8.4. Vulgarization

G. Hanrot gave two 1h30 lectures on algorithms for diophantine equations for teachers in *classes préparatoires*. A paper version of those talks [15] will be published as a chapter of a book with the other talks given at that occasion.

P. Zimmermann wrote a vulgarization article entitled *"MPFR : vers un calcul flottant correct ?"* on the *Interstices* web site [19]. He also wrote the chapter *The Elliptic Curve Method* in the *Encyclopedia of Cryptography and Security*, a collaborative work edited by Henk van Tilborg, and published by Springer [18]. He also contributed a chapter on algorithmic techniques and programmming methods in a French encyclopedia on computer science to be published by Vuibert [17].

8.5. Teaching

G. Hanrot gave three 3 hours lectures at MPRI (Master Parisien de Recherche en Informatique) about algorithmic number theory.

G. Hanrot is a member of the jury of "agrégation externe de mathématiques", a competitive exam to hire high school teachers.

9. Bibliography

Major publications by the team in recent years

[1] Y. BILU, G. HANROT, P. VOUTIER. *Existence of primitive divisors of Lucas and Lehmer sequences*, in "J. Reine Angew. Math.", vol. 539, 2001, p. 75–122.

[2] Y. BUGEAUD, G. HANROT. *Un nouveau critère pour l'équation de Catalan*, in "Mathematika", vol. 47, 2000, p. 63–73.

[3] D. DEFOUR, G. HANROT, V. LEFÈVRE, J.-M. MULLER, N. REVOL, P. ZIMMERMANN. *Proposal for a Standardization of Mathematical Function Implementation in Floating-Point Arithmetic*, in "Numerical Algorithms", vol. 37, n° 1-2, 2004, p. 367–375.

[4] L. FOUSSE, P. ZIMMERMANN. *Accurate Summation : Towards a Simpler and Formal Proof*, in "5th Conference on Real Numbers and Computers 2003 - RNC5, Lyon, France", Sept. 2003, p. 97–108.

[5] V. LEFÈVRE. *Moyens arithmétiques pour un calcul fiable*, Thèse de doctorat, École Normale Supérieure de Lyon, 2000.

[6] F. ROUILLIER, P. ZIMMERMANN. *Efficient Isolation of Polynomial Real Roots*, in "Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics", vol. 162, n° 1, 2003, p. 33-50.

[7] D. STEHLÉ, V. LEFÈVRE, P. ZIMMERMANN. *Worst Cases and Lattice Reduction*, in "16th IEEE Symposium on Computer Arithmetic 2003 - ARITH-16'03, Santiago de Compostela, Spain", Jun. 2003, p. 142-147.

Doctoral dissertations and Habilitation theses

[8] J.-P. CERRI. *Spectres euclidiens et inhomogènes des corps de nombres*, Thèse, Université Henri-Poincaré Nancy 1, 2005, http://tel.ccsd.cnrs.fr/tel-00011151.

[9] G. HANROT. *Quelques algorithmes en arithmétique*, Habilitation à diriger des recherches, Université Henri-Poincaré Nancy 1, 2005.

[10] D. STEHLÉ. *Algorithmique de la réduction de réseaux et application à la recherche de pires cas pour l'arrondi de fonctions mathématiques*, Thèse, Université Henri-Poincaré Nancy 1, 2005, http://tel.ccsd.cnrs.fr/tel-00011150.

Articles in refereed journals and book chapters

[11] R. BRENT, S. LARVALA, P. ZIMMERMANN. *A Primitive Trinomial of Degree 6972593*, in "Mathematics of Computation", vol. 74, n° 250, Mar 2005, p. 1001–1002.

[12] J.-P. CERRI. *Euclidean and inhomogeneous spectra of number fields with unit rank greater than 1*, in "J. Reine Angew. Math.", 2005.

[13] J.-P. CERRI. *Euclidean minima of totally real fields. Algorithmic determination*, in "Math. Comp.", 2005.

[14] Y. GERARD, I. DEBLED-RENNESSON, P. ZIMMERMANN. *An elementary digital plane recognition algorithm*, in "Discrete Appl. Math.", vol. 151, n° 1–3, 2005, p. 169–183.

[15] G. HANROT. *Journées X-UPS 2005*, chap. Quelques idées sur l'algorithmique des équations diophantiennes, Presses de l'École polytechnique, 2005.

[16] D. STEHLÉ, P. ZIMMERMANN, V. LEFÈVRE. *Searching Worst Cases of a One-Variable Function Using Lattice Reduction*, in "IEEE Transactions on Computers", vol. 54, n° 3, Mar 2005, p. 340-346, http://hal.inria.fr/inria-00000379.

[17] P. ZIMMERMANN. *Encyclopédie de l'informatique et des systèmes d'information*, 7 pages, chap. Techniques algorithmiques et méthodes de programmation, Vuibert, 2005, http://www.loria.fr/~zimmerma/papers/algo.pdf.

[18] P. ZIMMERMANN. *Encyclopedia of Cryptography and Security*, van Tilborg, Henk C.A. (Ed.), chap. The Elliptic Curve Method, Springer, 2005, http://hal.inria.fr/inria-00000630.

[19] P. ZIMMERMANN. *MPFR : vers un calcul flottant correct ?*, in "Interstices", 2005, http://interstices.info/display.jsp?id=c_9345.

Publications in Conferences and Workshops

[20] V. LEFÈVRE. *New Results on the Distance Between a Segment and $\mathbb{Z}^2$. Application to the Exact Rounding*, in "17th IEEE Symposium on Computer Arithmetic (Arith'17), Cape Cod, MA, USA", P. MONTUSCHI, E. SCHWARZ (editors). , IEEE Computer Society, June 2005, p. 68–75, http://hal.inria.fr/inria-00000025.

[21] P. NGUYÊN, D. STEHLÉ. *Floating-Point LLL Revisited*, in "Proceedings of Eurocrypt 2005", Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 3494, Springer-Verlag, 2005, p. 215–233.

[22] D. STEHLÉ, P. ZIMMERMANN. *Gal's Accurate Tables Method Revisited*, in "17th IEEE Symposium on Computer Arithmetic - ARITH'17, Cape Cod, MAS, USA", IEEE, Jun 2005, p. 236-257, http://hal.inria.fr/inria-00000378.

Internal Reports

[23] L. FOUSSE. *Correctly rounded Newton-Cotes Quadrature*, Research Report, n° RR-5605, Institut National de Recherche en Informatique et en Automatique, 2005, http://hal.inria.fr/inria-00000760.

[24] L. FOUSSE. *Multiple-Precision Correctly Rounded Gauss-Legendre Quadrature*, Research Report, n° RR-5705, Institut National de Recherche en Informatique et en Automatique, 2005, http://hal.inria.fr/inria-00000759.

[25] L. FOUSSE, G. HANROT, V. LEFÈVRE, P. PÉLISSIER, P. ZIMMERMANN. *MPFR: A Multiple-Precision Binary Floating-Point Library With Correct Rounding*, Research Report, n° RR-5753, INRIA, November 2005, http://www.inria.fr/rrrt/rr-5753.html.

[26] G. HANROT, G. TENENBAUM, J. WU. *Valeurs moyennes de fonctions multiplicatives sur les entiers friables, 2*, Technical report, 2005.

[27] V. LEFÈVRE. *The Euclidean Division Implemented with a Floating-Point Division and a Floor*, Research Report, n° RR-5604, INRIA, June 2005, http://hal.inria.fr/inria-00000154.

Bibliography in notes

[28] W. BOSMA (editor). *Fourth Algorithmic Number Theory Symposium, Leiden, The Netherlands*, Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci., vol. 1838, Springer–Verlag, July 2000.

[29] L. C. GUILLOU, J.-J. QUISQUATER (editors). *Advances in Cryptology – EUROCRYPT '95*, Lecture Notes

in Comput. Sci., Proc. International Conference on the Theory and Application of Cryptographic Techniques, Saint-Malo, France, vol. 921, May 1995.

[30] B. PRENEEL (editor). *Advances in Cryptology – EUROCRYPT 2000*, Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci., Proc. International Conference on the Theory and Application of Cryptographic Techniques, Brugge, Belgium, vol. 1807, Springer–Verlag, May 2000.

[31] C. D. WALTER, Ç. K. KOÇ, C. PAAR (editors). *CHES 2003*, Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci., Proc. 5th International Workshop on Cryptographic Hardward and Embedded Systems, Sep. 8–10, vol. 2779, Springer–Verlag, 2003.

[32] S. ARITA. *Algorithms for computations in Jacobians of C_{ab} curve and their application to discrete-log-based public key cryptosystems*, in "Proceedings of Conference on The Mathematics of Public Key Cryptography, Toronto, June 12–17", 1999.

[33] W. BACKES, S. WETZEL. *New Results on Lattice Basis Reduction in Practice*, in "ANTS-IV", W. BOSMA (editor). , Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci., vol. 1838, Springer–Verlag, July 2000, p. 135–152.

[34] P. BARRETT. *Implementing the Rivest Shamir and Adleman public key encryption algorithm on a standard digital signal processor*, in "Advances in Cryptology, Proceedings of Crypto'86", A. M. ODLYZKO (editor). , Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci., vol. 263, Springer–Verlag, 1987, p. 311–323.

[35] A. BASIRI, A. ENGE, J.-C. FAUGÈRE, N. GÜREL. *The arithmetic of Jacobian groups of superelliptic cubics*, To appear in Math. Comp..

[36] C. BURNIKEL, J. ZIEGLER. *Fast Recursive Division*, Research Report, n° MPI-I-98-1-022, MPI Saarbrücken, 1998, http://citeseer.ifi.unizh.ch/burnikel98fast.html.

[37] D. G. CANTOR. *Computing in the Jacobian of a hyperelliptic curve*, in "Math. Comp.", vol. 48, n° 177, 1987, p. 95–101.

[38] D. COPPERSMITH. *Finding Small Solutions to Small Degree Polynomials*, in "Proceedings of CALC'01", Lecture Notes in Computer Science, n° 2146, 2001, p. 20–31.

[39] D. COPPERSMITH. *Solving linear equations over $\mathrm{GF}(2)$ via block Wiedemann algorithm*, in "Math. Comp.", vol. 62, n° 205, 1994, p. 333–350.

[40] D. DEFOUR, G. HANROT, V. LEFÈVRE, J.-M. MULLER, N. REVOL, P. ZIMMERMANN. *Proposal for a Standardization of Mathematical Function Implementation in Floating-Point Arithmetic*, in "Numer. Algorithms", vol. 37, n° 1–4, 2004, p. 367–375.

[41] S. D. GALBRAITH, S. PAULUS, N. P. SMART. *Arithmetic on Superelliptic Curves*, in "Math. Comp.", vol. 71, n° 237, 2002, p. 393–405.

[42] P. GAUDRY. *An algorithm for solving the discrete log problem on hyperelliptic curves*, B. PRENEEL (editor). , Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci., Proc. International Conference on the Theory and Application of

Cryptographic Techniques, Brugge, Belgium, vol. 1807, Springer–Verlag, May 2000, p. 19–34.

[43] P. GAUDRY, É. SCHOST. *Cardinality of a genus 2 hyperelliptic curve over $GF(5 \cdot 10^{24}+41)$*, 2002.

[44] P. GAUDRY, E. SCHOST. *Construction of Secure Random Curves of Genus 2 over Prime Fields*, in "Advances in Cryptology – EUROCRYPT 2004", C. CACHIN, J. CAMENISCH (editors). , Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci., vol. 3027, Springer-Verlag, 2004, p. 239–256.

[45] M. HACK. *On intermediate precision required for correctly-rounding decimal-to-binary floating-point conversion*, in "Proceedings of RNC'6, Schloß Dagstuhl, Germany, November 15-17", 2004.

[46] G. HANROT, M. QUERCIA, P. ZIMMERMAN. *The middle product algorithm, I. Speeding up the division and square root of power series*, in "Appl. Algebra Engrg. Comm. Comput.", n° 14, 2004, p. 415–438.

[47] G. HANROT, P. ZIMMERMAN. *A long note on Mulders' short product*, in "J. Symbolic Comput.", n° 37, 2004, p. 391–401.

[48] R. HARASAWA, J. SUZUKI. *Fast Jacobian group arithmetic on C_{ab} curves*, in "ANTS-IV", W. BOSMA (editor). , Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci., vol. 1838, Springer–Verlag, 2000, p. 359–376.

[49] F. HESS. *Computing Riemann-Roch spaces in algebraic function fields and related topics*, in "J. Symbolic Comput.", vol. 33, 2002, p. 425–445.

[50] IEEE. *P1363: Standard specifications for public key cryptography*.

[51] H. KOY, C. P. SCHNORR. *Segment LLL-Reduction with Floating Point Orthogonalization*, in "Proceedings of CalC'01", Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci., vol. 2146, Springer–Verlag, 2001, p. 81–96.

[52] T. LANG, J.-M. MULLER. *Bounds on Runs of Zeros and Ones for Algebraic Functions*, in "Proceedings of the 15th IEEE Symposium on Computer Arithmetic", IEEE Computer Society, 2001, p. 13–20.

[53] T. LANGE. *Formulae for Arithmetic on Genus 2 Hyperelliptic Curves*, Preprint, 2003.

[54] V. LEFÈVRE, J.-M. MULLER. *Worst Cases for Correct Rounding of the Elementary Functions in Double Precision*, in "Proceedings of the 15th IEEE Symposium on Computer Arithmetic (ARITH'15)", N. BURGESS, L. CIMINIERA (editors). , IEEE Computer Society, 2001, p. 111-118.

[55] V. LEFÈVRE. *Moyens arithmétiques pour un calcul fiable*, Thèse de doctorat, École Normale Supérieure de Lyon, 2000.

[56] A. K. LENSTRA, H. W. LENSTRA, L. LOVÁSZ. *Factoring Polynomials with Rational Coefficients*, in "Mathematische Annalen", vol. 261, 1982, p. 515–534.

[57] P. L. MONTGOMERY. *A block Lanczos algorithm for finding dependencies over* $\mathrm{GF}(2)$, L. C. GUILLOU, J.-J. QUISQUATER (editors). , Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci., Proc. International Conference on the Theory and Application of Cryptographic Techniques, Saint-Malo, France, vol. 921, May 1995, p. 106–120.

[58] T. MULDERS. *On Short Multiplications and Divisions*, in "Appl. Algebra Engrg. Comm. Comput.", vol. 11, n° 1, 2000, p. 69–88.

[59] V. NECHAEV. *Complexity of a determinate algorithm for the discrete logarithm*, in "Math. Notes", vol. 55, n° 2, 1994, p. 165–172.

[60] J. PELZL, T. WOLLINGER, J. GUAJARDO, C. PAAR. *Hyperelliptic Curve Cryptosystems: Closing the Performance Gap to Elliptic Curves*, C. D. WALTER, Ç. K. KOÇ, C. PAAR (editors). , Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci., Proc. 5th International Workshop on Cryptographic Hardward and Embedded Systems, Sep. 8–10, vol. 2779, Springer–Verlag, 2003, p. 351–365.

[61] C. P. SCHNORR, M. EUCHNER. *Lattice basis reduction: improved practical algorithms and solving subset sum problems*, in "Math. Programming", vol. 66, 1994, p. 181–199.

[62] C. P. SCHNORR, M. EUCHNER. *Lattice basis reduction: improved practical algorithms and solving subset sum problems*, in "Mathematics of Programming", vol. 66, 1994, p. 181–199.

[63] C. P. SCHNORR. *Fast LLL-type lattice reduction*, in "To appear", 2005, http://www.mi.informatik.uni-frankfurt.de/research/papers.html.

[64] C. P. SCHNORR. *A more efficient algorithm for lattice basis reduction*, in "Journal of Algorithms", vol. 9, n° 1, 1988, p. 47–62.

[65] R. SCHOOF. *Elliptic curves over finite fields and the computation of square roots mod p*, in "Math. Comp.", vol. 44, 1985, p. 483–494.

[66] A. SCHÖNHAGE. *Factorization of Univariate Integer Polynomials by Diophantine Approximation and an Improved Basis Reduction Algorithm*, in "Proc. of ICALP '84", Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci., Springer–Verlag, 1984, p. 436–447.

[67] E. THOMÉ. *Computation of discrete logarithms in $\mathbb{F}_{2^{607}}$*, in "Advances in Cryptology – ASIACRYPT 2001", C. BOYD, E. DAWSON (editors). , Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci., vol. 2248, Springer–Verlag, 2001, p. 107–124.

[68] E. THOMÉ. *Discrete logarithms in $\mathrm{GF}(2^{607})$*, 2002.

[69] E. THOMÉ. *Subquadratic computation of vector generating polynomials and improvement of the block Wiedemann algorithm*, in "J. Symbolic Comput.", vol. 33, n° 5, 2002, p. 757–775.

[70] D. H. WIEDEMANN. *Solving sparse linear equations over finite fields*, in "IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory", vol. IT–32, n° 1, 1986, p. 54–62.

[71] J. VAN DER HOEVEN. *Relax, but don't be too lazy*, in "J. Symbolic Comput.", vol. 34, n° 6, 2002, p. 479–542.