<sup>1</sup> Università di Catania, <sup>2</sup> IMDEA Software Institute, <sup>3</sup> Protocol Labs.

International Conference on Practice and Theory of Public-Key Cryptography (PKC) 2020

## MonZa: fast maliciously-secure 2-party computation on the ring $\mathbb{Z}_{2^k}$

Dario Catalano<sup>1</sup>, Mario Di Raimondo<sup>1</sup>, Dario Fiore<sup>2</sup> and Irene Giacomelli<sup>3</sup>





## 2-party secure computation

### Two parties, Alice and Bob, with private inputs, a and b, want to compute c = f(a,b) without revealing extra info on the private inputs.









## 2-party secure computation

### Design an interactive protocol for Alice and Bob such that, at the end of its execution, they learn c = f(a,b) and nothing else.

### Active security: executing the protocol in presence of a maliciously party is as secure as sending inputs to a trusted party who computes and returns only the output.





## 2-party secure computation over a ring





## • <u>Common</u>: the function f is represented as

## • This work: f is represented as an arithmetic circuit over the ring $\mathbb{Z}_{2^k}$ (integers modulo 2<sup>k</sup>)

### binary circuit • circuit over a finite field

## $f: (\mathbb{Z}_{2^k})^n \times (\mathbb{Z}_{2^k})^m \rightarrow (\mathbb{Z}_{2^k})^u$



## Why focus on $\mathbb{Z}_{\gamma k}$ ?

Integer arithmetic on standard CPUs is done modulo 2<sup>k</sup> (eg, 32/64 bits), so an MPC protocol design that mirrors this can:

- reduction)

• simplify implementation (no need for modular arithmetic or to compensate modular

 use optimizations that are possible/done for CPU computations and that are often expensive to emulate modulo p.



## MPC over a ring





Cramer et al, actively-secure MPC with honest majority (black-box feasibility).

### Sharemind,

(Bogdanov et al, Araki et al. CCS2016) 3-party passively-secure protocol over  $\mathbb{Z}_{2^k}$  with 1 corruption.

### Esorics 2008

TCC 2009

### Ishai et al,

2-party activelysecure protocols (black-box feasibility & efficiency)

### SPDZ2k,

(Cramer et al, Damgård et al. S&P 2019) n-party actively-secure MPC protocol over  $\mathbb{Z}_N$  in the preprocessing model (based on OT) with dishonest majority.

**Overdrive2k** (Orsini et al) n-party actively-secure MPC protocol over  $\mathbb{Z}_{2^k}$  in the preprocessing model (based on SHE) with dishonest majority.

Crypto 2018

**CT-RSA** 2020

### Damgård et al, compiler from passive to active security for any ring. Small number of corrupted players.



## Our contribution

## MonZa



### Efficient 2-party actively-secure protocol over $\mathbb{Z}_{2^k}$ in the preprocessing model

Online phase: a la SPDZ2k

via the Joye-Libert encryption scheme

1. linearly homomorphic

2. works naturally with elements in  $\mathbb{Z}_{2^k}$  and many instances with the same

plaintext space

3. efficient: fast encryption/decryption and small rate equivalent with Paillier's scheme takes 9 to 5 ms, if exploiting CRT).

4. no need of ZK proofs of plaintext knowledge/range-proofs

Challenge: design a ZK proof of correct multiplication. Stay tuned!



### Preprocessing (new!): efficient generation of random triples and random elements

# For example, decrypting a 120-bit plaintext using a 2048-bit modulus takes 4.8 ms (the

## Everything solved? Nope...



## Our contribution

## MonZa

- Throughput:





### Efficient 2-party actively-secure protocol over $\mathbb{Z}_{2^k}$ in the preprocessing model

## Implemented in C, benchmarks on two servers Intel Xeon 8124M CPU runningat 3.0 GHz

cy (ms)	0.5 (LAN)	17 (WAN)	100 (WAN)
s/sec	19	18	17
values/sec	134	132	121

**★**Notice (computational complexity): the pre-processing phase of MonZa is asymmetric (Alice has to decrypt, but Bob uses only faster operations) MonZa can be used for applications in the server-client model, (one party has less computational power than the other one).



input bit-length = 64 computational security = 112 bits statistical security = 56 bits batch size = 1000

## SPDZ-like protocol

### • Additive secret-sharing: to hide the inputs and store the intermediate results.

## Information-theoretic MAC: to guarantee active security

## Used in the SPDZ family for computation over a field, adapted to work for computation over the ring $\mathbb{Z}_{2^k}$ by Cramer et al (Crypto 2018).

### $MAC(a) = \Delta \cdot a = m(a)_1 + m(a)_2$

 $\Delta = \Delta_1 + \Delta_2$ , global random MAC-key.

### share(a) = $(a_1, a_2)$ with $a_1 + a_2 = a_1$



## SPDZ2k - value representation

### **Key idea**: to securely compute over $\mathbb{Z}_{2^k}$ , share and authenticate over $\mathbb{Z}_{2^{k+s}}$

## $\Delta$ random value in $\mathbb{Z}_{2^s}$ (fixed for the protocol) shared as $\Delta = \Delta_1 + \Delta_2 \mod 2^{k+s}$ • a' in $\mathbb{Z}_{2^{k+s}}$ such that a' = a mod 2<sup>k</sup>, a' = $a_1$ + $a_2$ mod 2<sup>k+s</sup>, m(a)<sub>1</sub> + m(a)<sub>2</sub> = $\Delta \cdot a'$ mod 2<sup>k+s</sup>





MAC key share:  $\Delta_1$  (fixed) shares:  $a_1 + b_1$ MAC shares:  $m(a)_1 + m(b)_1$ 

## SPDZ2k - online phase

### Both the MAC and the secret-sharing scheme are homomorphic, so linear operations can be easily computed with no interaction!

Compute a + b mod 2<sup>k</sup>:









Multiplication is harder, it needs a random triple: x, y and z random elements (in shared & authenticated form) such that  $z = x \cdot y$ Given a triple, computing a  $\cdot$  b mod 2<sup>k</sup> can be done using Beaver's formula:  $a \cdot b = (a+x) \cdot (b+y) + (a+x) \cdot y + (b+y) \cdot y + z$ 

## SPDZ2k - online phase

operations can be easily computed with no interaction!

Compute a + b mod 2<sup>k</sup>:



## Both the MAC and the secret-sharing scheme are homomorphic, so linear

opened values

## Preprocessing model

### Random triples (and other correlated randomness) are created during a preprocessing phase (no inputs).







## Triple construction

- 1. Take x and y at random (easy, each party choses its share at random)  $x = x_1 + x_2 \mod 2^{k+s}$ ,  $y = y_1 + y_2 \mod 2^{k+s}$ and <u>compute</u> shares of MAC(x) =  $\Delta \cdot x \mod 2^{k+s}$  and MAC(y) =  $\Delta \cdot y \mod 2^{k+s}$ 2. <u>Compute</u> the shares of  $z = x \cdot y \mod 2^{k+s}$

- 3. <u>Compute</u> the shares of MAC(z) =  $\Delta \cdot z \mod 2^{k+s}$



## For all <u>compute</u>, we need a protocol for multiplying two secret values!



## Multiplication of secret values

### 1) Linearly-homomorphic encryption (e.g., BeDOZa, Overdrive) ZK proofs of plaintext knowledge (and range-proofs) • ZK proofs of correct multiplication (BeDOZa) or "SPDZ-sacrifice"

### 2) Somewhat homomorphic encryption (e.g., SPDZ, Overdrive2k) • ZK proofs of plaintext knowledge (and plaintext range) Relatively expensive computation, RAM-intense

## 3) **Oblivious transfer** (e.g., Mascot, SPDZ2k)

- Cheap computation with OT extension, but bandwidth intense
- Need to mitigate selective failure

# Our approach Use Joye-Libert (JL) scheme! (linearly-homomorphic encryption)

# • The message space is $\mathbb{Z}_{2^n}$ $(\mathbb{Z}_N)^*$ and whose Jacobi symbol is 1

• To encrypt  $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{2^n}$ , choose a random  $x \in (\mathbb{Z}_N)^*$  and set  $C = g^m \cdot x^{2^n} \mod N$ 

 $Jac_N(g) = Leg_p(g) \times Leg_q(g) = (g^{(p-1)/2} \mod p) \times (g^{(q-1)/2} \mod q)$ 

## • The public key is (N, g), where N = pq and g is an element of maximal order in











**Security for Alice**: Bob needs to prove that the ciphertext C is computed in the correct way via a ZK proof  $\pi$  proving C = y·A + Enc<sub>pk1</sub>(r) and B = Enc<sub>pk2</sub>(y) (y and r private inputs).

### **Security for Bob**: easy!

## Challenge: Design $\pi$ , the ZK proof for correct multiplication with JL!



### No such protocol exists for JL !

- possible)
- the message space not being a field (or  $\mathbb{Z}_{pq}$ ).

Overdrive's approach needs an encryption with enhanced CPA (i.e., non-linear operations on ciphertexts are not

Standard Schnorr-like protocol techniques do not work due to

In  $\mathbb{Z}_{2^n}$  there are several and efficiently-findable **noninvertible** elements, so novel techniques needed to prove soundness!

## Goal: ZK-proof for correct multiplication with JL scheme

**Bob's witness:** messages y and r in  $\mathbb{Z}_{2^n}$ Public inputs: ciphertexts A, B and C <u>Statement</u>:  $C = y \cdot A + Enc_{pk1}(r)$  and  $B = Enc_{pk2}(y)$ 

For the sake of simplicity, in this talk I'll focus on: ZK-proof of knowledge for a JL plaint text

Public inputs: ciphertext C <u>Statement</u>: C = Enc(m)

<u>Bob's witness</u>: messages m in  $\mathbb{Z}_{2^n}$ 









## ZK-proof for JL scheme

- **Bob's witness:** messages m in  $\mathbb{Z}_{2^n}$
- Public inputs: ciphertext C
- <u>Statement</u>:  $C = Enc(m) = g^m \cdot x^{2^n} \mod N$



### A Schnorr-like protocol goes like this:



Soundness: if Bob can answer to two challenges  $e \neq e'$ , then m is computed as  $m = (z - z') \cdot (e - e')^{-1} \mod 2^{n}$ .

<u>Solution</u>: we show that g.c.d.(e - e',  $2^n$ ) =  $2^t$  for some t  $\leq s < n$ and how to extract n-s bits of the message m.

to prove over  $\mathbb{Z}_{2^n}$  we need to work with JL with a larger message space,  $\mathbb{Z}_{2^{n+s}}$ ! This is not an efficiency problem, ciphertext length stays the same!

## ZK-proof for JL scheme

<u>Problem</u>: in  $\mathbb{Z}_{2^n}$  the value e - e' \neq 0 can be non invertible!





## **Conclusion**:



## Triple construction – all together

- Notice:

Parties have MAC-key shares,  $\Delta_1$  and  $\Delta_2$  and input shares  $x = x_1 + x_2 \mod 2^n$ ,  $y = y_1 + y_2 \mod 2^n$ 

1. Run Mult( $\Delta_i, x_{3-i}$ ) and Mult( $\Delta_i, y_{3-i}$ ) with i=1,2 to compute MAC(x) and MAC(y) 2. Run Mult( $x_1, y_2$ ) and Mult( $x_2, y_1$ ) to compute  $z_1 + z_2 = x \cdot y \mod 2^n$ 3. Run Mult( $\Delta_i, z_{3-i}$ ) with i=1,2 to compute MAC(z)

(variant of the ZK proof of correct multiplication) • "SPDZ sacrifice" is not needed!

## • we need two extra ZK proofs to prove that a party uses the correct value in step 3



## Bandwidth

k = bit size of the inputs s = stat. security parameter N = ciphertext bit length

1 triple = 78 N + 18 (k+2s) bits sent between Alice and Bob (reduced to 56 N + 18 (k+2s) using the random-oracle)

				$\mathbf{SPD}\mathbb{Z}_{2^k}$		$\mathbf{Mon}\mathbb{Z}_{2^k}\mathbf{a}\ \mathbf{base}$		$\mathbf{Mon}\mathbb{Z}_{2^k}\mathbf{a}$ optim.	
$S \mid$	N	k	s	triple	input	triple	input	triple	input
80		32	32	79.87	3.17	81.60	9.41	59.07	6.34
	1024	64	40	177.41	5.90	82.46	9.50	59.94	6.43
		128	40	362.75	8.53	94.22	10.86	68.70	7.38
112		32	32	79.87	3.17	161.47	18.62	116.42	12.48
	2048	64	56	267.52	10.03	162.91	18.78	117.86	12.64
		128	56	487.68	13.68	164.06	18.91	119.01	12.77
128	3072	32	32	79.87	3.17	241.34	27.84	173.76	18.62
		64	64	319.49	12.48	243.07	28.03	175.49	18.82
		128	64	557.06	16.64	244.22	28.16	176.64	18.94

(S: comp. sec. level; N: JL-schemes modulus; k: message bit-length; s: stat. sec. level) Cost in kbit

### For example, for 80-bit computational security and s = 40, < 70 kbit for a triple in Z2^128.

## Future work

- Extension to n parties
- Design batch verifications for the ZK-proofs of correct multiplication

# • Exploit JL unique properties to design sub-protocols (e.g., secure comparison)

## Thanks for the attention!



### https://eprint.iacr.org/2019/211