Advanced Tools from Modern Cryptography

Lecture 14 MPC: Fairness and Guaranteed Output Delivery

General MPC

Information-theoretic security

- Passive with corruption threshold t < n/2
- Passive with OT setup



BGW

- Guaranteed Output UC with t < n/3</p>
- Guaranteed Output UC with t < n/2 and Broadcast \"Rabin-BenOr"</p>
- Selective Abort UC, with OT 'Kilian." (Also: GMW paradigm implemented using OT-based proof)

Computational security

Passive Composing Yao or Passive GMW with a passive-secure OT protocol

Standalone

GMW: using ZK proofs

Selective Abort UC, with CRS

Composing Kilian with a CRS-based UC-secure OT protocol

MPC Dimensions



Basic Dimensions

- Adversary's computational power: PPT adversary, Informationtheoretic security
- Honest majority: Thresholds 1 (no honest majority), $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{3}$
- Security Level: Passive security, UC security with selective abort, or UC security with guaranteed output delivery
- Trusted setup: Point-to-point channels, Broadcast, Common Reference String (CRS), OT

Output Delivery

3 levels:

Infair (a.k.a., selective abort)

Adversary can see its output and decide which set of honest parties receive theirs

Fair

Adversary can cause abort for all parties before seeing its output. To get its output, should let all parties get theirs.
 Guaranteed output delivery

Adversary cannot prevent honest parties from producing an output. (Adversary will have well-defined inputs no matter what it does.)

Today: Impossibility of fairness/guaranteed output delivery even for some very simple tasks, if there is no honest majority

Fair Coin-Tossing

✓ For 2-party functions, fair protocol ⇒ guaranteed output delivery
 ✓ Modify protocol so that if abort, locally compute the output
 (with a fixed input for the other party)

2-party fair coin-tossing from commitment?

- Alice commits to a random bit a, Bob sends a bit b, Alice opens and they output a
 - Output: Alice can abort after learning the outcome

Two parties can never obtain a fair coin, given only unfair setups, even under computational assumptions, even for standalone security, even against fail-stop adversaries

Unfair setup: Sends outputs to the parties one at a time. Adversary can abort at any point.

Fair Coin-Tossing

- Guaranteed output delivery: Each party has a tentative output after each message it receives, if an abort happens right after it
- Best possible unfair setup: F runs the protocol on behalf of the parties; at each round, sends each party its tentative output.
 - X₀,Y₀ if abort before start. Then F Sends X₁ (to Alice), Y₁ (to Bob), X₂, Y₂, ..., X_n, Y_n. Allows adversary to abort at any point.
- X_0, Y_0 independent; also uniform (by correctness for abort at start)
- Sorrectness when no abort: $Pr[X_n=b, Y_n=b]=1/2$, for $b \in \{0,1\}$
- - So, some i s.t. either $Pr[X_i=Y_i]-Pr[X_i=Y_{i-1}] \ge 1/(4n)$ or $Pr[X_i=Y_{i-1}]-Pr[X_{i-1}=Y_{i-1}] \ge 1/(4n)$

Fair Coin-Tossing

∃i s.t. $Pr[X_i=Y_i]-Pr[X_i=Y_{i-1}] ≥ 1/(4n)$ or $Pr[X_i=Y_{i-1}]-Pr[X_{i-1}=Y_{i-1}] ≥ 1/(4n)$

- Suppose $Pr[X_i=Y_i]-Pr[X_i=Y_{i-1}] \ge 1/(4n)$
- Solution Note: Pr[Y_{i-1}=0] ≈ 1/2, Pr[Y_i=0] ≈ 1/2 (by correctness against Alice who aborts after Y_{i-1} and one who aborts after Y_i)

Consider two more attackers for corrupt Alice:
 A₀: If X_i=0, abort immediately, else abort after Y_i delivered
 A₁: If X_i=1, abort immediately, else abort after Y_i delivered

Onder attack by A₀, Pr[Bob outputs 0] = Pr[X_i=0,Y_{i-1}=0] + Pr[X_i=1,Y_i=0] = Pr[X_i=0,Y_{i-1}=0] - Pr[X_i=0,Y_i=0] + Pr[Y_i=0] \Rightarrow Pr[X_i=0,Y_{i-1}=0] \approx Pr[X_i=0,Y_i=0]

- Similarly, from A₁, $Pr[X_{i=1},Y_{i-1}=1] \approx Pr[X_{i=1},Y_{i=1}]$
- \bigcirc So, $\Pr[X_i=Y_{i-1}] \approx \Pr[X_i=Y_i]$. Contradiction!

Broadcast

Recall

BGW protocol relied on broadcast to ensure all honest parties have the same view of disputes, resolution etc.

- Concern addressed by broadcast: a corrupt sender can send different values to different honest parties
- Broadcast with selective abort can be implemented easily, even without honest majority

Sender sends message to everyone. Every party cross-checks with everyone else, and aborts if there is any inconsistency.

If corruption threshold t < n/3, then it turns out that broadcast with guaranteed output delivery can be implemented
If broadcast given as a serup, can do merc with guaranteed output delivery for up to t < n/2

No Broadcast with Guaranteed Output if 1/3 Corrupt Broadcast requirements (message being a single bit): If sender honest, all honest parties should output the bit it sends (can't abort) All honest parties should agree on the outcome (can't have some output 0 and others 1)

C

B

Input O

Output 0

B

C

A

Input 1

Consider 6 parties running the code for A, B, C (A is the sender)

Adversary corrupting C

Note: can't do this if A, B allowed to have a priori shared secrets (say message authentication keys)

No Broadcast with Guaranteed Output if 1/3 Corrupt Broadcast requirements (message being a single bit): If sender honest, all honest parties should output the bit

it sends (can't abort)

All honest parties should agree on the outcome (can't have some output 0 and others 1)



No Broadcast with Guaranteed Output if 1/3 Corrupt Broadcast requirements (message being a single bit):

- If sender honest, all honest parties should output the bit it sends (can't abort)
- All honest parties should agree on the outcome (can't have some output 0 and others 1)
 Output 0
 Output 1



No Broadcast with Guaranteed Output if 1/3 Corrupt

Broadcast requirements (message being a single bit):

- If sender honest, all honest parties should output the bit it sends (can't abort)
- All honest parties should agree on the outcome (can't have some output 0 and others 1)
- Impossible to satisfy both constraints simultaneously, if 1/3 can be corrupt
 - Irrespective of what computational assumptions are used!
 - But a priori shared keys can give broadcast with guaranteed output delivery against unrestricted corruption (in the synchronous model)