Huijing Gong CMSC 858F

ROUND COMPLEXITY LOWER BOUND OF ISC PROTOCOL IN THE PARALLELIZABLE MODEL

Overview

- Background
 - Byzantine Generals Problem
 - Network Model w/o Pre-existing Setup
- ISC Protocol in Parallelizable Model
 - ISC, Parallelizable Model
 - Intuition of Protocol
- Round Complexity Lower Bound
 - Theorem
 - Proof

- Byzantine Generals Problem
 - Commanding general and generals camped outside an enemy city
 - Commanding general sends the order to all
 - The generals exchange messages to agree on a battle plan: withdraw or attack
 - Traitor(s): confuse others

Byzantine Generals Problem



Traitor(s): confuse others

Byzantine Generals Problem



- **Goal of Byzantine Agreement Protocols:**
 - Generals reach agreement on whether attack or withdraw
 - Not obey Commander's order if Commander is a traitor

- Network Model w/o Pre-Existing Setup
 - N Parties: cannot be authenticated by pre-existing means
 - E.g. Public-Key Infrastructure (PKI)
 - Difference:
 - No idea where a receive message sent from
 - No idea if two message received from different rounds are sent from one party
 - But, a message sent by an honest party in some run received by all other parties at the end of that run

- Network Model w/o Pre-Existing Setup
 - Adversary:
 - Corrupt parties to behave arbitrarily
 - Inject message into the network (> n -1)
 - Change messages they relay
 - Send message to subset of the honest parties (< n 1)</p>

- □ Protocol (by J. Katz, A. Miller, and E. Shi [2014]):
 - N Parties: cannot be authenticated by pre-existing means
 - Goal: Establish a PKI
 - No bound on the number of corruption
 - Adversary cannot drop or modify honest parties' message
- Time-Lock Puzzle (Proof-of-Parallelizable Work Model)
 - Take role of trusted setup assumption
 - Each honest party has equal computational power
 - Adversary(f parties) runs sequentially faster by factor f
 - f correct parties cannot solve any faster taking as whole.

□ Interactive Set Consistency (ISC):

- Each party has an input and output a (multi)set of size n, s.t.
 - All the honest parties agree(output) on the same (multi)set S
 - S contains all the honest parties' inputs
- Can be used to establish PKI among parties,
 - PKI later can provide authenticated communication

$\square \mathcal{F}_{parpuz}$ Oracle

- Modeling the Time-Lock Puzzle
- Each party can produce a puzzle solution independently in each round
- An adversary who corrupts f processes can solve f puzzles per round in total

Scheme

- Solve a cryptographic puzzle upon request
- Check solutions upon request
- Polynomial Time

- $\square \mathcal{F}_{parpuz}$ Oracle
 - Solve:
 - \$\mathcal{F}_{parpuz}\$ oracle maintains a table T.
 Each party \$P_i\$ sends (solve, \$x_i\$) to \$\mathcal{F}_{parpuz}\$ oracle: For \$I = 1, \ldots, n\$, \$\mathcal{F}_{parpuz}\$ first check if \$(x_i, h_i\$) has been stored in T.
 - Yes: return h_i to P_i ;
 - Otherwise, generate $h_i \in \{0, 1\}^{\lambda}$, return h_i to P_i and store (x_i, h_i) in T.

- $\square \mathcal{F}_{parpuz}$ Oracle
 - Solve:
 - Each honest party is allowed to call \mathcal{F}_{parpuz} only once per round
 - Each round of honest party: All the solve request must be sent before any honest party receives its solution.
 - Each round of corrupted parties: they can call \mathcal{F}_{parpuz} one after another in sequence up to f times.

- $\Box \mathcal{F}_{parpuz}$ Oracle
 - Check:
 - Each party P_i sends (check, $(x_i^1, h_i^1), (x_i^2, h_i^2), ...$) to \mathcal{F}_{parpuz} oracle:
 - \mathcal{F}_{parpuz} oracle returns $(b_i^1, b_i^2, ...)$: ■ $b_i^j = 1$ if $(x_i^2, h_i^2) \in T$ ■ $b_i^j = 0$, otherwise.

Orders in rounds (honest parties)

- Each party sends (at most) one solve-request to $\mathcal{F}_{parpuz} \text{ and receive the solution}$
- Each party computes a message to send
- Message are delivered to each party
- \blacksquare Each party sends a list of puzzle solution to \mathcal{F}_{parpuz} for verification

Intuition of the Protocol:

- Mining Phase:
 - Each correct party generate a chain of $O(f^2)$ puzzle solutions:
 - **E.g.** Solve(pk_i , Solve(pk_i , Solve(...Solve(pk_i, ϕ)...)))
 - Each correct party can create a valid puzzle chain for its own key,
 - Corrupt party only can create at most f puzzle chains before the protocol terminate

Intuition of the Protocol:

- Communication Phase:
 - Each party publishes their chains and propagate the puzzle chain they received from others
 - In each round r: Each party accepts a value if it has received a collection of r signatures on that value, the process then add its own signature to the collection and relay it to the other processes.
 - Signatures without associated puzzle chains are ignored
 - A correct party consider a public key "valid" if it comes along with a puzzle chain containing the public key long enough

Reference

- Aguilera, Marcos Kawazoe, and Sam Toueg. "A simple bivalency proof that t-resilient consensus requires t+ 1 rounds." Information Processing Letters 71.3 (1999): 155-158.
- Dolev, Danny, and H. Raymond Strong. "Authenticated algorithms for Byzantine agreement." SIAM Journal on Computing 12.4 (1983): 656-666.
- Lamport, Leslie, Robert Shostak, and Marshall Pease. "The Byzantine generals problem." ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems (TOPLAS) 4.3 (1982): 382-401.
- Katz, Jonathan, Andrew Miller and Elaine Shi. "Pseudonymous Secure Computation from Time-Lock Puzzles." Cryptology ePrint Archive (2014):857.