

# RSA<sup>®</sup>Conference2019

San Francisco | March 4–8 | Moscone Center



**BETTER.**

SESSION ID: CRYPT-09

## Efficient Function-Hiding Functional Encryption: From Inner-Products to Orthogonality

### Authors:

Manuel Barbosa, Dario Catalano, Azam Soleimani, and Bogdan Warinschi

Corresponding author [Azam.Soleimani@ens.fr](mailto:Azam.Soleimani@ens.fr)

#RSAC

# Motivations: Functional Encryption for Orthogonality (OFE)

- Privacy-preserving role-based access control
- Keyword search over encrypted data



**Access** iff  $\langle r_f, r_u \rangle \neq 0$   
 where  $\langle r_f, r_u \rangle = \sigma \sum_i r_f^i r_u^i$



No information about  $r_f$  or  $\langle r_f, r_u \rangle$  when  $\langle r_f, r_u \rangle \neq 0$

**RSA**Conference2019

# Functional Encryption for Orthogonality



# Functional Encryption (for $F: X \times Y \rightarrow Z$ )

$$Setup(1^\lambda) \rightarrow (msk, mpk)$$

$$Enc(mp_k, x) \rightarrow ct$$

$$KeyGen(msk, y) \rightarrow sk$$

$$Dec(ct, sk)$$

## Inner-Product (IPFE)

$$F(x, y) = \langle x, y \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i$$

$$F(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \langle x, y \rangle = 0 \\ 0 & \text{othw} \end{cases}$$

## Orthogonality (OFE)

$$r \cdot \langle X, Y \rangle$$



# From IPFE to OFE

Randomization + function-hiding



## Algorithm (FH-OFE from FH-IPFE)

$\text{FE}^*. \text{KeyGen}(\text{msk}, \mathbf{y})$

$r_y \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_q$

$\mathbf{y}^* \leftarrow r_y \cdot \mathbf{y}$

$\text{sk}_y \leftarrow \text{FE}. \text{KeyGen}(\text{msk}, \mathbf{y}^*)$

Return  $\text{sk}_y$

$\text{FE}^*. \text{Enc}(\text{msk}, \mathbf{x})$

$\text{ct} \leftarrow \text{FE}. \text{Enc}(\text{msk}, \mathbf{x})$

Return  $\text{ct}$

$\text{FE}^*. \text{Dec}(\text{ct}, \text{sk}_y)$

$v \leftarrow \text{FE}. \text{Dec}(\text{ct}, \text{sk})$

If  $v = 0$  return 1

Else return 0

**FH-OFE**

- no information about  $\mathbf{x}$
- no information about  $\mathbf{y}$
- no information about  $\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle$  when  $\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle \neq 0$

- 
- The diagram illustrates the interaction between an **Adversary  $\mathcal{A}$**  and a **Challenger** in a security game. The Adversary is represented by a box on the left, and the Challenger by a box on the right. Arrows indicate the flow of information between them.
- Challenger's Initial Setup:** The Challenger performs  $\text{Setup}(1^\lambda) \rightarrow (\text{msk}, \text{mpk})$ . The master secret key  $\text{msk}$  is kept private, while the master public key  $\text{mpk}$  is sent to the Adversary (indicated by a green arrow).
  - Adversary's First Query:** The Adversary sends a pair of inputs  $x_0, x_1$  to the Challenger (blue arrow).
  - Challenger's Response:** The Challenger samples a bit  $b \leftarrow \{0, 1\}$  and returns the ciphertext  $ct_b = \text{Enc}(\text{mpk}, x_b)$  to the Adversary (blue arrow).
  - Adversary's Second Query:** The Adversary sends a pair of inputs  $y_0, y_1$  to the Challenger (red arrow).
  - Challenger's Response:** The Challenger samples a bit  $b$  and returns the secret key  $sk_b = \text{Gen}(\text{msk}, y_b)$  to the Adversary (red arrow).
  - Adversary's Third Query:** The Adversary sends another pair of inputs (blue arrow).
  - Challenger's Response:** The Challenger returns a ciphertext (blue arrow).
  - Adversary's Fourth Query:** The Adversary sends a pair of inputs (red arrow).
  - Challenger's Response:** The Challenger returns a secret key (red arrow).
  - Adversary's Fifth Query:** The Adversary sends a pair of inputs (blue arrow).
  - Challenger's Response:** The Challenger returns a ciphertext (blue arrow).
  - Adversary's Final Query:** The Adversary sends a pair of inputs  $b'$  to the Challenger (blue arrow).

## Selective vs. Adaptive

# Coming back to the construction

## Algorithm (FH-OFE from FH-IPFE)

$\text{FE}^*. \text{KeyGen}(\text{msk}, \mathbf{y})$

$r_y \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_q$

$\mathbf{y}^* \leftarrow r_y \cdot \mathbf{y}$

$\text{sk}_y \leftarrow \text{FE}. \text{KeyGen}(\text{msk}, \mathbf{y}^*)$

*Return*  $\text{sk}_y$

$\text{FE}^*. \text{Enc}(\text{msk}, \mathbf{x})$

$\text{ct} \leftarrow \text{FE}. \text{Enc}(\text{msk}, \mathbf{x})$

*Return*  $\text{ct}$

$\text{FE}^*. \text{Dec}(\text{ct}, \text{sk}_y)$

$v \leftarrow \text{FE}. \text{Dec}(\text{ct}, \text{sk})$

*If*  $v = 0$  *return* 1

*Else return* 0

Security level: one-selective

**RSA**Conference2019

# Going to Many-Adaptive security

**FH-OFE in Generic Group Model**



# FH-OFE in generic group model (GGM)

- Group Operations in GGM
  - Encoding
  - Add
  - Pair
  - Zero-test
- Pros and Cons with GGM?
  - Oracle access to group operations
  - non-generic attacks can be inefficient
  - Flexibility to present efficient constructions
  - Preventing **many-ciphertext** attacks

# FH-OFE in GGM

❖ FH-IPFE by Kim et al. SCN 2018

## Algorithm (FH-OFE in GGM)

- $\text{Setup}(1^\lambda) \rightarrow \text{msk}$   
where  $(\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}^*)$ ,  $\mathbf{B} \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}^{n \times n}$ , and  $\mathbf{B}^* = \det(\mathbf{B}) \cdot (\mathbf{B}^{-1})^T$
- $\text{Enc}(\text{msk}, \mathbf{x}) \rightarrow \text{ct}$  where  $\text{ct} = [\beta \cdot \mathbf{x} \cdot {}^T \mathbf{B}^*]_2$
- $\text{KeyGen}(\text{msk}, \mathbf{y}) \rightarrow \text{sk}_y$  where  $\text{sk}_y = [\alpha \cdot \mathbf{y}^T \cdot \mathbf{B}]_1$
- $\text{Dec}(\text{ct}, \text{sk}) \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^n e(\text{sk}[i], \text{ct}[i])$

Security Level: many-Adaptive

**RSA**Conference2019

## **FH-OFE in Standard Model**



# FH-OFE in standard model (SM)

❖ FH-IPFE by Lin CRYPTO 2017

$$\text{KeyGen}(\text{Enc}_{\text{mpk}}(\mathbf{x}))$$

$$\text{Enc}(\text{KeyGen}_{\text{msk}}(\mathbf{y}))$$

- General Construction by Lin
  - Requirements on the underlying scheme
  - Adding multi-linearity
  - Selective results in selective
  - Instantiation: scheme of Abdalla et al. PKC 2015



# FH-OFE in standard model (SM)

## Algorithm (FH-OFE in SM)

- $\text{Setup}(1^\lambda, 1^n)$ :  
 $(\text{msk}_1, \text{mpk}_1) \leftarrow \Gamma_1.\text{Setup}(1^\lambda, 1^n)$  and  
 $(\text{msk}_2, \text{mpk}_2) \leftarrow \Gamma_2.\text{Setup}(1^\lambda, 1^{n+1})$ .  
*output*  $k = (\text{msk}; \text{mpk}) = (\text{msk}_1, \text{msk}_2; \text{mpk}_1, \text{mpk}_2)$
- $\text{Enc}(k, \mathbf{x})$ :  
 $[\text{ct}]_1 = \Gamma_1.\text{Enc}(\text{mpk}_1, \mathbf{x})$  where  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ , set  
 $[\text{wCT}]_1 = \Gamma_2.\text{KeyGen}(\text{msk}_2, \boxed{\text{ct}})$
- $\text{KeyGen}(k, \mathbf{y})$ :  
 $[\text{sk}]_2 = \Gamma_1.\text{KeyGen}(\text{msk}_1, \mathbf{y})$  where  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ , set  
 $[\text{wSK}]_2 = \Gamma_2.\text{Enc}(\text{mpk}_2, \boxed{\text{sk}})$
- $\text{Dec}(\text{wSK}, \text{wCT})$ :  $\Gamma_2.\text{Dec}([\text{wSK}]_2, [\text{wCT}]_1)$

Security level: Depends on the underlying  
 scheme

# Instantiation: Wee's Scheme TCC 2017

## Algorithm

$\text{Setup}(1^\lambda):$ $\mathbf{A} \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}^{k+1 \times k}$ <i>For</i> $i \in [n]:$ $\mathbf{W}_i \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}^{k+1 \times k+1}$ $\text{msk} \leftarrow (\mathbf{A}, \{\mathbf{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n)$ $\text{mpk} \leftarrow ([\mathbf{A}^\top]_1, \{[\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{W}_i]_1\}_{i=1}^n)$ <i>Return</i> $(\text{msk}, \text{mpk})$	$\text{Enc}(\text{mpk}, \mathbf{x}):$ $\mathbf{s} \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}^k$ $\mathbf{U} \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}^{k+1 \times k+1}$ $\mathbf{M}_0 \leftarrow \mathbf{s}^\top \mathbf{A}^\top$ $\text{ct} \leftarrow [\mathbf{M}_0    \{\mathbf{M}_0(\mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{U} + \mathbf{W}_i)\}_{i=1}^n]_1$ <i>Return</i> $\text{ct}$
$\text{KeyGen}(\text{msk}, \mathbf{y}):$ $\mathbf{r} \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}^{k+1}$ $\text{sk} \leftarrow [-\sum_{i=0}^n \mathbf{y}_i \mathbf{W}_i \mathbf{r}    \{\mathbf{y}_i \mathbf{r}\}_{i=1}^n]_2$ <i>Return</i> $\text{sk}$	$\text{Dec}(\text{sk}, \text{ct}):$ <i>Return</i> $\langle \text{ct}, \text{sk} \rangle = \mathbf{1}$

- Instantiation: Harder but possible
  - Matrix scales
  - MDDH assumption
  - Many-Selective secure

# From Selective to Adaptive in SM

## Complexity Leveraging (CL)

- Converting selective security to adaptive security
- Losing a factor of security (is it tolerable?)

- CL on the general construction
  - Security loss:  $q^\tau$  where  $\tau = 2n(q_e + q_k)$  **Not tolerable, So?**
- CL on underlying schemes?
  - Security loss:  $q^{2n}$  **Tolerable if  $n$  is small enough**



# Implementation

Timing values in milliseconds

	GGM			SM		
N	Extract	Encrypt	Decrypt	Extract	Encrypt	Decrypt
16	6	2	10	36	15	60
32	12	4	19	71	28	116
64	22	9	37	139	60	231
128	46	20	73	270	112	463
256	100	44	155	558	229	968

Lengths in Kilobytes

	GGM		SM	
N	Keys	Cph	Keys	Cph
16	0,99	0,50	6,34	3,18
32	1,99	1,00	12,30	6,16
64	3,98	1,99	24,23	12,14
128	7,95	3,98	48,09	24,09
256	15,91	7,97	95,81	48,00



# Implementation

- MacBook Pro, 2.9 GHz Intel Core i5, RAM 16 GB
- C++
  - SCIPR Lab's library for finite fields and elliptic curves (libff)
    - Curve: BN128 (BN254)
  - Shoup's Number Theory Library (NTL)
  - GNU Multiprecision Library (GMP)

[www.shoup.net/ntl/](http://www.shoup.net/ntl/)

[www.gmplib.org](http://www.gmplib.org)

[www.github.com/scipr-lab/libff](https://www.github.com/scipr-lab/libff)

[www.github.com/zcash/zcash/issues/2502](https://www.github.com/zcash/zcash/issues/2502)



# Comparison

Scheme	GGM	SM	Shen et al.	Kawai et al.
security	full	full*	selective	full
group order	prime	prime	composite	prime
assumption	GGM	MDDH, DDH	C3DH, DLIN	DLIN
key size	$n$	$6n + 6$	$4n + 4$	$6n$
ciphertext size	$n$	$6n + 6$	$4n + 4$	$6n$
key extraction	$n$	$12n + 9$	$32n + 4$	$6n$
encryption	$n$	$12n + 9$	$24n + 16$	$6n$
decryption	$n$	$6n + 6$	$4n + 4$	$6n$

# Applications

- Privacy-preserving subset relation
  - Sorting algorithm
  - Searchable encryption
- Range queries
- Access Control

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \boxed{B \subseteq A} \\
 \text{mRep}(A) := \begin{cases} x_i = 1 & \text{if } u_i \in A, 1 \leq i \leq n \\ x_i = 0 & \text{if } u_i \notin A, 1 \leq i \leq n \\ x_{n+1} = -1 \end{cases} \\
 \text{kRep}(B) := \begin{cases} y_i = 1 & \text{if } u_i \in B, 1 \leq i \leq n \\ y_i = 0 & \text{if } u_i \notin B, 1 \leq i \leq n \\ y_{n+1} = |B| \end{cases} \\
 B \subseteq A \quad \text{iff} \quad \langle \text{mRep}(A), \text{kRep}(B) \rangle = 0
 \end{array}$$

# References

- Abdalla, M., Bourse, F., Caro, A.D., Pointcheval, D.: Simple functional encryption schemes for inner products. Public-Key Cryptography - PKC 2015.
- Kawai, Y., Takashima, K.: Predicate- and attribute-hiding inner product encryption in a public key setting. Pairing 2013, Revised
- Kim, S., Lewi, K., Mandal, A., Montgomery, H.W., Roy, A., Wu, D.J.: Function hiding inner product encryption is practical. SCN 2018
- Lin, H.: Indistinguishability obfuscation from SXDH on 5-linear maps and locality-5 prgs. Advances in Cryptology - CRYPTO 2017.
- Shen, E., Shi, E., Waters, B.: Predicate privacy in encryption systems. Theory of Cryptography - TCC 2009. Proceedings, pp. 457–473 (2009)
- Wee, H.: Attribute-hiding predicate encryption in bilinear groups, revisited. TCC 2017.



# RSA<sup>®</sup>Conference2019

## Summery:

- Functional encryption for orthogonality
- Function-hiding property
- IPFE + Randomization + function hiding  $\rightarrow$  one-selective FH-OFE
- FH-OFE in GGM with many-adaptive security is possible
- Wee's OFE + Lin's Transformation  $\rightarrow$  many-selective-secure FH-OFE
- CL on Wee's OFE+ hybrid +Lin's transformation  $\rightarrow$  many-adaptive-secure FH-OFE
- FH-OFE  $\rightarrow$  privacy-preserving subset relation

Thanks