
SINGLE ROUND-TRIP HIERARCHICAL ORAM VIA SUCCINCT INDICES

William Holland

School of Computing and Information Systems
The University of Melbourne
Melbourne, Australia
w.holland@student.unimelb.edu.au

Olga Ohrimenko

School of Computing and Information Systems
The University of Melbourne
Melbourne, Australia
oohrimenko@unimelb.edu.au

Anthony Wirth

School of Computing and Information Systems
The University of Melbourne
Melbourne, Australia
awirth@unimelb.edu.au

August 17, 2022

ABSTRACT

Accesses to data stored remotely create a side channel that is known to leak information even if the content is encrypted. Oblivious RAM is a cryptographic primitive that provides confidentiality of access patterns in remote storage settings. To outsource a database of n blocks of B bits, traditional solutions restrict the client to $\mathcal{O}(B)$ bits of private memory. A class of solutions, known as Hierarchical ORAM, has achieved theoretically *optimal* bandwidth performance in this setting. Hierarchical ORAM distributes data blocks at the server across a hierarchy of hash tables, with the most recently accessed blocks in the lower levels of the hierarchy. Locating a block in the hierarchy requires a large number of round-trips of communication, with the server, per virtual access. Furthermore, rebuilding the hierarchy incurs a large concrete bandwidth overhead. Thus, Hierarchical ORAMs are seen as theoretical artefacts and have not been deployed in practice.

For many applications, such as cloud storage, the client can afford a larger, $\omega(B)$ -bit, private memory allocation. With this premise, we introduce Rank ORAM, the first practical Hierarchical ORAM that takes advantage of a larger client. We construct a compact client-side data structure that keeps track of how recently data blocks have been accessed. Leveraging this information, Rank ORAM reduces both the number of round-trips of communication and the concrete bandwidth overhead of Hierarchical ORAM. In addition, Rank ORAM achieves a smaller client memory allocation than existing (non-Hierarchical) state-of-the-art practical ORAM schemes while maintaining comparable bandwidth performance. Our experiments on real network file-system traces demonstrate a reduction in client memory, against existing approaches, of a factor of 100. At the same time, client-memory is only 290MB when outsourced a database of 17.5TB.

1 Introduction

In remote storage settings, encryption cannot protect against all security vulnerabilities. For instance, the order in which a client accesses their outsourced data, known as the *access pattern*, can leak sensitive information. Access pattern vulnerabilities have been demonstrated in a number of domains. These include, but are not limited to, leakage through page fault patterns in secure processors [1, 2, 3], through SQL query patterns on encrypted outsourced databases [4, 5] and through search patterns, resulting in query recovery attacks, in searchable encryptions [6, 4].

To mitigate access pattern leakage, Goldreich and Ostrovsky introduced the notion of Oblivious RAM (ORAM) [7]. An ORAM scheme transforms a sequence of virtual accesses into a sequence of physical accesses that is independent of the input sequence. This transformation eliminates information leakage in the access trace. Ultimately, an adversary must not be able to distinguish between the access patterns produced by an ORAM on an arbitrary pair of input sequences of the same length.

A trivial ORAM can be constructed by sequentially downloading the full database during each access. Although the access pattern produced by the ORAM is *identical* for all input sequences of the same length, rendering this scheme oblivious, there is a linear blowup in bandwidth and it is impractical on meaningfully¹ sized databases. Thus, the principal aim is to minimize the bandwidth overhead, that is, the number of additional physical accesses per virtual access, without sacrificing the privacy guarantee. In contrast to the trivial solution, a bandwidth-efficient ORAM, to obfuscate the original access pattern, combines additional dummy accesses and periodic shuffling of the server’s contents.

The original formulation of the ORAM problem [7] has two constraints: (1) client memory is restricted to $\mathcal{O}(1)$ data blocks; and (2) server-side computation is forbidden. Under these constraints there exists a logarithmic lower bound for the bandwidth overhead [8] and optimality has been achieved by a class of solutions known as Hierarchical ORAMs (HierarchicalORAM) [9, 10]. The HierarchicalORAM was first introduced by Goldreich *et al.* [7] and has enjoyed a long line of improvements [11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18] and variations [19, 20, 21] over the past two decades. However, these constructions have poor *concrete*² bandwidth performance and have not been adopted in practice.

There are many scenarios where neither of the problem constraints are realistic, and a relaxation of the problem has led to the emergence of ORAMs with improved (concrete) bandwidth and latency performance. For example, a small client, that accommodates only $\mathcal{O}(1)$ blocks, cannot store information on *where* a targeted block is located at the server. Recall that blocks are periodically shuffled to help obfuscate the access pattern. Thus a large amount of communication between the client and the server is required to locate the block, without revealing this location to the adversary. *Increasing* the amount of metadata stored at the client can alleviate the interactive components of client-server communication and, consequently, reduce both the bandwidth overhead and the number of round-trips per access [22, 23]. Client memory is therefore engaged in a key trade-off with bandwidth and latency.

In a similar vein, our work seeks to extend HierarchicalORAM beyond its theoretical status while relaxing only the first constraint — allowing client memory larger than $\mathcal{O}(1)$ blocks. We construct a novel HierarchicalORAM protocol, RankORAM, that stores additional metadata at the client. The cost of the metadata is small when compared to the size of the outsourced database (*e.g.* 290MB for a 17.5TB database). The protocol exploits this metadata to improve the concrete bandwidth performance and latency against existing HierarchicalORAM schemes (see Table 1). Importantly, RankORAM is the first HierarchicalORAM that performs single-round access without the help of server-side computation.

RankORAM A HierarchicalORAM distributes the outsourced data across a sequence of oblivious hash tables that increase exponentially in size. More-recently accessed data blocks are located in the smaller levels and less-recently accessed blocks are gradually moved into the larger levels. The efficiency of a HierarchicalORAM rests on the implementation of the oblivious hash table. State-of-the-art oblivious cuckoo hash tables lead to optimality [24, 10].

In Hierarchical ORAM, the *recency* of a data block, that is, the number of accesses since it was last accessed, determines the level that it resides in. This is due to the deterministic scheduling of the rebuild phase that pushes the least-recently accessed blocks into the larger levels. Further, knowledge of the block recency supports non-interactive accesses to the server, which reduces the number of round-trips of communication [18]. However, storing the recency information for *all* data blocks is expensive and may be prohibitive in memory-constrained environments, such as secure enclaves. For example, the standard Intel SGX 2 [25] has only 96MB of private memory. This obstacle can be overcome with a

¹We assume that the size of the outsourced database is larger than the available private memory. Otherwise, the outsourcing becomes redundant.

²Throughout this work “concrete” refers to the *exact* bandwidth cost, unobscured by complexity notation.

	client storage	bandwidth	hash table
Square Root [7]	$\mathcal{O}(B)$	$\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n})$	Permuted array
Hierarchical [7]	$\mathcal{O}(B)$	$\mathcal{O}(\log^3 n)$	Balls-in-bins
Cuckoo [14, 11]	$\mathcal{O}(B)$	$\mathcal{O}(\log^2 n / \log \log n)$	Cuckoo
Chan <i>et al.</i> [11]	$\mathcal{O}(B)$	$\mathcal{O}(\log^2 n / \log \log n)$	Two tier
PanORAMa [16]	$\mathcal{O}(B)$	$\mathcal{O}(\log n \cdot \log \log n)$	Cuckoo
OptORAMa [9]	$\mathcal{O}(B)$	$\mathcal{O}(\log n)$	Cuckoo
RankORAM	$\mathcal{O}(n + \sqrt{n} \cdot B)$	$4 \log n$	Permuted array

Table 1: Asymptotical comparison of HierarchicalORAM solutions when outsourcing n block of B bits each. RankORAM is the only solution that achieves a single round-trip per access. All solutions with $\mathcal{O}(B)$ client storage require $\Theta(\log n)$ round-trips per access.

recent advance by Holland *et al.*, who demonstrate that approximate recency queries, with bounded relative error, can be supported under a *succinct* representation of the stored items [26].

Our scheme, RankORAM, utilises these techniques to compress recency information at the client. Consequently, we are able to support low latency, *non-interactive* queries with a client-memory allocation smaller, in theory and practice, than prior state-of-the-art practical ORAM schemes that utilise client-side metadata [23, 27] (see Table 2).

Compressed Metadata Existing large client-memory ORAMs, such as Partition ORAM [27] (PartitionORAM) and Ring ORAM [23] (RingORAM), use arrays to store various metadata regarding block locations at the server. For a database of n blocks of B bits, an array occupies $\Theta(n \log n)$ bits of client-memory. To reduce this cost it is standard to recursively store the array in a sequence of smaller ORAMs at the server. This comes at the expense of increased bandwidth and latency. In contrast, with RankORAM, we compress block metadata to achieve smaller client-memory without increasing bandwidth or round-trips with the server. Further, as our experiments demonstrate, it results in significant client memory reductions against approaches adopted in prior implementations. Though Stefanov *et al.* have mentioned the use of compression to reduce the cost of the metadata [27] (albeit not in the context of level information for HierarchicalORAM), they did not provide details of how this approach would work in terms of algorithms or data structures. To this end, we propose a detailed solution for [27], *compressedCounters*, that we use for comparison when evaluating our work (see Table 3).

Our contributions We present a new ORAM scheme named RankORAM. It belongs to the class of HierarchicalORAM and introduces a new trade-off between client memory and bandwidth. The following theorem captures the performance of RankORAM.

Theorem 1. RankORAM is an oblivious RAM that stores a database of n blocks of B bits, requires $\mathcal{O}(n + \sqrt{n} \cdot B)$ bits of private memory, performs accesses in a single round-trip and observes an amortized bandwidth overhead of $4 \log n$ blocks.

With this result, our work offers the following contributions.

- RankORAM is the first HierarchicalORAM that achieves *both* a single round-trip per online access and a low concrete bandwidth overhead. Though, we utilize more client memory than prior approaches, our experiments demonstrate that the memory allocation is feasible even for resource-constrained settings (e.g., 290MB of client memory when outsourcing 17.5TB).
- RankORAM is supported by a novel client-side data structure, *historicalMembership*, that compresses the location metadata of the blocks at the server. *historicalMembership* can be used to reduce the number of round-trips per access for *any* HierarchicalORAM.
- The memory allocation of RankORAM is asymptotically smaller than prior state-of-the-art ORAMs with low concrete bandwidth overhead. Compared to PartitionORAM and RingORAM, we reduce the size of the client by a factor of $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$.
- We supplement the work of Stefanov *et al.* [27] by providing a data structure, named *compressedCounters*, to compress client side metadata. The structure works for both PartitionORAM and RingORAM.
- Our experiments, conducted on real network file system traces, demonstrate, for a 4KB block size, a reduction in memory for RankORAM by a factor of 100 against a non-compressed structure and a factor of 10 against *compressedCounters*. We also experimentally demonstrate the poor worst-case behaviour of *compressedCounters*.

	client storage	(amortized) bandwidth	single round-trip	server computation
SR-ORAM [18]	$\mathcal{O}(B)$	$\mathcal{O}(\log n)$	✓	✓
TWORAM [29]	$\mathcal{O}(\log n)\omega(1) \cdot B$	$\mathcal{O}(\log n)$	✓	✓
BucketORAM [20]	$\mathcal{O}(\log n)\omega(1) \cdot B$	$\mathcal{O}(\log n)$	✓	✓
PathORAM [30]	$\mathcal{O}(\log n)\omega(1) \cdot B$	$8 \log n$		
RingORAM [23]	$\mathcal{O}(n \log n + \sqrt{n} \cdot B)$	$3 \log n$	✓	
PartitionORAM [27]	$\mathcal{O}(n \log n + \sqrt{n} \cdot B)$	$3 \log n$	✓	
RankORAM	$\mathcal{O}(n + \sqrt{n} \cdot B)$	$4 \log n$	✓	

Table 2: Comparison of ORAM schemes with low concrete bandwidth and/or a single round-trip of communication per access. Compared to state-of-the-art approaches, RankORAM reduces client memory by a factor of $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$.

2 Related Work

All the variations of HierarchicalORAM depend on the implementation of the oblivious hash table. The amortized bandwidth overhead of HierarchicalORAM is determined by the cost of the rebuild (offline bandwidth) and the cost of an access (online bandwidth). In the original proposal by Goldreich and Ostrovsky, at level l , the hash table contains 2^l buckets of $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ depth. When accessing a bucket obliviously, a linear scan is performed. The scheme’s (amortized) bandwidth cost of $\mathcal{O}(\log^3 n)$ is dominated by the rebuild phase.

Subsequent improvements were achieved by changing the hashing primitive to an oblivious cuckoo hash table [11, 14, 15, 17]. With cuckoo hashing, the lookup time is constant. These schemes incur an amortized $\mathcal{O}(\log^2 n / \log \log n)$ bandwidth cost that is dominated by a rebuilding phase, which relies on expensive oblivious sorting³. Patel *et al.*, with PanORAMa, provide a cuckoo construction algorithm that does not rely on oblivious sorting [16]. They assume that the input to the construction algorithm is randomly shuffled and the bandwidth overhead is reduced to $\mathcal{O}(\log n \cdot \log \log n)$ blocks. With OptORAMa, this idea was extended by Asharov *et al.* to achieve optimal, $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$, bandwidth overhead [9], mataching the lower bound of Larsen *et al.* [8].

Chan *et al.* present a simple two-tier hash table, not based on cuckoo hashing [11]. Observing that, in work prior to theirs, bandwidth is dominated by rebuilds, the authors construct a simpler two-tier table that permits a more expensive lookup query in exchange for a reduced rebuild cost. However, the overall bandwidth cost is not asymptotically improved. All of the above ORAM protocols operate with $\mathcal{O}(B)$ bits of client memory.

Single round-trips The execution of an ORAM access depends of *where* the accessed block is located at the server. Locating the block, with no prior knowledge of where it resides, introduces client-server interaction. In small memory, this interactive component can be removed by allowing server-side computation. For example, SR-ORAM [18] and BucketORAM [20] place encrypted Bloom filters at the server to separate membership testing from block storage. The schemes can then build a layered branching program with paths that depend on the location of the accessed item. The server queries each Bloom filter and the output is used to unlock the next step in the correct path through the branching program. The path reveals which blocks to return to the client. In contrast to our work, which relies on a server performing only read and write requests, the server in the above schemes can perform more complex operations on data.

Larger clients and low concrete bandwidth There are many applications in which clients can afford more than $\mathcal{O}(B)$ bits of private memory. Under this observation, there are two constructions, PartitionORAM [27] and RingORAM [23], that store metadata, concerning server block locations, explicitly at the client. The metadata is stored in *position maps*, occupying $\Theta(n \log n)$ bits using an array, and allows accesses to be executed with a single round-trip of communication. Both PartitionORAM and RingORAM achieve state-of-the-art total bandwidth overhead of $3 \log n$, which can be reduced further following optimizations, using server-side computation, proposed by Dautrich *et al.* [22]

In the context of memory constrained environments, these schemes rely on a technique that recursively stores the metadata in a sequence of smaller ORAMs at the server. This comes at the cost of increased bandwidth and latency.

Compressing metadata The position maps for both PartitionORAM and RingORAM, with multiple types of metadata per block, occupy $\Theta(n \log n)$ bits. As n increases, this term begins to dominate the client memory allocation. To alleviate this burden, Stefanov *et al.* outline a method to compress the position map [27]. The compression method,

³Oblivious sorting in $\mathcal{O}(B)$ bits is very expensive in practice and are required in many ORAM schemes for the rebuilding phase. For a discussion on the trade-offs between client memory and bandwidth, see Holland *et al.* [28].

	memory	update time
array [31, 22, 23, 27]	$\Theta(n \log n)$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
compressedCounters [27]	$\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$	$\mathcal{O}(\log^2 n)$
historicalMembership	$\mathcal{O}(n)$	$\mathcal{O}(\log^2 n)$

Table 3: Comparison of client side data structures.

compressedCounters, is designed for sequential workloads but has a worst-case memory allocation of $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ bits. We expand on this work further in Section 8. A summary of the theoretical properties of different client-side data structures is provided in Table 3.

3 Preliminaries

Fixing notation, we consider the setting where a client outsources n blocks, each of B bits, to untrusted storage.

3.1 Performance Metrics

For measuring performance we consider three key parameters: *client memory*, *bandwidth overhead* and *the number of round-trips* (latency). The size of the client memory measures the amount of storage, both temporary and permanent, required to execute an ORAM scheme. The bandwidth overhead refers to the the number of blocks, possibly amortized, exchanged between the client and server per virtual access. It represents the multiplicative overhead of moving from a non-oblivious to an oblivious storage strategy. The number of round trips counts the rounds of communication between the client and server per virtual access.

3.2 Definitions

Security We adopt the standard security definition for ORAMs. Intuitively, it states that the adversary should not be able to distinguish between two access patterns of the same length. In other words, the adversary should learn nothing about the access pattern.

Definition 1 (Oblivious RAM [27]). *Let*

$$\vec{y} := \{(\text{op}_1, \mathbf{a}_1, \text{data}_1), \dots, (\text{op}_m, \mathbf{a}_m, \text{data}_m)\}$$

denote a sequence of length n , where op_i denotes a $\text{read}(\mathbf{a}_i)$ or $\text{write}(\mathbf{a}_i, \text{data}_i)$. Specifically, \mathbf{a}_i denotes the logical address being read or written and data_i denotes the data being written. Let $A(\vec{y})$ denote the (possibly randomized) sequence of accesses to the remote storage given the sequence of data requests \vec{y} . An ORAM construction is deemed secure if for every two data-request sequences, \vec{y} and \vec{z} , of the same length, their access patterns $A(\vec{y})$ and $A(\vec{z})$ are, except by the client, computationally indistinguishable.

Oblivious Shuffle Oblivious shuffle is a key primitive of oblivious RAM solutions, including RankORAM. It implements the following functionality.

Definition 2 (Functionality: Array Shuffle). *Let \mathcal{P} denote a set of permutations. On input array U , of key-value pairs, and permutation $\pi \in \mathcal{P}$, the Array Shuffle outputs the array $V = \text{shuffle}(\pi, U)$, where $V[i] = (k, v)$ and $\pi(k) = i$.*

We assume that the permutation function, π , is given to the algorithm in a form that allows for its efficient evaluation. For example, it could be provided as a seed to a pseudo-random permutation. Oblivious algorithms preserve the input-output behaviour of a functionality and produce an access pattern that is independent of the input. We now define the notion of oblivious algorithm.

Definition 3 (Oblivious Algorithm). *Let $A(M^{\mathcal{F}}(x))$ denote the access pattern produced by an algorithm M implementing the functionality \mathcal{F} on input x . The algorithm M is oblivious if, for every two distinct inputs, x_1 and x_2 , of the same length, except to the client, their access patterns, $A(M^{\mathcal{F}}(x_1))$ and $A(M^{\mathcal{F}}(x_2))$, respectively, are computationally indistinguishable.*

Therefore, an oblivious shuffle implements functionality Definition 2 and does not reveal anything about the input permutation through its access pattern.

3.3 HierarchicalORAM

The Hierarchical ORAM contains a hierarchy of oblivious hash tables T_0, \dots, T_L , with $L = \log n$. In the words of Goldreich and Ostrovsky [7], the ORAM consists of “a hierarchy of buffers of different sizes, where essentially we are going to access and shuffle buffers with frequency inversely proportional to their sizes”. The *hash table* abstraction contains a look-up query and a construction algorithm. For the construction algorithm to be oblivious, by Definition 3, the input blocks must be placed in the table without leaking their locations through the access pattern.

A general HierarchicalORAM has the following structure. The hash table T_l stores 2^l data blocks. Next to each table, a flag is stored to indicate whether the hash table is *full* or *empty*. When receiving a request to an address, x , the ORAM operation involves both an `access` and `rebuild` phase:

1. `access`: Access all non-empty hash tables in order and perform a lookup for address x . If the item is found in some level l , perform dummy look ups in the non-empty tables of T_{l+1}, \dots, T_L . If the operation is a `read`, then store the found data and place the block in T_0 . If the operation is a `write`, ignore the associated data and update the block with the fresh value.
2. `rebuild`: Find the smallest empty hash table T_l (if no such level exists, then set $l = L$). Merge the accessed item and all of $\{T_j\}_{j \leq l}$ into T_l . Mark levels T_0, \dots, T_{l-1} as empty.

A block is never accessed twice in the *same* hash table in between rebuilds at a given level. This invariant is crucial to security of the scheme. As each block is always retrieved from a different location, the sequence of hash table probes produced by HierarchicalORAM appears random to an adversary.

Note that `access` is interactive since the client does not know which level a block belongs to. That is, the client has to query the levels sequentially until the target block is found. This requires a round trip per level and increases the latency of the protocol. Our client-side data structure is designed to remove this cost.

Our protocol adopts the HierarchicalORAM template. An instance depends on the choice of hash table and prior work has proposed a number of different constructions. The state-of-the-art HierarchicalORAM uses oblivious Cuckoo hash tables [9, 10]. They are theoretically optimal but the concrete bandwidth is too high to be used in practice.

3.4 Rank data structures

Our client-side data structure is built on set-membership structures that support the following operations on the set Φ

$$\Phi.\text{index}(r) = \text{return the } r^{\text{th}} \text{ smallest address in } \Phi \quad (1)$$

$$\Phi.\text{rank}(x) = |\{y \mid y \in \Phi, y < x\}| \quad (2)$$

A data structure that supports these operations, in addition to a membership query ($x \stackrel{?}{\in} \Phi$), is called an *indexed dictionary* [32]. For example, for the set $\Phi = \{2, 5, 7, 9\}$, the query functions evaluate as $\Phi.\text{rank}(7) = 3$ and $\Phi.\text{index}(3) = 7$.

4 Historical Membership

The key ingredient of our RankORAM solution is a client-side data structure, `historicalMembership`, that contains information about the location of the blocks at the server. This information helps us retrieve the required block from the server in a single round of communication. In this section we describe `historicalMembership`.

Let $\Phi_l = \{v \mid (v, _) \in T_l\}$ denote the set of logical addresses at level l . `historicalMembership` maintains each set Φ_l , for $l \in [L]$, in a compressed indexed dictionary (see Section 3.4). As access patterns typically have low entropy, for example, access patterns in file systems are highly sequential [33], the sets are compressible. Regardless, our choice of encoding has good worst-case behaviour, as we demonstrate below.

The collection of dictionaries, Φ , supports the following two functions:

$$\text{level}(x) = \min\{i \mid (x, _) \in T_i, i \in \{1, \dots, L\}\}, \quad (3)$$

$$\text{position}(x) = \begin{cases} \Phi_{\text{level}(x)}.\text{rank}(x) & \text{if } \text{level}(x) < L \\ x & \text{if } \text{level}(x) = L \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

The function `level` denotes the level a block belongs to and is calculated in a sequence of membership queries starting from Φ_0 . The function `position`(x) denotes the rank of address x *within* its current level. The `level` functionality

is observed in some prior work [23, 27], where implemented in an array (called the position map) mapping element addresses to a collection of auxiliary information. The position functionality is novel to this work and is used to map addresses into hash table locations.

When a merge happens at the server ($T_l \leftarrow \bigcup_{i=1}^{l-1} T_i$), the client-side structure is updated accordingly:

$$\begin{aligned} \forall i \in \{1, \dots, l-1\} : \Phi_i &\leftarrow \emptyset \\ \Phi_l &\leftarrow \bigcup_{i=1}^{l-1} \Phi_i. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, one requirement of our encoding is that it supports efficient merging. Further, as each element belongs to exactly one level, we do not need to store Φ_L . To evaluate Equation (3), if the element is not a member of $\{\Phi_l\}_{l \leq L-1}$, it must be a member of Φ_L . Further, we do not need rank information at level L . This is covered in more detail in Subsection 5.2.

4.1 Run length encoding

A simple compact representation of a set is *run length encoding* [34]. This representation compiles the set $S = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n_l}\}$, where $x_i < x_j$ for all pairs $i < j$, as the string:

$$\text{rl}(S) = (x_2 - x_1) \circ (x_3 - x_2) \circ \dots \circ (x_{n_l} - x_{n_l-1}) \circ (x_{n_l+1} - x_{n_l}),$$

where $x_{n_l+1} = n$. Each sub-string can be encoded with a prefix-free Elias code [35]. As the latter encodes the integer x in $\mathcal{O}(\log x)$ bits, a level l dictionary requires:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=2}^{n_l+1} \mathcal{O}(\log(x_i - x_{i-1})) &\leq \sum_{i=2}^{n_l+1} \mathcal{O}(\log n/n_i) \\ &= \mathcal{O}(n_l \log(n/n_l)) \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

bits. The first inequality comes from the observation that \log is a convex function. There are dictionaries that are more (space) efficient than this, such as those referred to as “succinct” [36]. However, run-length codes have the advantage of being easily mergeable: given encodings of the sets S_1 and S_2 , one can enumerate $S_1 \cup S_2$, *in order*, in $\mathcal{O}(|S_1| + |S_2|)$ time and with a working space of $\mathcal{O}(1)$ words⁴.

4.2 Auxiliary data structure

The efficiency of the `level` (Equation (3)) and `position` (Equation (4)) functions depend, respectively, on the efficiencies of the `membership` and `rank` queries on the component dictionaries. To support the latter efficiently, we supplement each code with an auxiliary structure of *forward pointers* that is constructed as follows. We divide the run-length code $\text{rl}(\Phi_l)$ into $\mathcal{O}(|\Phi_l|/\log n)$ segments of equal cardinality of order $\Theta(\log n)$. The auxiliary structure provides forward access to the beginning of each segment. Each pointer is stored with the starting address of the segment. This allows for a fast identification of the correct segment.

Query algorithms To execute a fast membership query, the procedure performs a binary search on the element keys in the auxiliary structure to realize the correct neighborhood, then jumps to the corresponding segment of the run-length code in a single probe. The query is completed with a linear scan of the segment. As the segments have equal cardinality, rank queries can be computed in a similar fashion if we keep track of the index of the segment during the binary search on the auxiliary structure.

index queries are computed as follows. Let $W = \Theta(\log n)$ denote the width of the segments. For $\Phi_l.\text{index}(i)$, the procedure first identifies the correct segment as $j = \lfloor i/W \rfloor$. It then performs a local index query on segment j for input $i' = i - j \cdot W$. The latter can be executed on a linear scan of the segment.

4.3 Performance

With the auxiliary structure established, we conclude by evaluating the performance of `historicalMembership`. The memory allocation depends on the choice of indexed dictionary.

Lemma 1. *historicalMembership, compressed with run-length codes, takes up $\mathcal{O}(n)$ bits.*

⁴That is, we do not need to uncompress the sets into client memory.

Proof. With respect to space- and time-efficiency, the worst-case occurs when the levels are full, that is, when $|\Phi_l| = 2^l, \forall l \in [L]$. Thus, the set $\{\text{rle}(\Phi_l)\}_{l \in [L]}$, following Inequality (5), for some constant $c > 0$, uses

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{l=1}^L c|\Phi_l| \log(n/|\Phi_l|) &\leq c \sum_{l=1}^L 2^l \cdot \log(n/2^l) \\ &= c \sum_{l=1}^L 2^l \cdot (L - l) \\ &= c \left[\sum_{l=0}^{L-1} 2^l + \sum_{l=0}^{L-2} 2^l + \dots + \sum_{l=0}^0 2^l \right] \\ &\leq c \cdot 2^{L+1} - 2 \\ &= \mathcal{O}(n), \end{aligned}$$

bits. □

We look at the query and update times separately. The update times need to consider the amortized cost of rebuilding the structure.

Lemma 2. *On a database of size n , `historicalMembership` supports updates in $\mathcal{O}(\log^2 n)$ amortized time.*

Proof. Following the schedule of `HierarchicalORAM`, each update involves inserting an address into Φ_0 and performing a merge. For a merge into level l , in order to stay within our memory bounds, we extract the addresses from $\Phi_0 \cup \Phi_1 \cup \dots \cup \Phi_{l-1}$, in sorted order, and build the run length code, on the fly, without resorting to a plain form representation. To do this, we retrieve one address from the front of each code and place it in a list of length l . Then, for $|\Phi_l|$ rounds we retrieve the smallest address from the list (deleting any duplicates) and place it in the next position of $\text{rle}(\Phi_l)$ by computing the corresponding run-length. When an address is removed from the list, we retrieve the next address from the corresponding code by adding the next run-length to the removed address.

The list has length l and we perform one scan per round. Inserting a new run-length into Φ_l and extracting an address from a code both take constant time. Therefore, a merge takes $\mathcal{O}(l \cdot |\Phi_l|)$ time.

The auxiliary structure can be built with one scan of the code. For $W = \Theta(\log n)$, we read W run-lengths at a time. When we reach the start of each segment, we place the corresponding address and offset in the auxiliary structure. This process completes in $|\Phi_l|$ time.

As a merge occurs every $|\Phi_l|$ updates, the amortized cost of merging into level l is $\mathcal{O}(l)$. Aggregated across all levels $\{0, 1, \dots, L - 1\}$ (we don't perform a merge into level Φ_L), this leads to an amortized update cost of

$$\sum_{l=0}^{L-1} \mathcal{O}(l) = \mathcal{O}(L^2) = \mathcal{O}(\log^2 n).$$

This completes the proof. □

The query times can be improved further with a different auxiliary structure. However, it is sufficient for our purposes that they obtain the same asymptotic cost as the update times.

Lemma 3. *On a database of size n , `historicalMembership` admits position and level queries in $\mathcal{O}(\log^2 n)$ time.*

Proof. We begin by evaluating the the cost of `rank`, and `membership` on the level dictionary Φ_l . The algorithmic details are available in Section 4.2. The code is divided into segments of width $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$. The `rank` and `membership` operations involve two stages; (1) locate the correct segment in the code (as specified by the auxiliary structure); (2) scan the segment in search of the block address. The auxiliary structure contains an ordered sequence of $\mathcal{O}(|\Phi_l|/\log n)$ block addresses that correspond to the starting address of each segment. Thus the forward pointer to the correct segment can be located, through a binary search, in $o(\log |\Phi_l|)$ time. The subsequent linear scan can be executed in time proportional to the length of the segment. Thus, both `rank` and `membership` require $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ time to complete. The `index` query does not require binary search on the auxiliary structure and can locate the correct segment in constant time. It also requires a linear scan of the segment and completes in $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ time.

The `level(x)` function sequentially probes, from bottom to top, the dictionaries $\Phi = \{\Phi_0, \Phi_1, \dots, \Phi_L\}$ with membership queries. In the worst-case, that is, when $x \in \Phi_L$, $L = \mathcal{O}(\log n)$ membership queries are performed. As each query takes $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ time, the `level` function is evaluated in $\mathcal{O}(\log^2 n)$ time in the worst-case. The `position(x)` function requires one additional `rank` query on $\Phi_{\text{level}(x)}$ at a cost of $o(\log |\Phi_l|)$ time. This completes the proof. \square

The times are fast when compared to standard network latencies.

5 RankORAM

Our goal is to construct a `HierarchicalORAM` that (1) incurs a single round-trip per online access and (2) obtains a low concrete bandwidth overhead comparable to prior state-of-the-art. Both of these are achieved with the support of our `historicalMembership` data structure introduced in Section 4. `RankORAM` follows the `HierarchicalORAM` template outlined in Section 3.3. The novelties that we introduce are how `historicalMembership` membership is used to reduce communication and our oblivious hash table used to instantiate the template:

1. To achieve a single online round-trip, we need to build a non-interactive query object to send to the server. `historicalMembership` encodes the level information, which tells us, a priori, where to retrieve the accessed block and where to retrieve dummies. Thus, all the hash table probes can be batched in a single request to the server.
2. To build an efficient oblivious hash table, we leverage the `rank` information provided by `historicalMembership`. This allows for a simple construction, with table locations generated by the `position` function (see Equation (4)), that dispenses with the (expensive) cuckoo hash table.

5.1 Setup

The client stores `historicalMembership` in private memory and requires $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n} \cdot B)$ bits of temporary storage to perform the oblivious shuffling required for rebuilds. With `historicalMembership`, the client can compute the `level` and `position` functions in private memory. The server stores the data blocks in a sequence of levels as specified by the `HierarchicalORAM` template. Similar to the client, the server requires temporary storage, of size proportional to the database, to support rebuilds.

The server is initialized with all data in level L . During rebuilds, fresh permutation functions are generated using a fresh seed to a family of pseudorandom permutation functions. A fresh dummy block is constructed by encrypting an empty payload with information regarding the location of the dummy at the server. For example, a dummy at level l could be constructed as `enc(i + t_l)`, where i denotes the hash table location and t_l denotes how many rebuilds have occurred at level l . Thus all dummies appear unique and are indistinguishable, to the adversary, from real blocks.

5.2 Permuted Array as Oblivious Hash Table

`RankORAM` implements the level-wise hash table using a permuted array. Fixing notation, let \mathbf{T}_l refer to the array, located at the server, that stores the elements of level l and let $n_l := 2^l$. The array has length $2n_l$ and stores at most n_l real elements and, consequently, at least n_l dummy elements. For levels $l < L$, we utilize the `rank` information to assign each element in level l to a *unique* index in the domain $[n_l]$. The `rank` information is available through the indexed dictionaries that form `historicalMembership`. Elements are then permuted, according to the permutation π_l , using their ranks:

$$\mathbf{T}_l[\pi_l(\Phi_l.\text{rank}(a))] = (a, _). \quad (6)$$

For level L , we do not need to worry about mapping the address space onto a smaller domain and we can proceed by simply permuting the address space:

$$\mathbf{T}_L[\pi_L(a)] = (a, _). \quad (7)$$

Thus, each block can be retrieved with the `position` function. When a level is rebuilt, a new permutation function is generated with fresh randomness.

`PartitionORAM` ORAM places blocks in \sqrt{n} small `Hierarchical ORAMs` of size $\sim \sqrt{n}$. There are some similarities here to the component ORAMs of the `PartitionORAM`, which also utilize permuted arrays. The key difference between our setup and that of partitioning is the size of the levels. Partitioning produces smaller levels. This allows shuffling to be performed exclusively at the client (the whole level is downloaded and permuted locally). In contrast, as the largest level of `RankORAM` has size n , we require an interactive shuffling algorithm. The advantage of our approach is that,




Figure 1: A $\text{read}(5)$ in RankORAM. Level 2 (in red) is empty). The operation queries the hash table (here represented as an array padded with dummies) looking for item 5. The server returns dummy elements at levels 0 and 1 (note that a non-dummy could be returned at lower levels). The queried item is found and returned to the client at level 3. After the payload of the block is read, a rebuild occurs. Table T_2 is the smallest empty hash table. We then (obviously) build T_2 on the input $5||T_0||T_1$ and mark T_0 and T_1 as empty.

Algorithm 1: Rank ORAM access. Lines highlighted in red represent operations performed at the server.

```

1 define  $\text{access}(a, \text{op}, \text{data}')$ 
2    $l \leftarrow \text{level}(a)$  // retrieve position information
3    $r \leftarrow \text{position}(a)$ 
4   initialize empty query  $Q$  // create a batched query to send to the server
5   for  $i \in \text{occupiedLevels}$  do
6     if  $i = l$  then
7        $Q \leftarrow Q \cup (i, \pi_l(r))$ 
8     else
9        $Q \leftarrow Q \cup (i, \pi_i(\text{dummyCntr}_i))$ 
10       $\text{dummyCntr}_i \leftarrow \text{dummyCntr}_i + 1$ 
11   send  $Q$  to the server
12   initialise empty output  $O$  // server executes  $Q$ 
13   for  $i \in \text{occupiedLevels}$  do
14     retrieve  $(i, \text{index})$  from  $Q$ 
15      $O \leftarrow O \cup T_l[\text{index}]$ 
16   send  $O$  to the client // returns result to client
17    $(a, \text{data}) \leftarrow \text{retrieve and decrypt block } a \text{ from } O$  // unpack output from the server
18   if  $\text{op} = \text{write}$  then
19      $\text{data} \leftarrow \text{data}'$ 
20      $T_0 \leftarrow \text{encrypt}(a, \text{data})$ 
21      $\Phi_0 \leftarrow a$ 
22      $\text{count} \leftarrow \text{count} + 1 \bmod 2^L$ 
23     rebuild
24   return  $\text{data}$ 

```

with the rank information compactly encoded in Φ , we can access blocks at the server directly through π_l (see Equation (6)). In other words, we are able to map the set Φ_l onto the domain of π_l without collisions. Without rank information, PartitionORAM is required to store the offsets explicitly. Through our experiments, we demonstrate that our approach leads to significant savings in client memory.

5.3 Access Phase

The access algorithm, formalized in Algorithm 1, is similar to that of prior Hierarchical ORAMs. The primary difference is that the procedure begins by determining the block metadata (the level and position of the data block)

Algorithm 2: Rank ORAM Rebuild

```

1 define rebuild()
2    $l \leftarrow \text{msb}(\text{count}) + 1$ 
3    $\pi_l \leftarrow$  a pseudo random permutation on the domain  $[2^l]$ 
4    $\Phi_l \leftarrow \Phi_0 \cup \dots \cup \Phi_{l-1}$ 
5    $\mathbf{I} \leftarrow \text{evict}(0) \parallel \dots \parallel \text{evict}(l-1)$ 
6    $\mathbf{I} \leftarrow \mathbf{I} \parallel [n_l \text{ dummy blocks}]$ 
7    $\mathbf{T}_l \leftarrow \text{shuffle}(\pi_l(\Phi_l.\text{rank}(\cdot)), \mathbf{I})$ 
8   for  $i \in \{0, \dots, l-1\}$  do
9      $\Phi_i \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
10    dummyCntr $_i \leftarrow |\Phi_i|$ 
11    occupiedLevels  $\leftarrow \{l\} \cup \text{occupiedLevels} \setminus \{0, \dots, l-1\}$ 
12  return

```

stored at the client. The `position` function is used to find the index of the block within its level (line 7). With the `level` information, we know, a priori, which level the block is stored at and which levels receive a dummy probe. Thus, access to all tables can be accumulated, as a set containing one hash table index per non-empty level, and sent to the server as a single request (lines 6-10). The server returns all requested blocks in one batch, resulting in one round-trip of communication.

A dummy counter is used to ensure that the scheme only returns untouched blocks. When a dummy is retrieved (line 9), we increment the counter (Line 10) so that an untouched dummy is retrieved at the next dummy request. An example of the access procedure is available in Figure 1.

5.4 Rebuild Phase

Recall that rebuilds enforce the invariant that a block is never retrieved, more than once, from a given hash table instance. This ensures that the sequence of hash table probes appears random to the adversary. The rebuild carries out the invariant by periodically moving blocks up the hierarchy into fresh hash table instances. Consequently, a block at level $l < L$ has recency less than $2 \cdot 2^l$.

Given that the hash tables are implemented as permuted arrays, the rebuild function is straightforward. We first update `historicalMembership` and rearrange the server’s memory accordingly. For a rebuild into level l , we merge the compressed dictionaries in levels $\{0, \dots, (l-1)\}$ to obtain the dictionary Φ_l . The rebuild at the server involves a single oblivious shuffle. The input array is the concatenation of the untouched blocks (including dummies) in levels $\{0, \dots, (l-1)\}$. A `evict` (Algorithm 3) is executed to construct the array of untouched elements. The input array is padded with dummy blocks to the width of the output array, The dummy blocks are indexed so that their encryptions are indistinguishable from real blocks. We generate a new pseudo-random permutation, π_l , (Line 2) and the input permutation for the oblivious shuffle is the composition of functions $\pi_l \circ \Phi_l.\text{rank}$. Any oblivious shuffle algorithm can be used here [37, 38]. (However, to reduce constants, we provide a shuffle optimized for RankORAM in the next section.)

The procedure concludes by updating some client-side data; the dictionaries at levels $\{0, \dots, (l-1)\}$ are deleted; the dummy counter is set for level l ; and the set of non-empty (or occupied) levels is adjusted (line 10). The `rebuild` procedure is formalized in Algorithm 2. The function `msb` (Line 2) computes the most significant bit of the input.

5.5 Eviction procedure

Hash table eviction (used in `rebuild` phase) involves removing all untouched elements from the hash table *chronologically* from lowest index to highest index. This procedure does not have to be done in an oblivious manner and can be carried out by the server. For completeness we provide two efficient ways for the client to perform eviction. We could store a bitmap, locally at the client, that indicates the untouched indicies. This approach requires an additional $4n$ bits but does not impact our asymptotic result. Otherwise, we can use the inverse permutation function, π_l^{-1} for level l , to enumerate the ranks of the elements in the correct order. The rank can be used to determine if the corresponding element is real or dummy; an element with a rank larger than the cardinality of the level is a dummy block. We can then determine if it is a touched block. If it is real and also belongs to a lower level, then it is touched. If it is a dummy

Algorithm 3: Rank ORAM hash table eviction: the procedure removes all blocks that were not touched during access at level l

```

1 define evict( $l$ )
2    $S \leftarrow []$  // empty array of length  $n_l$ 
3   for  $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, 2 \cdot n_l - 1\}$  do
4      $r \leftarrow \pi_l^{-1}(i)$ 
5     if  $r < |\Phi_l|$  then
6       //  $r$  represents a real element
7        $a \leftarrow \Phi_l.r$ 
8        $l' \leftarrow \text{level}(a)$ 
9       if  $l' = l$  then
10        //  $a$  is untouched
11         $S \leftarrow S \parallel V[i]$ 
12      else if  $r \geq \text{dummyCntr}$  then
13        //  $r$  represents an untouched dummy index
14         $S \leftarrow S \parallel V[i]$ 
15   return  $S$ 

```

and the rank is lower than `dummyCntr`, then it is touched. We skip over touched elements and only retrieve untouched elements. Finally we note that we could avoid eviction by requesting the server to delete every block retrieved in Line 14 in Algorithm 1.

6 Shuffling

RankORAM can use any prior oblivious shuffle [38, 37] out of the box when implementing `shuffle` in Algorithm 2 in Line 7. However, in our context, we have dummy blocks in both the input and output arrays. A given dummy block can be placed in *any* vacant location in the output array and we can exploit this fact to gain performance improvements relative to general shuffling algorithms. Therefore, we construct a variation of the `cacheShuffle` [37], that leverages a shuffling instance where dummies are placed in the output array. For comparison, with the standard `cacheShuffle`, permuting level l would cost $9 \cdot 2^l$ blocks of bandwidth. With our procedure, we reduce this cost to $7 \cdot 2^l$.

Given our prior optimizations, for a `rebuild` into level l , our algorithm, named `shortQueueShuffle`, takes as input an array of n_l untouched blocks (possibly including dummies) and produces an output array of length $2n_l$, which contains a random shuffling of the untouched blocks plus an additional n_l dummy blocks. This is a variation of the functionality of Definition 2.

For the sake of generalization, for the remainder of the exposition, we set $n := n_l$ and $\pi := \pi_l(\Phi_l.\text{rank})$. Similar to `cacheShuffle`, `shortQueueShuffle` uniformly at random assigns the indices of the input array into \sqrt{n} buckets of equal size S ($\sim \sqrt{n}$). Let $I_1, \dots, I_{\sqrt{n}}$ denote the buckets of the input indices. The client also initializes a temporary array at the server, divided into \sqrt{n} chunks of size $2S$. Let $T_1, \dots, T_{\sqrt{n}}$ denote the chunks of the temporary array. The client initializes, in private memory, the queues $Q_1, \dots, Q_{\sqrt{n}}$. Through \sqrt{n} rounds, the client performs the following operations. For round j :

1. Download the input chunk I_j into private memory.
2. For each *real* block $x \in I_j$, let $d = \lfloor \pi(x) / \sqrt{n} \rfloor$, and place x in queue Q_d .
3. In \sqrt{n} rounds, for each queue Q_k , place two blocks in T_k . If the queue is empty, place dummy blocks.

At the conclusion of this subroutine, all untouched blocks are either in the correct chunk in the temporary array, that is, a chunk that contains its final destination index, or the correct queue. The routine is named “*short* queue shuffle” as the arrival rate for each queue is half the departure rate. Subsequently, the client, in consecutive rounds, downloads each chunk in the temporary array; combines the chunk with any remaining blocks in its corresponding queue; arranges the real blocks according to π ; fills empty spaces with fresh dummies; and uploads the shuffled chunk to the output array.

The procedure is oblivious as the access pattern at the initial downloading of the input buckets does not depend on the input and the remaining accesses are identical for all inputs of the same length. However, if the combined size of the

queues becomes $\omega(\sqrt{n})$, we exceed our memory threshold and the algorithm fails. Fortunately, this happens only with negligible probability. We summarize performance with the following Lemma.

Definition 4 (Dummy shuffle functionality). *On an input array of length n and a permutation function $\pi : [2n] \rightarrow [2n]$, the dummy shuffle functionality outputs an array of length $2n$ with the input elements placed according to π and the remaining locations filled with dummies.*

Lemma 4. *The `shortQueueShuffle` is an oblivious dummy shuffling algorithm, it completes in $7n$ blocks of bandwidth and uses $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n} \cdot B)$ bits of private memory.*

Due to its similarities to Lemma 4.2 in [37], the proof is placed in Appendix A.1.

7 RankORAM Performance and Security

To evaluate the performance of RankORAM, we require some additional results. Primarily, we need to instantiate the `shuffle` procedure in Algorithm 2. Before moving to this step, we cover some optimizations that allow us to reduce both online and offline bandwidth.

7.1 Optimizations

We begin with a modification to the hierarchical ORAM template (see Section 3.3). As our client side structures, `historicalMembership` and a buffer to perform oblivious shuffle, occupy $\mathcal{O}(n + \sqrt{n}B)$ bits of memory, we can afford to store the smaller levels at the client. To stay within the memory bound, we trim the server side structure and store levels 1 to $L/2$ at the client. This reduces the offline bandwidth by a half.

To reduce the online bandwidth, we use a XOR trick, introduced by Dautrich *et al.* [22], to reduce the size of the batch of requested blocks sent to the client by the server. This optimization requires server-side computation. The server's output from the access request is a collection of encrypted dummies plus the encrypted target block. Therefore, the server can XOR the ciphertexts together to produce a *single* block to send to the client. The client can unpack the retrieved element by assembling the corresponding collection of encrypted dummies and apply one XOR against the returned block. Formally, let B_i denote the block the server retrieved from level i and l' denote the level that contains the accessed block. If the server returns the compressed batch $B_S = B_1 \oplus \dots \oplus B_L$ (ingoring for simplicity the fact that some levels might be empty), the client can decode $B_{l'}$ by first constructing

$$B_C = B_1 \oplus \dots \oplus B_{l'-1} \oplus B_{l'+1} \oplus \dots \oplus B_L$$

as a collection of encrypted dummy blocks. Then the client performs

$$B_{l'} = B_S \oplus B_C.$$

Note that this optimization requires server-side computation. Nonetheless, this is a standard optimization from the literature [22, 23].

In addition, to save bandwidth, the `evict` and `shuffle` subroutines of the `rebuild` can be intertwined. That is, instead of constructing a temporary array that is used as input to the `shuffle` algorithm, and padded with the requisite number of dummy blocks, we can use `evict(0) || \dots || evict(l-1)` and retrieve untouched blocks or generate fresh dummies as the `shuffle` algorithm requires them.

7.2 Performance

With our oblivious shuffle algorithm, we can calculate the concrete bandwidth overhead of RankORAM.

Lemma 5. *The amortized bandwidth overhead for RankORAM is $4 \log n$.*

Proof. We reduce bandwidth by storing levels 1 to $L/2$ at the client (see Subsection 7.1). Therefore, for online bandwidth, RankORAM downloads, $L/2 = \log n/2$ blocks from the server per access. Similarly, for offline bandwidth, we only need to account for the amortized cost of rebuilding levels $(L/2 + 1)$ to L . For $l > (L/2 + 1)$, a level `rebuild` costs $7n_l$ blocks of bandwidth by Lemma 4. Further, a `rebuild` occurs every n_l updates. Thus, the amortized bandwidth cost of maintaining a level stored at the server is 7 blocks. As there are $L/2$ levels stored at the server, the amortized offline bandwidth overhead is

$$7 \cdot L/2 = 3.5 \log n.$$

Therefore, total bandwidth is $4 \log n$. □

The bandwidth cost can be improved further by allowing server-side computation to support the XOR trick. When the server XORs a batch of blocks, online one block is sent across the channel per access. This reduces online bandwidth from $1/2 \log n$ to 1. We summarize this result in the following Lemma.

Lemma 6. *With server-side computation, the online bandwidth cost for RankORAM is 1 and the amortized bandwidth cost is $3.5 \log n$.*

7.3 Security

To demonstrate the obliviousness of RankORAM, we need to show that its access pattern is independent of the input sequence. Given that we use pseudorandom functions, it follows that the access patterns for an arbitrary pair of input sequences are computationally indistinguishable.

Lemma 7. *RankORAM is oblivious*

Proof. In the pseudo code all server operations are highlighted in red boxes. The security of the access procedure is standard. If the invariant is upheld (an block is only accessed once in a given level build), then any block retrieved from a hash table appears as a random index (independent of the input logical address) to the adversary. Similarly, all dummy fetches are “fresh” and retrieve an untouched physical address determined by the pseudo random permutation.

To complete the proof, we need to establish the security of the rebuild method. A rebuild involves two interactions with the server. First, we construct the input array for the shuffle. The security is inherited from the Evict routine. The untouched elements are removed chronologically and are already known to the adversary. Second, we perform an oblivious shuffle. The Evict algorithm is oblivious as the set of untouched indices is fixed in size (n_l for level l) and determined by the permutation. The server already knows the locations of the untouched elements and, as the indices are accessed chronologically, no information is leaked. \square

Now we have all the components of Theorem 1. Security is given by Lemma 7. The memory cost is incurred by the underlying shuffling algorithm (Lemma 4) and the client-side data structure (Lemma 1). Finally, the bandwidth cost is secured by Lemma 5.

8 Compressing Position Maps

Stefanov *et al.*, with PartitionORAM, were the first to suggest compressing client-side metadata to support a client-memory efficient ORAM protocol [27]. Their method constitutes a key baseline for `historicalMembership`. However, the authors omit details for implementing the approach. To supplement their work, we provide those details here. We begin with an overview of their concept.

PartitionORAM partitions the database into \sqrt{n} smaller Hierarchical ORAMs of size $\sim \sqrt{n}$. Each block is randomly assigned to a point in the partition. The position map of PartitionORAM stores the following pieces of metadata for a block: (1) the partition number; (2) the level number; and (3) the hash table offset. The partition numbers are selected uniformly at random and thereby have high entropy. Consequently, to achieve a more compressible position map, the count of each block is stored, instead of the partition number, and used as input to a pseudorandom function. For example, let ctr_i be the count of block i and PRF denote the function. Then block i is assigned to partition $\text{PRF}(i \mid \text{ctr}_i)$. On each access, the count is incremented and the pseudorandom function generates a fresh, and seemingly random, partition number. The advantage of storing the counts is that they are highly compressible for sequential access patterns. This is demonstrated by Opera *et al.* [33], who outline a compression method designed to leverage sequentiality.

Further, Stefanov *et al.* note that, if all levels are full, each block has probability 2^{l-L} of being in level l . Thus, the level information has low entropy and is highly compressible. No compression algorithm is nominated. Lastly, the hash table location metadata is dispensed with by uploading the blocks, including dummies, with random “aliases”. Then, during retrieval, the client requests blocks by their alias and the server finds the block on the clients behalf. Consequently, server-side computation is introduced. We refer to this combined approach of compressing metadata as `compressedCounters`. It requires two data structures; one for compressing the block counters; and one for compressing the level information. We now provide an instantiation of both.

8.1 Data structures

The method for compressing counters involves storing *counter intervals* instead of a separate count for each block. A counter interval stores a single count for each interval of consecutive blocks with the same access frequency. The

data structure contains two arrays. An index array `ind` stores the starting index for each interval and a counter array `ctr` stores the count for each interval. Thus the count for an index $i \in [\text{ind}[j], \text{ind}[j + 1])$ has count `ctr[j]`.

The challenge is to keep the arrays *compact* under a dynamic workload. We want to avoid resizing the array at each update. Thus, we divide each array into segments of width $\lfloor \frac{1}{2}Z, Z \rfloor$ for some parameter Z . Each segment is implemented with a *dynamic* array that we resize in accordance with its current capacity. Thus, to keep the memory allocation tight, at most one segment is resized after each access. The segments are stored in the leaves of a balanced binary search tree (we use an AVL tree [39]). When the combined cardinality of adjacent segments falls below Z , we merge the segments. Inversely, when the cardinality of a segment exceeds Z , we split the segment. The mechanics of the tree implementation keep the structure balanced. The parameter Z invokes a trade-off; small Z results in fast updates, as the smaller segment requires less shifting of elements and reallocation of memory, but incurs a large tree structure. On the other hand, large Z induces slow updates but a small auxiliary tree structure.

The level information can be stored in any dynamic string implementation, such as a wavelet tree [40]. We adopt a run-length encoding, similar to the constituent dictionaries in Section 4. To maintain a dynamic run-length code, we apply the same method for maintaining counter intervals. The code is split into segments, implemented with dynamic arrays, and stored in the leaves of a balanced binary search tree.

8.2 Performance

For completeness, we provide a theoretical bound for `compressedCounters`. The method is suited for sequential access patterns and has poor worst-case behaviour. This could limit its application in memory constrained environments under dynamic workloads with changing distributions. In the worst-case, if the memory allocation exceeds the application bounds and this scenario is observable to the adversary, it introduces an additional side-channel.

Lemma 8. *For a database of size n , for $Z = \Theta(\log n)$, to store the block frequencies on a workload of length $\text{poly}(n)$, `compressedCounters` requires $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ bits.*

Proof. We construct a pathological workload that induces the theoretical bound. Consider an access pattern $A = \langle 1, 3, 5, \dots, n - 1 \rangle$ that is executed a $c = \text{poly}(n)$ number of times. A contains n distinct counter intervals: $[(0, 0), (1, c), (2, 0), (3, c), \dots]$. As the values of the frequencies are polynomial in size, each interval requires $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ bits to store. Thus, the total memory allocation for the counter intervals is $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ bits.

As each segment contains $\Theta(\log n)$ intervals, the auxiliary binary search tree contains $\mathcal{O}(n / \log n)$ nodes and, with $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ bit pointers, occupies $\mathcal{O}(n)$ bits.

The memory allocation of the compressed level information can be computed from its entropy. Let X_i be a random variable that denotes the current level of block i . We assume that the access pattern is uniformly distributed, as this is the worst-case for run-length codes. If all levels are filled, then

$$\Pr[X_i = l] = 2^{l-L}$$

Thus, the entropy of X_i is

$$H(X_i) = - \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} \log_2(2^{l-L}) = \sum_{i=1}^L i \cdot 2^{-i} < 1. \quad (8)$$

As we calculate the run lengths $\mathbf{R} = (R_1, R_2, \dots)$ from the block levels $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$, it holds that

$$H(\mathbf{R}) \leq H(\mathbf{X}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n H(X_i) = n \cdot H(X_i) < n,$$

by Equation (8). Thus, the run length encoding can be stored in less than n bits. Similar to the counter intervals, the auxiliary tree, with $Z = \Theta(\log n)$, has $\mathcal{O}(n / \log n)$ nodes and occupies $\mathcal{O}(n)$ bits. This completes the proof. \square

9 Experiments

In this paper we have presented `RankORAM`; a new hierarchical ORAM scheme based on a novel client-side data structure, `historicalMembership`. `RankORAM` trades off client memory to achieve bandwidth efficiency. The focus of the experimental evaluation is to measure the overhead of storing and retrieving metadata at the client when using `HierarchicalORAM` ORAM. We have implemented two baseline approaches, `array` and `compressedCounters`, whose properties are summarized in Table 3. The former is the standard in practice [31, 22, 23, 27] and the latter has not been

	n	database size
Tenet	4 370 466 280	17.5TB
K5cloud	1 065 643 040	4.3TB

Table 4: Problem and database sizes for datasets on commercial cloud traces.




Figure 2: Client memory vs. update time for `compressedCounters` on $Z \in \{20, 200, 2000, 20000\}$. The parameter Z represents the size of the dynamic array segments in the component data structures of `compressedCounters`.

implemented in an ORAM context. For each data structure, we measure *peak client memory* and the *update time* as these measurements depend on the access patterns. The update time measures the total time per access. This would include any query costs that are required to execute the access. We refer the reader to Table 2 for the bandwidth costs of these schemes (`compressedCounters` can be used with both `PartitionORAM` and `RingORAM`) as the bandwidth performance is determined only by the size of the input (otherwise it would leak information).

In order to evaluate the performance of `historicalMembership` and baseline approaches in practice, we use real and synthetic workloads. The real workloads come from two separate commercial cloud storage network traces. The first trace, provided by Zhang *et al.* [41], is collected on Tencent Cloud Block Storage over a 6 day period. The average block size is 4KB. The second trace, provided by Oe *et al.* [42], is collected on the Fujitsu K5 cloud service. The properties of the traces are summarized in Table 5.

In addition, we have generated synthetic workloads based on uniform and Zipfan distributions. With the Zipfan, or *skewed*, datasets, we vary the size of the problem instance n , from 2^{21} to 2^{29} and the skew parameter $\phi \in \{1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5\}$, where 1.1 represents low skew and 1.5 represents high skew. The synthetic datasets allow us to test the schemes on average and worst-case access scenarios that ORAM is designed to protect. We use two block sizes B , 64 bytes and 4KB, simulating the size of a cache line and a page size.

Recall that large-client ORAM schemes, including `RankORAM`, utilize client memory to temporarily store and shuffle $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n})$ blocks. To this end, we also measure the amount of temporary memory required for reshuffles, that we refer as `blockBuffer`, and compare it to the memory requirements of the index data structures stored at the client (i.e., `array`, `compressedCounters` and `historicalMembership`). Intuitively, the size of `blockBuffer` is the minimum requirements of these ORAMs. Hence, the use of methods such as `compressedCounters` and `historicalMembership` would be justified only if (1) the memory allocation of `array` significantly exceeds the allocation of `blockBuffer`; and (2) the

dataset	data structure	client memory (GB)	update time (μ seconds)
Tencent	array	39.33	0.1
	compressedCounters	0.56	14.4
	historicalMembership	0.29	10.6
K5cloud	array	9.60	0.1
	compressedCounters	1.30	8.1
	historicalMembership	0.13	2.7

Table 5: Performance of data structures on real cloud traces with block size $B = 4\text{KB}$. The memory required for the rebuild phase (i.e., the size of `blockBuffer`) is 540MB (0.54 GB) for the Tencent dataset and 260MB (0.26 GB) for the K5cloud dataset. `historicalMembership` outperforms all competitors in terms of client-memory size and requires less memory than `blockBuffer`. It is also faster than `compressedCounters` on both test cases. Note that the `array` is the standard used in implementations for `PartitionORAM` and `RingORAM` [31]



(a) memory vs. n for $\phi = 1.2$ (b) memory vs. skew for $n = 2^{27}$

Figure 3: The size of client memory across several ORAM implementations for synthetic workloads of varying size and skew. Dashed lines correspond to the size of `blockBuffer` (temporary client memory) for block sizes of 64 bytes and 4 KB. Note that the size of `array`, `HierarchicalORAM` and `compressedCounters` are independent of the block size.

compression methods produce memory allocations less than or equal to the allocations of `blockBuffer`. Our experiments demonstrate when this is the case.

Prior works [27] have stated that, for a sufficiently large block size, in practice, the memory allocation of block cache significantly exceeds that of the metadata array. However, even for 4KB blocks, experimental work has demonstrated that this is not always the case [31].

9.1 Experimental setup

All code is written in C++. We simulate the client and server on a single machine. The server is simulated by an interface that abstracts array management: all data is stored and retrieved on disk.

Each workload is executed on a `HierarchicalORAM` to generate a dataset of accesses and rebuilds. The client-side data structures are evaluated on these datasets through the metrics of client-memory and update time. This approach of simulating the accesses and rebuilds at the client allows for a more accurate calculation of update time.

Parameter for `compressedCounters` As one of the baselines [27] we use did not provide details on how to implement the compressed counters, in Section 8 we proposed a candidate data structure called `compressedCounters`. Performance of `compressedCounters` depends on a parameter Z that we tune as follows and use for the main experiments.

Recall that the core of the `compressedCounters` data structure is a dynamic array, for the counters, and a dynamic string of run lengths, for the levels. Both dynamic structures are split into segments of size $[\frac{1}{2}Z, Z]$, for a parameter Z , and the segments are stored in the leaves of a balanced binary search tree. To infer the effect of Z on performance we tested `compressedCounters` on a synthetic dataset ($n = 2^{21}$ and $\phi = 1.2$) for values $Z \in \{20, 200, 2000, 20000\}$. The results are displayed in Figure 2. The test demonstrates a clear trade-off between client memory and update time. For $Z = 20$ updates are fast, as only a small segment is updated on each access. However, due to the size of the auxiliary binary tree, the memory allocation is close to double the other instances of `compressedCounters`. As Z increases, the memory drops sharply and begins to plateau for $Z > 20$. In contrast, the update time steadily increases. To achieve a good balance between memory and throughput, we select $Z = 20$ for all experiments.

9.2 Real data

The results on cloud traces are displayed in Table 5. The size of the `blockBuffer`, with $B = 4\text{KB}$, is 540MB for Tencent and 260MB for K5cloud. Notably, the `blockBuffer` is significantly less than the memory allocation for `array`, including a factor 80 difference for the Tencent cloud. This indicates that, particularly for large n , the `array` represents the significant component of client memory. `historicalMembership` outperforms `array` and `compressedCounters` in client memory. On the Tencent dataset, `historicalMembership` encodes the block metadata in 0.53 bits per block and reduces client memory by a factor of 135 against the baseline `array`. On the K5cloud dataset, `compressedCounters` encodes the block metadata 9.8 bits per block and attains a memory allocation that is larger than `historicalMembership` by a factor of 10. The encoding is larger than the 2 bits per block hypothesized by Stefanov *et al.* [27] and demonstrates its sensitivity to the access pattern. Recall that, unlike `historicalMembership`, `compressedCounters` has poor worst-case behaviour (see Table 3).

Both compression techniques, `historicalMembership` and `compressedCounters`, obtain memory allocations comparable to the `blockBuffer`. Further, their update times are markedly smaller than a standard network latency of 30-40ms. Thus, the experiments demonstrate the feasibility of both these techniques in practice.

9.3 Synthetic Data

The results on synthetic data are displayed in Figure 3. Both plots contain lines that approximate the size of the `blockBuffer` for $B = 64$ bytes (long dashed) and $B = 4\text{KB}$ (dashed). Figure 3a expresses the effect of the problem size for $\phi = 1.2$. As expected, the `array` is proportional to $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ and grows notably faster than the `blockBuffer`. Both `historicalMembership` and `compressedCounters` grow linearly with the database size. For `historicalMembership`, this is in line with the theoretical bounds. In contrast, for `compressedCounters`, this indicates that the worst-case bounds do not hold when there is moderate skew in the access pattern. Further, for an Intel SGX secure processor, with an Enclave Page Cache of 96MB and block size $B = 64$ bytes (matching a typical processors cache line), Figure 3a demonstrates that RankORAM can be executed, on these access patterns, entirely in private memory for $n \leq 2^{27}$.

To illustrate the effect of skew on the compression techniques, Figure 3b plots client memory against the skew parameter. The database size is fixed at $n = 2^{27}$. Both `historicalMembership` and `compressedCounters`, on highly skewed access patterns, reduce client memory by a factor of 100 against the baseline `array`. However, the performance of `compressedCounters` degrades significantly as the amount of skew decreases. To test this further, we conduct a separate experiment on a uniformly distributed access pattern, which is the worst-case. In this instance `compressedCounters` obtained a memory allocation larger than `array` (1.5 GB for `compressedCounters` and 1.2GB for `array` when $n = 2^{27}$). In contrast, `historicalMembership`, still outperformed `array` by a factor of 12 when the access pattern was uniformly distributed.

On all instances of synthetic data, `historicalMembership` requires a lower memory allocation than the `blockBuffer` (the memory required for the rebuild phase). At the same time, for larger values of n , the `array` obtains a memory allocation that exceeds the `blockBuffer` by a factor of at least 10. This testifies to the efficacy of our approach.

We note that one has to be careful when deploying `historicalMembership` and `compressedCounters` in practice as varying memory requirements between the skews could introduce an additional side-channel revealing the type of access pattern. To this end reserving memory for the worst-case is advisable. For such cases, `historicalMembership` data structure would be preferred due to an order of magnitude smaller memory requirements in the worst case.

10 Conclusions

We have presented the first protocol for Hierarchical ORAM that can retrieve the required block in a single-round without requiring server computation. Our construction, RankORAM, exploits a larger client memory allocation, relative to prior work, to achieve improved bandwidth and latency performance. The foundation of RankORAM is a novel client-side data structure, `historicalMembership`, that maintains a compact representation of the locations of the blocks at the server. Significantly, `historicalMembership` can be used in *any* Hierarchical ORAM to reduce the number of round trips of communication, per access, from $\log n$ to one. Further, with `historicalMembership` levels at the server can be stored as permuted arrays, avoiding complex hash tables, and allowing fast and practical oblivious shuffle algorithms to be used for rebuilds.

Compared to state-of-the-art practical solutions, PartitionORAM and RingORAM, we reduce client memory by a logarithmic factor, while maintaining comparable bandwidth and latency performance. The standard for practical ORAMs is to use an array to store position maps at the client. Our experiments, on real network file system traces, demonstrate a reduction in client memory by a factor of a 100 compared to the array approach and by a factor of 10 compared to closest related work.

References

- [1] Shweta Shinde, Zheng Leong Chua, Viswesh Narayanan, and Prateek Saxena. Preventing page faults from telling your secrets. In *Proceedings of the 11th ACM on Asia Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 317–328, 2016.
- [2] Wenhao Wang, Guoxing Chen, Xiaorui Pan, Yinqian Zhang, XiaoFeng Wang, Vincent Bindschaedler, Haixu Tang, and Carl A Gunter. Leaky cauldron on the dark land: Understanding memory side-channel hazards in sgx. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 2421–2434, 2017.

- [3] Yuanzhong Xu, Weidong Cui, and Marcus Peinado. Controlled-channel attacks: Deterministic side channels for untrusted operating systems. In *2015 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, pages 640–656. IEEE, 2015.
- [4] Mohammad Saiful Islam, Mehmet Kuzu, and Murat Kantarcioglu. Access pattern disclosure on searchable encryption: ramification, attack and mitigation. In *Ndss*, volume 20, page 12. Citeseer, 2012.
- [5] Georgios Kellaris, George Kollios, Kobbi Nissim, and Adam O’neill. Generic attacks on secure outsourced databases. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 1329–1340, 2016.
- [6] David Cash, Paul Grubbs, Jason Perry, and Thomas Ristenpart. Leakage-abuse attacks against searchable encryption. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security*, pages 668–679, 2015.
- [7] Oded Goldreich and Rafail Ostrovsky. Software protection and simulation on oblivious rams. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 43(3):431–473, 1996.
- [8] Kasper Green Larsen and Jesper Buus Nielsen. Yes, there is an oblivious ram lower bound! In *Annual International Cryptology Conference*, pages 523–542. Springer, 2018.
- [9] Gilad Asharov, Ilan Komargodski, Wei-Kai Lin, Kartik Nayak, Enoch Peserico, and Elaine Shi. Oporama: Optimal oblivious ram. *Advances in Cryptology—EUROCRYPT 2020*, 12106:403, 2020.
- [10] Gilad Asharov, Ilan Komargodski, Wei-Kai Lin, and Elaine Shi. Oblivious ram with worst-case logarithmic overhead. In *Annual International Cryptology Conference*, pages 610–640. Springer, 2021.
- [11] T-H Hubert Chan, Yue Guo, Wei-Kai Lin, and Elaine Shi. Oblivious hashing revisited, and applications to asymptotically efficient oram and opram. In *International Conference on the Theory and Application of Cryptology and Information Security*, pages 660–690. Springer, 2017.
- [12] Eyal Kushilevitz, Steve Lu, and Rafail Ostrovsky. On the (in) security of hash-based oblivious ram and a new balancing scheme. In *Proceedings of the twenty-third annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 143–156. SIAM, 2012.
- [13] Steve Lu and Rafail Ostrovsky. Distributed oblivious ram for secure two-party computation. In *Theory of Cryptography Conference*, pages 377–396. Springer, 2013.
- [14] Michael T Goodrich and Michael Mitzenmacher. Privacy-preserving access of outsourced data via oblivious ram simulation. In *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming*, pages 576–587. Springer, 2011.
- [15] Michael T Goodrich, Michael Mitzenmacher, Olga Ohrimenko, and Roberto Tamassia. Privacy-preserving group data access via stateless oblivious ram simulation. In *Proceedings of the twenty-third annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 157–167. SIAM, 2012.
- [16] Sarvar Patel, Giuseppe Persiano, Mariana Raykova, and Kevin Yeo. Panorama: Oblivious ram with logarithmic overhead. In *2018 IEEE 59th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 871–882. IEEE, 2018.
- [17] Benny Pinkas and Tzachy Reinman. Oblivious ram revisited. In *Annual cryptology conference*, pages 502–519. Springer, 2010.
- [18] Peter Williams and Radu Sion. Single round access privacy on outsourced storage. In *Proceedings of the 2012 ACM conference on Computer and communications security*, pages 293–304, 2012.
- [19] Dan Boneh, David Mazieres, and Raluca Ada Popa. Remote oblivious storage: Making oblivious ram practical. 2011.
- [20] Christopher W Fletcher, Muhammad Naveed, Ling Ren, Elaine Shi, and Emil Stefanov. Bucket oram: Single online roundtrip, constant bandwidth oblivious ram. *IACR Cryptol. ePrint Arch.*, 2015:1065, 2015.
- [21] Chandrasekhar Nagarajan, Ali Shafiee, Rajeev Balasubramonian, and Mohit Tiwari. ρ : Relaxed hierarchical oram. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems*, pages 659–671, 2019.
- [22] Jonathan Dautrich, Emil Stefanov, and Elaine Shi. Burst {ORAM}: Minimizing {ORAM} response times for bursty access patterns. In *23rd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 14)*, pages 749–764, 2014.
- [23] Ling Ren, Christopher W Fletcher, Albert Kwon, Emil Stefanov, Elaine Shi, Marten van Dijk, and Srinivas Devadas. Ring oram: Closing the gap between small and large client storage oblivious ram. *IACR Cryptol. ePrint Arch.*, 2014:997, 2014.

- [24] Gilad Asharov, Ilan Komargodski, Wei-Kai Lin, Enoch Peserico, and Elaine Shi. Optimal oblivious parallel ram. *IACR Cryptol. ePrint Arch.*, 2020:1292, 2020.
- [25] Ittai Anati, Shay Gueron, Simon Johnson, and Vincent Scarlata. Innovative technology for CPU based attestation and sealing. 2013.
- [26] William L Holland, Anthony Wirth, and Justin Zobel. Recency queries with succinct representation. In *31st International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation (ISAAC 2020)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2020.
- [27] Emil Stefanov, Elaine Shi, and Dawn Song. Towards practical oblivious ram. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1106.3652*, 2011.
- [28] William L Holland, Olga Ohrimenko, and Anthony Wirth. Robust and verifiable information embedding attacks to deep neural networks via error-correcting codes. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Asia Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, 2022.
- [29] Sanjam Garg, Payman Mohassel, and Charalampos Papamanthou. Tworam: efficient oblivious ram in two rounds with applications to searchable encryption. In *Annual International Cryptology Conference*, pages 563–592. Springer, 2016.
- [30] Emil Stefanov, Marten Van Dijk, Elaine Shi, Christopher Fletcher, Ling Ren, Xiangyao Yu, and Srinivas Devadas. Path oram: an extremely simple oblivious ram protocol. In *Proceedings of the 2013 ACM SIGSAC conference on Computer & communications security*, pages 299–310, 2013.
- [31] Zhao Chang, Dong Xie, and Feifei Li. Oblivious ram: A dissection and experimental evaluation. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, 9(12):1113–1124, 2016.
- [32] Rajeev Raman, Venkatesh Raman, and Srinivasa Rao Satti. Succinct indexable dictionaries with applications to encoding k-ary trees, prefix sums and multisets. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms (TALG)*, 3(4):43–es, 2007.
- [33] Alina Oprea and Michael K Reiter. Integrity checking in cryptographic file systems with constant trusted storage. In *USENIX Security Symposium*, pages 183–198. Boston, MA., 2007.
- [34] Stevan D Bradley. Optimizing a scheme for run length encoding. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 57(1):108–109, 1969.
- [35] Peter Elias. Universal codeword sets and representations of the integers. *IEEE transactions on information theory*, 21(2):194–203, 1975.
- [36] Roberto Grossi, Alessio Orlandi, Rajeev Raman, and S Srinivasa Rao. More haste, less waste: Lowering the redundancy in fully indexable dictionaries. *arXiv preprint arXiv:0902.2648*, 2009.
- [37] Sarvar Patel, Giuseppe Persiano, and Kevin Yeo. Cacheshuffle: An oblivious shuffle algorithm using caches. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.07069*, 2017.
- [38] Olga Ohrimenko, Michael T Goodrich, Roberto Tamassia, and Eli Upfal. The melbourne shuffle: Improving oblivious storage in the cloud. In *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming*, pages 556–567. Springer, 2014.
- [39] Caxton C Foster. A generalization of avl trees. *Communications of the ACM*, 16(8):513–517, 1973.
- [40] Gonzalo Navarro. Wavelet trees for all. *Journal of Discrete Algorithms*, 25:2–20, 2014.
- [41] Yu Zhang, Ping Huang, Ke Zhou, Hua Wang, Jianying Hu, Yongguang Ji, and Bin Cheng. {OSCA}: An {Online-Model} based cache allocation scheme in cloud block storage systems. In *2020 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC 20)*, pages 785–798, 2020.
- [42] K Oe, K Ogihara, and T Honda. Analysis of commercial cloud workload and study on how to apply cache methods. *IEICE CPSY, Kumamoto, Japan (SWoPP 2018), CPSY2018-14*, pages 7–12, 2018.
- [43] Devdatt P Dubhashi and Desh Ranjan. Balls and bins: A study in negative dependence. *BRICS Report Series*, 3(25), 1996.

A Additional Proofs

A.1 Proof for Lemma 4

We break down Lemma 4 into its components of fail rate, performance and security. The algorithm fails if the temporary client storage exceeds $c \cdot \sqrt{n}$ for some constant c .

Lemma 9. *On input array length n , `shortQueueShuffle` fails with probability negligible in n .*

Before proving the result we require some probability tools.

Definition 5 (Negative Association). *The random variables X_1, \dots, X_n are negatively associated if for all disjoint sets $\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2 \subseteq \{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$,*

$$\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{X}_1) \cdot g(\mathbf{X}_2)] \leq \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{X}_1)] \cdot \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{X}_2)],$$

for all functions f and g that both non-increasing or both non-decreasing.

This property, along with the following result, will be used to bound the size of the queues.

Lemma 10 (Lemma 2 of [43]). *Let X_1, \dots, X_n be negatively associated random variables. Then for non-decreasing functions f_1, \dots, f_k over disjoint sets $S_1, \dots, S_k \subseteq \{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{i \in [k]} f_i(S_i) \right] \leq \prod_{i \in [k]} \mathbb{E}[f_i(S_i)]$$

Finally, we need the following result from Queuing Theory.

Theorem 2. *Let Q be a queue with batched arrival rate $1 - \varepsilon$ and departure rate 1 and let q_t be the size of the queue after t batches of arrival. Then, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, $\mathbb{E}[e^{q_t}] \leq 2$.*

proof of Lemma 9. The goal is to bound the combined size of the queues during the execution of the algorithm. To accomplish this, we construct a variant of `shortQueueShuffle` that has the same functionality and fail rate. We will prove that the fail rate for this variant is negligible. The variant splits the input buckets $I_1, \dots, I_{\sqrt{n}}$ in half and executes the first step of `shortQueueShuffle` by reading the half-buckets in $2\sqrt{n}$ rounds. After a half-bucket has been downloaded, *one* item from each queue is uploaded to the temporary bucket at the server. This is the only difference between the two. As the ratio between the arrival and eviction rates at each queue is the same for both algorithms, they have identical fail rates. The variation allows us to use Theorem 2 with $\varepsilon = 0.5$.

Fixing notation, let I'_{2i} denote the first half of I_i , I'_{2i+1} denote the second half of I_i and $X_{i,j}$ denote the number of addresses from I'_i that are placed in Q_j . As the addresses from the input buckets are uniformly distributed across $Q_1, \dots, Q_{\sqrt{n}}$, with $|I'_i| = \sqrt{n}/2$, it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}[X_{i,j}] = \frac{1}{2}. \tag{9}$$

Now, let $Y_{i,j}$ denote the length of Q_j after I'_i has been read from the server. Note that $Y_{i,j}$ is a non-decreasing function of the set of variables $\{X_{1,j}, \dots, X_{i,j}\}$. Let $Y_i = \sum_{j=1}^{\sqrt{n}} Y_{i,j}$. To complete the proof, we need to bound Y_i for all $2\sqrt{n}$ rounds.

The random variables $X_{i,1}, \dots, X_{i,q}$ follow a balls-in-bins process. Therefore, by Theorem 3.2 of [43], the variables are negatively associated. Further, for all $i \neq j$, the sets $\{X_{i,1}, \dots, X_{i,q}\}$ and $\{X_{j,1}, \dots, X_{j,q}\}$ are mutually independent. Therefore, the $Y_{i,j}$ are non-decreasing functions of disjoint sets of negatively associated random variables. By Markov's Inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[Y_i > c \cdot \sqrt{n}] &= \Pr[e^{\varepsilon Y_i} > e^{\varepsilon c \cdot \sqrt{n}}] \\ &\leq e^{-\varepsilon c \cdot \sqrt{n}} \mathbb{E}[e^{\varepsilon Y_i}]. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

By Equation 9, the batched arrival rate is 0.5 and the departure rate is 1. Therefore, by Theorem 2, with $\varepsilon = 0.5$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[e^{0.5 \cdot Y_i}] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{i=j}^{\sqrt{n}} e^{0.5 \cdot Y_{i,j}} \right] \\ &\leq \prod_{j=1}^{\sqrt{n}} \mathbb{E}[e^{0.5 \cdot Y_{i,j}}] \\ &\leq 2^{\sqrt{n}}. \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality follows from Lemma 10. Thus, by inequality 10, with $\varepsilon = 0.5$,

$$\Pr[Y_i > c \cdot \sqrt{n}] \leq e^{-(c \cdot e / (1+e) - \ln 2) \sqrt{n}}.$$

Therefore, by setting $c > (1 + 1/\varepsilon) \ln 2e$, $Y_i = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n})$ with probability at most $e^{-\mathcal{O}(1)\sqrt{n}}$. Taking a union bound across all $2\sqrt{n}$ timesteps completes the result. \square

We cover bandwidth and memory with the following result.

Lemma 11. *On an input array of length n , the `shortQueueShuffle` completes in $7n$ blocks of bandwidth and, on the condition that it does not fail, requires $\mathcal{O}(B \cdot \sqrt{n})$ bits of temporary private memory.*

Proof. The memory claim comes from Lemma 9 and our definition of failure. For the bandwidth, the first component of the algorithm downloads n address and uploads $2n$ addresses. The second component, in a sequence of rounds, downloads the full temporary array of length $2n$ and uploads it to the output array. This leads to a total bandwidth cost of $7n$. \square

Lemma 12. *The `shortQueueShuffle` is oblivious on functionality dummy shuffle (Definition 4).*

Proof. We need to demonstrate that the access patterns produced by `shortQueueShuffle` on two distinct inputs π_1 and π_2 are computationally indistinguishable to the adversary. Let $\{I_i^b\}_{i \in \sqrt{n}}$ denote the input buckets for the execution of `shortQueueShuffle` on π_b for $b \in \{1, 2\}$. Both sets of input buckets are independent of their corresponding input permutations. Similarly, let $X_{i,j}^b$ denote the number of addresses from I_i^b that are placed in Q_j^b for $b \in \{1, 2\}$. As the addresses are assigned uniformly at random to the sets $\{I_i^b\}_{i \in \sqrt{n}}$, $X_{i,j}^1$ is independent of $X_{i,j}^2$. Therefore, for a fixed input array, the fail rate, which is observable to the adversary, is independent of the input permutation.

The set of buckets $\{I_i^b\}_{i \in \sqrt{n}}$ is independent of the input permutation. Thus, the initial phase of downloading the input array appears as a sequence of uniformly random accesses. The remaining accesses in the algorithm are identical for all inputs of the same length. This completes the proof. \square