Policy-Based Signature Scheme from Lattices

Shantian Cheng, Khoa Nguyen and Huaxiong Wang



Outline



Policy-Based Signatures
Definition

- Our construction
- 3 Delegatable Policy-based Signature



Overview

Background:

- Policy-based signature (PBS) is introduced by Bellare and Fuchsbauer ([BF14]).
- Signer is only allowed to sign messages satisfying certain policy.

Our innovation:

• We construct a PBS scheme based on lattices.



Digital Signature





Practical Motivation

- A company allows the employees to sign contract anonymously on behalf of the company.
- Existing schemes:
 - **Group signature:** Anonymous signing, no control of what can be signed.
 - Attribute-based signature (ABS): The singer can sign a message with a predicate (public) that is satisfied by his attributes (private).

 $\mathsf{CEO} \lor (\mathsf{Senior}\ \mathsf{Manager} \land \mathsf{Leader}\ \mathsf{of}\ \mathsf{Project}\ \mathsf{A})\,.$



Practical motivation

A company issues a key to a staff Bob that

• he can only sign contracts with companies A and on behalf of company.

Advantage of PBS:

- There are some constraints on what can be signed.
- In ABS, to verify the signature, Melvin need to know whether

$\mathsf{Bob} \in \mathsf{Manager} \lor \mathsf{Leader} \text{ of } \mathsf{Project} \text{ A}$

• In PBS, the policies can be more complicated (for example, sign contract at fixed time) and the verifier Melvin only knows the public parameter.



Policy-Based Signature(PBS)



Intuitive Security

- **Unforgeability:** The signer can sign a message *m* only if he owns the key *sk_p*, where *m* satisfies policy *p*.
- Privacy: The signature does not reveal the policy.



Theoretical motivation

- Digital signature deserves more investigation.
- PBS unifies some existing signature schemes. For example, group signature and attribute-based signature can be derived from PBS.



Outline





- Definition
- Our construction





Definition

Policy language: A policy checker is a NP-relation

 $\begin{array}{rcl} \mathsf{PC}: \{0,1\}^* \times \{0,1\}^* & \to & \{0,1\} \\ & & ((p,m),w) & \mapsto & 0 \text{ or } 1. \end{array}$

The policy language associated to PC is defined as

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathsf{PC}) := \{(p, m) : \exists w \text{ such that } \mathsf{PC}((p, m), w) = 1\}.$



PBS scheme

Algorithms:

- $\mathsf{Setup}(1^{\lambda}) \to (\mathsf{pp}, \mathsf{msk})$
- KeyGen(msk, p) \rightarrow sk_p
- Sign(sk_p, m) $\rightarrow \sigma$
- Verify(pp, m, σ) ightarrow 0 or 1



Unforgeability

Game:



 ${\mathcal A}$ wins if

- Verify(pp, m^{*}, σ^{*}) = 1;
- \mathcal{A} did not query signature of m^* ;
- for all p ever queried for key: $(p, m^*) \notin \mathcal{L}(PC)$.



Indistinguishability



 ${\mathcal A}$ wins if

- $(p_0, m), (p_1, m) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathsf{PC});$
- b' = b.



Stronger Security Notions

• Simulatability.

- One scheme revealing policies may satisfy indistinguishability.
- In simulatability, it requires there is an algorithm

$\sigma \leftarrow \mathsf{Simulate}(m),$

whose outputs are indistinguishable from real signatures.

Extractability.

- In unforgeability, to check whether (p, m^{*}) ∉ L(PC) for all queried p may be inefficient.
- In extractability, it requires there is an algorithm

```
(p^*, w^*) \leftarrow \mathsf{Extract}(m^*, \sigma^*).
```

It only need to verify p^* has not been queried.



Definition Our construction

Lattice based Policy Language.

We define the policy checker as PC : $(\{0,1\}^\ell \times \mathbb{Z}_q^n) \times \mathbb{Z}_q^n \to \{0,1\}$ satisfying

$$\mathsf{PC}((\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{M}), \mathbf{w}) = 1 \Longleftrightarrow \begin{cases} \mathbf{G} \cdot \mathbf{p} + \mathbf{w} = \mathbf{M} \mod q, \\ ||\mathbf{w}||_{\infty} \leq \beta \end{cases}$$



 $\mathsf{KeyGen}(p): \ \mathsf{sk}_p = z \ \text{is one Bonsai signature} \ ([\mathsf{CHKP10}]) \ \mathsf{on} \ p.$

 $\label{eq:sign} \begin{array}{ll} \mathsf{Sign}(\mathsf{sk}_p, M) \text{: non-interactive zero-knowledge argument of knowledge to} \\ \text{ show the possession of } (p, z, w) \text{ such that} \end{array}$

 $\bullet~(p,z)$ is a valid Bonsai massage-signature pair.

We apply

- Stern's 3-move argument system ([LLNW14]). (Interactive)
- Fiat-Shamir heuristic. (Non-interactive)



Security

- **Simulatability.** Based on the zero-knowledge property of the underlying argument system.
- **Extractability.** We reduce the SIS-solver to the successful extractability adversary of our scheme.



Outline

1 Overview

Policy-Based Signatures
Definition

• Our construction





Delegation.

- Policies may be set up hierarchically.
- Possessing sk_p , one can delegate $sk_{p'}$ for subpolicy p'.





Techniques

- Policy vectors: $(\mathbf{p}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{p}_r) \rightarrow (\mathbf{p}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{p}_r, \mathbf{p}_{r+1}).$
- Instead of short vector in PBS, signing key in DPBS is short basis of certain lattices.
- For signing phase, $\mathbf{z}_r \leftarrow \text{SampleD}(\mathbf{A}_r, \mathbf{S}_r, \mathbf{u}, \sigma)$.
- For delegation phase,

$$\overline{\mathbf{S}}_{r+1} \leftarrow \mathsf{ExtBasis}(\mathbf{A}_r, \mathbf{A}_{r+1}, \mathbf{S}_r)$$

and

$$\mathbf{S}_{r+1} \leftarrow \mathsf{RandBasis}(\mathbf{A}_{r+1}, \overline{\mathbf{S}}_{r+1}, \sigma).$$
 ([CHKP10])



References

Mihir Bellare and Georg Fuchsbauer. Policy-Based Signatures.

In *Public Key Cryptography*, volume 8383 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 520–537. Springer, 2014.

 David Cash, Dennis Hofheinz, Eike Kiltz, and Chris Peikert.
Bonsai Trees, or How to Delegate a Lattice Basis.
In EUROCRYPT, volume 6110 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 523–552. Springer, 2010.

Adeline Langlois, San Ling, Khoa Nguyen, and Huaxiong Wang. Lattice-Based Group Signature Scheme with Verifier-Local Revocation.

In *Public Key Cryptography*, volume 8383 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 345–361. Springer, 2014.



THANK YOU

THANK YOU!

