Protean Signature Schemes

Stephan Krenn[‡], Henrich C. Pöhls[§], Kai Samelin*, Daniel Slamanig[‡]

October 2, 2018—Cryptology And Network Security (CANS 2018), Naples, Italy



Digital Signatures



- Establish the origin of a message (bind signer's identity to message)
- A valid signature guarantees
 - Message integrity (no modifications happened)
 - Identity of the signer

- Establish the origin of a message (bind signer's identity to message)
- A valid signature guarantees
 - · Message integrity (no modifications happened)
 - Identity of the signer

Security (EUF-CMA)

- Obtain signatures on arbitrary messages
- Not able to produce valid signature for non-queried message

Modifications? That's what we try to prevent?

Modifications? That's what we try to prevent?

Controlled modifications

- Signer determines *how* signed message can be altered
- Think of implicitly signing all possible messages

Modifications? That's what we try to prevent?

Controlled modifications

- Signer determines *how* signed message can be altered
- Think of implicitly signing all possible messages
- Example: Medical documents
 - Anonymization for research/accounting (still want authenticity guarantees)
 - Removing exact diagnosis for sick leave

Re-signing after the fact might not be possible (availability, etc.)

Will look at two common schemes: redactable and sanitizable signatures





define mods & sign



define mods & sign

Security properties

- Unforgeability
 - In EUF-CMA sense: cannot come up with valid signature for a message not "derivable" from signed ones
- Privacy
 - Redacted signatures leaks no information about redacted parts
- Transparancy (optional)
 - Not visible if redaction happened or not
- Unlinkability

Originally proposed in [SBZ, ICISC'01] and [JMSW, CT-RSA'02]

Various ad-hoc constructions for different message representations (linear, sets, trees)

Generic construction from EUF-CMA secure signatures and *indistinguishable* accumulators [DPSS, ICISC'15]

Sketch of RSS for sets (accumulator + EUF-CMA signatures Σ):

Accumulator: $\mathcal{X} = \{x_1, ..., x_n\}$ succinctly represented by $acc_{\mathcal{X}}$

Accumulator: $\mathcal{X} = \{x_1, ..., x_n\}$ succinctly represented by $\operatorname{acc}_{\mathcal{X}}$ Witnesses wit_{x_i} certifying membership of x_i in $\operatorname{acc}_{\mathcal{X}}$

• Efficiently computable $\forall x \in \mathcal{X}$, intractable $\forall y \notin \mathcal{X}$

Accumulator: $\mathcal{X} = \{x_1, ..., x_n\}$ succinctly represented by $acc_{\mathcal{X}}$ Witnesses wit_{x_i} certifying membership of x_i in $acc_{\mathcal{X}}$

• Efficiently computable $\forall x \in \mathcal{X}$, intractable $\forall y \notin \mathcal{X}$

Indistinguishability [DS, CT-RSA'15]

- Neither acc nor wit leak information about ${\cal X}$

Accumulator: $\mathcal{X} = \{x_1, ..., x_n\}$ succinctly represented by $acc_{\mathcal{X}}$ Witnesses wit_{x_i} certifying membership of x_i in $acc_{\mathcal{X}}$

• Efficiently computable $\forall x \in \mathcal{X}$, intractable $\forall y \notin \mathcal{X}$

Indistinguishability [DS, CT-RSA'15]

- Neither acc nor wit leak information about ${\cal X}$

RSS: To sign $m = \{m_1, ..., m_n\}$

Accumulator: $\mathcal{X} = \{x_1, ..., x_n\}$ succinctly represented by $acc_{\mathcal{X}}$ Witnesses wit_{x_i} certifying membership of x_i in $acc_{\mathcal{X}}$

• Efficiently computable $\forall x \in \mathcal{X}$, intractable $\forall y \notin \mathcal{X}$

Indistinguishability [DS, CT-RSA'15]

- Neither acc nor wit leak information about ${\cal X}$

RSS: To sign $m = \{m_1, ..., m_n\}$

- Compute acc_m and use Σ to sign acc_m

Accumulator: $\mathcal{X} = \{x_1, ..., x_n\}$ succinctly represented by $acc_{\mathcal{X}}$ Witnesses wit_{x_i} certifying membership of x_i in $acc_{\mathcal{X}}$

• Efficiently computable $\forall x \in \mathcal{X}$, intractable $\forall y \notin \mathcal{X}$

Indistinguishability [DS, CT-RSA'15]

- Neither acc nor wit leak information about ${\cal X}$

RSS: To sign $m = \{m_1, ..., m_n\}$

- Compute acc_m and use Σ to sign acc_m
- As redactable signature provide signature of Σ and {wit_{*m*_i}}}









Replacement of designated parts by designated entity





Security properties

- Unforgeability
- Immutability
 - In EUF-CMA sense: Sanitizer cannot come up with valid signature for a message not "derivable" from signed ones
- Privacy
- Signer/Sanitizer accountability
 - Signer/sanitizer cannot blame the other party for having produced a signature
- Transparancy (optional)
- Invisibility (optional)
 - Signature does not leak which parts are sanitizable
- Unlinkability

Originally proposed in [ACMT, ESORICS'05] and rigorous security model [BFFLP+, PKC'09]

Various constructions with different properties and sanitizing restrictions, e.g., limit sanitizing to defined set

Generic construction from EUF-CMA secure signatures and *chameleon hash functions* [BFFLP+, PKC'09]

Sketch of SSS (chameleon hashes + EUF-CMA signatures Σ):

Chameleon Hash: Collision resistant hash keyed with (sk, pk)

Chameleon Hash: Collision resistant hash keyed with (sk, pk)

• Hashing: *h* ← CHash(pk,*m*;*r*)

Chameleon Hash: Collision resistant hash keyed with (sk, pk)

- Hashing: $h \leftarrow CHash(pk, m; r)$
- Collision: sk allows for any h, \hat{m} to compute \hat{r} s.t. CHash(pk, m; r) = CHash(pk, \hat{m} ; \hat{r})

Chameleon Hash: Collision resistant hash keyed with (sk, pk)

- Hashing: $h \leftarrow CHash(pk, m; r)$
- Collision: sk allows for any h, \hat{m} to compute \hat{r} s.t. CHash(pk, m; r) = CHash(pk, \hat{m} ; \hat{r})

SSS: To sign $m = (m_1, \dots, m_n)$

Chameleon Hash: Collision resistant hash keyed with (sk, pk)

- Hashing: $h \leftarrow CHash(pk, m; r)$
- Collision: sk allows for any h, \hat{m} to compute \hat{r} s.t. CHash(pk, m; r) = CHash(pk, \hat{m} ; \hat{r})

SSS: To sign
$$m = (m_1, ..., m_n)$$

Use Σ to sign $h = (h_1, ..., h_n)$ where

$$h_i = \begin{cases} \mathsf{CHash}(\mathsf{pk}, m_i; r_i), & \text{if sanitizable} \\ m_i, & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

Chameleon Hash: Collision resistant hash keyed with (sk, pk)

- Hashing: $h \leftarrow CHash(pk, m; r)$
- Collision: sk allows for any h, \hat{m} to compute \hat{r} s.t. CHash(pk, m; r) = CHash(pk, \hat{m} ; \hat{r})

SSS: To sign
$$m = (m_1, ..., m_n)$$

Use Σ to sign $h = (h_1, ..., h_n)$ where
$$h_i = \begin{cases} CHash(pk, m_i; r_i), & \text{if sanitizable} \\ m_i & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

As sanitizable signature provide signature of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ and \boldsymbol{r}

Provide a primitive that supports removal and editing at the same time

Generalize RSS and SSS into a single primitive having all desired properties of RSS and SSS

Motivating example (k-anonymization):

- Removal of attributes
- Generalization of attributes

We could use SSS to mimic the functionality of RSS

• Use limited set replacement with a special symbol denoting redaction

We could use SSS to mimic the functionality of RSS

• Use limited set replacement with a special symbol denoting redaction

Destroys transparency!

We could use SSS to mimic the functionality of RSS

• Use limited set replacement with a special symbol denoting redaction

Destroys transparency!

Ideally have efficient construction providing all properties

Protean Signature Schemes (PSS)



Protean Signature Schemes (PSS)



Protean Signature Schemes (PSS)



Replacement and removal of designated parts by designated entity



Security properties

- Unforgeability
- Immutability
- Privacy
- Signer/Sanitizer accountability
- Transparancy (optional)
- Invisibility (optional)

We provide a black-box construction of a protean signature scheme

Ingredients

- A secure sanitizable signature scheme (SSS)
- A secure redactable signature scheme (RSS)
- A CCA2 secure labeled public key encryption scheme
 - Only required if RSS provides auxiliary redaction information RED
 - RED typically makes redactions more efficient

Signer keys (keys from SSS and RSS)

- $\cdot \ \mathsf{sk}_{\mathsf{sig}} \gets (\mathsf{sk}_{\mathsf{sig}}^{\mathsf{SSS}}, \mathsf{sk}^{\mathsf{RSS}})$
- $\cdot \ \mathsf{pk}_{\mathsf{sig}} \gets (\mathsf{pk}_{\mathsf{sig}}^{\mathsf{SSS}},\mathsf{pk}^{\mathsf{RSS}})$

Sanitizer keys (keys from SSS)

$$\boldsymbol{\cdot} ~ \mathsf{sk}_{\mathsf{san}} \gets \mathsf{sk}_{\mathsf{san}}^{\mathsf{SSS}}$$

 $\cdot \ \mathsf{pk}_{\mathsf{san}} \gets \mathsf{pk}_{\mathsf{san}}^{\mathsf{SSS}}$

Let us consider a message $m = (m_1, m_2, m_3)$

Let us consider a message $m = (m_1, m_2, m_3)$

Inner SSS



Let us consider a message $m = (m_1, m_2, m_3)$

Inner SSS



RSS

$$\underbrace{(\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau, \mathsf{pk}_{\mathsf{sig}}, \mathsf{pk}_{\mathsf{san}})}_{\sigma^{\mathsf{RSS}}}$$

Let us consider a message $m = (m_1, m_2, m_3)$

Inner SSS



RSS

$$\underbrace{(\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau, \mathsf{pk}_{\mathsf{sig}}, \mathsf{pk}_{\mathsf{san}})}_{\sigma^{\mathsf{RSS}}}$$

Outer SSS

$$\underbrace{((m_1, m_2, m_3), \sigma^{\text{RSS}}, (\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \sigma_1^{\text{SSS}}, \sigma_2^{\text{SSS}}, \sigma_3^{\text{SSS}}), \tau, \text{pk}_{\text{sig}}, \text{pk}_{\text{san}})}_{\sigma_0^{\text{SSS}}}$$

Edit the message $m = (m_1, m_2, m_3)$ to $\hat{m} = (m_1, \hat{m}_2)$

Edit the message $m = (m_1, m_2, m_3)$ to $\hat{m} = (m_1, \hat{m}_2)$

Inner SSS



Edit the message $m = (m_1, m_2, m_3)$ to $\hat{m} = (m_1, \hat{m}_2)$

Inner SSS



RSS

$$\underbrace{(\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau, \mathsf{pk}_{\mathsf{sig}}, \mathsf{pk}_{\mathsf{san}})}_{\hat{\sigma}^{\mathsf{RSS}}}$$

Edit the message $m=(m_1,m_2,m_3)$ to $\hat{m}=(m_1,\hat{m}_2)$

Inner SSS



RSS

$$\underbrace{(\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau, \mathsf{pk}_{\mathsf{sig}}, \mathsf{pk}_{\mathsf{san}})}_{\hat{\sigma}^{\mathsf{RSS}}}$$

Outer SSS

$$\underbrace{((m_1, m_2, m_3), \sigma^{\text{RSS}}, (\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \sigma_1^{\text{SSS}}, \sigma_2^{\text{SSS}}, \sigma_3^{\text{SSS}}), \tau, \text{pk}_{\text{sig}}, \text{pk}_{\text{san}})}_{\sigma_0^{\text{SSS}}}$$

Edit the message $m = (m_1, m_2, m_3)$ to $\hat{m} = (m_1, \hat{m}_2)$

Inner SSS



RSS

$$\underbrace{(\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau, \mathsf{pk}_{\mathsf{sig}}, \mathsf{pk}_{\mathsf{san}})}_{\hat{\sigma}^{\mathsf{RSS}}}$$

$$\underbrace{((m_1, \hat{m}_2), \hat{\sigma}^{\text{RSS}}, (\tau_1, \tau_2, \sigma_1^{\text{SSS}}, \sigma_2^{\text{SSS}}), \tau, \text{pk}_{\text{sig}}, \text{pk}_{\text{san}})}_{\hat{\sigma}_0^{\text{SSS}}}$$

Block-level: Accountability notions on a block instead of message level

Block-level: Accountability notions on a block instead of message level

Dependencies: Enforce restrictions such as "if block *i* is redacted, also block *j* needs to be redacted"

Block-level: Accountability notions on a block instead of message level

Dependencies: Enforce restrictions such as "if block *i* is redacted, also block *j* needs to be redacted"

Unlinkability: Seems hard to achieve with our construction paradigm

• RSS and SSS allow controlled modifications of signed messages

- RSS and SSS allow controlled modifications of signed messages
- RSS and SSS provide different features (e.g., remove vs. replace)

- RSS and SSS allow controlled modifications of signed messages
- RSS and SSS provide different features (e.g., remove vs. replace)
- We generalize RSS and SSS into protean signatures (PSS)

- RSS and SSS allow controlled modifications of signed messages
- RSS and SSS provide different features (e.g., remove vs. replace)
- \cdot We generalize RSS and SSS into protean signatures (PSS)
- PSS provide all features and strong privacy guarantees

- RSS and SSS allow controlled modifications of signed messages
- RSS and SSS provide different features (e.g., remove vs. replace)
- We generalize RSS and SSS into protean signatures (PSS)
- PSS provide all features and strong privacy guarantees
- We provide a generic construction based on RSS and SSS (and labeled PKE)

Thank you! Questions?





Supported by EU H2020



and ECSEL

