

Security: "unauthorized set of shares leaks no info

Idea: Define 2 libraries, same interface
Interface should let caller see un authorized set of shares
only diff between (ibs is choice of m

which set of shares?
which m to secret-share?

I the set of shares?

which m to secret-share?

choose!

Def: SSS is secure if

Query
$$(m_L, m_R, U)$$
:

| Guery (m_L, m_R, U) :
| if $|U| \ge t$: about
| $\vec{S} \leftarrow Share(m_L)$
| return $(si)_{i \in U}$

| $\vec{S} \leftarrow Share(m_R)$
| return $(si)_{i \in U}$

| $\vec{S} \leftarrow Share(m_R)$
| $\vec{S} \leftarrow$

an unauthorized set of shares

Note: example: 5-out-of-8 555 (t=5)Adv can ask for U with $|U| \le 4$ but Adv can ask for users 1, ..., 4 in one call 5, ..., 8 in another

=> 2 calls to Share (rand.algo) give independent sets of shares, no reason for the 2 sets of shares to be correlated Simple Construction: (2-out-of-2 SSS) {1} unauthorized => S, alone: no info m $\{2\}$ unauth. \Rightarrow S_2 alone: no if o $\{1,2\}$ auth. \Rightarrow S_1,S_2 together: reveal midea: in one-time pad: key by itself: indep. of ptxt ctx+ by itself: indep. of ptxt key, ctxt together: Dec to learn ptxt [see supplementary slides] Q: What about 3-out-of-3? n-out-of-n? $M \stackrel{\text{31}}{\rightleftharpoons}$ where $S_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus S_n = m$ $S_{n} \leftarrow \{0,1\}^{l}$ $S_{2} \leftarrow \{0,1\}^{l}$ $S_{n-1} \leftarrow \{0,1\}^{l}$ $S_{n-1} \leftarrow \{0,1\}^{l}$ $S_{n} = m \oplus S_{n} \oplus \cdots \oplus S_{n-1}$