

Lecture Notes 20:

Fully Homomorphic Encryption

Reading.

- Barak–Brakerski blog post:
<http://windowsonthetheory.org/2012/05/01/the-swiss-army-knife-of-cryptography/>
- Gentry–Sahai–Waters paper §1

1 Homomorphic Encryption

- Example: textbook RSA encryption
 - $[\text{Enc}_{N,e}(m_1) \cdot \text{Enc}_{N,e}(m_2) \bmod N] = \text{Enc}_{N,e}([m_1 \cdot m_2 \bmod N])$
 - Can multiply encrypted messages without decrypting!
 - Previously discussed as a vulnerability in textbook RSA signatures; here we will see this as a useful feature.
- Informally, we want to say that a (public-key) encryption scheme with message space \mathcal{M}_{pk} and ciphertext space \mathcal{C}_{pk} is *homomorphic* with respect to $f : \mathcal{M}_{pk}^k \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{pk}$ if there is a PPT algorithm $\text{Eval}_{pk}^f : \mathcal{C}_{pk}^k \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{pk}$ such that if c_1, \dots, c_k are encryptions of messages m_1, \dots, m_k , then $f(c_1, \dots, c_k)$ is an encryption of $f(m_1, \dots, m_k)$.
- Above can be formalized in several ways for probabilistic encryption:
 - **Strongly Homomorphic:** For every $c_1 \in \text{Enc}_{pk}(m_1), \dots, c_k \in \text{Enc}_{pk}(m_k)$, $\text{Eval}_{pk}^f(c_1, \dots, c_k)$ is identically distributed to $\text{Enc}_{pk}(f(m_1, \dots, m_k))$, where these are random variables taken over the coin tosses of Eval and Enc , respectively.
 - * has “rerandomization” built in
 - **Weakly Homomorphic:** For every $m_1, \dots, m_k \in \mathcal{M}_{pk}$, $\text{Dec}_{sk}(\text{Eval}_{pk}^f(\text{Enc}_{pk}(m_1), \dots, \text{Enc}_{pk}(m_k))) = f(m_1, \dots, m_k)$ with probability $1 - \text{neg}(n)$ over coins of Enc and Eval .
 - * has limited usability. why?
 - * trivial construction:
 - * can rule out trivial construction by requiring ciphertext to be *compact* — not grow with homomorphic evaluation.

- Existing constructions of *fully* homomorphic encryption schemes achieve properties somewhere between the above two definitions.
- Some probabilistic encryption schemes that are strongly homomorphic and are CPA-secure under standard crypto assumptions:
 - El Gamal: homomorphic wrt multiplication in \mathbb{Z}_p^*
 - Goldwasser–Micali (KL1e §11.1, PS10): homomorphic wrt XOR
 - Paillier (KL1e §11.3): homomorphic wrt addition in \mathbb{Z}_N
- Already these single-operation homomorphic properties are very useful in the construction of cryptographic protocols such as electronic voting (see KL2e §14.2) and private information retrieval (PS 10).
- NB: homomorphic encryption schemes *cannot* be chosen-ciphertext secure.

2 Fully Homomorphic Encryption

- What if we had an encryption scheme that is homomorphic with respect to *both* addition and multiplication?
 - \Rightarrow also homomorphic wrt boolean AND, OR, and NOT (for messages in $\{0,1\}$):
 - * $\text{Eval}_{pk}^{\text{NOT}}(c) =$
 - * $\text{Eval}_{pk}^{\text{AND}}(c_1, c_2) =$
 - \Rightarrow homomorphic wrt to any boolean *circuit* C
 - * A boolean circuit $C : \{0,1\}^k \rightarrow \{0,1\}$ computes on boolean inputs by sequence of AND, OR, and NOT gates).
 - * $\text{Eval}^C(c_1, \dots, c_k)$ can take C as an input and runs in time $\text{poly}(|C|, n)$, where $|C|$ is the number of gates in C and n the security parameter.
 - \Rightarrow homomorphic wrt any polynomial-time algorithm $A : \{0,1\}^* \rightarrow \{0,1\}$
 - * Given an algorithm $A : \{0,1\}^* \rightarrow \{0,1\}$ that runs in time $t(k)$ on inputs of length k , can construct in time $\text{poly}(t(k), k)$ a boolean circuit $C : \{0,1\}^k \rightarrow \{0,1\}$ that computes the same function as A , restricted to inputs of length k .
 - * $\text{Eval}_{pk}^{A,t(k)}(c_1, \dots, c_k)$ runs in time $\text{poly}(|A|, k, n, t(k))$, where $|A|$ is the length of the program A .
- An encryption scheme satisfying the above properties is called *fully homomorphic*.
 - Idea first proposed in 1978.
 - First candidate construction 2009 (Gentry).
- Canonical Application: cloud computing with privacy
 - B wants to use a cloud provider A to store and compute on his files m_1, \dots, m_k
 - Worried about privacy, B uploads only encrypted files $c_1 = \text{Enc}_{pk}(m_1), \dots, c_k = \text{Enc}_{pk}(m_k)$ and his public key pk .
 - Later when B wants to run a program F on his files, he sends F and the runtime t of F to A .

- A computes $\text{Eval}_{pk}^{F,t}(c_1, \dots, c_k)$ and sends B the result c .
- B decrypts c to obtain $\text{Dec}_{sk}(c) = F(m_1, \dots, m_k)$.

3 Sketch of GSW Construction

- First attempt:
 - Secret key is a vector $v \in \mathbb{Z}_q^n$.
 - Ciphertexts are $n \times n$ matrices C over \mathbb{Z}_q , where q is a $\text{poly}(n)$ -bit prime, such that $Cv = \mu v$ (matrix-vector product modulo q) for some $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}_q$. μ is the message encrypted by C .
 - $\text{Eval}^+(C_1, C_2) = C_1 + C_2$ (componentwise addition).
 - $\text{Eval}^\times(C_1, C_2) = C_1 C_2$ (matrix multiplication).
 - Why is this insecure?
- Fix:
 - Cv is only approximately equal to v , i.e. $\|Cv - v\|$ is small.
 - Solving noisy linear systems conjectured to be hard (and in fact can even be proven to be *average-case hard* based on a *worst-case* assumption about the hardness of estimating the length of the shortest vector in high-dimensional lattices).
 - How to decrypt?
 - Problem: homomorphic evaluation increases noise
 - * Can only do a bounded number of homomorphic operations.
 - * Many beautiful ideas go into controlling the noise blow-up and “bootstrapping” such a scheme to allow an unbounded number of homomorphic evaluations.
 - See GSW paper for more details (including proof of security).