Secret Sharing

CS 6750 Lecture 7

October 29, 2009

Riccardo Pucella

The Treasure Map Problem

- Suppose you and a "friend" find a map that leads to a treasure
- You each want to go home and prepare
- Who keeps the map?
- What if you don't trust each other?

A Real Life Solution

- Split the map in two
 - Such that you need both pieces to find the island
 - You and your friend each take a piece

- This is the basic idea of secret splitting
 - A special case of secret sharing



- Definition: given a secret S, we would like N parties to share the secret so that the following properties hold:
 - 1) All N parties can recover S
 - 2) Less than N parties cannot recover S

 In general, we split the secret into N pieces (shares) S₁, ..., S_N and give one share to each party.

Does This Work?

- Without loss of generality, we consider the secret to be a bit string or an integer
 - We know everything can be encoded as such

- Concrete example: suppose you want to keep your salary secret, but share it between two parties. If your salary is \$150,000, you could always split it as 150 and 000, and give each a piece.
 - Is this a good way to split such a secret?

Partial Information Disclosure

- In the above scheme, we are leaking partial information about the secret
 - E.g., the most significants digits of the salary
 - Problem for some applications (not always)
 - E.g., secret is a password
- In general, hard to characterize what kind of information should not be leaked, and which is okay to leak.
 - So we want to forbid any kind of partial information disclosure



- Revised definition: given a secret S, we would like N parties to share the secret so that the following properties hold:
 - 1) All N parties can recover S
 - 2) Less than N parties cannot recover S or obtain any partial information about S

• This is surprisingly easy to achieve

A Two-Party Scheme

- Suppose S is a bitstring in {0,1}^m
 - Choose m bits at random (coin tosses)
 - Let S_1 be those m random bits
 - Let $S_2 = S \oplus S_1$

• Easy: Given S_1 and S_2 , reconstruct $S = S_1 \oplus S_2$

No Partial Information Disclosure

- Given S₁ (or S₂), we do not get any partial information about S
 - How can we formalize that?
 - Show that given S₁, you do not restrict what S could have been. Information == restricted possibilities
 - Given S1, for any T there exists ST such that $S_1 \oplus S_T = T$
 - A share can be a share for any secret!

Generalization to N parties

- Suppose S is a bit string in $\{0,1\}^m$
 - Choose m bits at random (coin tosses)
 - Let S_1 be those m random bits
 - Do the same for S_2 , ..., S_{N-1} (all random)
 - Let $S_N = S \oplus S_1 \oplus ... \oplus S_{N-1}$

 Argument for no partial information disclosure similar to above

The Generals Problem

- You have been put in charge of designing a control mechanism for your country's nuclear arsenal. You choose a keyed secret code mechanism:
 - To launch missiles, you need the right secret code
- You don't want to give every general the code
 - A rogue general might just launch an attack!
 - You decide to split the code among the generals

• What's your new problem?



- Secret splitting ensures that the partial information about the secret is not recoverable unless you have all the shares
- But it does not guarantee availability, that you can recover the secret even if some of the shares are unavailable

- E.g. 2 or more generals can launch missiles
- but less than 2 generals cannot

(N,T) Secret Sharing

- Definition: Given a secret S, we would like N parties to share the secret so that the following properties hold:
 - Greater than or equal to T parties can recover S
 - Less than T parties cannot recover S or obtain any partial information about S

- Generals problem == (3,2) secret sharing
- Secret splitting == (N,N) secret sharing

- To motivate the general solution, consider first an (N,2) secret sharing scheme
- Secret S is an integer



- To motivate the general solution, consider first an (N,2) secret sharing scheme
- Secret S is an integer



- To motivate the general solution, consider first an (N,2) secret sharing scheme
- Secret S is an integer



- To motivate the general solution, consider first an (N,2) secret sharing scheme
- Secret S is an integer



 $\tilde{S}_1 \tilde{S}_2 \tilde{S}_3 \tilde{S}_4 \tilde{S}_5$

- To motivate the generative (N,2) secret sharing
- Secret S is an integ

(0,S)

Easy to check: any two points can be used to recover the line and hence (0,S)

A single point is not enough

Generalizing to (N,T)

- A line intersecting the y axis = degree 1 polynomial $[y = a_1x + a_0]$
 - Line uniquely characterized by two points
 - Once you know the line, you can compute where it crosses the y axis.

- Generalize to (N,T) threshold schemes
 - Use a degree T-1 polynomial $[y = a_{T-1}x^{T-1}+...+a_1x+a_0]$
 - Curve uniquely characterized by T points
 - Once you know the curve, you can compute where it crosses the y axis

Resharing the Secret

- This can be useful when the secret needs to be kept for a long time
 - The longer a secret needs to be kept, the more likely the adversary is to get enough shares

The Shamir threshold scheme admits resharing the secret without computing that secret

- Again, let's consider the (N,2) case
- Secret S is an integer



- Again, let's consider the (N,2) case
- Secret S is an integer



- Again, let's consider the (N,2) case
- Secret S is an integer



- Again, let's consider the (N,2) case
- Secret S is an integer



- Again, let's consider the (N,2) case
- Secret S is an integer



Generatin

f+h

(0,S)

- A central server wanting to reshare the secret would send $h(x_1)$ Again, let's cont to party $1, ..., h(x_n)$ to party n
- Secret S is an Each party would compute their new
 - share $(x_i, f(x_i) + h(x_i))$



initial sharing resharing line

Again, let's consider the (N,2) case



General Secret Sharing

- Suppose you want an even more general way of sharing secrets
 - N parties, and you specify exactly what subsets of parties can get the secret
 - E.g. Bob and Alice can get together and reconstruct the secret, Bob and Charlie can get together and reconstruct the secrete, but no one else



- An access structure for a set P of parties is a set AS of subsets of P
- $B \in AS$ is called an authorized subset

- Access control structures are monotone:
 - If $B \in AS$ and $B \subseteq C \subseteq P$, then $C \in AS$
- We often only list the "minimal" elements: the sets $B \in AS$ such that there is no $C \in AS$ with $C \subset B$

Perfect Secret Sharing Scheme for AS

- Definition: A perfect secret sharing scheme realizing the access structure AS is a method of sharing a secret S among a set P of parties such that:
 - 1) Any authorized subset of AS can recover S
 - 2) No unauthorized subset can recover S or obtain any partial information about S

Threshold Access Structures

- Let P be a set of N parties
 - Take AS = { $B \subseteq P : |B| \ge T$ }
 - This is called a threshold access structure

 A (N,T) secret sharing scheme == a perfect secret sharing scheme realizing a threshold access structure

Secret Sharing Scheme for AS

- Given an access structure AS, we want a perfect secret sharing scheme realizing AS
 - We use a Boolean circuit corresponding to AS
 - And a secret-splitting scheme
 - e.g., the ⊕-based scheme

Boolean Circuit for AS

- Inputs to the circuit:
 - a wire for every element of P
- Output of the circuit:
 - whether the set of elements that are given a 1 on input is a member of AS
- Can be constructed from the "minimal elements" of AS

Example Circuit

- $P = \{P_1, P_2, P_3, P_4\}$
- AS with min elts { {P1,P2,P4}, {P1,P3,P4}, {P2,P3} }



- Given a secret S as a bitstring in $\{0,1\}^m$
- First set output wire of circuit to be S



• Then duplicate secret back through a \vee node











• Give the appropriate shares to each party by looking at the wires out of that party



• Give the appropriate shares to each party by looking at the wires out of that party



P1 gets { a1, c1 } P2 gets { a2, b1 } P3 gets { S⊕b1, c2 } P4 gets { S⊕a1⊕a2, S⊕c1⊕c2 }

• Give the appropriate shares to each party by looking at the wires out of that party



P1 gets { a1, c1 } P2 gets { a2, b1 } P3 gets { S⊕b1, c2 } P4 gets { S⊕a1⊕a2, S⊕c1⊕c2 }

CHECK: This is a perfect secret sharing scheme

• Give the appropriate shares to each party by looking at the wires out of that party



P1 gets { a1, c1 } P2 gets { a2, b1 } P3 gets { S⊕b1, c2 } P4 gets { S⊕a1⊕a2, S⊕c1⊕c2 }

CHECK: This is a perfect secret sharing scheme

• Give the appropriate shares to each party by looking at the wires out of that party



P1 gets { a1, c1 } P2 gets { a2, b1 } P3 gets { S⊕b1, c2 } P4 gets { S⊕a1⊕a2, S⊕c1⊕c2 }

CHECK: This is a perfect secret sharing scheme