High-precision RNS-CKKS on small word-size architecture

Duhyeong Kim, Intel Labs FHE.org Meetup Jan 11th, 2024

Notices and Disclaimers

© Intel Corporation. Intel, the Intel logo, and other Intel marks are trademarks of Intel Corporation or its subsidiaries. Other names and brands may be claimed as the property of others.

Performance varies by use, configuration and other factors. Learn more at www.Intel.com/PerformanceIndex. Performance results are based on testing as of dates shown in configurations and may not reflect all publicly available updates. See backup for configuration details. No product or component can be absolutely secure.

* Other names, logos and brands used throughout this presentation may be claimed as the property of others.

* This research was, in part, funded by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) through contract HR0011-21-3-0003. The views, opinions, and findings expressed are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as representing the official views or policies of the Department of Defense or the U.S. Government. Distribution Statement 'A' (Approved for Public Release, Distribution Unlimited).

Overview

- Enable high-precision RNS-CKKS on fixed but smaller word-size architectures
 - Single scaling → Composite scaling
- Enable functionally correct CKKS composite scaling in two open-source libraries
 - OpenFHE: C++, enabled by Intel labs
 - Lattigo: Go, enabled by Seoul National University (SNU)
- Demonstrate with secure parameters the **equivalence** between single and composite scaling
 - 7-layer CNN Inference with longitudinal packing in OpenFHE-CKKS with composite scaling
 - 7-layer CNN Inference with multiplexed packing in Lattigo-CKKS with composite scaling
 - Logistic Regression Training in OpenFHE-CKKS with composite scaling

Fully Homomorphic Encryption (FHE)

Any computation on encrypted data "without decryption process"



CKKS: FHE for real-number arithmetic

How can we think of the "approximate" computation in CKKS?

- Imitation of "fixed-point" arithmetic in cleartext version
- Example: computation of $1.584 \times 2.4835 \times 9.5937 \times 8.7264 \times 6.12743$ (≈ 2017.9897)



CKKS: FHE for real-number arithmetic

How can we think of the "approximate" computation in CKKS?

- Imitation of "fixed-point" arithmetic in cleartext version
- Example: computation of $1.584 \times 2.4835 \times 9.5937 \times 8.7264 \times 6.12743$ (≈ 2017.9897)



Scaling Factor in CKKS

- Determine the "initial precision bits" under the decimal point
- CKKS Encoding/Encryption results in



- Larger Δ , start with higher precision
- Smaller Δ , start with lower precision

Scaling Factor in CKKS

- Exponential growth of Scaling Factor $\succ (\Delta \cdot m) \cdot (\Delta \cdot m') = \Delta^2 \cdot mm'$ $\succ (\Delta^{2^k} \cdot m) \cdot (\Delta^{2^k} \cdot m') = \Delta^{2^{k+1}} \cdot mm'$
- How to control the growth of scaling factor?

"rescale"

• Rescale(*ct*): *ct* mod $\Delta^{\ell} \mapsto \left[\frac{ct}{\Delta}\right] \mod \Delta^{\ell-1}$ (from the context of "original" CKKS) $\gg (\Delta \cdot m) \cdot (\Delta \cdot m') = \Delta^2 \cdot mm' \xrightarrow{\text{Rescale } (1/\Delta)} \Delta \cdot mm'$

- RNS-CKKS
 - > An efficient way to implement CKKS w/o big-number arithmetic
 - \succ Ctxt moduli $Q_{\ell} = q_0 q_1 \cdots q_{\ell}$ for level ℓ (instead of modulo Δ^{ℓ})

 $\operatorname{RNS}_{Q_\ell}(x) \coloneqq (x \mod q_0, x \mod q_1, \dots, x \mod q_\ell)$

- Rescale modulo Q_{ℓ} in RNS?
 - > No efficient way to compute $\mathbf{x} \mapsto \left| \frac{1}{\Delta} \cdot \mathbf{x} \right|$
 - > Instead, we can efficiently compute $\mathbf{x} \mapsto \left| \frac{1}{q_{\ell}} \cdot \mathbf{x} \right|$

$$\circ \left[\frac{1}{q_{\ell}} \cdot x\right] = q_{\ell}^{-1} \cdot (x - x \mod q_{\ell})$$

- \circ Easy to obtain the RNS representation of $x \mod q_\ell$
 - $\operatorname{RNS}_{Q_{\ell-1}}(x \mod q_{\ell}) = (x \mod q_{\ell}, x \mod q_{\ell}, \dots, x \mod q_{\ell})$

- Case 1: $\log \Delta < \text{word-size}$
 - \succ Set each prime q_{ℓ} to be $\log \Delta$ bits
 - Perform the "single scaling"

$$\mathbf{x} \mod Q_{\ell} \mapsto \left[\frac{\mathbf{1}}{\boldsymbol{q}_{\ell}} \cdot \boldsymbol{x} \right] \mod Q_{\ell-1}$$

- Case 2: $\log \Delta$ > word-size
 - Set each product of q_ℓ 's to be $\log \Delta$ bits
 - Perform the "composite scaling"

- Case 1: $\log \Delta < \text{word-size}$
 - \succ Set each prime q_{ℓ} to be $\log \Delta$ bits
 - Perform the "single scaling"

$$\mathbf{x} \mod Q_{\ell} \mapsto \left[\frac{\mathbf{1}}{\boldsymbol{q}_{\ell}} \cdot \boldsymbol{x} \right] \mod Q_{\ell-1}$$

- Case 2: $\log \Delta$ > word-size
 - Set each product of q_ℓ 's to be $\log \Delta$ bits
 - Perform the "composite scaling" (degree = 2)

$$\mathbf{x} \mod Q_{\ell} \mapsto \left[\frac{\mathbf{1}}{\boldsymbol{q}_{\ell} \boldsymbol{q}_{\ell-1}} \cdot \mathbf{x} \right] \mod Q_{\ell-2}$$

- Case 1: $\log \Delta < \text{word-size}$
 - \succ Set each prime q_{ℓ} to be $\log \Delta$ bits
 - Perform the "single scaling"

$$\mathbf{x} \mod Q_{\ell} \mapsto \left[\frac{\mathbf{1}}{\boldsymbol{q}_{\ell}} \cdot \boldsymbol{x} \right] \mod Q_{\ell-1}$$

• Case 2: $\log \Delta$ > word-size

- Set each product of q_ℓ 's to be $\log \Delta$ bits
- Perform the "composite scaling" (degree = 3)

$$\mathbf{x} \mod Q_{\ell} \mapsto \left[\frac{1}{q_{\ell} q_{\ell-1} q_{\ell-2}} \cdot \mathbf{x} \right] \mod Q_{\ell-3}$$

- Case 1: $\log \Delta < \text{word-size}$
 - \succ Set each prime q_{ℓ} to be $\log \Delta$ bits
 - Perform the "single scaling"

$$\mathbf{x} \mod Q_{\ell} \mapsto \left[\frac{\mathbf{1}}{\boldsymbol{q}_{\ell}} \cdot \boldsymbol{x} \right] \mod Q_{\ell-1}$$

- Case 2: $\log \Delta$ > word-size
 - Set each product of q_ℓ 's to be $\log \Delta$ bits
 - Perform the "composite scaling" (degree = t)

$$\mathbf{x} \mod Q_{\ell} \mapsto \left[\frac{1}{q_{\ell} \cdots q_{\ell-t+1}} \cdot \mathbf{x} \right] \mod Q_{\ell-t}$$

Examples

 $\geq \log \Delta = 30$, word-size = 64: single scaling

 $\geq \log \Delta = 30$, word-size = 32: single scaling

 $\geq \log \Delta = 50$, word-size = 64: single scaling

 $\geq \log \Delta = 50$, word-size = 32: composite scaling

 $\geq \log \Delta = 70$, word-size = 64: composite scaling

 $\geq \log \Delta = 70$, word-size = 32: composite scaling

:

(double-prime) (double-prime) (triple-prime)

Precision Issue due to Rescale

- Original CKKS: NO precision issue
 - \succ Scaling factor is **ALWAYS** preserved as Δ
- RNS-CKKS: **YES** precision issue
 - Scaling factor is **NOT** be preserved as Δ \circ Division by q_{ℓ} 's, instead of Δ $\circ \Delta^2/q_{\ell} \neq \Delta$
 - Critical Impact to Homomorphic Addition
 Enc($\Delta \cdot m$) + Enc($\Delta' \cdot m'$) = Enc($\Delta \cdot (m + \Delta' / \Delta \cdot m')$) \neq Enc($\Delta \cdot (m + m')$)
 The ratio Δ' / Δ (≠ 1) directly harms the precision

Precision Issue due to Rescale

• Solution 1: Choose the primes properly

- \succ To keep the scaling factors (not equal but) very close to Δ
- Single Scaling
 - \circ Requirement: $oldsymbol{q}_\ell \simeq oldsymbol{\Delta}$ (proposed in original RNS-CKKS)
 - $\circ \ \Delta^2/q_\ell \ \simeq \Delta$
- Composite Scaling
 - \circ Requirement: $q_{\ell}q_{\ell-1} \simeq \Delta$
 - $\circ \ \Delta^2/q_\ell q_{\ell-1} \simeq \Delta$

> Precision (Single Scaling v.s. Composite Scaling)

- NO Difference in Mult + Relin + Rescale
- **Closeness** of q_ℓ (resp. $q_\ell q_{\ell-1}$) and ∆ affects the **Add Precision**

Precision Issue due to Rescale

• Solution 2: Exact Scaling

- Differences v.s. Solution 1
 - \circ Scaling factor Δ_i for each level i
 - $\circ \Delta_i$'s are **NOT** required to be very close to Δ
 - \circ Adjust the ciphertext scaling factors to Δ_i before Add and Mult
 - As a result, we "always" add two ciphertexts with "same" scaling factors
- Precision (Single Scaling v.s. Composite Scaling)
 - NO Difference in Mult + Relin + Rescale
 - NO Difference in Add
- We implemented 32-bit RNS-CKKS in OpenFHE and Lattigo with Solution 2
 - "FLEXIBLEAUTO" mode in OpenFHE
 - Bootstrapping enabled in both libraries

Theoretical Analysis on Precision

Rescale(ct):
$$ct \mod Q_i \mapsto \left\lfloor \frac{1}{q_i} \cdot ct \right\rfloor \mod Q_{i-1}$$
(single scaling)Rescale(t)(ct): $ct \mod Q_i \mapsto \left\lfloor \frac{1}{q_i q_{i-1} \cdots q_{i-t+1}} \cdot ct \right\rfloor \mod Q_{i-t}$ (composite scaling)

Theorem. Let B_{rs} , B_{comp-} be the upper bounds of the error induced by $\text{Rescale}(\cdot)$ and $\text{Rescale}^{(t)}(\cdot)$, respectively. Then, it holds that

$$B_{comp-rs} \le \left(\frac{1}{q_i q_{i-1} \cdots q_{i-t+1}} + \frac{1}{q_i q_{i-1} \cdots q_{i-t+2}} + \dots + \frac{1}{q_i} + 1\right) B_{rs} \approx \left(\frac{1}{q_i} + 1\right) B_{rs}$$

Hence, composite scaling results in less than $\log\left(\frac{1}{q_i}+1\right) \approx \frac{3.322}{q_i}$ bit **precision loss**, which is **negligible**, compared to single scaling.

Experimental Results

7-layer CNN Inference (CIFAR-10)

- Implementation in OpenFHE with longitudinal packing
 - Unit tests with Same Precision

Unit	t tests	Precision bits 64-bit single scaling	Precision bits 32-bit composite scaling	=======ParametersRing dimension: 65536Scaling factor: 258
Fully co	onnected	39	39	• Same for both cases
R	eLU	40	40	Primes
Mea	n pool	41	41	 (29, 29)-bit primes for 32-bit case
Conv	olution	39	39	 Double-prime scaling 58 = 29 + 29
Bootst	rapping	12	12	Security

• Same for both cases

- Implementation in Lattigo with multiplexed packing
 - > The end-to-end CNN Inference results match up to 5 digits after the decimal point
 - 14 consecutive bootstrapping (2 per layer, before and after ReLU)

Experimental Results

Logistic Regression Training

- Reference code: <u>https://github.com/openfheorg/openfhe-logreg-training-examples</u>
- 1 bootstrapping per epoch



Train	Losses	VS.	Epoc	hes	Taken
II GIIII	203303		LPOCI	100	I GINGII

======================================					
Ring dimension	: 32768				

Scaling factor		or		: 2 ⁵⁸	
	-	~			

Same for both cases

Primes

- 58-bit primes for 64-bit case
- (29, 29)-bit primes for 32-bit case
 - Double-prime scaling
 - > 58 = 29 + 29

Security

• Same for both cases

Bootstrapping

Same for both cases

Wrap-up

- **Result:** Enable high-precision RNS-CKKS on small word-size architectures without multi-precision arithmetic
 - Use of small word-size: GPU, FPGA, Embedded devices, etc.
 - Arbitrary precision for bootstrapping combined with Meta-BTS
- Limitation: Choice of scaling factor
 - Lower bound exists on each prime (NTT condition)
 - E.g., $\Delta = 2^{40} \rightarrow$ two 20-bit primes for double-prime scaling
 - How many 20-bit "NTT-friendly" primes exist for the dimension $N = 2^{16}$?
 - Several small intervals that are not usable as scaling factor
- Implementation: Not public yet but planning for open-sourcing compositescaling variant of OpenFHE-CKKS



https://eprint.iacr.org/2023/1462