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## Traditional Crypto Assumptions

- Factoring: Given $N=p q$, find $p, q$
- RSA Given $N=p q, e, x^{e} \bmod N$, find $x$.
- Discrete Log: Given $g^{x} \bmod p$, find $x$.
- Diffie-Hellman Assumptions $\left(g^{x}, g^{y}, g^{x y}\right)$, $\left(g^{x}, g^{y}, g^{z}\right)$


## Are They Secure?

- Algorithmic Advances:
- Factoring: Best algorithm time $2^{\tilde{O}\left(n^{\frac{1}{3}}\right)}$ to factor $n$-bit number.
- Discrete log: Best algorithm $2^{\tilde{o}\left(n^{\frac{1}{3}}\right)}$ for groups $Z_{p}^{*}$, where $p$ is $n$ bits.
- [Adrian et al. 2015] With preprocessing could possibly be feasible for nation-states and $n=1024$.
- Quasipolynomial time algorithms for small characteristic fields. Not known to apply in practice.
- Quantum Computers:
- Shor's algorithm solves both factoring and discrete log in quantum polynomial time ( $\widetilde{O}\left(n^{2}\right)$ ).


## Are They Secure?

"For those partners and vendors that have not yet made the transition to Suite B algorithms (ECC), we recommend not making a significant expenditure to do so at this point but instead to prepare for the upcoming quantum resistant algorithm transition.... Unfortunately, the growth of elliptic curve use has bumped up against the fact of continued progress in the research on quantum computing, necessitating a re-evaluation of our cryptographic strategy. " - NSA Statement, August 2015


## Post-Quantum Approach

- New set of assumptions based on finding short vectors in lattices.
- Believed to be hard for quantum computers.
- Evidence of hardness "worst case to average case reduction".
- Versatile: Can essentially construct all cryptosystems out of these assumptions.


## My Research

- New efficient cryptosystems from post-quantum and FHE assumptions [1], [7]
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- Concrete hardness of FHE (with or without side information) [10]
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Math Prelim

## Matrix Multiplication

$$
\left.\begin{array}{cllll}
m_{1,1} & m_{1,2} & m_{1,3} & v_{1, j} \\
m_{2,1} & m_{2,2} & m_{2,3} \times v_{2, j}=\sum_{i=1}^{3} & m_{1, i} \\
m_{3,1} & m_{3,2} & m_{3,3} & v_{3, j} & m_{2, i} \\
m_{3, i} \\
m_{1,1} & m_{1,2} & m_{1,3} & v_{1,1} & v_{1,2}
\end{array}\right)
$$

For $j \in\{1,2,3\}, j$-th column of the output is computed as :

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{3} v_{i, j} \cdot \begin{array}{r}
m_{1, i} \\
m_{2, i} \\
m_{3, i}
\end{array}
$$

## Lattices

An $n$-dimensional lattice L is an additive discrete subgroup of $R^{n}$. A basis $\boldsymbol{B} \in R^{n \times n}$ defines a lattice $\mathrm{L}(\boldsymbol{B})$ in the following way:
$L(\boldsymbol{B})=\left\{\boldsymbol{v} \in R^{n}\right.$ s.t. $\boldsymbol{v}=\boldsymbol{B} \boldsymbol{z}$ for some $\left.\boldsymbol{z} \in Z^{n}\right\}$.
"integer linear combinations of the basis vectors"
$i$-th successive minima $\lambda_{i}(L(B))$ : The smallest radius $r$ such that there are $i$ linearly independent vectors $\left\{v_{1}, \ldots, v_{i}\right\}$ of length at most $r$.

Shortest vector: $(1,2)$
Shortest basis: $\begin{aligned} & \lambda_{1}=\sqrt{5} \\ & 3 \\ & 1 \\ & \lambda_{2}=\sqrt{10}\end{aligned}$


## Lattices

An $n$-dimensional lattice L is an additive discrete subgroup of $R^{n}$. A basis $\boldsymbol{B} \in R^{n \times n}$ defines a lattice $\mathrm{L}(\boldsymbol{B})$ in the following way:
$L(\boldsymbol{B})=\left\{\boldsymbol{v} \in R^{n}\right.$ s.t. $\boldsymbol{v}=\boldsymbol{B} \boldsymbol{z}$ for some $\left.\boldsymbol{z} \in Z^{n}\right\}$.
"integer linear combinations of the basis vectors"
Basis is not unique!
For the lattice to the right,
$\begin{array}{ll}3 & 1 \\ 1 & 2\end{array}$ form a basis
$\begin{array}{ll}4 & 9 \\ 3 & 8\end{array}$ also form a basis
Given two bases $B, B^{\prime}$, they define the same lattice iff $B^{\prime}=B U$, where $U$ is a $r$ unimodular matrix (determinant $\pm 1$ ).


## Hard Lattice Problems

- Are all parameterized by "approximation factor" $\gamma>1$.
- Shortest Vector Problem (SVP): Given a basis B, find a non-zero vector $\boldsymbol{v} \in L(\boldsymbol{B})$ whose length is at most $\gamma$. $\lambda_{1}(L(B))$.
- Shortest Independent Vector Problem (SIVP): Given a basis $B$, find a linearly independent set $\left\{v_{1}, \ldots, v_{n}\right\}$ such that all vectors have length at most $\gamma \cdot \lambda_{n}(L(B))$.
- Gap Shortest vector problem (GapSVP): Given a basis $B$, and a radius $r>0$
- Return YES if $\lambda_{1}(L(B)) \leq r$
- Return NO if $\lambda_{1}(L(B))>\gamma \cdot r$.

Believed hard
even for a
quantum
computer!

## Cryptographic Hard Problems

## The SIS Problem



Problem: Given A, find $z \in\{0,1\}^{m}$ (or sufficiently "short" z)

## Relation to Lattices

- Worst-Case to Average-Case Reduction: Breaking the cryptosystem on average is as hard as breaking the hardest instance of the underlying lattice problem.
- SIS:
- Worst-Case to Average-Case Reduction from SIVP.


## CRHF from Lattices

## CRHF from Lattices

Public
Matrix:


Public $n \times m$ matrix $A$, with entries chosen at random over $Z_{p}$

To evaluate the hash on $z$ output:


## CRHF from Lattices

Given a collision $z_{1}, z_{2} \in\{0,1\}^{m}$ :


$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Obtain } \\
& \left(z_{1}-z_{2}\right) \in \\
& \{-1,0,1\}^{m} \text { : }
\end{aligned}
$$



## The LWE Problem (Search)



Problem: Given, $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{u}=\mathrm{As}+\mathrm{e}$, find s .

## The LWE Problem (Decision)

Secret $n$-dimension vector s
with entries chosen at random
Operations are mod p .


Public $m \times n$ matrix A , with entries chosen at random over $Z_{p}$

m-dimension error vector e, with entries sampled from $\chi$.

Problem: Distinguish (A , u) from (A, v)

## Relation to Lattices

- Worst-Case to Average-Case Reduction: Breaking the cryptosystem on average is as hard as breaking the hardest instance of the underlying lattice problem.
- LWE:
- Worst-Case to Average-Case Quantum Reduction from SIVP.
- Worst-Case to Average-Case Classical Reductions from GapSVP.


## Lattice-Based Encryption

## Regev’s Cryptosystem [Regev '04]

Public
Key:


Secret
Key:

## Regev's Cryptosystem—Encryption of

## $m \in\{0,1\}$



## Regev's Cryptosystem—Decryption



## Regev's Cryptosystem—Decryption



## Regev's Cryptosystem—Decryption



## Regev's Cryptosystem—Decryption



## Properties of LWE

- Equivalance of Search/Decision LWE
- Equivalence of LWE with random secret/secret drawn from error distribution


## Efficiency

- Efficiency is a main concern in lattice-based cryptosystems.
- In both SIS and LWE-based cryptosystems, the public key consists of a random matrix of size $\mathrm{m} \times \mathrm{n}(m \geq n \log p)$, requiring space $O\left(n^{2} \log ^{2} p\right)$.
- RSA and discrete-log based cryptosystems: public key size is linear in the security parameter.
- To reduce the public key size, consider lattices with structure.
- This is the Ring-LWE setting.


## Ring-LWE Setting

- Highly efficient key exchange protocols are possible in the Ring-LWE setting.
- Similar to Diffie-Hellman Key Exchange
- It is likely that at least one such scheme will be standardized by NIST.
- Details in the slides, but will skip in the lecture.


## Summary

- Lattice-based cryptography is a promising approach for efficient, post-quantum cryptography.
- All the basic public key primitives can be constructed from these assumptions:
- Public key encryption, Key Exchange, Digital Signatures
- For more information on research projects, please contact me at: danadach@umd.edu


## Thank you!

## The Ring Setting

- Quotient ring $\mathrm{Z}_{q}[x] / \Phi_{m}(x)$, where $\Phi_{m}$ is the $m$-th cyclotomic polynomial of degree $\varphi(m)$
- e.g., $\Phi_{2 n}=x^{n}+1, n=2, q=13$.
$-x^{2}=-1 \bmod \left(x^{2}+1\right)$
$-12 x^{3}+15 x^{2}+9 x+25 \rightarrow 12 x^{3}+2 x^{2}+9 x+$ $12 \rightarrow x-2+9 x+12 \rightarrow(10,10)$.
- Lattice is defined as an ideal $I \subseteq Z[x] / \Phi_{m}(x)$.
- Ring-LWE and ring-SIS problems are defined by substituting the matrix A with polynomials from the quotient ring and substituting polynomial multiplication for matrix-vector multiplication.
- The public key is now a polynomial in $\mathrm{Z}_{q}[x] / \Phi_{m}(x)$, and so can be described using $O(n \log q)$ bits.


## NTT Transform

Consider $\Phi_{m}$, where $m$ is a power of 2 . Then degree is equal to $n$, power of $2, m=2 n$. $\Phi_{2 n}=x^{n}+1$

- Consider prime $q$ s.t. $q=1 \bmod 2 n$.
- Then we have $n 2 n$-th primitive roots modulo $q$
- Why? $Z_{q}^{*}$ is cyclic with order $q-1.2 n \mid(q-1)$.
- Let $g$ be a generator of $Z_{q}^{*} \cdot g$ is a $(q-1)$-th primitive root.
- $g^{a \cdot 2 n}=g^{q-1}$, since $2 n \mid(q-1) . g^{a}$ is a $2 n$-th primitive root. Also $\left(g^{a}\right)^{i}$, where $i$ is relatively prime to $2 n$.
- Note that $\left(g^{a}\right)^{n}=-1 \bmod q$. Modulo $x^{n}+1$ means $x^{n}=-1$.
- Let $\gamma_{1}, \ldots, \gamma_{n}$ be the $n$ number of $2 n$-th primitive roots
- For a polynomial $p(x) \in Z_{q}[x] / x^{n}+1$
- For every $\gamma_{i}, p\left(\gamma_{i}\right) \bmod p$ is equal to taking $p(x)$ modulo $x^{n}+1$ and modulo $q$ and then evaluating the reduced polynomial at $\gamma_{i}$.


## NTT Transform

- For a polynomial $p(x) \in Z_{q}[x] / x^{n}+1$
- Evaluate $p(x)$ on all $n$ number of $2 n$-th primitive roots. Obtain a vector $p\left(\gamma_{1}\right) \ldots p\left(\gamma_{n}\right)$.
- Can now do both addition and multiplication coordinate-wise.


## Key Exchange from Ring-LWE

## Simple Key Exchange

| $P_{1}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $s_{1}$ |  |
| $\left(a, u_{1}=a \cdot s_{1}+e_{1}\right)$ | $P_{2}$ |
| $s_{2}$ |  |
|  | $\left(a, u_{2}=a \cdot s_{2}+e_{2}\right)$ |

$u_{2} \cdot s_{1} \approx a \cdot s_{2} \cdot s_{1} \quad$ RECONCILIATION

$$
u_{1} \cdot s_{2} \approx a \cdot s_{1} \cdot s_{2}
$$

