Candidate Witness Encryption from Lattice Assumptions

Rotem Tsabary

Reichman University (IDC), Israel

Google Research, Israel

Witness Encryption [Garg, Gentry, Sahai, Waters, STOC13]

Encrypt a message s.t. decryption requires solving a problem in NP.

Encrypt with respect to a predicate $f: \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$.

Decrypt with any witness w where $f(w) = 1$.

Security: decryption is hard if $f(w) = 0$ for all w.

Witness Encryption [Garg, Gentry, Sahai, Waters, STOC13]

Existing Candidates

- From MMaps [GLW14]
- Lattice-based candidates [WZ17,CVW18]
- From iO

Motivation

A ‘simple’ lattice-based candidate with better insight on its security.

Our Contribution

A candidate with provable security from a new* lattice assumption.

[Wee22] Evasive LWE

Branching Programs



Branching Programs

$w = 1001$



Branching Programs

$w = 1001$



[Barrington 89]: Every $f \in NC^1$ can be computed by a poly-sized BP.

Witness Encryption from Branching Programs

A natural approach: ct_{in}, ct_{out}, key-pair for each level



Security relies on the premise that $f(w) = 0$ for all w.

Problem: Inconsistent inputs might result in the accepting state.

Witness Encryption from Branching Programs

A natural approach: ct_{in}, ct_{out}, key-pair for each level



Security relies on the premise that $f(w) = 0$ for all w.

Problem: Inconsistent inputs might result in the accepting state.

Witness Encryption from Branching Programs

A natural approach: ct_{in}, ct_{out}, key-pair for each level



Observation: WE for read-once BP is trivial.

BP with Consistency Check [CHVW19]

Multi-State Branching Program



BP with Consistency Check [CHVW19]

Multi-State Branching Program



BP with Consistency Check [CHVW19]

Consistency check:

Add a 'memory cell' for each input bit that verifies its consistency.

Memory cell for w_2:



BP with Consistency Check [CHVW19]



BP with Consistency Check [CHVW19]

$w = 1001$



BP with Consistency Check [CHVW19]



Graph-Induced Lattice Encodings (GGH15)

[Gentry, Gorbunov, Halevi, TCC15]



$$Encode(A^{td}, S_0, B) \rightarrow K_0$$

$$Encode(A^{td}, S_1, B) \rightarrow K_1$$

$$(sA + e)K_0 = sS_0B + e'$$

$$(sA + e)K_1 = sS_1B + e'$$

GGH15 Encodings for Branching Programs

[GGH15,CC17,WZ17,GKW17a,CVW18,CHVW19]



BP Encoding: $sA + e, \quad \left\{K_0^i, K_1^i\right\}_i$

GGH15 Encodings for Branching Programs

[GGH15,CC17,WZ17,GKW17a,CVW18,CHVW19]



Evaluation on x:

$$(sA + e)\prod_i K_{x_i}^i \approx s\prod_i S_{x_i}^i B$$

[BPR12,CC17]:

$$PRF(x) := s\prod_i S_{x_i}^i B$$

Encoding the Consistency-Checking BP



BP Encoding: $s[A_f|A_1|\ldots|A_n] + e, \quad \{K_0^i, K_1^i\}_i$

Can compute $s \prod_i S_{x_i}^i B$ for any transcript x that leads to a matrix B.

Decryption



Let x be a transcript of a witness w s.t. $f(w) = 1$.

Decryption



Let x be a transcript of a witness w s.t. $f(w) = 1$.

Compute $s \prod_i S^i_{x_i} \boldsymbol{B_f} + \sum_j s \prod_i S^i_{x_i} \boldsymbol{B_j}$

Security - Intuition



Let x be a consistent transcript w.r.t. some w.

Recall: $f(w) = 0$ for all w.

Security - Intuition



Let x be a consistent transcript w.r.t. some w.

Recall: $f(w) = 0$ for all w.

⟹ Cannot compute $s \prod_i S_{x_i}^i \boldsymbol{B_f}$

Security - Intuition



Let x be a transcript inconsistent at index j.

Security - Intuition



Let x be a transcript inconsistent at index j.

⟹ Cannot compute $s \prod_i S_{x_i}^i \boldsymbol{B_j}$

Security Analysis – GGH15 Example



$$Encode\left(A^{td}, S_0, B\right) \rightarrow K_0$$

$$Encode\left(A^{td}, S_1, B\right) \rightarrow K_1$$

$$sA + e$$

Security Analysis – GGH15 Example



$$Encode(A^{td}, S_0, B) \rightarrow K_0$$

$$Encode(A^{td}, S_1, B) \rightarrow K_1$$

$$sA + e$$

Standard Analysis Steps:

1. LWE w.r.t. B is hard.

Security Analysis – GGH15 Example



$$Encode(A^{td}, S_0, B) \rightarrow K_0$$

$$Encode(A^{td}, S_1, B) \rightarrow K_1$$

$$sA + e$$

Standard Analysis Steps:

1. LWE w.r.t. B is hard.
2. Simulate K_0, K_1 without a trapdoor.

Security Analysis – GGH15 Example



$$Encode(A^{td}, S_0, B) \rightarrow K_0$$

$$Encode(A^{td}, S_1, B) \rightarrow K_1$$

$$sA + e$$

Standard Analysis Steps:

1. LWE w.r.t. B is hard.
2. Simulate K_0, K_1 without a trapdoor.
3. Generate A without a trapdoor.

Security Analysis – GGH15 Example



$$Encode(A^{td}, S_0, B) \rightarrow K_0$$

$$Encode(A^{td}, S_1, B) \rightarrow K_1$$

$$sA + e$$

Standard Analysis Steps:

1. LWE w.r.t. B is hard.
2. Simulate K_0, K_1 without a trapdoor.
3. Generate A without a trapdoor.
4. LWE w.r.t. A is hard.

Security Analysis – BP Encoding



$$sA + e, \quad \{K_0^i, K_1^i\}_i$$

Security Analysis – BP Encoding



$$sA + e, \quad \left\{K_0^i, K_1^i\right\}_i$$

Standard Analysis Steps:

1. LWE w.r.t. i'th level is hard.

Security Analysis – BP Encoding



$$sA + e, \quad \left\{K_0^i, K_1^i\right\}_i$$

Standard Analysis Steps:

1. LWE w.r.t. i'th level is hard.
2. Simulate K_0^i, K_1^i without a trapdoor.

Security Analysis – BP Encoding



$$sA + e, \quad \left\{K_0^i, K_1^i\right\}_i$$

Standard Analysis Steps:

1. LWE w.r.t. i'th level is hard.
2. Simulate K_0^i, K_1^i without a trapdoor.
3. Generate (i-1)'th level without a trapdoor.

Security Analysis – BP Encoding



$$sA + e, \quad \left\{K_0^i, K_1^i\right\}_i$$

Standard Analysis Steps:

1. LWE w.r.t. i'th level is hard.
2. Simulate K_0^i, K_1^i without a trapdoor.
3. Generate (i-1)'th level without a trapdoor.
4. LWE w.r.t. (i-1)'th level is hard.

Security Analysis – BP Encoding



$$sA + e, \quad \left\{K_0^i, K_1^i\right\}_i$$

Standard Analysis Steps:

1. LWE w.r.t. i'th level is hard.
2. Simulate K_0^i, K_1^i without a trapdoor.
3. Generate (i-1)'th level without a trapdoor.
4. LWE w.r.t. (i-1)'th level is hard.

Security Analysis – BP Encoding



$$sA + e, \quad \left\{K_0^i, K_1^i\right\}_i$$

Standard Analysis Steps:

1. LWE w.r.t. i'th level is hard.
2. Simulate K_0^i, K_1^i without a trapdoor.
3. Generate (i-1)'th level without a trapdoor.
4. LWE w.r.t. (i-1)'th level is hard.

Security Analysis – BP Encoding



$$sA + e, \quad \left\{K_0^i, K_1^i\right\}_i$$

Standard Analysis Steps:

1. LWE w.r.t. i'th level is hard.
2. Simulate K_0^i, K_1^i without a trapdoor.
3. Generate (i-1)'th level without a trapdoor.
4. LWE w.r.t. (i-1)'th level is hard.

Security Analysis – BP Encoding



$$sA + e, \quad \left\{K_0^i, K_1^i\right\}_i$$

Standard Analysis Steps:

1. LWE w.r.t. i'th level is hard.
2. Simulate K_0^i, K_1^i without a trapdoor.
3. Generate (i-1)'th level without a trapdoor.
4. LWE w.r.t. (i-1)'th level is hard.

Security Analysis



LWE with respect to the last level is not hard since the matrices are correlated.

However, correlated matrices **cannot** be accessed with the same LWE secret.

Security Analysis

Define a designated LWE experiment:

$$s,\ \{S_0^i, S_1^i\},\ \{B_j\}$$

$$x$$

$$\left\{ s \prod_i S^i_{x_i} B_j \ : \ x \text{ consistent at } j \right\}_{j \in [n]}$$

$$s \prod_i S^i_{x_i} B_f \quad if \quad BP_f(x) = 1$$

Within natural barriers that were discussed in [GSW13, GLW14].

We show the hardness of this experiment via $2^{poly(n)}$ reductions to standard LWE.

Security Analysis

WE security game $\longrightarrow$ designated LWE experiment

A new assumption [Wee22,Tsa22]**:**

$$\text{Let } A, B \in \mathbb{Z}_q^{n \times m} \text{ and } K \leftarrow A^{td}(B)$$

$$\text{LWE w.r.t. } [A] \text{ given } aux = K$$

is as hard as

$$\text{LWE w.r.t. } [A|B]$$

Security Analysis - Summary