

# Privacy Pass Ecosystem

Drafts, Key Management, APIs, Implementations

IETF 107 – Virtual – 2020-03

Steven Valdez - [svaldez@google.com](mailto:svaldez@google.com)

# Privacy Pass Drafts

# pp-protocol

- <https://github.com/alxdavids/privacy-pass-ietf/blob/master/draft-davidson-pp-protocol.md>
- Protocol for Client/Server Issuance and Redemption
- Specification of cryptographic requirements
- Defines Extension Policy for the protocol

# pp-architecture

- <https://github.com/alxdavids/privacy-pass-ietf/blob/master/draft-davidson-pp-architecture.md>
- Interfaces that Client/Server should expose
- Interface for configuration/key management
- Privacy Considerations
  - User Segregation
  - Tracking/Identity Leakage
- Security Considerations
  - Key Rotation
  - Token Exhaustion
- Defines Extension Policy for the architecture

# pp-http-api

- <https://github.com/alxdavids/privacy-pass-ietf/blob/master/draft-svaldez-pp-http-api.md>
- HTTP API Extension of pp-architecture
- HTTP Wrapping for Protocol Messages/Interfaces
- Key Management for HTTP Clients (Commitment Registry)
- Delegated Redemption

# Key Management Options

# Key Management Requirements

- Consistent Key Commitments across Clients
  - User Segregation
  - Issuance-Time Fingerprinting
- Key Rotation
  - Compromised Keys
  - Lost Keys
- Auditability

# Option: Issuer Configuration

- Clients fetch latest Key Commitments directly from Issuer
  - Anonymous \*separate\* Connection (reduce the fingerprint an Issuer can get)
  - Fetched at issuance and redemption time to verify Issuer isn't quickly rotating keys
- Some form of "auditor" is required to defend against split-view.
- Auditing is only a partial mitigation.



# Option: Proxied Configuration Fetching

- Proxy fetches key configurations.
- Clients fetch key configuration from proxy
- Auditors verify proxy is seeing consistent views of key commitments
- Proxy has no client state to segregate key configurations

# Option: Commitment Registry

- Append-Only Log
- Auditors verify issuers aren't rotating key commitments too frequently
  - Client Policy for rate of key rotation is allowable.
  - Client or Third-Party Auditors responsible for detecting violations.
  - Log may prevent additions to the log on violations.
- Clients fetch latest Key Commitments
  - Directly from Log
  - From Token Issuer (with some form of inclusion proof)

# Open Questions

- Strategy for double-spending?
  - Eventually consistent
  - Global Registry
- Protocol for detecting/reporting malicious servers?
  - Client Policy
  - Gossip Protocol
- Acceptable key rotation windows?
  - Key Compromise vs First Party State
- Recommended key management strategy?
  - Proxied Fetching vs Append-only Log
- Balancing number of issuers versus privacy considerations?
  - Consolidation, Limiting Redemption vs Issuance

# Current APIs/Implementations

- Challenge Bypass Extension (<https://github.com/privacypass/challenge-bypass-extension>)
  - Cloudflare
  - Go/JS
- Ad Confirmations (<https://github.com/brave/brave-browser/wiki/Security-and-privacy-model-for-ad-confirmations>)
  - Brave
  - Rust/JS
- Trust Token (<https://groups.google.com/a/chromium.org/g/blink-dev/c/X9sF2uLe9rA/>)
  - Chrome
  - C/JS

# Privacy Pass Ecosystem

Drafts, Key Management, APIs, Implementations

IETF 107 – Virtual – 2020-03

Steven Valdez - [svaldez@google.com](mailto:svaldez@google.com)