



## Mobile Agents Technology

Situation: author distribute programs for his own needs.

Question: Threats and applications you see?

- Privacy of data in mobile agents
  - Sending hard computational task to untrusted cluster
  - Auxiliary computing devices for smart cards
- Illegal agent modification
  - Network monitoring system
- Keys protection
  - Buying agents

## Network Monitoring Systems

First interesting example of mobile agent needed protection is network monitoring and management systems.

We have: a huge network consisting of nodes, and a monitoring agent installed on each node.

Some observations:

- Agents interacts with their hosts
- Agents interacts with central (the only trusted) node. We call it control center.
- We can't protect agents against just deleting (uninstalling them)
- We want to protect the "state" of agents and their proper execution

## Buying Agent

Another important example is buying agent.

What do we have: a set of "sellers" with installed buying agents. These agents have a task to purchase a specific good if some conditions (usually on price) holds

Aspects:

- Buying agents have keys to the credit card or electronic money.
- Adversary is always able to delete an agent.
- Agents owner wants to prevent key's extraction and changing conditions of purchase or even buying wrong good.

## Applications in Cryptography

What applications in cryptography can we imagine?

- Private key cryptosystem  $\rightarrow$  Public key cryptosystem
  - It was mentioned even in famous Diffie-Hellman paper
- Constructing homomorphic encryption schemes
- Realizing random oracles in cryptosystems

## New Public-Key Cryptosystems

General idea: given a private-key (symmetric) cryptosystem publish obfuscated encryption algorithm  $O(E_k)$  as a public key.

Analysis:

- We must be sure that key extraction of  $O(E_k)$  is computationally hard
- Moreover, rewriting  $O(E_k)$  to any efficient program computing  $D_k$  must be computationally hard
- Conclusion: starting symmetric cryptosystem should have sufficient difference in encrypting and decrypting algorithms

## Constructing Homomorphic Encryption

Given good enough obfuscator it's easy to construct a homomorphic encryption.

Question: Any ideas how to do this?

Construction: as such homomorphic encryption we can take just any public key cryptosystem:

Input:  $E(x), E(y)$   
Program algorithm: using private key decrypt  $x$  and  $y$ , compute  $x + y$  (respectively  $xy$ ), then encrypt it.  
Output:  $E(x + y)$  (respectively,  $E(xy)$ )

If we are able to obfuscate  $P$  and  $Q$  in the way that extracting private key and intermediate results ( $x$  and  $y$ ) is computationally hard than we are done!

## More Applications

- Diversity producing (every user receive his own version)  
Makes virus attacks harder
- Guaranteed slowdown of encrypting procedure in cryptosystems  
Makes brute-force attacks harder
- Digital Rights Management software  
Protection against extracting secret keys from players for copyrighted media files

Question: Your ideas of applications?

## Outline

- 1 Applications of Obfuscation
  - Classification of Threats
  - Applications in Software Protection
  - Applications in Mobile Agents
  - Applications in Cryptography
  - More Applications
- 2 Blackbox Secure Obfuscation
  - Defining Security of Obfuscation
  - Impossibility Result

## Security Definitions in Cryptography (1)

- 1 Define adversary's inputs
- 2 Define adversary's goal
- 3 **Security** = achieving goal is computationally hard

Proof instrument:

Reduction: "If somebody can break this new system than he also able to solve some well-known hard problem"

Example: security of pseudorandom generators

## Ana and BAna

We are interested in 2 types of polynomial-time analyzers:

- **Ana** is a source-code analyzer that can read the program.

$$\text{Ana}(P)$$

- **BAna** is a black-box analyzer that only queries the program as an oracle.

$$\text{BAna}^P(\text{time}(P))$$

### Black-Box security

Ana can't get more information than BAna could

## Unobfuscatable Function Family

Family  $\mathcal{H} = \cup H_k$

$H_k$  is a set (distribution) of functions  $B^{n_k} \rightarrow B^{m_k}$

- $h \in H_k$  computable in  $\text{poly}(k)$  time
- $\exists \pi : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  such that
  - $|\Pr\{S^h(1^k) = \pi(h)\} - 1/2| = \nu(k)$
  - $\exists A$  such that for every TM  $M$  computing  $h$ ,  $A(M) = \pi(h)$

## Counterexample

Cannibalistic construction:

$$C_{\alpha,\beta}(x) = \begin{cases} \beta, & x = \alpha \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$D_{\alpha,\beta}(C) = \begin{cases} 1, & C(\alpha) = \beta \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$Z_k(x) = 0^k$$

**Intuition:** it is difficult to distinguish pairs  $C_{\alpha,\beta}, D_{\alpha,\beta}$  from pair  $Z_k, D_{\alpha,\beta}$  given only black box access to these programs.

## Security Definitions in Cryptography (2)

- 1 Define ideal model
- 2 **Security** = adversary cannot compute more than in ideal model

Proof instrument:

Simulation: "For any property that could be extracted from the new system almost the same property can be extracted from the ideal model"

Example: security of zero-knowledge proofs

## Black-box Security

Randomized algorithm  $O$  is an **Obfuscator** if three following conditions hold:

- 1 (functionality)  $\forall$  TM  $M: O(M) \approx M$
- 2 (effectiveness)  $\exists p: M(x)$  terminates in  $t$  steps  $\Rightarrow O(M)(x)$  terminates in  $p(t)$  steps.
- 3 (black-box security) For every PPT  $A$  there exists PPT  $S$  such that for all TMs  $M$ :

$$|\Pr\{A(O(M)) = 1\} - \Pr\{S^M(1^{|M|}) = 1\}| = \nu(|M|).$$

## Unobfuscatable 2-Functions Family

Family  $\mathcal{G} = \cup G_k$

$G_k$  is a set (distribution) of pairs of functions  $B^{n_k} \rightarrow B^{m_k}$

- $(g_1, g_2) \in G_k$  computable in  $\text{poly}(k)$  time
- $\exists \pi : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  such that
  - $|\Pr\{S^{g_1, g_2}(1^k) = \pi(g_1, g_2)\} - 1/2| = \nu(k)$
  - $\exists A$  such that for every TMs  $M_1, M_2$  computing  $g_1, g_2$ ,  $A(M_1, M_2) = \pi(g_1, g_2)$

Existence of unobfuscatable function families and 2-function families. What follows from what?

## Technical Details

We leave out technical details:

- Truncated version of  $D$
- Combining pair of functions into a single one.

More impossibilities of obfuscation:

- Unobfuscatable **functional** properties (not only predicates)
- Computationally easy but still unobfuscatable programs (in  $TC_0$  class)
- Attack (deobfuscation algorithm) is known in advance
- Obfuscator might preserve functionality only approximately
- Impossibility of obfuscation for **sampling algorithms**





## Summary

Main points:

- Rough idea of **applications**: cryptosystem design, mobile agents technology, software protection.
- Black-box security: obfuscated program tells no more than input-output behaviour.
- There exists unobfuscatable function families

Whether the family  $f_\alpha(x) = x \cdot \alpha$  is obfuscatable with black-box security?

## Reading List

-  B. Barak, O. Goldreich, R. Impagliazzo, S. Rudich, A. Sahai, S., Vadhan, K. Yang  
On the (Im)possibility of Obfuscating Programs, 2001.  
<http://eprint.iacr.org/2001/069>.
-  K. Yang  
Talk on "(Im)possibility of Obfuscating", 2001.  
<http://www.cs.cmu.edu/~yangke/papers/obf-talk.pdf>.
-  N. Kuzyurin, N. Varnovsky and V. Zakharov  
Mathematical problems of Obfuscation, 2004.  
<http://www.ispras.ru/news/downloads/obfuscation/obfuscation.pdf>.
-  Yu. Lifshits  
Lecture Notes on Program Obfuscation, 2005.  
<http://logic.pdmi.ras.ru/~yura/obfuscation.html>.

Thanks for attention. **Questions?**