Structured Encryption and Controlled Disclosure

Melissa Chase Seny Kamara

Microsoft Research

Cloud Storage

 \bigcirc

 \bigcirc

 \bigcirc











Security for Cloud Storage

• **Main concern:** *will my data be safe?*

- it will be encrypted
- it will be authenticated
- it will be backed up
- \circ access will be controlled
- 0 ...
- Security only vs.
 - outsiders
 - other tenants

• **Q**: can we provide security against the *cloud operator*?

Confidentiality in Cloud Storage

• How do we preserve confidentiality of data in the cloud?

- Encryption!
- What happens when I need to retrieve my data?
- e.g., search over emails or pictures

Two Simple Solutions



Q: can we achieve O(1) storage at client and ``small'' comm. complexity?

Searchable Symmetric Encryption [Song-Wagner-Perrig01]



Related Work

- Two-party computation [Yao82]
 - O(|data|) OTs & poly(|data|) server computation
- Oblivious RAMs [Goldreich-Ostrovsky96]
 - O(log n) rounds & polylog(n) server computation
- Fully-homomorphic encryption [Gentry09]
 - 1 round & poly(|data|) server computation
- Searchable encryption
 - [SWP01,Goh03,Chang-Mitzenmacher05,Boneh-diCrescenzo-Ostrovsky-Persiano04,...]: 1 round & O(n) server computation
 - [Curtmola-Garay-K-Ostrovsky06]: 1 round & O(# of docs w/ word) server computation

Limits of Searchable Encryption

• Private *keyword search* over encrypted *text* data

- $\circ \mathbf{Q}$: can we privately query other types of encrypted data?
 - o maps
 - image collections
 - social networks
 - web page archives

Graph Data

- Communications

 email headers, phone logs

 Networks

 Social networks
- Web crawlers
- \circ Maps







Structured Encryption



Our Results

- Structured Encryption
- Formal security definition
 - simulation-based
- Constructions
 - Adjacency queries on encrypted graphs
 - Neighbor queries on encrypted graphs
 - *Focused subgraph* queries on encrypted web graphs
- Controlled disclosure
 - Application to cloud-based data brokering

Structured Encryption

Structured Data



• Email archive = Index + Email text

Structured Data



• Social network = Graph + Profiles

Structured Encryption

○ Gen(1^k) ⇒ K
○ Enc_K(δ, m̄) ⇒ (γ, c̄)
○ Token_K(q) ⇒ t
○ Query(γ, t) ⇒ I
○ Dec_K(c_i) ⇒ m_i



CQA2-Security

Security against *adaptive* chosen query attacks
 generalizes CKA2-security from [Curtmola-Garay-K-Ostrovsky06]

Simulation-based definition

 ``given the ciphertext and the tokens no adversary can learn any information about the data and the queries, even if the queries are made adaptively"

• Too strong

- e.g., SSE constructions leak some information
- access pattern: pointers to documents that contain keyword
- search pattern: whether two queries were for the same keyword

CQA2-Security

• Security is *parameterized* by 2 stateful leakage functions

Simulation-based definition

``given the ciphertext and the tokens no adversary can learn any information about the data and the queries other than what can be deduced from the L₁ and L₂ leakages..."
"...even if queries are made adaptively"

Leakage Functions

2 leakage functions

- L1: leakage about data items
- L2: leakage about data items and queries
- Previous work on SSE -- except [Goldreich-Ostrovsky96]
 - L1: number of items and length of each item
 - L2: access pattern and search pattern

• This work:

- L1: number of items and length of each item
- o L2: *intersection* pattern and query pattern
- \circ intersection pattern \ll access pattern

Access vs. Intersection Patterns

Access pattern

• Pointers to relevant data items (i.e., result of query)

• Intersection pattern

• Replace each pointer in access pattern with random value in [1,n]

• Note:

access pattern could reveal information about query



Adaptiveness

 $_{\odot}\,$ Simulator "commits" to encryptions before queries are made

requires equivocation and some form of non-committing encryption

 \circ Lower bound on token length ≈ [Nielsen02]

- $\circ \Omega(\log\binom{n}{\lambda})$ (w/o ROs)
 - n: # of data items
 - \circ λ : # of relevant items

• All our constructions achieve lower bound

vs. Functional Encryption [Boneh-Sahai-Waters10]

• Functional encryption

- token can be used on *multiple* ciphertexts
- Indistinguishability-based definitions
 - Simulation-based definitions are impossible (w/o ROs)
- Currently can handle: inner products (i.e., polynomial predicates, AND, OR, boolean DNF & CNF)

• Structured encryption

- token can be used on a *single* ciphertext
- Simulation-based definition
- Currently can handle: keyword search on text data; neighbor & adjacency queries on graphs; focused subgraph queries on web graphs; ...

Constructions

Constructions

Adjacency queries on encrypted graphs

from lookup queries on encrypted matrices

Neighbor queries on encrypted graphs

from keyword search on encrypted text (i.e., SSE)

Focused subgraph queries on encrypted web graphs

from keyword search on encrypted text
from neighbor queries on encrypted graphs

Neighbor Queries on Graphs



Neighbor Queries on Graphs

Building blocks

- Dictionary (i.e., key-value store)
- Pseudo-random function
- Non-committing symmetric encryption
 - PRF + XOR \Rightarrow tokens are as long as query answer
 - \circ RO + XOR \Rightarrow tokens are as long as security parameter

Neighbor Queries on Graphs

 $\begin{array}{c} F_{K}(N_{1}) \\ F_{K}(N_{1}) \\ \vdots \\ F_{K}(N_{1}) \\ F_{K}(N_{$



• Web graphs

- Text data -- pages
- Graph data --- hyperlinks
- Simple queries on web graphs
 - All pages linked from P
 - All pages that link to P
- Complex queries on web graphs
 - ``mix" both text and graph structure
 - search engine algorithms based on link-analysis
 - Kleinberg's HITS [Kleinberg99]
 - SALSA [LM01]
 - o ...

Focused Subgraph Queries

• HITS algorithm

- Step 1: compute *focused* subgraph
- Step 2: run iterative algorithm on focused subgraph



FSQ on Encrypted Graphs

• Encrypt

- pages with SE-KW
- graph with SE-NQ
- does not work!

• Chaining technique

- combine SE schemes (e.g., SE-KW with SE-NQ)
- preserves token size of first SE scheme
- Requires associative SE
 - message space: private data items and semi-private information
 - answer: pointers to data items + associated semi-private information
 - [Curtmola-Garay-K-Ostrovsky06]: associative SE-KW but not CQA2-secure!

Associativity

- $\circ \operatorname{Gen}(1^k) \Rightarrow \mathrm{K}$
- $\circ \operatorname{Enc}_{K}(\delta,\overline{m}) \Rightarrow (\gamma,\overline{c})$
- $\circ \operatorname{Token}_{K}(q) \Rightarrow t$
- $\circ \operatorname{Query}(\gamma, t) \Rightarrow I$
- $\circ \operatorname{Dec}_{K}(c_{i}) \Rightarrow m_{i}$

Associativity

- $\circ \operatorname{Gen}(1^k) \Rightarrow \mathrm{K}$
- $\circ \operatorname{Enc}_{K}(\delta, \overline{m}, \overline{\nu}) \Rightarrow (\gamma, \overline{c})$
- $\circ \operatorname{Token}_{K}(q) \Rightarrow t$
- ∘ Query(γ, t) ⇒ ($I, \{v_i: i \in I\}$)
- $\circ \operatorname{Dec}_{K}(c_{i}) \Rightarrow m_{i}$







35

Controlled Disclosure

Limitations of Structured Encryption

• Structured encryption

- Private queries on encrypted data
- $\circ \mathbf{Q}$: what about computing on encrypted data?
 - Two-party computation
 - Fully-homomorphic encryption

o 2PC & FHE don't scale to massive datasets (e.g., Petabytes)
o Do we give up security?

Controlled Disclosure

• Compromise

- reveal only what is *necessary* for the computation
- Local algorithms
 - Don't need to ``see" all their input
 - e.g., simulated annealing, hill climbing, genetic algorithms, graph algorithms, link-analysis algorithms, ...



Controlled Disclosure



Cloud-based Data Brokerage



Microsoft Azure MarketplaceInfochimps

Secure Data Brokerage



 \circ Producer

 accurate count of data usage
 Collusions b/w
 Cloud
 Consumer

The End