Adaptively Secure Computation For RAM Programs

Laasya Bangalore, Rafail Ostrovsky, Oxana Poburinnaya, and

Muthuramkrishnan Venkitasubramaniam







Our Result in a Nutshell

We construct a <u>communication-efficient</u>

Only depends on the RAM

constant-round 2PC protocol with full adaptive security under minimal assumptions.

Secure Multiparty Computation



Parties learn *nothing more than* $z = f(x_1, ..., x_n)$

Adversarial Corruption Strategies

- Static security
 The set of adversarial parties is fixed in advance before the protocol begins
- Adaptive security

Secure Multiparty Computation



Parties learn *nothing more than* $z = f(x_1, ..., x_n)$

Adversarial Corruption Strategies

•

- Static security The set of adversarial parties is fixed in advance before the protocol begins
- Adaptive security
 The adversary can choose whom to corrupt during the execution of the protocol.

Fully Adaptive MPC



Parties learn *nothing more than* $z = f(x_1, ..., x_n)$

Adversarial Corruption Strategies

- Static security
 The set of adversarial parties is fixed in advance before the protocol begins
- Adaptive security
 The adversary can choose whom to corrupt during the execution of the protocol.

Fully adaptive MPC

- All parties can be corrupted eventually
- Important protocol is used within larger protocol
- Trivial in the static case
- Hard for the adaptive case

Adaptive MPC (Definition)



<u>Adaptive Security:</u> The adversary can choose whom to corrupt during the execution of the protocol.

Simulator:

- Simulate the communication (without knowing the inputs x₁, x₂, ..., x_n)
- Simulate the randomness of corrupted parties consistent with the communication and its inputs (Equivocation)

Function f can be encoded as either a Circuit or RAM Program

Circuits

- Standard Boolean circuits
- Well suited for highly-structured computation (such as FFT)
- Circuit complexity is expressed in terms of the #gates (say s) in the circuit.

RAM

- Circuits augmented with memory accesses.
- High-level languages are easily reduced to RAM programs.
- RAM complexity is expressed in terms of the running time (say T) of the RAM program.

RAM Model



• A memory access is made at every CPU step.

Prior Work: Adaptive MPC (for Circuits)

Feasibility

- [CLOS02] established the feasibility of fully adaptive protocols (in O(d) rounds)
- Next, we focus on constant round protocols.
- Known for specific assumptions:
 - Reliable erasures Garg and Sahai [GS12]
 - CRS model + iO [CPP15, DKR15, GP15] where CRS size is O(|C|)
- [CPV17] Constant-round protocol under minimal assumptions
- [BLPV18] (Precise rounds) 2-round MPC

Prior Work: Adaptive MPC (for Circuits)

Communication

- [CGP15, DKR15, GP15] (Optimal) Comm. independent of the size of the circuit, but CRS as large as circuit size.
 - Bound on the size of the circuit was required at the time of CRS generation
- [CsW12] Improved both comm. and CRS size is O(d) and assumes CRS + iO
- **Minimal assumptions**: [CPV17, BLPV18] Communication grows quadratically in circuit size.

Can we improve the communication of a constantround fully adaptive secure computation under minimal assumptions?



Communication is proportional to square of the RAM complexity of the function

Prior Work: Static/Adaptive MPC (for RAM)

Static MPC

• [LO13, GHORW14, GLOS14, GLO15] Communication prop. to RAM complexity*

*ignoring polylog factors.

- Adaptive MPC

• [CPV16, CP16] Communication is dependent to RAM complexity, but required strong assumptions.

The current state of affairs

- [CPV17] Communication prop. to the square of the Boolean complexity but with minimal assumptions.
- [CGP15, CPV16, CsW19, DKR15] Strong assumptions and huge CRS but better communication.

Main Theorem

Theorem: There exists a fully adaptively-secure constant-round garbled RAM with communication proportional to the square of the RAM complexity of the function under minimal assumptions, which is constructed from

- Equivocal garbed RAM + Equivocal ORAM
- Adaptively secure OT
- non-committing encryption

Focus on 2 PC, Semi-honest setting

Main Ideas: Challenges Towards Constructing Adaptive Garbled RAM and How To Overcome Them

Naïve Attempt: RAM to Circuit Conversion Adaptively Garble this circuit state₁ state₂ Circuit size is $\tilde{O}(T^{3})$ CPU Step 1 CPU Step 2 CPU Step 3 Deter ninistic Read transformation Read Read α_2 α_3 v_0 v_2 v_1 v_3 v_1 v_2 F-1 α_1 α_2 α_3 Applying CPV17: communication = $\tilde{O}(T^6)!$

https://codegolf.stackexchange.com/questions/24834/building-circuit-for-divisibility-by-3

Smarter Attempt: Garble each step circuit...



https://codegolf.stackexchange.com/questions/24834/building-circuit-for-divisibility-by-3

Smarter Attempt: Garble each step circuit...



Challenge I

- Memory access patterns may leak information.
- ORAM resolves this issue for static garbled RAM.
- For adaptive security, we require ORAM with additional properties.

Challenge II

- [CPV17] is designed for stand-alone circuits.
- It does not handle external memory accesses.

Other Challenges...

Smarter Attempt: Garble each step circuit...



Challenge I

- Memory access patterns may leak information.
- ORAM resolves this issue for static garbled RAM.
- For adaptive security, we require ORAM with additional properties.

Challenge II

- [CPV17] is designed for stand-alone circuits.
- It does not handle external memory accesses.

Other Challenges...

Addressing Challenge I



- The memory locations accessed by RAM are input-dependent. Use ORAM!
- This leaks information about Bob's input! \bullet







- For statistical ORAMs, such consistent randomness exists.
 - Can the randomness be extracted efficiently?
- Stronger requirement: the cost to determine consistent randomness should be proportional to the RAM complexity of the function.
 - This algorithm is incorporated within Equivocal Garbled RAM
- Next, we show how to determine randomness for a specific tree-based ORAM.

Database D





- Each memory location in *D* is associated with a leaf node.
- For every read operation, two passes are made from the root to the leaf:
 - Access the location to read
 - <u>Flush</u> to map the value to a new (unknown) location



Instructions

1. Read location 3





- For every read operation, two passes are made from the root to the leaf:
 - Access the location to read
 - <u>Flush</u> to map the value to a new (unknown) location



Instructions

1. Read location 3

• **<u>Access</u>** ℓf_1 (red path)

• Assign a new leaf node ℓf_2 to location 3











What does it mean to show ORAM is adaptive?

Actual Memory Accesses M_1

$lpha_1$	α_2	α_3	$lpha_4$
		Π	
Simulator must			
generate the			
random	ness		

Oblivious Memory Accesses M_2

ſĹ

 $\ell f_1 \ \ell f_3 \ \ell f_1 \ \ell f_3 \ \ell f_1 \ \ell f_3 \ \ell f_1 \ \ell f_3$

- SimORAM samples 2*m* leaf nodes randomly as the oblivious leaf nodes.
- Generating consistent randomness for each memory access corresponds to the new leaf node assigned to a memory location after it is read.
- Essentially, the randomness corresponds to leaf nodes $\{\ell f_2\}_{i\in[m]}$
- Suppose $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$, then $\ell f_2 = \ell f_1$
- Efficiency: $m \cdot polylog(m)$

Addressing Challenge II

Recall that:

- [CPV17] is designed for stand-alone circuits.
- It does not handle external memory accesses.
- Quick Review of Equivocal Garbling of [CPV17]

Overview: How to Garble Circuits?



CPA-secure Encryption

Overview: How to Adaptively Garble Circuits?

CPV17



Overview: How to Adaptively Garble RAM Programs?





Yao's Garbling: Static Security k,k^* k, k^* k, k^* Simulation: 0 1 Pick an active key for each wire 1 ciphertext encrypts the active key OR Other 3 ciphertexts are simulated • 1 k, k^* • Set output table to match the output C(x)AND $??? \rightarrow k, k, k$ Given input x, show the consistent randomness generation 1 Inactive keys *k*, *k*^{*} Randomness for encryption We have: We need: Simulated $Enc_{k^*,k}(k)$ Which key should be encrypted is determined by the wire values of $Enc_{k,k}(k)$ $Enc_{k,k}(k)$ circuit C. Simulated $Enc_{k,k^*}(k^*)$ Simulated $Enc_{k^*,k^*}(k)$

Non-Committing Encryption

- Honestly generated cipertexts: standard correctness and security
- Simulated cipertexts can be "opened" to any plain text m_i :
 - Sim can generate k_i such that $c = Enc(k_i: m_i)$



Circuit-Efficient Equivocal Encryption (Def.)

- Simulated cipertexts can be "opened" to some (but exp many) plaintexts:
 - Sim can generate k_i such that $c = Enc(k_i, m_i)$
- Only plaintexts in the image space of a function F can be equivocated.



CEE Property: $k \leftarrow Equivocate(x)$ Dec(k; c) = F(x) for simulated c

- [CPV17] F is expressed as a circuit.
- Next, we will see how to instantiate F.

Function For Equivocal Encryption Function F

But the step circuits are dependent and take additional inputs other than x.

- Given just input x, it is not sufficient to compute wire values in any step circuit.
 - Require state and memory values to evaluate the wire values in intermediate step circuits
- Solution: So, we could convert the RAM to a circuit and then use this within Enc.

Function For Equivocation Encryption

Function *F*





Function For Equivocation Encryption Function *F* CPU _tep Circuit size is $\tilde{O}(T^3)$!

- Each ciphertext is of size $\tilde{O}(T^3)$
- There are $T \cdot polylog(T)$ such ciphertexts in the entire garbled RAM
- So, the communication is $\tilde{O}(T^4)$!



- Each ciphertext is of size $\tilde{O}(T)$
- There are $T \cdot polylog(T)$ such ciphertexts in the entire garbled RAM
- So, the communication is $\tilde{O}(T^2)$

Other Challenges...

- Most Garbled RAM works are non-black-box in PRFs
 - Non-trivial to equivocate!
- However, [GLO15] fits well into our framework
 - Black-box use of underlying primitives
 - Memory is expressed as a tree of circuits
- Malicious security
 - Construct RAM-efficient adaptively-secure Zero-knowledge proofs
 - Previously based on indistinguishability obfuscation [GP15, CPV17].
 - Then apply standard transformation (GMW compiler)

Future Directions

For fully adaptive constant-round protocols, the communication is

- [CPV17] Quadratic in the circuit complexity of a function
- Our result: Quadratic in the RAM complexity of a function

Is the quadratic communication cost in the circuit/RAM complexity inherent in this regime?

THANK YOU!