

On the Practicality of Dynamic Updates in Fast Searchable Encryption

Steven Willoughby
Portland State University

Spring 2019

Abstract

Searchable encrypted (SE) indexing systems are a useful tool for utilizing cloud services to store and manage sensitive information. However, much of the work on SE systems to date has remained theoretical. In order to make them of practical use, more work is needed to develop optimal protocols and working models for them. This includes, in particular, the creation of a working update model in order to maintain an encrypted index of a dynamic document set such as an email inbox. I have created a working, real-world end-to-end SE implementation that satisfies these needs, including the first empirical performance evaluation of the dynamic SE update operation. In doing so, I show a viable path to move from the theoretical concepts described by previous researchers to a future production-worthy implementation and identify issues for follow-on investigation.

1 Introduction

There are many situations and contexts wherein users of information systems need to collect, store, search, and retrieve large amounts of information. When the collection of data is large enough or needs to be available to multiple geographically-separated users, an attractive option may be to host the document repository on a cloud service provided by a third party.

While this allows the users to utilize the service's data centers and network connections to provide a robust platform to host their data, it opens a number of very serious security and privacy concerns if the data being hosted are in any way sensitive, since the hosting service may not necessarily be trusted to protect that information from their own personnel or others.

Consider, for example, an organization which uses such an externally-hosted searchable repository to manage confidential pre-release product design documentation, or financial information belonging to the organization. Worse, consider if the data were to contain personal information about employees or customers which would have expensive and disruptive effects on people's lives if it were to be leaked to unauthorized parties.

The obvious solution is to encrypt the data, so that they may be stored on the untrusted server in a form that cannot be understood by anyone but authorized personnel. This solves the problem of protecting the

data at rest on the server. However, since the index must be decrypted in order to search within it, we must take one of two approaches: either provide decryption keys to the server in order to decrypt and search server-side, or download the entire index to the client for the decryption and search to be performed there. The former approach is not desirable because we have already established that the hosting provider may not be authorized to see the data nor trusted to protect it from unauthorized access. The latter is less than practical due to the amount of data which must be copied to users' local systems. These client systems may not have sufficient storage or processing power¹ and the data may well be unreasonably large to transmit repeatedly—it may be hundreds of megabytes, gigabytes, or terabytes depending on the amount of indexed data.

Ideally, we desire to have a method whereby the server can facilitate searches within an index of interesting keywords from the document repository, then report back with a list of documents containing the requested keywords (allowing the user to then retrieve those documents, locally decrypt them, and make use of their contents), all without the server having the ability to actually read the document index itself (since that provides a great deal of insight into the contents of each indexed document). In fact, the

¹We must accept in these modern times that client computing platforms may well include cell phones and low-power notebooks in addition to more traditional computing platforms.

server should not even be able to understand what keywords it was searching for (since that provides insight into the nature of the documents and what the users are looking for), or what documents were in the result list of each search.

While that may seem to be an impossible expectation, in reality we can find an acceptable middle ground which allows efficient server-side searching without divulging any direct information about the details of the search terms or results. The price paid for this, however, is that a determined hostile observer (perhaps the hosting provider themselves) could analyze patterns of input and output over time which will “leak” useful information from which some amount of the protected data may be inferred.

Building on the foundational work of previous researchers in this field, I have created a dynamic update capability which allows an SE index to accumulate new documents over time, whereas previous implementations were primarily focused on a one-time generation of an SE index for a static document set. I also moved beyond the previous theoretical treatments of this subject by adding empirical performance evaluation of my new update mechanism using a typical TCP/IP client-server architecture. Based on this work I identified some considerations for future optimization work.

2 Definitions and Nomenclature

In this paper I will use the terminology set out by Curtmola, et al. [1] which is also used by other authors, notably Demertzis and Papamanthou, [2] for the sake of consistency with established work on this topic. Basic notation and symbology is summarized in Table 1.

Central to this topic is the notion of a collection of documents for which the user wishes to maintain a searchable encrypted index. Following Curtmola, et al.’s nomenclature, let Δ be a dictionary of all “interesting” words in all documents, i.e., $\Delta = \{w_1, \dots, w_d\}$ where d is the number of unique interesting words. If 2^Δ is the power set of all possible documents containing words $w \in \Delta$, then we will consider a set $\mathcal{D} \subseteq 2^\Delta$ which is the specific set of n documents being indexed in some particular instance of searchable encrypted index being discussed.

Each such document has a unique identifier by which it can be fetched from its storage location. Let $\text{id}(D)$ be the identifier for some arbitrary document D . Further, let $\mathcal{D}(w) = \{\text{id}(D) \mid D \in \mathcal{D} \mid w \in D\}$ be the set of unique identifiers for all documents in our indexed collection which contain the word w . (Curt-

mola, et al. use the notation \mathbf{D} and $\mathbf{D}(w)$ instead of \mathcal{D} and $\mathcal{D}(w)$ respectively).

For my work which builds primarily on the work by Demertzis and Papamanthou, [2] I will also use the following nomenclature from their work: Let λ be the security parameter (in practical terms, the encryption key length in bits), such that each key k_i is generated using a cryptographically secure random number source, i.e., $k_i \xleftarrow{\$} \{0, 1\}^\lambda$.

Also let N be the number of entries stored in the SE, where *entry* is a word which here means a unique tuple $(w, \text{id}(D))$ mapping an indexed keyword w to the identifier of a document D containing that word. Thus, we have

$$N = \sum_{\forall w \in \Delta} |\mathcal{D}(w)|.$$

As we shall see, Demertzis and Papamanthou [2] posit a storage array arranged in tiered *levels* of varying sized storage *buckets*.

Let $\ell = \lceil \log_2 N \rceil$ be the number of levels of index storage which would be employed in this model.

Let $s \leq \ell$ be a configurable number of tiers which will actually be stored on the server (to save space since not all indexes will have values actually assigned to all possible levels), and \mathcal{L} be the set of s storage levels allocated for the SE.

This SE model supports the notion of *locality* where data associated with the same keyword are placed in 1 or more co-located areas in the data store. Let L be the user-configurable locality such that specifying $L > 1$ allows each indexed term to be stored in multiple non-contiguous storage areas, facilitating parallelization of search operations within the index. These levels of storage are implemented in storage arrays A_i where $i \in \mathcal{L}$. Each level is further partitioned into *buckets*. Bucket x of array A_i is denoted $A_i[x]$.

I will refer to a few standard functions, as follows. Let F be a pseudo-random function (PRF) $F : \{0, 1\}^* \times \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*$, which emits a deterministic pattern of bits based on the values of its two inputs (key and data), but whose output is indistinguishable from random bits if those inputs are not known. Let Enc and Dec be CPA-secure² symmetric encryption functions $\text{Enc} : \{0, 1\}^* \times \{0, 1\}^\lambda \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*$ and $\text{Dec} : \{0, 1\}^* \times \{0, 1\}^\lambda \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*$ (such that $\text{Dec} = \text{Enc}^{-1}$) which take λ -bit keys to transform arbitrary-length bit strings to another arbitrary-length ciphertext and back again. Finally, let $H : \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^b$ be a cryptographically strong one-way hash function which outputs b bits of digest from its input data

²A CPA-secure cipher is one which resists chosen-plaintext attacks.

Notation	Meaning
$a \parallel b$	Concatenation of strings a and b
$ X $	Cardinality of set X
$x \oplus y$	Bitwise exclusive-or of x and y
$x \stackrel{\$}{\leftarrow} X$	Element x sampled uniformly from set X
$x \leftarrow \mathcal{A}$ or $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow x$	Output x from algorithm or function \mathcal{A}
$\Delta = \{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_d\}$	Dictionary of d words in an index
$\mathcal{D} = \{D_1, D_2, \dots, D_n\}$	Set of n documents whose words are indexed
$\mathcal{D}(w)$	List of all documents containing word w
$A_i[x]$	Bucket x of level i in index storage array A
λ	Bit length of encryption keys
L	Locality of the index
$\mathcal{L} = \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_s\}$	Set of s storage levels in use for the index
N	Number of stored $(w, \text{id}(D))$ tuples in index
o	Order of a SE index, related to its storage capacity
s	Number of actually stored index levels
$c \leftarrow \text{Enc}(K, m)$	Encryption function with key K and plaintext message m
$m \leftarrow \text{Dec}(K, c)$	Decryption function with key K and ciphertext message c
$y \leftarrow \text{F}(K, x)$	Pseudo-random function with key K and data x
$x' \leftarrow \text{H}(x)$	Collision-resistant hash function taking data x
$\text{id}(D)$	Unique identifier for document D
ε	Empty string or unused storage location
000C	Hexadecimal values are shown in fixed-width type

Table 1: Summary of Notation Used in This Paper

of arbitrary length. This function must be collision resistant.

To the above notation I add the concept of the *order* of an index, which gives us a useful way to organize a collection of various-size SE indexes. For this research, I chose to assume the order o of an index to be $o = \ell = \lceil \log_2 N \rceil$ with the intention that it would yield a reasonable pattern of varying sizes of indexes to avoid expensive large-index merge operations as long as reasonably possible.

3 Basic Principles of SE

Here, and throughout the rest of this paper, the term *client* shall refer to the system a user of the SE system employs to initiate searches or add new documents to the SE index. It is a trusted system under the control of an authorized user. Encryption keys may be employed on it, and plain-text search terms and results may be known to it.

The term *server* shall refer to the remote system on which the encrypted documents and the SE indexes are stored. This system is not allowed to see any decryption keys nor to see the plaintext search terms nor results.

The essential principle on which SE is based is that, given an index \mathcal{I} mapping a set Δ of interesting keywords from a document repository \mathcal{D} , we must represent \mathcal{I} in some opaque fashion such that it can be stored on an untrusted server without anyone being able to glean information about \mathcal{D} by examining \mathcal{I} , even given an arbitrarily large amount of time to analyze \mathcal{I} . This implies the use of a one-way cryptographically strong hash function, since that will provide a way to derive an opaque value to represent a value in the index without a reliable way to reverse the encoding function to obtain the original value again.

If we can then use the same hash function to encode the client-side search terms we can match them on the server to the encoded entries in \mathcal{I} without revealing the original search terms directly.

To illustrate this concept, consider a document repository which contains five documents, specifically, the first five volumes of Douglas Adams' magnum opus *The Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy*. These volumes are separately encrypted and stored on the server. Each is assigned a document ID as shown in Table 2.

We identify a set Δ of all words in these documents

ID	Document Title
3	<i>The Hitchhiker’s Guide to the Galaxy</i>
5	<i>The Restaurant at the End of the Universe</i>
8	<i>Life, the Universe, and Everything</i>
12	<i>So Long, and Thanks for All the Fish</i>
15	<i>Mostly Harmless</i>

Table 2: Example Document Repository \mathcal{D}

we find interesting for our purposes. Say, for example, $\Delta = \{\text{Arthur}, \text{dolphin}, \text{Fenchurch}, \text{hooloovoo}, \text{krikkrit}, \text{Zaphod}\}$. (Obviously, in a full production repository the list of interesting words would be orders of magnitude greater than this trivial example.) If we make a list of all documents in \mathcal{D} in which each of the words in Δ appear, we find the following associations of each keyword $w \in \Delta$ to a set of document IDs $D(w)$:

Arthur $\rightarrow \{3, 5, 8, 12, 15\}$
 dolphin $\rightarrow \{3, 12\}$
 Fenchurch $\rightarrow \{12, 15\}$
 hooloovoo $\rightarrow \{3\}$
 krikkrit $\rightarrow \{8, 12\}$
 Zaphod $\rightarrow \{3, 5, 8, 12, 15\}$

From these associations we generate an index \mathcal{I} which is a collection of tuples $(w, \text{id}(D))$. Specifically, we get: (Arthur, 3), (Arthur, 5), (Arthur, 8), (Arthur, 12), (Arthur, 15), (dolphin, 3), (dolphin, 12), (Fenchurch, 12), (Fenchurch, 15), (hooloovoo, 3), (krikkrit, 8), (krikkrit, 12), (Zaphod, 3), (Zaphod, 5), (Zaphod, 8), (Zaphod, 12), and (Zaphod, 15).

We store \mathcal{I} on disk in two parts: a storage array which holds the actual tuples, and a hash table which associates each search term w with the location in storage holding its set of tuples. Setting aside for the moment the finer points of storage optimization so that we may focus just on the encryption aspect, let us visualize the storage arrangement of our index \mathcal{I} as shown in Figure 1.

With such a storage arrangement, if the client wishes to search for keyword $w = \text{dolphin}$, the server looks that up in the hash table, finding that the tuples to satisfy the search are contained in storage array level 1, bucket 0 (which we will designate $A_1[0]$). Looking in that bucket, we find (among other things that happen to be stored there as well) the tuples (dolphin, 3) and (dolphin, 12). From this the server

reports the result set $\{3, 12\}$ as the set of document IDs where the word “dolphin” is found.

3.1 Encrypting the Index

To the above trivial storage arrange we now need to add a layer of encryption to obscure the meaning of the information in \mathcal{I} beyond the ability of the server to understand, but in such a way that the client can use it to get the same search results.

For this encryption, we generate a secret key known only to authorized clients. This key $K = (k_1, k_2, k_3)$ has three parts, each of which is created from λ random bits (i.e., $k_i \xleftarrow{\$} \{0, 1\}^\lambda$).

First, given a cryptographically strong one-way hash function H , pseudo-random function F , and encryption function Enc as described above, we encode the tuples stored in the array A by encrypting the value $\text{id}(D) \parallel 0^\lambda$ using the encryption key $F(k_3, w)$. In our example, assuming for simplicity that document IDs are 16 bits and $\lambda = 16$, the tuple (dolphin, 3) is encoded by calculating $\text{Enc}(F(k_3, \text{dolphin}), 00030000)$. Likewise, the tuple (dolphin, 12) is encoded by calculating $\text{Enc}(F(k_3, \text{dolphin}), 000C0000)$. Assuming these two calculations produce the hex values A462910E and 07B422A7, and that we carried out corresponding encodings with the other tuples, we would now have the encrypted storage array shown in Figure 2. Note that we also filled the empty storage locations with random bits to further obfuscate the index.

It is important to note that each tuple is encrypted with a key that is based on the search term to which it belongs, so the data there is only recoverable if one is in possession of that secret key k_3 and the search term w .

Now that the tuples are encoded, we must encrypt the hash table’s keys and values in a similar fashion. The keys (the search terms) are simply replaced with the results of hashing them with another secret key: $H(F(k_1, w))$. Thus, search term “dolphin” would be replaced by $H(F(k_1, \text{dolphin}))$, say 38A9039C.

The value associated with “dolphin”, is the tuple




Figure 1: Example Index \mathcal{I} Storage (unencrypted)




Figure 2: Example Index \mathcal{I} Storage (encrypted)

(1, 0) which means that the entries for that keyword are to be found in $A_1[0]$ (storage level 1, bucket 0). We represent location $A_i[x]$ as a single numeric value $i \parallel x$ (in this case the hex value 00010000). This is encoded in the hash table as $[i \parallel x] \oplus H(F(k_2, w))$. Again, note that the search term w and a secret key are part of this encryption scheme. Supposing this gives the result 6BF86758, and continuing this for the rest of the table, we get the completely encrypted index shown in Figure 2. The values where the entries for our example term “dolphin” are encoded in \mathcal{I} are highlighted in red.

Now if we wish to search for a word like “dolphin”, we generate a *search token* $T = (t_1, t_2, t_3)$ by providing the portion of the encoding operations requiring knowledge of the secret values, sending to the server only the output from F which it can use to complete the hashing and decryption without divulging the actual keys or search terms: $t_1 = F(k_1, w)$, $t_2 = F(k_2, w)$, and $t_3 = F(k_3, w)$.

The server, upon receiving the client’s search token T , calculates $H(t_1)$ and gets 38A9039C. Looking at the hash table in Figure 2 we see that this is a key stored there, associated with value 6BF86758. The server then calculates $6BF86758 \oplus H(t_2)$ to get the result 00010000. Although the server never knew the search term w , it was given just enough information in T to determine that the answer to that query is to be found in storage location $A_1[0]$. T does not provide any information to decode any other hash table entries since they were encoded using different values of w .

Now the server knows that some of the values stored in $A_1[0]$ can be decrypted using the key $H(t_3)$. Running the contents of $A_1[0]$ through this decryption, it gets the results 00030000, 1AED5898, EF00F293, 000C0000, and 923BF508. Since any valid entry has 0^λ bits appended, the server knows that only the first and fourth values were correctly decrypted by the key it was given, so the result reported to the client is the set of document IDs {3, 12}.

Note that when we set locality $L > 1$, we must allow for multiple buckets to hold the tuple lists for any given keyword, so the actual calculations for the hash table keys and values includes a counter $c \in \{0, 1, \dots, L - 1\}$. The key is actually encoded as $H(F(k_1, w) \parallel c)$ and the value as $[i \parallel x] \oplus H(F(k_2, w) \parallel c)$.

4 Prior Work

In their seminal work on the subject, Song, Wagner, and Perrig [3] laid out the essential idea for SE indexing for the first time. From this beginning almost

two decades ago, other researchers have further developed and extended these initial concepts in order to improve functionality, security, and performance.

One approach explored by Pinkas and Reinman [4] as an alternative to SE was to leverage the concept of oblivious RAM (ORAM)—a specially-arranged memory system originally proposed by Goldreich and Ostrovsky [5] which has the property that “the sequence of memory accesses ... reveals no information about the input ... , beyond the running-time for the input.” Pinkas and Reinman sought to use this aspect of ORAM to hide the nature of the calculations used to search through an encrypted index to thwart attempts at cryptanalysis or other means of obtaining confidential details of the index. Unfortunately, this approach is very expensive compared to more practical software-only solutions described here.

As these software SE systems were developed, they were primarily implemented as in-memory schemes. Cash, et al. [6] note that this approach did not scale effectively as the repository size expanded into the near-terabyte range and beyond. As index entries may be scattered throughout the index, the amount of data transmitted back to the user for local decryption multiplies with the database size. Cash and his co-authors proposed refinements which resulted in greater locality of the encrypted index entries, guaranteeing that entries matching a given search term cluster near each other in the index, thus reducing the number of encrypted index blocks which must be sent.

Cash and Tessaro [7] continued improving their previous SE schemes, working on maximizing data locality—the number of non-contiguous storage groups from which the server reads data to satisfy a given search query. They note—and go on to formally prove—how this optimization runs counter to the need to reduce the size of the index storage on the server.

Building further on that research, Asharov, et al. [8] created SE schemes with improved read efficiency (they report $O(\log n)$ and $O(\log \log n)$) and demonstrated that it will always be the case that to achieve either maximal read efficiency and locality it will be necessary to sacrifice one to achieve the other.

Finally, Demertzis and Papamanthou [2] improved on these earlier efforts by developing a scheme which provides reasonable locality, including controls the repository owner may adjust to “tune” the storage to be maximally efficient for the type of data being indexed.

My research is directly based on the work of Demertzis and Papamanthou, whose scheme I extended to include multiple index collections and dynamic up-

dates.

4.1 Security of SE Systems

The observation above that SE systems will “leak” information over time from which an observer can infer confidential information raises the question of how much information leakage is acceptable. This issue has been explored at length by previous researchers. Song, Demertzis, and their colleagues who developed their respective SE implementation models (e.g., [3, 2]) provided with them formal proofs of the security of their encryption schemes. This was important to establish the trustworthiness of the SE concept in general.

Following on from this foundation, Naveed, Kamara, and Wright [9] along with Zhang, Katz, and Papamanthou [10] studied various attack scenarios and found that it was possible for a determined observer to eventually decrypt a significant amount of information out of an encrypted database stored on an untrusted server. These findings helped drive Demertzis and Papamanthou to develop more cryptographically robust encryption schemes which I also used for my work, and prompted me to seek a means of periodically invalidating accumulated inferences an observer may have gleaned as part of my update procedure.

4.2 Locality Optimization

As noted above, early SE research posited in-memory solutions for the sake of theoretical exploration, but this presented a roadblock to adapting SE systems for real-world applications as it didn’t allow the indexes to scale up to the data sizes needed in the real world. To address this, a number of storage strategies were proposed by Cash, et al., [6, 7] but these often ran into difficulties. For example, the practice of obfuscating the layout of the index by permuting index data throughout the storage area came at the expense of having related data clustered to make reads more efficient.

Demertzis and Papamanthou [2] proposed one improvement which I found advantageous enough to base my own work upon. Given some array A of storage locations on the server, this is organized into tiered *levels* A_0, A_1, \dots, A_ℓ , where each level A_i consists of a number of *buckets* $A_i[0], A_i[1], \dots, A_i[q_i]$ in which we will store document IDs.

At each level, the bucket sizes increase exponentially. For example, one level would hold buckets containing 2 references, the next level would hold buckets of size 4, the next 8, the next 16, and so

forth. The documents themselves are stored as encoded $(w, \text{id}(D))$ tuples as described above on p. 4.

This arrangement nicely facilitates our need to populate the index with document IDs where the number of IDs matching any given keyword varies widely from the number matching another keyword, while allowing us to co-locate these tuples within L buckets for efficiency. By adjusting the value of L at index creation time, the SE administrator can reduce the locality of the tuple storage but gain the ability to split up searches into parallel tasks.

They also introduced the optimization parameter s which allows an index to be built with only a subset of levels actually used. Specifically, for $s = \ell$, all levels are utilized, with each level i containing buckets sized to hold 2^i tuples. If s is reduced to some value $1 \leq s \leq \ell$, however, the set of actual levels utilized will be

$$\mathcal{L} = \{\ell, \ell - p, \dots, \ell - (s - 1)p\}$$

and the tuples will be stored in the nearest actual level to the one it would have been assigned if all were allocated.

5 My Contributions

I focused my work in two specific areas: to create a working production-scale SE implementation based on Demertzis and Papamanthou’s model, [2] and then to develop a system to add more information to the SE index over time. Their procedure for building a new SE index is summarized in Algorithm 1.

5.1 Real-World Implementation

I investigated two avenues for implementing a remotely hosted SE indexing system. The first was to implement an indexing scheme that maintained its indexes in local files. This was done with some straightforward Python programs:

- **genkeys** generates a set of cryptographic keys $K = (k_1, k_2, k_3)$ for use by the client to encrypt and decrypt index information.
- **buildindex** reads a collection of documents, extracting a list of words from each. These words are then encoded into an encrypted index stored as a simple DBM database.
- **search** takes a search query from the user, looks that up in the SE index, and reports the matching list of document IDs to the user.

Algorithm 1 Build an Index (summarized from Demertzis and Papamanthou [2])

procedure `SETUP`(k, \mathcal{D}) $\triangleright L, s$ (locality and stored levels) are publicly known parameters
Let Δ be the list of all “interesting” keywords in document set \mathcal{D} .
Let $N = \sum_{w \in \Delta} |\mathcal{D}(w)|$; $\ell = \lceil \log N \rceil$; and $p = \lceil \ell/s \rceil$.
Let $\mathcal{L} = \{\ell, \ell - p, \dots, \ell - (s - 1)p\}$.
if $L > 1$ **then**
 $\mathcal{L} \leftarrow \mathcal{L} \cup \{0\}$
end if
 $\forall i \in \mathcal{L}$ organize storage level A_i , divided into buckets $A_i[x]$.
for each keyword $w \in \Delta$ in random order **do**
 Find adjacent $i, j \in \mathcal{L} : L2^j < |\mathcal{D}(w)| \leq L2^i$.
 Split $\mathcal{D}(w)$ into a set of chunks C_w . Set $c = 0$.
 for each chunk $v \in C_w$ **do**
 $c \leftarrow c + 1$.
 Let A be buckets in A_i able to hold chunk v .
 Pick one bucket $A_i[x]$ from A randomly; store v in it.
 Add $H(F(k_1, w) \parallel c) \Rightarrow [i \parallel x] \oplus H(F(k_2, w) \parallel c)$ to hash table.
 end for
end for
Permute and encrypt entries in \mathcal{L} ; fill HT with random data.
end procedure

Since these operate on local files, all scripts are considered “client-side” in terms of having access to secret keys. In this model, I had in mind an implementation where another operating system layer—transparent to the SE code—handles remote hosting of the files. My choice for this was the InterPlanetary File System (IPFS), [11] which provides a distributed filesystem between clients, so each user sees a copy of the same underlying files, allowing a purely localized operation.

However, while that provides for simplicity of SE implementation, it comes at too high a cost for the widest audience since it requires substantial local data storage to be available on every client. It did, however, serve to demonstrate the correctness of the basic SE operations themselves before adding the extra complexity of network operations.

From there I switched to a traditional client-server model, defining a hard separation of duties between the data host (which may be remote and untrusted) and the local client. This is implemented in a new set of Python programs:

- `fserver` runs on the server system to carry out requests on behalf of clients. This manages the DBM databases which comprise the SE index.
- `buildindex_client` works as `buildindex` does but rather than building local database files, it encrypts a new index and sends it to the server for remote storage.

- `search_client` takes a search query from the user, computes a search token T as described on p. 6, and passes that to the server. It relays the search results from the server back to the local user.

When designing the client-server protocol for my implementation, one of my significant design goals was to allow large blocks of raw binary data since so much of the index is encrypted and needs to be sent as whole buckets at a time. This way I would not waste resources encoding and decoding the binary blocks as, e.g., base-64.

5.2 Dynamic SE

The key intention of my work on SE systems was to find a practical implementation of *dynamic* SE indexing. In today’s world it seems quite likely that an SE indexing system would be gainfully employed to help users search through a fluid stream of communication, such as an email inbox or the conversation history of an official chat service such as those used for customer support by some companies.

Most of the work to this point has referenced the idea of building an index \mathcal{I} from a set of documents \mathcal{D} and set of search terms Δ in a single indexing operation. Once \mathcal{I} is built, it is then searched any number of times but there is no notion of \mathcal{I} changing over time. Indeed, the way \mathcal{I} is constructed in the

first place depends on values such as N (the number of $(w, \text{id}(D))$ tuples stored) and the distribution of words $w \in \Delta$ throughout the data set and the number of documents $\mathcal{D}(w)$ for each. If those values change, the internal arrangement of the whole index may be different.

This implies that updating \mathcal{I} over time is necessarily a matter of rebuilding it again from scratch. However, this is obviously untenable for large indexes (e.g., when adding a single email message to an existing index holding 10 million messages already).

Cash, et al. [6] discuss their own approach to dynamic SE schemes and the limitations they and others encountered. They note that prior schemes “had an impractically large index or leaked [information allowing the server to learn] the pattern of which keywords appear in which documents. . . which is a severe form of leakage.” They go on to improve on that but make the assumption that full index rebuilds will be performed periodically and that deletions from the index will be rare. However, the approach they took does not lend itself to the tiered architecture I am working with. This prompted me to implement a new dynamic update system which is compatible with the tiered organization so I can retain the optimizations afforded by that structure.

Demertzis and Papamantou [2] do discuss dynamic updates to SE systems, but only to a limited extent. While acknowledging the shortcomings of previous attempts, their proposal was sketched out in basic terms: “The main idea is that we organize n sequential updates to a collection of . . . independent encrypted indexes. . . . [For each $(w, \mathcal{D}(w))$ tuple mapping a search word to a document ID,] the data owner initializes a new SE scheme by creating a new SE index that contains only the specific tuple, [that] is subsequently uploaded to the untrusted server. Whenever two indexes of the same size t are detected there [sic] are downloaded by the data owner, decrypted and merged to form a new SE index of size $2t$, again with a fresh secret key. The new index is then used to replace the two indexes of size t .”

To provide real-world practicality to the scheme, I chose to modify this to avoid unnecessarily creating many tiny indexes which will trigger many rapid successions of cascading merges with existing indexes. My design introduced the notion of an SE index *order* $o = \lceil \log N \rceil$. Rather than storing a single index \mathcal{I} , the server will maintain a collection of indexes. Let \mathcal{O} be the set of orders of indexes currently stored on a server. Then $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathcal{I}_o \mid o \in \mathcal{O}\}$ is the collection of all SE indexes which may logically appear to the client as “the SE index.”

When asked to perform a search, the server will perform the same operation on all indexes in \mathcal{C} , returning the union of their results.

For this scheme to work, I further impose the restriction that no two indexes of the same order may exist at the same time in a collection (i.e., all elements of \mathcal{O} are unique). When new data are to be added to the SE index, a new index is built for the new data, resulting in a new index \mathcal{I}_o . If no other index of order o exists in \mathcal{C} , then \mathcal{I}_o is added to \mathcal{C} . Otherwise, the contents of the existing \mathcal{I}_o are merged with the new data to create a new index \mathcal{I}_p . Then \mathcal{I}_p replaces the old \mathcal{I}_o in \mathcal{C} . It may or may not be the case that $o = p$. (If, at this point, there is an existing p -order index in \mathcal{C} , then this process is repeated until all the cascading merges have resulted in an index of an order not currently on the server.)

By using this exponential progression in index sizes, I seek to minimize the amount of index data rebuilt at any given time. The larger-order indexes (which will have more data in them) are merged less frequently than the smaller, lower-order ones.

Implementing this feature required a compromise to be added to the original scheme proposed by Demertzis and Papamantou—I added an encrypted list Δ of all indexed search terms. Only the client can decrypt this list, and it is never referenced during normal operations. It is only accessed and decrypted by the client during merge operations. Doing this is necessary because the SE index is set up to be useful only if a client already knows what search terms they’re looking for, so there was no previous reason to store Δ inside the index. Thus, no means were provided to reconstruct the original set Δ of search terms that was used. Without that information, the rest of the index cannot be decoded back into the original set of tuples.

My updated index-building process (replacing Algorithm 1) is summarized in Algorithm 2.

6 Evaluation

My evaluation of this implementation sought to verify the correct operation of the new dynamic indexing scheme, and to measure its runtime efficiency for various runtime input sizes. In particular, I wanted to see the effects of performing updates over different time intervals to see if there would be any benefit to updating the index in real time, or daily, weekly, or less frequently.

The correctness was confirmed through a number of testcases which confirmed that the input data encoded into the index was correctly retrieved again by

Algorithm 2 Create or Add to a Dynamic Index

procedure INDEXGEN(k, \mathcal{D}) ▷ Modifies and extends original SETUP(k, \mathcal{D})
Let Δ be the list of all “interesting” keywords in document set \mathcal{D} .
 $N \leftarrow \sum_{w \in \Delta} |\mathcal{D}(w)|$
 $\ell \leftarrow \lceil \log N \rceil$
 $\mathcal{L} \leftarrow \{\ell, \ell - p, \dots, \ell - (s - 1)p\}$.
Let order $o = \ell$. We will now build a new order- o index \mathcal{I} .
if $L > 1$ **then**
 $\mathcal{L} \leftarrow \mathcal{L} \cup \{0\}$
end if
if An order- o index already exists on the server **then**
 Retrieve and decrypt Δ_o from server from existing order- o index \mathcal{I}_o
 Retrieve and decrypt all storage buckets holding actual data from existing index \mathcal{I}_o to \mathcal{D}_o
 $\mathcal{D}' \leftarrow \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_o$
 Delete old index \mathcal{I}_o
 return INDEXGEN(k, \mathcal{D}')
end if
 $p \leftarrow \lceil \ell/s \rceil$
 $\forall i \in \mathcal{L}$ organize storage level A_i , divided into buckets $A_i[x]$.
for each keyword $w \in \Delta$ in random order **do**
 Find adjacent $i, j \in \mathcal{L} : L2^j < |\mathcal{D}(w)| \leq L2^i$.
 Split $\mathcal{D}(w)$ into a set of chunks C_w . Set $c = 0$.
 for each chunk $v \in C_w$ **do**
 $c \leftarrow c + 1$.
 Let A be buckets in A_i able to hold chunk v .
 Pick one bucket $A_i[x]$ from A randomly; store v in it.
 Add $H(F(k_1, w) \parallel c) \Rightarrow [i \parallel x] \oplus H(F(k_2, w) \parallel c)$ to hash table.
 end for
end for
end for
Encrypt Δ and store in hash table in blocks of 100 words.
Permute and encrypt entries in \mathcal{L} ; fill HT with random data.
Upload \mathcal{I} to server.
end procedure

search operations. The remainder of the evaluation is focused on performance characteristics of the update function itself.

6.1 Experimental Methodology

To evaluate the efficiency of my implementation, I set up test cases based on real-world data samples representative of highly dynamic document sets. I specifically chose email to approximate casual conversations which include both message text and metadata headers. Indexing archives of chat rooms, text messages, and other similar communication would be analogous.

My dataset was taken from the Enron email archive, [12] which is a collection of 517,401 actual email messages belonging to 150 users.³ Since this is a collection of actual communication between users, it provides a valuable test case to simulate how my SE implementation would fare in a real application. As noted by Klimt and Yang, “It can be used both as a large sample of real life email users and as a standard corpus for comparison of results using different methods.” [13]

For the purposes of the evaluation, each email message is stored in an individual disk file (in Maildir format). The document ID ($\text{id}(D)$) for each is the system’s inode number for the message file. This provides a guaranteed unique ID for each file without the overhead of assigning custom IDs.

One experimental run of my dynamic SE implementation looked at the case of maintaining a comprehensive index of all messages. To simulate a realistic flow of new messages coming into the repository, I batched up the messages according to the original **Date:** header lines.

I ran three separate experiments, using batch sizes of 1, 7, and 30 days, to measure the performance of the implementation if it were to be re-indexing on a daily, weekly, or monthly basis respectively. Each of these operated on five subsets of the Enron data corpus, organized as shown in Table 3 by the recipient’s initials. This is meant to simulate an arbitrary partitioning of a workforce into “departments” which may have slightly different input patterns. Figure 3 shows the day-by-day intake of $(w, \text{id}(D))$ tuples for each of the departments. We see from this that although there are differences in activity day-to-day, the overall pattern of activity was similar, giving us five sample sets to compare and contrast. I observed consistent behavior among all five departments as I examined the server resource usage as each of their document indexes expanded over time.

³I used a privacy-cleaned list which is slightly smaller than the original release of the dataset.

With the input data thus broken into batches of various sizes, I ran each set of updates while measuring the following performance characteristics after each update operation:

- Size N of each index \mathcal{I}_o in terms of N
- Disk storage on the server for each \mathcal{I}_o
- Full set of words Δ added in that update
- Contents of all storage locations in A_i
- Histogram of distribution of each keyword w within the input document set \mathcal{D}
- Wall-clock time in seconds taken to build the new index (including any needed merges with existing ones)
- Number of network transactions required to perform the update operation
- Number of bytes exchanged between client and server during the update operation
- Number of input documents added during that update
- If merging, how many words and tuples from previous indexes were downloaded to be merged into the new index
- Which orders of indexes were merged at each update

6.2 Results

Using Department 1 as a representative example of the results obtained, we see in Figure 4 how the processing time varied as a function of the frequency of updates. At first glance, it is apparent that we can get an overall savings in processing work by doing updates less frequently. For example, in the close-up view in Figure 5 we see that over the same period of time the daily and weekly updates saw spikes of activity as they had to merge multiple indexes but the monthly updates (blue line) did not, since it had the advantage of performing the update operation with more data at a time locally in a single step rather than making more incremental updates which needed to be downloaded again to be merged later.

This prompted me to seek a predictor for these merge events, as a potential avenue to optimize the merge by anticipating when merges would be necessary. While there are some straightforward (if naïve) indicators we could use, such as the number of incoming documents $|\mathcal{D}|$ or the number of input words

Department	Initial	People	Messages	Data (kB)
1	A-F	33	119,477	667,632
2	G-K	29	143,652	760,388
3	L-P	32	103,354	504,668
4	Q-S	38	105,930	526,084
5	T-Z	18	44,988	225,600

Table 3: Arrangement of Users into Departments




Figure 3: Incoming Keyword Tuples For All Departments




Figure 4: Processing Time (Dept. 1) by Batch Size




Figure 5: Processing Time (Dept. 1) by Batch Size, Detail View

$|\Delta|$ or even the number N of incoming tuples, none of these is a completely accurate predictor of either the time a merge will happen, or of the magnitude of each merge event.

The reason for this is that the conditions which trigger a merge event depend on the exact distribution of keywords (w) in each existing index $\mathcal{I}_o \in \mathcal{C}$ as well as how the specific incoming data will alter that distribution. As we see in the data sample in Figure 6, a given input batch may have a few messages with a high diversity of input words (driving N significantly higher than $|\mathcal{D}|$) or vice versa.

If we want a loose correlation to track with the performance over time of the SE updates, N would still seem the best reasonable value that is easily at hand, which may be useful for long-range statistical analysis including the prediction of incoming message volume to the system overall, from which merge probability may be inferred.

6.3 Issues

I discovered a pathological condition as an index hit certain sizes requiring large-scale cascading re-indexing operations. Most updates were completing in seconds, but these exceptional cases were taking many hours. In some cases they took days to complete. For example, among the daily updates for Dept. 1 there were 3 out of the total 995 update batches (0.3% of the total) which took more than one day to complete. These took 1 day, 1 hour; 1 day, 14 hours; and 4 days, 15 hours.

Further investigation led to an initial diagnosis that this was likely caused by a combination of resource scarcity on the server and inefficiencies in the Python implementation which still need to be optimized further. For example, at some points an index collection included an order-24 index. This would contain a small number of buckets of size 33,554,432 words. For 64-bit words (as my implementation uses to store the $i \parallel x$ encoded values), that's approximately a quarter-gigabyte string value to be assembled, copied, transmitted, received, buffered, copied, and decoded. In a runtime system such as Python's, that is not necessarily going to be handled as efficiently as it might be.

6.4 Summary of Results

Overall, the results indicate that even this experimental Python implementation performed well enough to be of practical use. Updates finished in time for the index to be used for a reasonable time before the next update batch needed to start. The rare exceptions to

this were due to the pathological case described in the previous section. Table 4 summarizes the runtime results of each of the experiments.

7 Future Work

Given the success of the experimental Python implementation, it makes sense to continue optimizing this design by coding it in a more efficient runtime system based on a language such as C or Go, as well as to continue looking for ways to optimize the server protocols and possibly the storage system itself. Specifically, the cause of the occasional very-long update operations should be investigated more.

This system also needs to be expanded to include the concept of deletion of messages from the index.

Finally, a formal evaluation of the cryptographic strength, including the likelihood and impact of potential information leakage over time when using this design compared to other SE schemes.

I did not examine the effects of changing the locality and storage variables L and s since that was already thoroughly treated by Demertzis and Papanthou [2] in their proposal for this SE architecture initially. However, it would be interesting to come back to that once my dynamic changes to their design have matured and evolved into a fully workable model with deletion support, to see if then the effect of adjusting those variables is different from what was found previously.

8 Conclusions

I have expanded on the work of previous SE researchers to implement an experimental yet functional dynamic SE indexing service. With that in place, I have analyzed the runtime performance with the update batch size as the independent variable for my experiments. I concluded from those experiments that the scheme as described in this paper is practical for real-world applications. Further, I identified how more efficient updates (requiring less overall work) are achieved by delaying updates for longer periods of time (e.g., weekly or monthly rather than hourly or daily). However, this comes at the cost of not having that new data available for users of the index. It is necessary for a server administrator to determine what update frequency serves the needs of their users best.

This work contributes to the future implementation of real-world encrypted document indexing systems which can be employed to organize repositories




Figure 6: Incoming Tuple Count vs. Message Count (Dept. 1)

Sample	Dept. 1		Dept. 2		Dept. 3		Dept. 4		Dept. 5	
	Avg	SD	Avg	SD	Avg	SD	Avg	SD	Avg	SD
Daily	21.14	240.75	4.75	47.87	11.07	111.57	12.49	119.33	0.99	11.20
Weekly	110.92	576.32	25.28	117.14	53.82	242.18	72.53	301.46	—	—
Monthly	322.31	855.13	—	—	197.31	504.38	254.61	583.68	96.26	341.74

Table 4: Summary of Experimental Results (batch wall-clock time in minutes)

of chat logs, emails, discussion forums, or other dynamic document collections while protecting the confidentiality of the content being served.

9 Acknowledgements

I wish to express gratitude to the guidance provided by Dr. Charles V. Wright, my Ph.D. advisor, who supervised this research and provided valuable feedback along the way. Also to Dr. David Maier, for his advice and instruction on writing styles for the earliest drafts of this paper.

References

- [1] Reza Curtmola, Juan Garay, Seny Kamara, and Rafail Ostrovsky. Searchable symmetric encryption: improved definitions and efficient constructions. In *Proceedings of the 13th ACM conference on Computer and communications security*, pages 79–88, 2006.
- [2] I. Demertzis and C. Papamanthou. Fast Searchable Encryption with Tunable Locality. In *Proc. 2017 ACM Int. Conf. Management of Data*, pages 1053–1067, 2017.
- [3] Dawn Xiaoding Song, David Wagner, and Adrian Perrig. Practical techniques for searches on encrypted data. In *Proceeding 2000 IEEE symposium on security and privacy. S&P 2000*, pages 44–55. IEEE, 2000.
- [4] Benny Pinkas and Tzachy Reinman. Oblivious ram revisited. In *Advances in Cryptology—CRYPTO 2010: 30th Annual Cryptology Conference, Santa Barbara, CA, USA, August 15–19, 2010. Proceedings 30*, pages 502–519. Springer, 2010.
- [5] Oded Goldreich and Rafail Ostrovsky. Software protection and simulation on oblivious rams. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 43(3):431–473, 1996.
- [6] David Cash, Joseph Jaeger, Stanislaw Jarecki, Charanjit Jutla, Hugo Krawczyk, Marcel-Cătălin Roşu, and Michael Steiner. Dynamic searchable encryption in very-large databases: Data structures and implementation. *Cryptology ePrint Archive*, 2014.
- [7] David Cash and Stefano Tessaro. The locality of searchable symmetric encryption. In *Advances in Cryptology—EUROCRYPT 2014: 33rd Annual International Conference on the Theory and Applications of Cryptographic Techniques, Copenhagen, Denmark, May 11–15, 2014. Proceedings 33*, pages 351–368. Springer, 2014.
- [8] Gilad Asharov, Moni Naor, Gil Segev, and Ido Shahaf. Searchable symmetric encryption: optimal locality in linear space via two-dimensional balanced allocations. In *Proceedings of the forty-eighth annual ACM symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 1101–1114, 2016.
- [9] Muhammad Naveed, Seny Kamara, and Charles V Wright. Inference attacks on property-preserving encrypted databases. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 644–655, 2015.
- [10] Yupeng Zhang, Jonathan Katz, and Charalampos Papamanthou. All your queries are belong to us: the power of {File-Injection} attacks on searchable encryption. In *25th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 16)*, pages 707–720, 2016.
- [11] Juan Benet. Ipfs-content addressed, versioned, p2p file system. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1407.3561*, 2014.
- [12] Bryan Klimt and Yiming Yang. Introducing the enron corpus. In *CEAS*, volume 45, pages 92–96, 2004.
- [13] Bryan Klimt and Yiming Yang. The enron corpus: A new dataset for email classification research. In *European conference on machine learning*, pages 217–226. Springer, 2004.