

Confidential Transactions

Theory Justification

Iftach Haitner*

August 5, 2025

Abstract

[Iftach's Note: **TODO**]

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Preliminaries	2
2.1	Notation	2
2.2	Homomorphic Encryption	2
3	The Confidential Transaction Protocols	2
3.1	The Ideal Functionality	2
3.2	The Protocol	3
3.2.1	Security of Protocol 3.2	6
4	The ElGammal-Based Additive Homomorphic Encryption	6
4.1	ElGammal In-the-Exponent Scheme	6
4.2	The Scheme	7
4.3	Proofs	7
4.4	Adjusting Section 3.2	8

*Stellar Development Foundation. E-mail: iftach.haitner@stellar.org.

1 Introduction

[Iftach's Note: TODO]

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Notation

We use calligraphic letters to denote sets, uppercase for random variables, and lowercase for integers and functions. Let \mathbb{N} denote the set of natural numbers. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $(n) := \{0, \dots, n\}$. For a relation \mathcal{R} , let $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{R})$ denote its underlying language, i.e., $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{R}) := \{x : \exists w : (x, w) \in \mathcal{R}\}$.

2.2 Homomorphic Encryption

An homomorphic encryption is a triplet $(\text{KeyGen}, \text{Enc}, \text{Dec})$ of efficient algorithms, with the standard correctness and semantic security properties. In addition, there is addition operation denote $+$ over any two (valid) ciphertexts such that for any validly generated public key pk and valid ciphertexts x_0, x_1 , it holds that $\text{Enc}_{sk}(x_0) + \text{Enc}_{pk}(x_1) \in \text{Supp}(\text{Enc}_{sk}(x_0 + x_1 \bmod q))$, where $q \in \mathbb{N}$ is efficiently determined by pk .

[Iftach's Note: Do we really need the homomorphic properties or only for the proofs?]

3 The Confidential Transaction Protocols

3.1 The Ideal Functionality

Functionality 3.1 ($\mathcal{F}_{\text{ConfTrans}}$: Confidential transactions).

Parties: Issuer I , chain holder C and users U_1, \dots, U_n .

Parameters: $p_{\text{num}}, p_{\text{size}} \in \mathbb{N}$.

Init. Upon receiving `init` from all parties:

1. For each $i \in [n]$: $\text{avlBalance}_i, \text{pndBalance}_i \leftarrow 0$, $\text{transnum}_i \leftarrow 0$, and $\text{log}_i \leftarrow \emptyset$.
2. $\text{log} \leftarrow \emptyset$.

Issue. Upon receiving $(\text{sid}, \text{issue}, x, d)$ from C and I :

1. $\text{Assert}(x \in (p_{\text{num}}), \text{transnum} \leq p_{\text{size}} \text{ and } d \in [n])$.
2. transnum^{++} .
3. $\text{pndBalance}_d += x$.
4. Set $\text{log} \cup = (\text{sid}, \text{issue}, x, d)$.

Transfer. Upon receiving $(\text{sid}, \text{transfer}, d)$ from C and U_s , with U_s using private input x .

1. Assert($x \in (p_{\text{num}})$, $\text{transnum} \leq p_{\text{size}}$, $\text{avlBalance}_s \geq x$ and $d \in [n]$).
2. transnum^{++} .
3. $\text{avlBalance}_s -= x$.
4. $\text{pndBalance}_d \cup = x$.
5. Set $\log_d \cup = (\text{sid}, \text{transfer}, s, x)$
6. Set $\log \cup = (\text{sid}, \text{transfer}, s, d)$

Rollover. Upon receiving $(\text{sid}, \text{rollover})$ from party U_i and C, party C

1. $\text{transnum} \leftarrow 0$.
2. Set $\text{avlBalance}_i += \text{pndBalance}_i$.
3. Set $\text{pndBalance}_i \leftarrow 0$.
4. Set $\log \cup = (\text{sid}, \text{rollover}, i)$

Withdraw. Upon receiving $(\text{sid}, \text{withdraw}, x)$ from party U_i and C, party C

1. Assert($x \in \mathbb{N}$, $\text{avlBalance}_i \geq x$ and $i \in [n]$).
2. $\text{avlBalance}_i -= x$.
3. Set $\log \cup = (\text{sid}, \text{withdraw}, i, x)$

History. Upon receiving $(\text{sid}, \text{history})$ from party P_i and C:

Send (\log, \log_i) to P_i .

Audit. [Iftach's Note: Later]

3.2 The Protocol

Throughout, we fix a security parameter κ and omit it from the notation. We also fix an homomorphic encryption scheme $(\text{KeyGen}, \text{Enc}, \text{Dec})$ over \mathbb{Z}_q with randomness domain \mathcal{D} . We require that $\text{Dec}_{sk}(\bar{A})$ outputs $(a; r)$ such that $\bar{A} = \text{Enc}(a; r)$.

Protocol 3.2 ($\Pi_{\text{ConfTrans}}$: Confidential transactions).

Parties: Issuer I, chain-holder C and users U_1, \dots, U_n .

Subprotocols: See below.

Init. We use POK for the relation:

Key generation: $\mathcal{R}_{\text{KeyGen}} = \{(pk, w) : \text{KeyGen}(w) = (\cdot, pk)\}$.

Protocol 3.3 ($\Pi_{\text{ConfTrans-Init}}$).

Participating parties. All parties.

Proofs: $\Pi_{\mathcal{R}_{\text{KeyGen}}}^{\text{ZK-POK}}$.

Algorithms: **KeyGen**.

Operation:

1. P_i , for all $i \in [n]$:
 - (a) Set $(pk_i, sk_i) \xleftarrow{R} \text{KeyGen}(r_i)$ for $r_i \xleftarrow{R} \mathcal{D}$.
 - (b) Store sk_i .
 - (c) Let $\pi_i \xleftarrow{R} \Pi_{\mathcal{R}_{\text{KeyGen}}}^{\text{ZK-POK}}(pk_i, r_i)$.
 - (d) Send (pk_i, π_i) to C .
2. C :
 - (a) Call $\{V_{\mathcal{R}_{\text{KeyGen}}}^{\text{ZK-POK}}(pk_i, \pi_i)\}_{i \in [n]}$. Abort and publish i , if the i^{th} proof is not verified.
 - (b) Store $\{pk_i\}_{i \in [n]}$.
3. C :
 - (a) Broadcast $\{\bar{P}_i \leftarrow 0, \bar{P}_i \xleftarrow{R} \text{Enc}_{pk_i}(0), \bar{B}_i \leftarrow \emptyset\}_{i \in [n]}$.
 - (b) Broadcast $\log \leftarrow \emptyset$.

Issue.

Protocol 3.4 ($\Pi_{\text{ConfTrans.Issue}}$).

Participating parties. I and C .

C 's input. $\text{sid}, x \in \mathbb{N}$ and $i \in [n]$.

Operation:

1. I : Send (x, i) to C .
2. C :
 - (a) Assert($x \in [p_{\text{size}}]$ and $\bar{P}_i \leq p_{\text{size}}$)
 - (b) Set $\bar{P}_i += \text{Enc}_{pk_i}(x)$.
 - (c) Publish $\log \cup = (\text{sid}, \text{issue}, x, i, \bar{P}_i)$.

Transfer. We use proof and POK for the following relations:

In range. $\mathcal{R}_{\text{rp}} = \{((pk, A), (a, r)) : \text{Enc}_{pk}(a; r) = A \wedge a \in [p_{\text{size}}]\}$, i.e., encryption of values in $[p_{\text{size}}]$.

Equality. $\mathcal{R}_{\text{eq}} = \{((pk^0, pk^1, A^0, A^1), (a, r^0, r^1)) : \forall i \in \{0, 1\} \text{Enc}_{pk^i}(a; r^i) = A^i\}$, i.e., encryptions of the same pair under different public keys.

Larger than. $\mathcal{R}_{\text{lrger}} = \{((pk, A^0, A^1), (a^0, r^0, a^1, r^1)) : \forall i \in \{0, 1\} \text{ Enc}_{pk}(a^i; r^i) = A^i \wedge a^1 - a^0 \in [q]\}$,
i.e., encryptions of the pair of values (a_0, a_1) , under the same public key, with $a_1 \geq a_0$.

Protocol 3.5 ($\Pi_{\text{ConfTrans} \cdot \text{Transfer}}$).

Participating parties: P_s and C .

Proofs: $\Pi_{\mathcal{R}_{rp}}^{\text{ZK}}, \Pi_{\mathcal{R}_{eq}}^{\text{ZK}}, \Pi_{\mathcal{R}_{lrger}}^{\text{ZK}}$

Algorithms: Dec.

Common input: $d \in [n]$.

P_s 's private input. $x \in \mathbb{N}$.

Operation:

1. P_s :

- (a) $X_d \xleftarrow{R} \text{Enc}_{pk_d}(x; r)$ for $r^d \xleftarrow{R} \mathcal{D}$.
- (b) $\pi^{rp} \xleftarrow{R} \Pi_{\mathcal{R}_{rp}}^{\text{ZK}}((pk_d, X_s, p_{\text{size}}), (x, r))$.
- (c) $X_s \xleftarrow{R} \text{Enc}_{pk_s}(x; r)$ for $r^s \xleftarrow{R} \mathcal{D}$.
- (d) $\pi^{eq} \xleftarrow{R} \Pi_{\mathcal{R}_{eq}}^{\text{ZK}}((pk_s, pk_d, X_s, X_s), (x, r_s, r_d))$.
- (e) $(b, r^b) \leftarrow \text{Dec}_{sk_s}(\overline{B}_s)$.
- (f) $\pi^{lrger} \xleftarrow{R} \Pi_{\mathcal{R}_{lrger}}^{\text{ZK}}((pk_s, X_s, \overline{B}_s), (x, r_s, r_b))$.
- (g) Send $(X_s, X_d, \pi^{rp}, \pi^{eq}, \pi^{lrger})$ to C .

2. C :

- (a) Call $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}_{rp}}^{\text{ZK-POK}}((pk_d, X_s, p_{\text{size}}), \pi^{rp})$,
 $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}_{eq}}^{\text{ZK-POK}}((pk_s, pk_d, X_s, X_s), \pi^{eq})$ and $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}_{lrger}}^{\text{ZK-POK}}((pk_s, X_s, \overline{B}_s), \pi^{lrger})$.
- (b) Set $U_s \leftarrow X_s$.
- (c) Set $\overline{P}_d \leftarrow X_d$.
- (d) Publish $\log \cup = (\text{sid}, \text{transfer}, s, d, U_s, \overline{P}_d)$.

Rollover.

Protocol 3.6 ($\Pi_{\text{ConfTrans} \cdot \text{Rollover}}$).

Participating parties. P_i and C .

Operation:

C :

- 1. $\overline{B}_i \leftarrow oP_i$.

2. $\bar{P}_i \leftarrow \bar{P}_i$.
3. $\log \leftarrow (\text{sid}, \text{rollover}, i, \bar{B}_i, \bar{P}_i)$

History.

Protocol 3.7 ($\Pi_{\text{ConfTrans.History}}$).

Participating parties. P_i and C .

Operation: C : send \log to P_i .

Audit. [Iftach's Note: TODO]

3.2.1 Security of Protocol 3.2

Theorem 3.8 (Security of Protocol 3.2). [Iftach's Note: TODO]

4 The ElGammal-Based Additive Homomorphic Encryption

In this section we define the (efficient) additive homomorphic encryption scheme based on ElGammal multiplicative homomorphic encryption scheme. [Iftach's Note: give citations]

The idea is to bootstrap the so-called *ElGammal in-the exponent* additive homomorphic encryption scheme,¹ which in turn is based on the ElGammal multiplicative homomorphic encryption scheme, that lacks efficient decryption algorithm, by splitting the plain text into small “chunks”. That is, we present message $m \in \mathbb{Z}_t$ as

$\sum_{i \in (t/c)} 2^{ic} \cdot m_i$, where c , the chunk size, is some integer that divides $[t]$, and encrypt using additive homomorphic EG each of the m_i . To decrypt $\bar{M} = (M_0, \dots, M_{t/c})$, one

1. Decrypt each M_i to get $m_i \cdot G$.
2. Use brute force to find m .²
3. Reconstruct m .

4.1 ElGammal In-the-Exponent Scheme

Throughout we fix a cyclic additive q -size group \mathcal{G} with generator G . The ElGammal in-the-exponent scheme ($\text{EgGen}, \text{EgEnc}, \text{EgDec}$) is define as follows:

Key generation: $\text{EgGen}()$ samples $e \xleftarrow{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{Z}_q$, and outputs $(e, e \cdot G)$.

Encryption: $\text{EgEnc}_E(m)$ samples $e \xleftarrow{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{Z}_q$, and outputs $\tilde{M} \leftarrow (r \cdot G, r \cdot E + m \cdot G)$

¹It is called ElGamal “in-the-exponent” due to typical multiplicative group notation. Here use additive group notation, but keep the name for historical reason.

²One can use standard processing to speed-up this part from c group operations to \sqrt{c} operations, or even [Iftach's Note: cite] to $\sqrt[3]{c}$.

Decription: $\text{EgDec}_e(\widetilde{M})$,

1. Let $M \leftarrow \widetilde{M}_2 - e \cdot \widetilde{M}_2$.
2. Find (using brute force) m so that $m \cdot G = M$.
3. Output m .

4.2 The Scheme

In the following we fix $t, c \in \mathbb{N}$ with $t \leq q$ and $\ell \leftarrow t/c \in \mathbb{N}$. The encryption scheme $(\text{KeyGen}, \text{Enc}, \text{Dec})$ is defined as follows:

Key generation: $\text{KeyGen}()$: act as $\text{EgGen}()$.

Encryption: $\text{Enc}_{\text{pk}}(m)$

1. Compute $m_0, \dots, m_{\ell-1}$ do that $m = \sum_{i \in (\ell)} 2^{ic} \cdot m_i$.
2. For each $i \in (\ell)$: let $\widetilde{M}_i \xleftarrow{\text{R}} \text{EgEnc}_{\text{pk}}(m_i)$.
3. Output $\overline{M} \leftarrow (\widetilde{M}_0, \dots, \widetilde{M}_{\ell-1})$.

Decription: $\text{EgDec}_{\text{sk}}(\overline{M})$

1. For each $i \in (\ell)$: let $m_i \xleftarrow{\text{R}} \text{EgDec}_{\text{sk}}(\overline{M}_i)$.
2. Let $m \leftarrow \sum_{i \in (\ell)} 2^{ic} \cdot m_i$.
3. Output m .

4.3 Proofs

Knowledge of secret key.

Task: ZKPOK for $\mathcal{R}_{\text{KeyGen}} = \{(pk, w) : \text{KeyGen}(w) = (\cdot, pk)\}$.

Proof: Apply the (standard) ElGammal POK for the secret key relation.

Knowledge of plain text.

Task: ZKPOK for $\mathcal{R}_{\text{enc}} = \{((pk, A), (a, r)) : \text{Enc}_{pk}(a; r) = A\}$.

Proof: On plaintext \overline{A} , for each \overline{A}_i apply the standard EG POK for the ciphertxts relation.

Decryptability.

Task: ZKP for $\mathcal{R}_{\text{dec}} = \{((pk, \overline{A}), (\overline{a}, \overline{w})) : \forall i \in (\ell) \text{EgEnc}_{\text{pk}}(\overline{a}_i; \overline{r}_i) = \overline{A}_i \wedge \overline{w}_i \in (2^c)\}$.

Proof: On plaintext \overline{A} , for each \overline{A}_i : apply EG range proof to show that th encrypted plaintext is in (2^c) .

Equality.

Task: ZKP for $\mathcal{R}_{\text{eq}} = \{((pk^0, pk^1, A^0, A^1), (a, r^0, r^1)) : \forall i \in \{0, 1\} \text{ Enc}_{pk^i}(a; r^i) = A^i\}$.

Proof: On input $(pk^0, pk^1, \bar{A}^0, \bar{A}^1, a, \bar{r}_0, \bar{r}_1)$

1. For both $j \in \{0, 1\}$:
 - (a) Let $a \leftarrow \sum_i 2^c \cdot a_i$

Task: ZK for $\mathcal{R}_{\text{rp}} = \{((pk, A), (a, r)) : \text{Enc}_{pk}(a; r) = A \wedge a \in [p_{\text{size}}]\}$.

Proof: On public key sk , for each $i \in [\ell]$ apply the (standard) ElGamal ZKP for the secret key relation.

Larger than.

Task: POK for $\mathcal{R}_{\text{lrger}} = \{((pk, A^0, A^1), (a^0, r^0, a^1, r^1)) : \forall i \in \{0, 1\} \text{ Enc}_{pk}(a^i; r^i) = A^i \wedge a^1 - a^0 \in [q]\}$.

Proof:

4.4 Adjusting Section 3.2