

Attribute-based Encryption Resilient to Auxiliary Input

Zhiwei Wang



Hello
everybody



Siu Ming Yiu



See you at the
next conference!



Outline

- * Problem Statement
- * Attribute-Based Encryption with Auxiliary
- * Our Techniques

Side-Channel Attack

- * The central notion of modern cryptography relies on the secrecy of the secret key.
- * In practice, this paradigm is subject to the immanent threat of side-channel attacks.

Leakage-Resilient Cryptography

- * Formal security guarantees even when the secret (key/randomness) leaks
- * Here we only consider memory leakage.
- * The adversary is allowed to specify an efficiently computable leakage function f
 - * Obtain the output of f applied to the secret
 - * Aims to model the possible leakage in practice

A Major Open Problem

- * [Goldwasser @ Eurocrypt '09 Invited Talk]
- * *allowing for continuous unbounded leakage*
- * *without additionally restricting its type*

- * [AGV09, NS09, ADNSWW10, BKKV10, CDRW10, DGKPV10, DHLW10, LLW11, LRW11...]

Bounded Retrieval Model

- * Allowed bits of leakage is l
- * l is also a system parameter
- * Size of the secret key increases with l
- * But l does not affect public key size, communication and computation efficiency
- * e.g., [ADNSWW10, CDRW10]
- * Hope the attack is detected and stopped before the whole secret is leaked

Auxiliary Inputs

- * Any f that no poly. time adversary can invert
- * E.g., One-way permutation (OWP)
- * OWP is not allowed in the relative model
- * [DGKPV10] proposed public-key encryption (PKE) schemes with auxiliary inputs
- * [YSY12] proposed ABE schemes with auxiliary inputs
- * All these bound the leakage throughout the *entire lifetime* of the secret key

Continual Leakage Model

- * Allows for continuous memory leakage (CML)
- * Continually updates / refreshes the secret key
- * Leakage between updates are still bounded
- * [DHLW10]: signature and identification
- * [BKKV10]: signature, PKE, and selective-ID IBE
- * [LLW11]: signature and PKE
- * [Zhang13]: ABE

ABE with Auxiliary Inputs

- * ABE found many applications
- * Resilience => composition of Attribute-based systems
- * A “clean” security definition
 - * Free from numeric bounds

Continual-Leakage-Resilient ABE

- * Current CML models for ABE consider leakage of the current secret key for a given time only
 - * [Zhang13]
- * The old secret key should be *securely* erased.
- * Less disastrous leakage => Less benefits

Problem Statement

- * We tackle the problem of “*allowing ABE for continuous unbounded leakage, without additionally restricting the type of leakage*”.
- * [DGKPV10]: PKE, no continual leakage
- * [BKKV10]: IBE, selective-ID, no leakage from *msk*
- * [LRW11]: IBE, adaptive-ID, leakage size bounded
- * [YSY12]: IBE, adaptive-ID

Our Contributions

- * We propose the first CP-ABE scheme that is secure in the presence of auxiliary inputs
 - * Adaptive security in the Standard Model
 - * Based on Static Assumptions
 - * Moderate costs (ctxt. size, comp. complexity)
- * We propose the first KP-ABE scheme resilience to auxiliary inputs
- * We improve our ABE schemes secure in the presence of continual auxiliary model

Goldreich-Levin Theorem

- * The key technique in [DGKPV10] is the modified Goldreich-Levin (GL) theorem.
- * The original GL theorem is over $GF(2)$
 - * For an uninvertible function $h: GF(2)^m \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*$,
 - * $\langle \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{y} \rangle \in GF(2)$ is pseudorandom
 - * given $h(\mathbf{e})$ and uniformly random \mathbf{y}

Modified GL Theorem

- * Let q be a prime
- * H be a $\text{poly}(m)$ -sized subset of $GF(q)$
- * $h : H^m \rightarrow \{0,1\}^*$ be any (randomized) function
- * If there is a PPT algorithm D that distinguishes between $\langle \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{y} \rangle$ and the uniform distribution over $GF(q)$ given $h(\mathbf{e})$ and $\mathbf{y} \leftarrow GF(q)^m$
- * then there is a PPT algorithm A that inverts h with probability $1/(q^2 \cdot \text{poly}(m))$

Aux-PKE \rightarrow Aux-ABE

- * Attribute-based secret key has “structure”
 - * Not a λ -bit number
 - * Secret random factors from a small domain
 - * The size of attribute-based secret key is according to the number of attributes

Aux-PKE + LR-ABE \rightarrow Aux-ABE?

- * Even worse, many many secret keys in ABE...
- * Leak “semi-functional” (SF) keys in simulation
- * SF-key is perturbed from a real key by m blinding factors from \mathbf{Z}_p where p is of size 2^λ .
- * Inefficient inverter if we followed
- * Countermeasure for leakage just appears in the security proof but not the actual scheme.

Our Auxiliary Input Model

- * Usual secure against chosen-plaintext attack (CPA)
- * Leakage oracle (LO) in addition to Key Extraction oracle (KEO)
- * LO takes an input of $f \in \mathbf{F}$ and S returns $f(\text{msk}, sk_S, \text{mpk}, S)$
- * No LO query after challenge phase
- * **F**: Given $\text{mpk}, S^*, \{f_i(\text{msk}, sk_{S_i}, \text{mpk}, S_i)\}$, and a set of secret keys w/o sk_{S_i} , no PPT algo. can output a secret key sk_{S^*} of S^*



Here are the parameters, I will keep msk from you

I want $f_0(\text{msk}), f_1(sk_{S_1}), sk_{S_4}, sk_{S_1}$ and $f_3(\text{msk}, sk_{S_4})$

Sure, just make your adaptive choices

I want to be challenged with these 2 messages: $m_0,$

m_1
Now I encrypt a random 1 of them, make your guess



Roadmap of Our Construction

Lewko-Waters Adaptive-ID IBE



Lewko-Rouselakis-Waters LR-IBE



Yuen-Chow-Zhang-Yiu IBE with Auxiliary Inputs



Zhang-Shi-Wang-Chen-Mu LR-ABE



Our ABE with Auxiliary Inputs

Leakage via Dual System

- * We know how to “fake” everything!
- * We can leak them too.
- * Caution: leaking can't spoil faking.
- * Correlation regarding SF objects is information-theoretically (IT) hidden

Our Design Constraints

- * Small blinding factors are used in SF key
- * When the key is leaked, uninvertible function of key can be created from uninv.-func. of factors
- * Inner product = 0 \Rightarrow Exponent in $\mathbf{G}_q = 0$
- * Use modified GL theorem to ensure the indistinguishability of 2 types of SF keys.

Our Contributions (2)

- * For the security proof, we propose three improved static assumptions, and prove them in appendix.

Function Family

- * Basic: Given mpk, S^* , $\{f_i(msk, sk_{S_i}, mpk, S_i)\}$, and a set of secret keys w/o sk_{S_i} , no PPT algo. can output a secret key sk_{S^*} of S^*
- * CAL: Given mpk, S^* , $\{f_i(L_{msk}, L_S, msk, sk_{S_i}, mpk, S_i)\}$, and a set of secret keys w/o any valid sk_{S_i} , no PPT algo. can output sk_{S^*} of S^*
- * The lists L 's include all keys ever produced
- * Additionally, may give leakage during setup

*Thank! Any questions?