Privacy and Identity Management for Distributed Systems



Prof. Simone Fischer-Hübner Karlstad University/Sweden Keynote @ IEEE SRDS Symposium 2009 Niagara Falls / NY, 29. September 2009



Overview

- I. Privacy Challenges & PETs
- II. Identity & Anonymity in Ad Hoc Networks
 - Self-certified, unlinkable, Sybil-free identifiers
 - Chameleon anonymous protocol
- III. PrimeLife Privacy and Identity Management for Life



I. Privacy Challenges & PETs: Privacy Dimensions

 Informational selfdetermination



Spatial privacy





Basic Privacy principles (implemented in EU-Directive 95/46/EC)

- Legitimisation by law, informed consent (Art. 7 EU Directive)
- Data minimisation (Art. 6 I c, Art. 7)
- Purpose specification and purpose binding (Art. 6 I b)
 - "Non-sensitive" data do not exist !
- **Transparency**, rights of data subjects



Privacy Challenges

- Global networks, cookies, webbugs, spyware,...
- Location-based Services (LBS)
- Ambient Intelligence, RFID...
- Social Networks





Location Data /LBS – Privacy Risks

Privacy Risks:

- Unsolicited tracking of users' position, movements
- Unsolicited Profiling
- Disclosure of the user's current context
- Disclosure of social networks



Image source: Rannenberg, Goethe Univ. Frankfurt



Privacy Risks of Social Networks

Uppdaterad 2007-10-25 19:01 🛛 🗁 Skriv ut 🖂 Skicka



Enisa, det europeiska organet för nätverkssäkerhet, går i dag ut med en varning till dem som är med i nätverken på internet. Bland annat varnar man för att tagga, ansiktsidentifiera, sina vänner och anhöriga på bilder.

Facebook äger dig

"Det är ett slavkontrakt"

Samtliga 400 000 svenskar som registrerat sig på Facebook har skrivit över rättigheterna till sina bilder och hemligheter på det amerikanska företaget – för all evighet.

De har själva godkänt detta i ett 13sidiat kontrakt

FACEBOOK ÄGER

- Dina mejl
- Dina bilder
- Dina intressen
- Dina filmer

Dina kontaktuppgifter

- Intimate personal details about social contacts, personal life, etc.
- The Internet never forgets completely....
 - Not only accessible by "friends"







Privacy Risks of Social Networks – Personal data/photos inserted by others





Privacy Risks of Social Networks Social Network Analysis

The Stanford Daily

FRIDAY January 20, 2006 Home FULL SCHOLARSHIPS KAUST Discovery FOR SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY OTHER ISSUES. Scholarship STUDENTS READ MORE 5 «Prev Next» Archives Employers snoop on Facebook January 20, 2006 Cool Jobs Powered by Bing MSN Home

Nightly News *

Dateline -

Meet the Press

Technology & science / Internet



Oxford using Facebook to snoop University e-mailing students fines of \$80 to \$200 for breaking rules Oxford University students jump into the river from Magdeline Bridge to celebrate May Day. Officials at the university are now using Facebook as a way to find - and fine -

eaturing TODAY

cebook.com began as a ests, the site has now b rin of some young job-seekers.

nent Center (CDC) Lance Choy confirmed that 'eb searches to find background information on job thered this practice by using Facebook.

•

- Social Network Analysis/Profiling by:
 - •Employers
 - Schools/Universities
 - Direct Marketing
 - Hackers
 - •I aw Enforcement
 - Tax authorities



Need for Privacy-Enhancing Technologies (PETs)

- Law alone is not sufficient for protecting privacy in our Network Society
- PETs needed for implementing Law
- PETs for increased transparency & user control



Classifications of PETs

1. PETs for minimizing/ avoiding personal data (-> Art. 6 I c., e. EU Directive 95/46/EC)

(providing Anonymity, Pseudonymity, Unobservability, Unlinkability)

- At communication level:
 - Mix nets, Onion Routing, TOR
 - DC nets
 - Crowds,...
- At application level:
 - Anonymous Ecash
- idemix 🖏
- Anonymous Credentials,...

2. PETs for the safeguarding of lawful processing

- (-> Art. 17 EU Directive 95/46/EC)
 - P3P, Privacy policy languages
 - Encryption,...
- 3. Combination of 1 & 2
 - Privacy-enhancing Identity Management (PRIME, PrimeLife)









Platform for Privacy Preferences



II. Identity & Anonymity in Ad Hoc Networks Objective

How to obtain reliable anonymous communication?

PRIVACY is best protected with anonymity

ANONYMITY

Is the basis for Privacy-Enhancing Applications





Anonymous Communication Functions







Ad (1): Grouping Function

Identifiers in Ad Hoc Networks

- No native trustworthy identification scheme in ad hoc networks
- Perfect environment for achieving anonymity?



Source: Martucci et al. 2008



Self-Certified, Unlinkable Sybil-Free Identifiers

- Given: Initial Sybil-free Identity Domain
- How to propagate Sybil-freeness to arbitrary many identity (sub) domains, such as
 - In every identity domain each user is known under a different unique pseudonym (-> unlinkability)





Source: Martucci et al. 2008







The Initial Assumption

TTP (temporarily) available for bootstrapping

The initial identity domain is Sybil-free



(honest)



Initial Identity Domain used for one or more applications

Assumptions and Construction

- Assumption:
 - Every user U has obtained a (pseudonymous) membership certificate cert_U o from TTP. TTP stores pk_U and revocation information under U's identity
 - Each (sub) identity domain, created by a so-called domain controller, has a unique context identifier *ctx*, which is publicly announced
- Construction



 Variation of Camenisch et al. periodically spendable etoken*

*Camenisch et al. How to Win the Clone Wars: efficient periodic n-times anonymous authentication. In: ACM CCS 2006



Solution Overview

- For each (sub) identity domain *ctx*, U can create with *cert*_U one self-certified pseudonym^o consisting of:
 - Pseudo-random pseudonym P_(U,ctx)
 - New public key $pk_{(U, ctx)}$
 - Pseudonym certificate cert_(u,ctx)
- Pseudonyms are mutually unlinkable



Sybil node detection

- Detection of multiple $P_{(U_2, ctx)}$
- obtain the user permanent pk_{U_2}
- cert_U is revoked by TTP



(1) Grouping Function (1) Grouping Function (1) Grouping Function (2) Embedding Function



The anonymity set

How to design privacy-friendly identifiers?

The anonymous path

How to establish an anonymous (virtual) path?

path

nodes

Source: Martucci et al. 2008





Ad (2): Embedding Function





Anonymous Communication in Ad Hoc Networks

- Routing layer
 - + transparency towards application
 - incompatibility with standard ad hoc routing

Overlay applications

- (+ independency from routing layer
- not transparent to applications



The Chameleon Protocol – Mobile Ad Hoc Crowds



- Low-latency overlay anonymous communication mechanism, inspired by the Crowds protocol [Reiter/Rubin]
 - Anonymous virtual path establishment:
 - Every node selects its next hop
 - First, path initiator forwards message to arbitrary Chameleon member
 - Further forwarding is determined by a toss of a biased coin (with pf >0.5)
- Multiple directory servers instead of one centralized "blender"
- Self-certified Sybil-free pseudonyms to distinct the elements of the anonymity set



Propagating self-certified, unlinkable Sybil-free identifiers

- Chameleon users have to obtain membership certificate *cert_U* from a (temporarily available) TTP
- One user acts as the domain controller, to which Chameleon users may register
- The domain controller periodically broadcasts the certified pseudonyms of enrolled users (incl. temporal network addresses)
- Users check that other users possess valid certified pseudonyms
- Pseudonym certificates stored at the domain controller automatically become invalid after the validity period of *ctx*



Applying the Crowds metrics



Attacker Model adjusted to ad-hoc networks

	Sender Anonymity	Receiver Anonymity	
Malicious insiders (Г')	probable innocence if $ \Gamma \ge \frac{p_f}{(p_f - \frac{1}{2})} * (\Gamma' + 1)$	$P(absolute privacy) = \left(\frac{ \Gamma - \Gamma }{ \Gamma }\right)^{L_{exp} - 1}$	
Destination	beyond suspicion for Γ ≥3	-	



Chameleon - Performance Evaluation and Trade-offs

- Analytical Performance Properties
 - fair distribution of workload
 - scalability (same as Crowds)
 - few public key operations to set a path (2L)
- Simulation to obtain a cumulative distribution function (CDF) of percentage of packet arrivals in relation to the end-to-end delay and resistance against malicious insiders [Martucci 2009]
 - Example: For a tolerated 16.7% of malicious insiders (a probability of forwarding of 0.60):
 - the average end-to-end delay is 5.35 ms
 - 93.8% of the packets are expected to arrive within 10ms and
 - 99,7% within 20ms in our simulation setting



III. Privacy-enhancing Identity Management (IDM) for Life



Vision: Users can act *securely* in the Information Society while keeping *sovereignty* of their private spheres

Viability of privacy-enhancing IDM has been demonstrated



Integrated approach providing:

Data Minimisation

- Anonymous communication, anonymous credentials, privacy-enabling authorisation model
- Assurance & Life Cycle Management
 - Assurance control, privacy & trust policy negotiation & enforcement (sticky policies), obligation management
- Transparency
 - Data track,...

 \star \star \star Privacy and Identity Management for Europe

http://www.prime-project.eu/



PRIME/PrimeLife Architecture – Key Elements

1 Data Minimisation

2 Assurances & Data Life Cycle Management

The following slides were kindly provided by Dieter Sommer/IBM Research



Data Minimisation

How service providers can authorise users while users retain their privacy



Traditional Model

Request of service



Please log in!

Username = jap

Password Ok, the requestor is Jane Doe Address = Paradeplatz, 8001 Zurich, Switzerland Birth date = 01 June 1979 Email = Jane.doe@main.provider-xyz.com Credit card details = (VISA, 1234 5678 9012, ...) And so on...

> Other profiling data: Detailed interest profiles, browsing behavior, detailed mouse movement profiles, complete history of interactions over the last 3 years, derived data and much more

External linkable data: Potentially everything that is linkable to Jane Doe's identity





Data minimisation

- isn't the answer to everything
- [there are many scenarios where identifying data are just required]



2 Assurances

& Data Life Cycle Management

How users establish trust in service providers and how service providers enforce their promises for data handling Well, I don't know anything about this service provider...

There's not much choice than just providing the data...

Let's hope that these are not those bad privacy-infringing gays one reads about in the news every other day...



raditional Model

eate an account

Please provide Name, street, zip unde & city, country, birth date, email address, credit card details, personal preferences on X, ...



Hare's what you have requested Jane Doe, Paradeplatz, 8001 Zurich, Switzerland, 1978-06-01 Jane.doe@mail-provider-xyz.com, VISA, 1234 5678 9012, ...



PRIME/PrimeLife Model





Privacy Obligation Management





[discussed so far]



What about user-to-user

interactions?

PRIME architecture is symmetric!Open and expressive RDF-based data modelTechnologies apply similarlyHumans on both sides of the negotiation





http://www.primelife.eu/

Start date: 01 March 2008, **Duration**: 36 Months, **Total EC Funding**: 10.200,000 €

Bringing Sustainable Privacy and Identity Management to Future Networks and Services

- Fundamentally understanding privacy-enhancing identity management 'for life'
- Bringing Privacy to the future web/social networks
- Research on Policies, HCI, Infrastructures

Beyond data minimization:

Address data-intensive scenarios and user-generated content (Web 2.0, virtual communities such as Friendster, SecondLife)

Make privacy-enhancing identity management widely available:

- Infrastructures, Open Source, and Standards
- Cooperation with other Projects (Master, TAS3, SWIFT,...),
- Education (summer schools, ...)







HCI Challenges addresed by PrimeLife

- User-friendly representation of complex technical privacy concepts
 - Unlinkability, pseudonymity, privacy policy management, anonymous credential selection,...

Mapping legal privacy requirements

- Informed consent, transparency,...
- Mapping social requirements
 - Mediating trust, raising awareness,...
- Providing security
 - Against phishing, spoofing,...





Conclusions

- Identity-Anonymity Paradox: Reliable
 Identifiers
 Anonymity
- Anonymity
 Privacy-enhancing Identity Management
- Holistic Approach to PETs is needed!





http://www.cs.kau.se/~simone/