

# Wen Taproot?!

What do we need to get full advantage of the Taproot-enabled features?

Leonardo Comandini – leonardocomandini@gmail.com

Satoshi Spritz – Conio

February, 2023



## About me

- ▶ PoliMi, math engineering, quantitative finance
- ▶ Eternity Wall, OpenTimestamps
- ▶ Blockstream, Green Wallet, Liquid Network

# Presentation Structure

- ▶ What is Taproot
- ▶ Schnorr
- ▶ MAST
- ▶ Elliptic Curve Commitments (Taproot)
- ▶ Why Taproot
- ▶ Taproot Timeline
- ▶ State of the Art
- ▶ Wen (spend from) Taproot?!
- ▶ Taproot Cosigner
- ▶ Demo
- ▶ Conclusions

# What is Taproot

A Bitcoin Soft-Fork that enabled:

- ▶ Schnorr
- ▶ MAST
- ▶ Elliptic Curve Commitments (Taproot)

(and more...)

# Schnorr Signature Algorithm

$$sig = (R, s) \quad (1)$$

where

$$s = r + h(R, P, m)x \quad (2)$$

Verify if

$$sG == R + h(P, R, m)P \quad (3)$$

- ▶ Linearity
- ▶ Key/signature aggregation (MuSig, MuSig2, FROST, ROAST, ...)
- ▶ Security proof
- ▶ Adaptor signatures (DLC)
- ▶ and more...

# MAST (Merkalized Abstract Syntax Trees)

- ▶ Unbalanced Merkle tree
- ▶ Commit to an arbitrary set of scripts
- ▶ To prove the commitment, only a single script can be revealed

Benefits:

- ▶ Efficiency
- ▶ Privacy

# Elliptic Curve Commitments (Taproot)

An elliptic curve point (a public key) can commit to some arbitrary data while still be used for its original purpose (e.g. signing).

$$Q = P + h(P||c)G \quad (4)$$

$$y = x + h(P||c) \quad (5)$$

- ▶ Key tweaking
- ▶ Pay-to-contract, tweak an output public key
- ▶ Sign-to-contract, tweak the nonce in the signature

# Taproot

Taproot = schnorr + MAST + elliptic curve commitment

- ▶  $\{P_i\}_{i=1..m}$  set of keys
- ▶  $\{s_i\}_{i=1..n}$  set of scripts (spending conditions)
- ▶  $P = \text{AggKey}(\{P_i\}_{i=1..m})$  internal key
- ▶  $c = \text{MAST}(\{s_i\}_{i=1..n})$  Merkle root committing to the set of scripts
- ▶  $Q = P + h(P||c)G$  tweaked key

Ways of spending:

- ▶ **Key Path Spend:** produce a Schnorr signature for  $Q$
- ▶ **Script Path Spend:** choose a script committed to  $c$ , prove its commitment and satisfy the script conditions



# Why Taproot

## Efficiency and Privacy

- ▶ Can commit to complex spending conditions with no extra cost (bandwidth and fee)
- ▶ Do not need to reveal those spending conditions if spending using another path
- ▶ If spending with key path (cheaper), single sig, multi sig and wallets with complex spending conditions all look the same, **larger anonymity set**

# Taproot Timeline

- ▶ Schnorr signature paper, 1989
- ▶ Schnorr signature patent expired, Feb 2008
- ▶ MAST discussed, 2013 (BIP 114, 116, 117, 341)
- ▶ Taproot Mailing list announce, Jan 2018
- ▶ MuSig, 2018 - fixed 2019
- ▶ MuSig2, 2020
- ▶ Taproot activation, Nov 2021 (BIP 340, 341, 342, 343)

# State of the Art

- ▶ Taproot support in Bitcoin Core, rust-bitcoin, BDK etc
- ▶ MuSig (n-of-n, 3 rounds)
- ▶ MuSig-DN (n-of-n, 2 rounds, ZK proofs)
- ▶ Musig2 (n-of-n, 2 rounds)
- ▶ FROST (t-of-n)
- ▶ ROAST (t-of-n, robust and asynchronous)
- ▶ Support for MuSig2 in  
<https://github.com/BlockstreamResearch/secp256k1-zkp>

## Wen (spend from) Taproot?!

- ▶ Multisig wallets have incentives to use taproot (less fees)
- ▶ Once multisig wallets use taproot, single sig wallets can use taproot and join the anonymity set of multisig users
- ▶ Aggregated signatures are easy to verify but complex to produce
- ▶ Parties need to run a protocol to produce such signatures in which they mutually distrust

So let's start with a simple yet useful case.

# Taproot Cosigner

- ▶ 2of2 between a Server and a Client
- ▶ Server is always online and ~always cosigns
- ▶ Client can choose the script path spending conditions

E.g.

- ▶  $P = \text{AggKey}(P_c, P_s)$
- ▶  $s = \text{and}(P_c, \text{after}(144 * 60\text{blocks}))$
- ▶  $c = \text{MAST}(s)$
- ▶  $Q = P + h(P|c)G$

# Demo

- ▶ Start the Cosigning Server using `taproot-cosigner-fun`  
(rocket + secp256kfun + BDK)
- ▶ Get the Server xpub
- ▶ Create a Taproot descriptor with an aggregated key between the Server and the Client
- ▶ Generate an address and send some funds to it
- ▶ Create a transaction spending those funds
- ▶ Ask the Server to cosign the transaction
- ▶ Partially signs the transaction with the Client key
- ▶ Client aggregates the signatures
- ▶ Finalize and broadcast the transaction

# Conclusions

- ▶ Taproot makes privacy more convenient (!)
- ▶ Multisig wallets should lead in Taproot adoption
- ▶ Signature aggregation protocols are complex to put into production

# Resources

- ▶ taproot-cosigner-fun,  
<https://github.com/LeoComandini/taproot-cosigner-fun>
- ▶ secp256kfun, which includes a Rust implementation of MuSig2 and Frost,  
<https://github.com/LLFourn/secp256kfun>
- ▶ MuSig2, <https://eprint.iacr.org/2020/1261.pdf>
- ▶ Notes on the musig module API in secp256k1-zkp,  
<https://github.com/BlockstreamResearch/secp256k1-zkp/blob/master/src/modules/musig/musig.md>