

Application-Oriented Selection of Privacy-Enhancing Technologies (Short Paper)

Immanuel Kunz and Andreas Binder

Fraunhofer AISEC

Annual Privacy Forum '22

Agenda

Motivation and State-of-the-Art

Classifying Privacy-Enhancing Technologies

- Criteria

- Classification

Evaluation

Conclusions

Motivation and State-of-the-Art

Motivation and State-of-the-Art

- ▶ Selection of PETs is application-specific, but can be approached systematically

Motivation and State-of-the-Art

- ▶ Selection of PETs is application-specific, but can be approached systematically
- ▶ Application-oriented selection criteria are not sufficiently addressed

Motivation and State-of-the-Art

- ▶ Selection of PETs is application-specific, but can be approached systematically
- ▶ Application-oriented selection criteria are not sufficiently addressed
- ▶ Deng et al.: LINDDUN

Motivation and State-of-the-Art

- ▶ Selection of PETs is application-specific, but can be approached systematically
- ▶ Application-oriented selection criteria are not sufficiently addressed
- ▶ Deng et al.: LINDDUN
- ▶ Heurix et al.: A taxonomy for privacy enhancing technologies

Classifying Privacy-Enhancing Technologies

Criteria

- ▶ Privacy Protection Goal (LINDDUN)

Criteria

- ▶ Privacy Protection Goal (LINDDUN)
- ▶ Metric (based on Wagner and Eckhoff)

Criteria

- ▶ Privacy Protection Goal (LINDDUN)
- ▶ Metric (based on Wagner and Eckhoff)
- ▶ Functional Scenario (Computation, Messaging, Retrieval, Release, Authentication, Authorization)

Criteria

- ▶ Privacy Protection Goal (LINDDUN)
- ▶ Metric (based on Wagner and Eckhoff)
- ▶ Functional Scenario (Computation, Messaging, Retrieval, Release, Authentication, Authorization)
- ▶ Maturity (based on TRL)

Criteria

- ▶ Privacy Protection Goal (LINDDUN)
- ▶ Metric (based on Wagner and Eckhoff)
- ▶ Functional Scenario (Computation, Messaging, Retrieval, Release, Authentication, Authorization)
- ▶ Maturity (based on TRL)
- ▶ Performance Impact

Criteria

- ▶ Privacy Protection Goal (LINDDUN)
- ▶ Metric (based on Wagner and Eckhoff)
- ▶ Functional Scenario (Computation, Messaging, Retrieval, Release, Authentication, Authorization)
- ▶ Maturity (based on TRL)
- ▶ Performance Impact
- ▶ Architectural Impact

Criteria

- ▶ Privacy Protection Goal (LINDDUN)
- ▶ Metric (based on Wagner and Eckhoff)
- ▶ Functional Scenario (Computation, Messaging, Retrieval, Release, Authentication, Authorization)
- ▶ Maturity (based on TRL)
- ▶ Performance Impact
- ▶ Architectural Impact
- ▶ Utility

<i>Name</i>	<i>Linkability</i>	<i>Identifiability</i>	<i>Non-Repud.</i>	<i>Detectability</i>	<i>Disclosure</i>	<i>Unawareness</i>	<i>Non-Comp.</i>	<i>Metrics</i>	<i>Functional Scenario</i>	<i>Maturity</i>	<i>Performance</i>	<i>Architecture</i>	<i>Utility</i>
k-anonymity	■							Data similarity	Release	3			▲
Suppression	■	■						Data similarity	Release	3			▲
Anonymous Credentials	■	■						Cryptographic Games	AuthN	2			
Local Differential Privacy			■					Indistinguishability	Release	2			▲
Global Differential Privacy	■							Indistinguishability	Release	2			▲
Homomorphic Encryption					■			Cryptographic Games	Computation	2	▲		
⋮								⋮					

Example threats

1. **Linkability (Release)**: linkability of transactional data
2. **Identifiability (Release)**: identification via transactional data
3. **Disclosure (Computation)**: disclosure of processed data
4. **Detectability (Messaging)**: detectable messages sent between users

Threat	LINDDUN Result	Our Classification
Linkability (Release)	k-anonymity, Multi-Party Computation, (A)symmetric Encryption, Homomorphic Encryption, Deniable Encryption, Anonymous Buyerseller Watermarking Prot., Verifiable Encryption, Feedback Tools for User Privacy Awareness, Data Removal Tools	k-anonymity, Suppression, Recoding, Aggregation, Swapping, Noise Masking, PRAM, Synthetic Data, Group Signatures, Global Differential privacy
⋮		
Detectability (Messaging)	Mix Network, Steganography, Deniable Authentication, Dummy Traffic, ISDN-Mixes, Onion Routing, Tor, Crowds Low-Latency Communication, Java Anon Proxy, Covert Communication, Spread Spectrum Off-The-Record Messaging, Mixmaster Type 2 Mixminion Type 3, Single Proxy, Anonymous Remailer, DC-Networks	Mix Network, Steganography, Dummy traffic

Conclusions

Summary

- ▶ Systematic classification (protection goal, metric, functional scenario, maturity, performance impact, architectural impact, utility impact)

Future Work

Conclusions

Summary

- ▶ Systematic classification (protection goal, metric, functional scenario, maturity, performance impact, architectural impact, utility impact)
- ▶ Comparison with LINDDUN

Future Work

Conclusions

Summary

- ▶ Systematic classification (protection goal, metric, functional scenario, maturity, performance impact, architectural impact, utility impact)
- ▶ Comparison with LINDDUN

Future Work

- ▶ Maintain and extend classification

Conclusions

Summary

- ▶ Systematic classification (protection goal, metric, functional scenario, maturity, performance impact, architectural impact, utility impact)
- ▶ Comparison with LINDDUN

Future Work

- ▶ Maintain and extend classification
- ▶ Integrate into threat modeling tools

Conclusions

Summary

- ▶ Systematic classification (protection goal, metric, functional scenario, maturity, performance impact, architectural impact, utility impact)
- ▶ Comparison with LINDDUN

Future Work

- ▶ Maintain and extend classification
- ▶ Integrate into threat modeling tools
- ▶ In general: only few PET implementations have high maturity

Thank you!

Immanuel Kunz and Andreas Binder

{firstname.lastname}@aisec.fraunhofer.de