

1 Introduction

Till now, we have seen deniable encryption, using indistinguishability obfuscation (Sahai-Waters paper). After that, public key encryption has been constructed, from secret key encryption, using $i\mathcal{O}$. In this lecture, we are going to see (from [20]), $i\mathcal{O}$ construction for P, from $i\mathcal{O}$ for NC^1 and fully homomorphic encryption scheme, with decryption in NC^1 .

1.1 Review of $i\mathcal{O}$ and FHE

Definition 1.1 (Homomorphic Encryption).

A homomorphic encryption scheme is defined as four-tuple of ppt algorithms (KeyGen, Enc, Dec, Eval).

1. $\text{KeyGen}(1^\lambda)$: It gives output (pk, sk, evk) the public key, secret key and evaluation key.
2. $\text{Enc}(pk, m)$: If m is a message then it outputs some ciphertext c .
3. $\text{Dec}(sk, c)$: It outputs some message bit m_1 from ciphertext c .
4. $\text{Eval}(evk, f, c_1, \dots, c_l)$: For some function f and ciphertexts c_1, \dots, c_l it outputs $f(c_1, \dots, c_l) = c_f$.

Correctness: The above scheme is correct if

$$\Pr[\text{Dec}_{sk}(\text{Eval}_{evk}(f, c_1, \dots, c_l)) \neq f(m_1, \dots, m_l)] = \text{negl}(\lambda)$$

where $c_i \leftarrow \text{Enc}(pk, m_i) \forall i$.

Compactness: The scheme is compact if the size of $\text{Eval}_{evk}(f, c_1, \dots, c_l)$ is bounded by $\text{poly}(\lambda)$ bits and it is independent of the function and number of inputs to it.

Definition 1.2 (Indistinguishability Obfuscator).

Indistinguishability Obfuscator $i\mathcal{O}$ is a ppt algorithm so that:

Given input some program P_0 , $i\mathcal{O}(P_0)$ satisfies:

1. $i\mathcal{O}(P_0)$ can be computed in time polynomial over the description of P_0 .
2. $i\mathcal{O}(P_0)$ preserves functionality.
3. For any ppt adversary A and programs P_1, P_2 , with equal complexity and functionality,

$$|\Pr[A(i\mathcal{O}(P_1)) = 1] - \Pr[A(i\mathcal{O}(P_2)) = 1]|$$

is negligible.

2 Construction

Say, $(\text{KeyGen}, \text{Enc}, \text{Dec}, \text{Eval})$ is our given FHE scheme, so that, it's decryption circuit is in NC^1 . In the following procedure, we construct $i\mathcal{O}$ for a circuit C with polynomial depth.

1. Say, λ is our security parameter and $(\text{pk}_1, \text{sk}_1) \leftarrow \text{KeyGen}(1^\lambda)$, $(\text{pk}_2, \text{sk}_2) \leftarrow \text{KeyGen}(1^\lambda)$.
2. Encrypt C using two public keys. Say, $e_1 \leftarrow \text{Enc}_{\text{pk}_1}(C)$, $e_2 \leftarrow \text{Enc}_{\text{pk}_2}(C)$.
3. Now, we obfuscate of a program $P \in \text{NC}^1$ and description of P is given below.

For $i\mathcal{O}$ construction of C , we have to assure two main points. The first one is $i\mathcal{O}(C)$ should hide C and from the encryption of the circuit, we have the security guarantee. Now, we need to make sure that it preserves functionality.

Although Dec circuit is in NC^1 , we cannot simply give the obfuscated Dec circuit publicly. As, in that case, by computing $\text{Dec}(\widehat{C})$, the circuit C can be easily recovered (Here, \widehat{C} is the encryption of circuit C).

So, we describe the program $P \in \text{NC}^1$ by following procedure.

Here, we define **Universal Circuit** U . Given a circuit C and some input x , $U(C, x)$ computes $C(x)$. Let, U_x be the circuit $U(\cdot, x)$ where x is hard-wired.

From definition of FHE.Eval , $\text{Eval}_{\text{evk}}(U_x, \widehat{C}) = \widehat{C(x)}$. So, we want to assure that the input to the obfuscated Dec circuit was computed as $\text{Eval}_{\text{evk}}(U_x, \widehat{C})$, for some x .

Say, R_1, R_2 are the circuits, which compute $y_1 \leftarrow \text{Eval}_{\text{evk}_1}(U_x, e_1)$ and $y_2 \leftarrow \text{Eval}_{\text{evk}_2}(U_x, e_2)$ respectively. Let π_1 and π_2 are the values of internal wires of circuits R_1 and R_2 , on input x .

Define $P = P_{\text{pk}_1, \text{pk}_2, \text{sk}_1, e_1, e_2}$, on input $(x, y_1, y_2, \pi_1, \pi_2)$ in the following way:

1. Check whether $R_1(x) = y_1$ and $R_2(x) = y_2$ by using π_1, π_2 .
2. if condition (1) is satisfied then output $\text{Dec}(\text{sk}_1, y_1)$.

FHE.Dec circuit is in NC^1 and as we have π_1, π_2 , we can check if $R_1(x) = y_1$ and $R_2(x) = y_2$ by using log depth circuit. Hence, $P_{\text{pk}_1, \text{pk}_2, \text{sk}_1, e_1, e_2} \in \text{NC}^1$. We can obfuscate $P_{\text{pk}_1, \text{pk}_2, \text{sk}_1, e_1, e_2}$ by our known $i\mathcal{O}$ for NC^1 circuit. In this way we assure functionality.

Proof of Security:

We prove indistinguishability property for this construction, by hybrid argument. Here the $i\mathcal{O}$ for \mathcal{P} adversary challenger gives two circuits $C_0, C_1 \in \mathcal{P}$ and it receives $i\mathcal{O}(C_b)$ for some random $b \in \{0, 1\}$. It has to guess b .

And for the reduction from one hybrid to another, $i\mathcal{O}$ for NC^1 challenger or the \mathcal{FHE} challenger is invoked. Through these hybrids, we transform obfuscation of C_0 to obfuscation of C_1 and H_{i+1} is indistinguishable from H_i for all i .

1. H_0 : The real world with $e_1 = \text{Enc}_{\text{pk}_1}(C_0)$, $e_2 = \text{Enc}_{\text{pk}_2}(C_0)$ with obfuscated $P_{\text{pk}_1, \text{pk}_2, \text{sk}_1, e_1, e_2}$.
2. H_1 : Here we make $e_2 = \text{Enc}_{\text{pk}_2}(C_1)$, using FHE security.

3. H_2 : $P_{pk_1, pk_2, sk_1, e_1, e_2}$ is changed to $P_{pk_1, pk_2, sk_2, e_1, e_2}$ (it uses sk_2 instead of sk_1), using $i\mathcal{O}$ security.
4. H_3 : Make $e_1 = \text{Enc}_{pk_1}(C_1)$ using FHE security.
5. H_4 : Change P to $P_{pk_1, pk_2, sk_1, e_1, e_2}$ again, using $i\mathcal{O}$ security.
And here we arrive at real world with C_1 .

References

- [20] Lecture 20. Using indistinguishability obfuscation. <https://people.eecs.berkeley.edu/~sanjamg/classes/cs276-fall14/scribe/lec20.pdf>.