On Valiant's Conjecture Eurocrypt 2023

Mathias Hall-Andersen, Jesper Buus Nielsen



Prover Penguin



Prover Penguin







Prover Penguin







Prover Penguin

prove it !"





Prover Penguin



Prover Penguin





Prover Penguin







Prover Penguin

prove it!"







Prover Penguin





Prover Penguin

Incrementally Verifiable Computation

prove it !"

Stati, Mari

String = f(String Computed from String.





prove it " Stati, The. $S_{n+1} = f(S_{n})$ Computed from S_{n} . What about computing T_{n+1} from T_{n} ?





Ĩ,

 $St_{o} - f - St_{o}$

Ĩ,



















PComplexity: O(poly(|f|, log(n)))



PComplexity: O(poly(|f|, log(n)))

VComplexity: O(poly(|f|, log(n)))



Prover Penguin



Prover Penguin







Prover Penguin



Random Oracle





đ

Prover Penguin





đ

Prover Penguin





Prover Penguin







Valiant's Construction of IVC "in the ROM"

Valiant's Construction [2008] IVC From CS Proofs

Valiant's Construction of IVC "in the ROM"



Valiant's Construction [2008] IVC From CS Proofs
































Valiant's Construction [2008] IVC From CS Proofs

SNARK proves NP relations

SNARK in The ROM



Valiant's Construction of IVC "in the ROM" Valiant's Construction [2008] IVC From CS Proofs

SNARK proves NP relations

SNARK in The ROM



Only works when heuristically "instantiating" the ROM



Valiant's Construction of IVC "in the ROM" Valiant's Construction [2008] IVC From CS Proofs

SNARK proves NP relations

SNARK in The ROM

Of Course Valiant Noted This.



Only works when heuristically "instantiating" the ROM

The construction does not work in the ROM



"... recursion breaks down because, even at the first level of recursion, we are no longer trying to prove statements about classical computation but rather statements of the form "M with oracle access to O accepts the following string..." Thus standard applications of random oracles do not appear to help. – Paul Valiant

"... recursion breaks down because, even at the first level of recursion, we are no longer trying to prove statements about classical computation but rather statements of the form "M with oracle access to O accepts the following string..." Thus standard applications of random oracles do not appear to help. – Paul Valiant

Can we prove this intuition?





Ideally: "IVC is Impossible in the ROM"

IVC to Non-Deterministic IVC

Ideally: "IVC is Impossible in the ROM"

Ideally: "IVC is Impossible in the ROM"

- **Constructions with CRS:** Devadas, Goyal, Kalai and Vaikuntanathan [2022]

Ideally: "IVC is Impossible in the ROM"

Problem: Hard to Even Rule Out Trivial Schemes.

Introduce a Witness:

- **Constructions with CRS:** Devadas, Goyal, Kalai and Vaikuntanathan [2022]

Ideally: "IVC is Impossible in the ROM"

- **Constructions with CRS:** Devadas, Goyal, Kalai and Vaikuntanathan [2022]
- Introduce a Witness: "RO Does Not Help Construct non-Deterministic IVC"

Ideally: "IVC is Impossible in the ROM"

JE; Ulitne *i*+1

- **Constructions with CRS:** Devadas, Goyal, Kalai and Vaikuntanathan [2022]
- Introduce a Witness: "RO Does Not Help Construct non-Deterministic IVC"



Ideally: "IVC is Impossible in the ROM"

JE; Ulitne *i*+1

- **Constructions with CRS:** Devadas, Goyal, Kalai and Vaikuntanathan [2022]
- Introduce a Witness: "RO Does Not Help Construct non-Deterministic IVC"



- Covers PCD: Setting is A Special Case of PCD in The ROM.

- Covers PCD: Setting is A Special Case of PCD in The ROM.

- Natural Schemes: Valiant's Scheme Extended to Non-Deterministic IVC.

- Covers PCD: Setting is A Special Case of PCD in The ROM.

- Natural Schemes: Valiant's Scheme Extended to Non-Deterministic IVC.

- Justifying New Models: Contrasts Positive Results in Related Idealised Models.

- Covers PCD: Setting is A Special Case of PCD in The ROM.
- Natural Schemes: Valiant's Scheme Extended to Non-Deterministic IVC.
- Justifying New Models: Contrasts Positive Results in Related Idealised Models. - zk-SNARKs and PCD for Low-Degree ROM (LDROM) [CCS2022]
- - PCD from AROM [CCS2022]
 - (No Such Hope for Regular ROM)

- Covers PCD: Setting is A Special Case of PCD in The ROM.
- Natural Schemes: Valiant's Scheme Extended to Non-Deterministic IVC.
- Justifying New Models: Contrasts Positive Results in Related Idealised Models. - zk-SNARKs and PCD for Low-Degree ROM (LDROM) [CCS2022]

 - PCD from AROM [CCS2022]
 - (No Such Hope for Regular ROM)
- Contrast with SNARKs in ROM: Proving Incrementally is Harder.

OverviewOf All The Caveats

Non-Deterministic IVC.

Non-Triviality: Accepting Proofs (for true statements) can be Generated by Programming the RO

Intuition: Soundness Dependent on RO Otherwise: a Scheme without ROM

Zero-Knowledge Impossible

Without ZK: Schemes of Certain Structure (Blackbox Knowledge Extractor)
OverviewOf All The Caveats

Non-Deterministic IVC.

Non-Triviality: Accepting Proofs (for true statements) can be Generated by Programming the RO

Intuition: Soundness Dependent on RO Otherwise: a Scheme without ROM

Zero-Knowledge Impossible

Without ZK: Schemes of Certain Structure (Blackbox Knowledge Extractor)

OverviewOf All The Caveats

Non-Deterministic IVC.

Non-Triviality: Accepting Proofs (for true statements) can be Generated by Programming the RO

Intuition: Soundness Dependent on RO Otherwise: a Scheme without ROM

Zero-Knowledge Impossible

Takeaway: Adding a RO Does Not Help.

Without ZK: Schemes of Certain Structure (Blackbox Knowledge Extractor)

Overview **Of All The Caveats**

Non-Deterministic IVC.

Non-Triviality: Accepting Proofs (for true statements) can be Generated by Programming the RO

> Intuition: Soundness Dependent on RO Otherwise: a Scheme without ROM

Zero-Knowledge Impossible

Takeaway: Adding a RO Does Not Help.

Note: Non-Deterministic IVC + CRH → SNARKs

Without ZK: Schemes of Certain Structure (Blackbox Knowledge Extractor)

Proof Sketch















Then final proof is accepting under real oracle.



Then final proof is accepting under real oracle.



Then final proof is accepting under real oracle.



Then final proof is accepting under real oracle.



Then final proof is accepting under real oracle.



Then final proof is accepting under real oracle.



Then final proof is accepting under real oracle.

Affects prob. by negl(λ)

Computationally Indistinguishable from \mathcal{L}





ZK Ensures P acts "Normally" on Simulated Proof with Programmed RO

UL,

6

ZK Ensures P acts "Normally" on Simulated Proof with Programmed RO

UL,

Remove Indistinguishibility of Accepting Proof from Programmed RO

ZK Ensures P acts "Normally" on Simulated Proof with Programmed RO

Ш,

Remove Indistinguishibility of Accepting Proof from Programmed RO

Rules Out Schemes In Which:

ZK Ensures P acts "Normally" on Simulated Proof with Programmed RO

UL,



Remove Indistinguishibility of Accepting **Proof from Programmed RO**

Rules Out Schemes In Which:



Query Was Made by P previously



ZK Ensures P acts "Normally" on Simulated Proof with Programmed RO

W,



Remove Indistinguishibility of Accepting Proof from Programmed RO

Rules Out Schemes In Which:



Allowed to fail with arbitrary 1/p(n) Prob.

Ouestions? "On Valiant's Conjecture" Mathias Hall-Andersen Jesper Buus Nielsen

Paintings By Bartholomeus Johannes van Hove

