

Franchised Quantum Money

Bhaskar Roberts¹ and Mark Zhandry^{2,3}

¹ UC Berkeley, ² Princeton University, ³ NTT Research

Asiacrypt 2021

Quantum Money

- Cash (physical money) should be:
 - ▶ Unclonable
 - ▶ Locally verifiable - no communication with the bank during verification
- Classical digital currency cannot be unclonable
- No-cloning theorem suggests unclonability may be possible
- *Public key quantum money* (PKQM)
 - ▶ Unclonable quantum banknotes
 - ▶ Can be verified locally with a public key

Other Unclonable Primitives

- Other unclonable primitives include:
 - ▶ Copy protection
 - ▶ Copy detection and secure software leasing
 - ▶ Unclonable signature tokens
- The proposed constructions of these primitives are often based on proposals for quantum money [BS17; Aar+20; KNY21]

Approaches to PK Quantum Money

- There are many proposals for quantum money
- [AC12; Zha19] uses quantum-secure iO

Franchised Quantum Money

- *Public key quantum money* (PKQM) - Banknotes are verified with a single public key.
- *Franchised quantum money* (FQM) - Each verifier gets a unique secret key.
 - ▶ The adversary doesn't know the verifier's key, so it's harder to trick the verifier

Applications

- Money
- Secure software leasing
- Other unclonable primitives in the franchised model?

Public Key Quantum Money

Syntax

- $Setup(1^\lambda) \rightarrow pk, sk$
- $Mint(sk) \rightarrow | \$ \rangle$
- $Ver(pk, | \$ \rangle) \rightarrow b, | \$' \rangle$

PKQM from iO

- Computations are done over \mathbb{Z}_2^n , an n -dimensional finite vector space.
- Secret key: sk is a random subspace A such that $\dim(A) = \dim(A^\perp) = n/2$
- Banknote: $|\$\rangle \propto \sum_{x \in A} |x\rangle$
- Public key: $pk = (O_A, O_{A^\perp})$, a pair of oracles deciding membership in A and A^\perp .
 - ▶ The oracles are obfuscated using quantum-secure iO.

PKQM from iO

Ver:

- 1 Check that $O_A(|\$\rangle)$ passes.
- 2 Take the quantum Fourier transform: $|\$\rangle \rightarrow |\tilde{\$}\rangle$
 - ▶ A valid banknote becomes $|\tilde{\$}\rangle \propto \sum_{y \in A^\perp} |y\rangle$
- 3 Check that $O_{A^\perp}(|\tilde{\$}\rangle)$ passes.

FQM Construction (simplified)

- Master secret key: a random subspace A
- Banknote: $|\$\rangle \propto \sum_{x \in A} |x\rangle$
- Verification key:
 - ▶ Let $V \leq A$ be a random subspace of dimension $\Theta(\sqrt{n})$.
 - ▶ Let $W \leq A^\perp$ be a random subspace of dimension $\Theta(\sqrt{n})$.
 - ▶ $vk = (O_{W^\perp}, O_{V^\perp})$
 - ▶ O_{W^\perp} and O_{V^\perp} do not need to be obfuscated

FQM Construction (simplified)

Ver:

- 1 Check that $O_{W^\perp}(|\$\rangle)$ passes.
- 2 Take the quantum Fourier transform of the banknote.
- 3 Check that $O_{V^\perp}(|\tilde{\$}\rangle)$ passes.

Collusion Bound

- If $\omega(\sqrt{n})$ verifiers collude, they can learn the entire subspace, with high probability.
- Then they can create counterfeit banknotes.
- We require a collusion bound: no more than $C = O(\sqrt{n})$ verifiers can collude.
- Future work aims to improve or eliminate the collusion bound.

Security

We prove security against two kinds of attacks:

- 1 *Counterfeiting*: The adversary gets n banknotes and produces $n + 1$ states that pass verification
- 2 *Sabotage*: adversary introduces error into a banknote so that one user accepts it but another user rejects it
 - ▶ Does not require that the adversary can counterfeit

Security Proof

- *Full verifier*: the verification key is (O_A, O_{A^\perp})
 - ▶ Equivalent to [AC12]'s construction of PKQM
- *Franchised verifier*: the verification key is $(O_{W^\perp}, O_{V^\perp})$, for random subspaces $V \leq A$ and $W \leq A^\perp$

Security Proof

- Main Lemma: the adversary can't distinguish whether they're interacting with full or franchised verifiers
 - ▶ Proof based on the adversary method
 - ▶ O_{W^\perp} and O_{V^\perp} each accept a negligible fraction of \mathbb{Z}_2^n

Security Proof

[AC12]'s construction is secure against counterfeiting and sabotage, so our FQM construction is as well

Future Work

- Improve the collusion bound.
 - ▶ For any $poly(\lambda)$ collusion bound C , there should be an efficient FQM scheme (polynomial size and runtime) that is secure against C colluding adversaries.
 - ▶ Perhaps techniques from traitor tracing will help [GKW18]

References I

- [Aar+20] Scott Aaronson, Jiahui Liu, Qipeng Liu, Mark Zhandry, and Ruizhe Zhang. *New Approaches for Quantum Copy-Protection*. 2020. arXiv: 2004.09674 [cs.CR].
- [AC12] Scott Aaronson and Paul Christiano. “Quantum Money from Hidden Subspaces”. In: *Proceedings of the Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing* (Mar. 2012). DOI: 10.1145/2213977.2213983.
- [BS17] Shalev Ben-David and Or Sattath. *Quantum Tokens for Digital Signatures*. 2017. arXiv: 1609.09047 [quant-ph].
- [GKW18] Rishab Goyal, Venkata Koppula, and Brent Waters. “Collusion Resistant Traitor Tracing from Learning with Errors”. In: *Proceedings of the 50th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*. STOC 2018. Los Angeles, CA, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2018, pp. 660–670.

References II

- [KNY21] Fuyuki Kitagawa, Ryo Nishimaki, and Takashi Yamakawa. *Secure Software Leasing from Standard Assumptions*. 2021. arXiv: 2010.11186 [quant-ph].
- [Zha19] Mark Zhandry. “Quantum Lightning Never Strikes the Same State Twice”. In: *Advances in Cryptology – EUROCRYPT 2019*. Ed. by Yuval Ishai and Vincent Rijmen. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2019, pp. 408–438. ISBN: 978-3-030-17659-4.