Tools for Ubicomp Privacy

Distributed Systems

RESEARCH GROUP FOR

Marc Langheinrich ETH Zurich



What's Up?

- Privacy Enhancing Technologies (PETs)
 - Encryption & Authentication
 - Anonymization & Pseudonymization
 - Access & Control
 - Transparency & Trust
- Legal Aspects
 - US Privacy Landscape
 - European Privacy Laws

Solution Space Revisited

- Notice and Disclosure
 - Transparency Tools
- Choice and Consent
 - Anonymity and Pseudonymity Tools
- Security
 - Encryption and Authentication Tools
- Access and Control
 - PETs in the Enterprise
- Recourse
 - Laws and Regulations

Anonymity & Pseudonymity

Distributed Systems

RESEARCH GROUP FOR



Anonymizing Proxies

- Acts as a proxy for users
- Hides information from end servers



- Proxy Sees all traffic
- User Identity Easily Compromisable
- Note: Server Identity Protectable (Rewebber)

Rewebber.com

- Created at Hagen University, Germany
- Provides both Client- and Server-Anonymity
- Only as subscription service (\$5-\$15 per month)



Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule Zürich Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich

Mixes [Chaum81]



 \bigcirc k_x = encrypted with public key of Mix X

Sender routes message randomly through network of "Mixes", using layered public-key encryption.

Realization of Mixes

- Onion Routing (Office of Naval Research)
 - http://www.onion-router.net
 - service ended 01/2000



JAP

- Freedom (Zero-Knowledge Systems, Canada) zerøknowledge⁻
 - http://www.zeroknowledge.com
- Java Anon Proxy (TU Dresden)
 - http://anon.inf.tu-dresden.de

Further Issues

- Mobile IPv4/IPv6 Node Mobility
 - Binding Updates Can be Tracked
 - Unencrypted Home Network Address
 - Integration into Mix Networks necessary
- IPv6 Stateless Address Configuration
 - Address Based on Fixed Interface Identifier
 - Better: Fake Identifiers (Random/Statistical)
- Bluetooth BD_ADDR Problem

IPv6 Privacy See also: Alberto Escudero Pascale, KHT Sweden. http://www.it.kth.se/~aep/

Transparency Tools

RESEARCH GROUP FOR

Distributed Systems



Example: Web Privacy Policies

- Let consumers know about collector's privacy practices
- Consumers can then decide
 - whether or not practices are acceptable
 - when to opt-in or opt-out
 - who to do business with
- Increase consumer trust



Privacy Policy Drawbacks

- BUT policies are often
 - difficult to understand
 - -hard to find
 - take a long time to read
 - usually 3-4 pages!
 - changed without notice

Seal Programs

- TRUSTe http://www.truste.org
- BBBOnline http://www.bbbonline.org
- CPA WebTrust –
 http://www.cpawebtrust.org/
- Japanese Privacy Mark http://www.jipdec.or.jp/security/p rivacy/









Seal Program Problems

- Basic Principle:
 - Publish a policy (any policy) and follow it
- Only few require base-level standard
 - BBBOnline requires client in good standing with Better Business Bureau
- Effect:
 - Good notices of bad practices









P₃P

- Platform for Privacy Preference Project
 - Chartered by World Wide Web Consortium (W3C)
 - 1997-2001 (Recommendation December 2001)
- A framework for automated privacy discussions
 - Web sites disclose their privacy practices in standard machine-readable formats
 - Web browsers automatically retrieve P3P privacy policies and compare them to users' privacy preferences
 - Sites and browsers can then negotiate about privacy terms

P3P1.0 defines

Data

<POLICY xmlns="http://www.w3.org/2000/P3Pv1" entity="TheCoolCatalog, 123 Main Street, Seattle, WA 98103, USA"> <DISPUTES-GROUP> <DISPUTES service="http://www.PrivacySeal.org"</pre> - Us resolution-type="independent" description="PrivacySeal, a third-party seal provider" - AIIimage="http://www.PrivacySeal.org/Logo.gif"/> </DISPUTES-GROUP> <DISCLOSURE discuri="http://www.CoolCatalog.com/Practices.html" access="none"/> Voca <STATEMENT> <CONSEQUENCE-GROUP> Colle <CONSEQUENCE>a site with clothes you would appreciate</CONSEQUENCE> </CONSEQUENCE-GROUP> <RECIPIENT><ours/></RECIPIENT> <RETENTION><indefinitely/></RETENTION> – Pii <purpose><custom/><develop/></PURPOSE> <DATA-GROUP> XML <DATA name="dynamic.cookies" category="state"/> <DATA name="dynamic.miscdata" category="preference"/> <DATA name="user.gender"/> Meth <DATA name="user.home." optional="yes"/> </DATA-GROUP> </STATEMENT> Trans <STATEMENT> <RECIPIENT><ours/></RECIPIENT> <PURPOSE><admin/><develop/></PURPOSE> No <RETENTION><indefinitely/></RETENTION> <DATA-GROUP> <DATA name="dynamic.clickstream.server"/> <DATA name="dynamic.http.useragent"/> </DATA-GROUP> </STATEMENT> </POLICY>

Eidgenössische Technische Hochsc Swiss Federal Institute of Technology

The P3P Vocabulary

- Who is collecting data?
- What data is collected?
- For <u>what purpose</u> will data be used?
- Is there an ability to <u>change</u> <u>preferences</u> about (opt-in or opt-out) of some data uses?
- Who are the data <u>recipients</u> (anyone beyond the data collector)?

- To what information does the data collector provide <u>access</u>?
- What is the data <u>retention</u> policy?
- How will <u>disputes</u> about the policy be resolved?
- Where is the <u>human-readable</u> <u>privacy policy</u>?

Privacy Infrastructures



P3P Issues

- Legal Applicability of XML-Policies?
 - Lawyers Do Not Like Binary Stuff
- Expressability of Personal Preferences?
 - Not All Situations Foreseeable and Definable
- User Proficiency?
 - Can the Layman Configure Sufficiently?
- Who Sets the Defaults?
 - Most Users Will Not Bother to Change Prefs
- Promises, Promises, Promises
 - Who Says That Policies Will Be Followed?
- Negotiations?

The Identity Protector

John Borking, 1996 (Dutch Data Protection Comm.)



Infomediaries

- Hagel/Singer: "Net Worth" 1997
- Services and tools that help people manage their online identities



- Digitalme http://www.digitalme.com
- Lumeria http://www.lumeria.com
- Privaseek http://www.privaseek.com







Identity Managers

- History: Open Profiling Standard (Netscape, 97)
 Inspired P3P, Local Storage, Soon Abandoned
- XNS.ORG (Open Source by OneName Inc.)
 - Implements Subset of P3P + Identity Services
- Microsoft Passport ("My Services")
 - Mounting Criticism Led to Number of Alterations
- Liberty Alliance (Sun, 2001)
 - AmEx, HP, IBM, Nokia, GM, NTT, Philips, Visa, SAP, ...
- IDSec (Open Source, IETF-Draft, 05/2002)

See also: http://weblog.digital-identity.info/

More Identity Managers

- PISA Privacy Incorporating Software Agent (EU 5th Framework Project)
 - Uses Software Agent Technology
 - Partners: ZeroKnowledge, NRCC, TU Delft, ...
 - http://www.tno.nl/instit/fel/pisa/
- Freiburg University Identity Manager
 - Mobile Applications
 - Incorporate with Location Privacy System
 - <u>http://www.iig.uni-freiburg.de/telematik/atus/</u>

Encryption and Authentication

Distributed Systems

RESEARCH GROUP FOR

EITH Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule Zürich Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich

Confidentiality

- Plenty of Options
 - IPSec, SSH, SSL, SET, PGP, WEP (Flawed)...
- Bulk Traffic Encryption Possible
 - But Power Consumption a Factor
- Most Important Question: Who You Are Talking To?
 - Authentication Primary Concern
 - Difficult Due to Lack of Infrastructure!

Making "Friends"

- Resurrecting Duckling Model (Stajano)
 - Security Principal Imprinted on "Blank" Unit
 - "Secure Transient Association:"
 Deassociation Possible
 After Imprinting
- Interface Challenge
 - Example: Smart-Its



Making "Friends"

 The shaking motion establishes a shared context (i.e., acceleration pattern) that no other devices will have



Image: TecO

EITH Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule Zürich Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich

Access & Control

RESEARCH GROUP FOR

Distributed Systems



Keeping Your Promises

- Goal: Data Processing in Synch with Data Collection Policies
 - Enterprise-wide PETs
 - Metadata Controls Back-End Processing



Enterprise PETs

Advantages

- Allows Individual Policies
- Simplifies Data Management (Metadata)
- Provides Accountability (Privacy Audits)
- Players
 - IBM (e.g., pASL, Zurich Research Labs)
 - PricewaterhouseCoopers (Consulting)
 - NCR Teradata (Warehousing Software)

More PET Issues

Digital Watermarking

- Protecting Personal Information with Digital Copyright Protection?
- Individual Access
 - Authenticating Users to Edit Personal Data
 - Costs?
- Negotiation
 - How Much Do We Need?

•••

Solution Space Revisited

- Notice and Disclosure
 - Transparency Tools
- Choice and Consent
 - Anonymity and Pseudonymity Tools
- Security
 - Encryption and Authentication Tools
- Access and Control
 - PETs in the Enterprise
- Recourse
 - Laws and Regulations

Laws & Regulations

RESEARCH GROUP FOR

Distributed Systems

Laws and Regulations

- Privacy laws and regulations vary widely throughout the world
- US has mostly sector-specific laws, with relatively minimal protections
 - Self-Regulation favored over comprehensive Privacy Laws
 - Fear that regulation hinders e-commerce
- Europe has long favoured strong privacy laws
 - First data protection law in the world: State of Hesse, Germany (1970)
 - Privacy commissions in each country (some countries have national and state commissions)

Privacy Laws In the US

- Basis
 - 4th Amendment
- Historical Development (Surveillance)
 - Olmstead vs. US
 - Katz vs. US
 - Kyllo vs US
- Modern Privacy Laws (Informational)

4th Amendment

- Basis for many privacy issues in US
 - "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized."

Olmstead vs. US, 1928

- Police caught bootlegger by placing wiretaps to phone lines outside his house
- Defendant claimed 4th Amendment
- Supreme Court claimed no physical trespassing occurred
 - Judge Brandeis disagreed: Phone Tapping a Search, Recording Conversation a Seizure
- Privacy as By-Product vs. Privacy as Limit of Power!

Katz vs. US, 1967

- Police Placed Microphone outside Public Phone in Front of Defendants House
 - Federal Communications Act, 1934, Forbid Wire Tapping (Exceptions Possible)
- Overruled Olmstead case: Reasonable Expectation of Privacy
- Law "protects people, not places."
 - Microphone was Unreasonable Search, Recording was Unreasonable Seizure

Kyllo vs. US, 2001

- Police used Thermal Image Scanner to Detect Heat Lamps Growing Marijuana Plants
- Supreme Court: Unreasonable Search Barred By 4th Amendment
 - Device Not In General Use By Public, Gives
 Expectation of Privacy
 - But: Visual Search Still Allowed

US Privacy Law (Tort)

- Allows Recovery of Damages (Prosser, 1960)
 - Intrusion
 - Disclosure of Private Facts
 - False Light
 - Appropriation ("Identity Theft")
- Other Torts
 - Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress
 - Assault
 - Trespass
- But: No Privacy Protection in Public Places
 - Unless "Reasonable Expectation of Privacy"

Source: Ronald B. Sandler, "Privacy Law in the USA" (http://www.rbs2.com/privacy.htm)

US Public Sector Privacy Laws

- Federal Communications Act, 1934, 1997 (Wireless)
- Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Street Act, 1968
- Bank Secrecy Act, 1970
- Privacy Act, 1974
- Right to Financial Privacy Act, 1978
- Privacy Protection Act, 1980
- Computer Security Act, 1987
- Family Educational Right to Privacy Act, 1993
- Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 1994
- Freedom of Information Act, 1966, 1991, 1996
- Driver's Privacy Protection Act, 1994, 2000

US Private Sector Laws

- Fair Credit Reporting Act, 1971, 1997
- Cable TV Privacy Act, 1984
- Video Privacy Protection Act, 1988
- Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act, 1996
- Children's Online Privacy Protection Act, 1998
- Gramm-Leach-Bliley-Act (Financial Institutions), 1999

Solutions

Laws and Regulations

- Privacy laws and regulations vary widely throughout the world
- US has mostly sector-specific laws, with relatively minimal protections
 - Self-Regulation favored over comprehensive Privacy Laws
 - Fear that regulation hinders e-commerce
- Europe has long favoured strong privacy laws
 - First data protection law in the world: State of Hesse, Germany (1970)
 - Privacy commissions in each country (some countries have national and state commissions)

EU Data Directive

1995 Data Protection Directive 95/46/EC

- Sets a Benchmark For National Law For Processing Personal Information In Electronic And Manual Files
- Follows OECD Fair Information Practices
 - Collection Limitation, Openness, Purpose Specification, Use Limitation, Access, Security, Participation, Accountability
- Facilitates Data-flow Between Member States And Restricts Export Of Personal Data To "Unsafe" Non-EU Countries

Safe Harbor

Membership

össische Technische Hochschule Zürich

- US companies self-certify adherance to requirements
- Dept. of Commerce maintains list (222 as of 08/02) http://www.export.gov/safeharbor/SafeHarborInfo.htm
- Signatories must provide
 - notice of data collected, purposes, and recipients
 - choice of opt-out of 3rd-party transfers, opt-in for sensitive data
 - access rights to delete or edit inaccurate information
 - security for storage of collected data
 - enforcement mechanisms for individual complaints
- Approved July 26, 2000 by EU
 - reserves right to renegotiate if remedies for EU citizens prove to be inadequate

Privacy around the World

- Australia*
 - Proposed: Privacy Amendment (Private Sector) Bill in 2000
 - In talks with EU officials
- Brazil
 - Proposed: Bill No. 61 in 1996 (pending)
- Canada*
 - Passed: Bill C-6 in 4/2000
 - Under review by EU
- Hong Kong*

Solutions

Passed: Personal Data (Privacy)
 Ordinance in 1995

- Japan
 - Currently: self-regulation & prefectural laws
 - In talks with EU officials
- Russia
 - Law on Information, Informatization, and Inform. Protect. 1995
 - In Progress: updated to comply with EU directive
- South Africa
 - Planned: Privacy and Data Protection Bill
- Switzerland*
 - EU-certified safe third country for data transfers

* Has National Privacy Commissioner

EU Directive (cont.)

1997 Telecommunications Directive 97/66/EC

- establishes specific protections covering telecommunications systems
- July 2000 proposal to strengthen and extend directive to cover "electronic communications"
- Member states responsible for passing relevant national laws by 10/1998
 - 13 out of 15 member states have passed legislation, 2 are still pending (as of 08/2002)

Data Protection Agencies

- Australia: http://www.privacy.gov.au/
- Canada: http://www.privcom.gc.ca/
- France: http://www.cnil.fr/
- Germany: http://www.bfd.bund.de/
- Hong Kong: http://www.pco.org.hk/
- Italy: http://www.privacy.it/
- Spain: http://www.ag-protecciondatos.es/
- Switzerland: http://www.edsb.ch/
- UK:http://www.dataprotection.gov.uk/

... And many more

Post 9-11 Issues (US)

- Uniting and Strengthening America Act by **Providing Appropriate Tools Required to** Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism (USA PATRIOT) Act, 2001
 - online activities, surveillance, money laundering, immigration
- Operation TIPS (Terrorist Information and **Prevention System**) citizen
 - Begin Scheduled August 2002
 - One Million Volunteers in 10 US Cities to Report "Suspicious Activity" (Goal: 4% of Population)
 - Targets: Letter Carriers, Utility Technicians, ...

Learn more and join today!



Post 9-11 Issues (EU)

- Directive on Privacy and Electronic Communications 2002/58/EC
 - Members States Have Until 11/03 to Implement
 National Law Allowing Traffic Data Retention
 - Retention Period: 12 Months 7 Years (Proposal)
- Data to be Retained (Planned Requirement):
 - Email: IP address, message ID, sender, receiver, user ID
 - Web/FTP: IP address, User ID, Password, Full Request
 - Phone: numbers called (whether connected or not), date, time, length, geographical location for mobile subscribers

See also: http://www.epic.org/privacy/intl/data_retention.html

Example UK

- UK Terrorism Act, 2001
 - Telcos, ISPs Retain Traffic Data Longer Than for Billing Purposes
 - Purpose: National Security Investigations
- Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act, 2000
 - Allows Law Enforcement Access To Retained Data
 - Planned: Extend Access to Health and Transport, Local Authorities, ... (Halted o6/o2)
- Other EU Countries With Existing Laws for Data Retention:
 - Belgium, France, Spain

EU Private Video Surveillance

- Usually Governed By General Data Protection Principles (EU Directive)
 - Justified (by Agreement, Public/Private Interest, Law)
 - Proportional (Sufficient to Achieve Purpose)
 - Footage Selection
 - Storage Duration
 - Clearly Identified (Signs, maybe Contact Info)
 - Secure Storage (If Any)
 - Use Limitation (No Secondary Uses)

For Example of Swiss Law see http://www.edsb.ch/e/doku/merkblaetter/video.htm

Summary & Outlook

RESEARCH GROUP FOR

Distributed Systems



Summary

- Privacy Enhancing Technologies (PETs)
 - Large Body of Existing Technology (Internet)
 - Many New Challenges in Ubicomp
 - Authentication and Authorization
 - User Interfaces, Configuration for Consent
- Legal Aspects
 - Strong Differences US vs Europe
 - New Legal Developments Re. Data Retention

Privacy Web Sites

- http://www.privacyinternational.org
- http://www.privacyfoundation.org
- http://www.privacyexchange.org
- http://www.privacycouncil.com
- http://www.privacyplace.com
- http://www.junkbusters.com
- http://www.privacilla.org
- http://www.statewatch.org
- http://www.privacy.org
- http://www.pandab.org
- http://www.epic.org
- http://www.cdt.org

Solutions

More Books

- Security for Ubiquitous Computing, by Frank Stajano
- The Privacy Law
 Sourcebook 2001: United
 States Law, International
 Law, and Recent
 Developments, by Marc
 Rotenberg
- Privacy & Human Rights, EPIC



Solutions