

Practical Mix Network Design

Jeff Burdges David Stainton





27.12.2017

"Encryption works. Properly implemented strong crypto systems are one of the few things that you can rely on." —Edward Snowden (2013) "We kill people based on metadata" -Michael Hayden (Ex-NSA Director)





Time to resist traffic analysis!

Existing solutions?



Five years ago the NSA considered Tor effective, at least against mass location tracking.

```
TOP SECRET//COMINT// REL RVEY
```

- We will never be able to de-anonymize all Tor users all the time.
- With manual analysis we can de-anonymize a <u>very small fraction</u> of Tor users, however, <u>no</u> success de-anonymizing a user in response to a TOPI request/on demand.

Tor is not enough

"[Tor does not] protect against an attacker who can see .. both traffic going into [and] coming out of the Tor network .. as simple statistics let you decide whether [both flows] match up." —Roger Dingledine, "One cell is enough .."

See:

Johnson, Wacek, Jansen, Scherr, Syverson. Users Get Routed: Traffic Correlation on Tor By Realistic Adversaries. (CCS 2013) You only need one side if the other side behaves predictably, like a website.



Admit defeat on the web for now ..



How can we keep messaging metadata private?

What is a mix network?

- 1. Message oriented
- 2. Unreliable packet switching network
- 3. Layered encryption in a single packet
- 4. Added latency per hop, aka they mix

What is a mix network?



Mix networks are among the oldest anonymity tools, dating back to

David Chaum. Untraceable electronic mail, return addresses, and digital pseudonyms, Comm. ACM, 24, 2 (Feb. 1981); 84-90

We know other anonymity system designs, like

- Dining cryptographer's networks (DC-nets)
- Private Information Retrieval (PIR)

but they all scale poorly.. most need quadratic bandwidth per user.

Attack: Epistemic



Topology: Cascade



Topology: Free route



Topology: Stratified



Diaz, Murdoch, Troncoso. *Impact of Network Topology on Anonymity and Overhead in Low-Latency Anonymity Networks* PETs 2010

Topology: Stratified



No: Onion routers provde cryptographic unlinkability, ... but they do not mix!

Mix strategies delay packets to reduce correlation between incoming and outgoing packets.. adding *latency*.

See:

Claudia Diaz & Andrei Serjantov. Generalising Mixes. PET 2003







Attack: Blending aka n-1



Attack: Statistical disclosure



Attack: Statistical disclosure



Loopix Achitecture



Ania Piotrowska, Jamie Hayes, Tariq Elahi, Sebastian Meiser, and George Danezis. *The Loopix Anonymity System* Usenix 26, 2017.

Loopix Provider to Client traffic padding



Anonymity Trilemma (Das, Meiser, Mohammadi, Kate (2017)) Anonymity cannot scale better than |cover traffic| · |latency|

Take aways:

Tor's situation: |cover traffic| * 0 = 0

Anonymity cost still looks quadratic too.. but not in users. -

"The universe believes in encryption" -Julian Assange (2012)

Encryption is free, but you must pay for anonymity.

Don't roll your own packet format!

Sphinx is a remarkably compact and secure packet format designed by George Danezis and Ian Goldberg.



Security proof in the universal composability model, using on earlier work by Camenisch & Lysyanskaya 2005.

Don't roll your own packet format!

Sphinx is a remarkably compact and secure packet format designed by George Danezis and Ian Goldberg.



Security proof in the universal composability model, using on earlier work by Camenisch & Lysyanskaya 2005.

A Sphinx packet is a tuple $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta)$ where

- is an elliptic curve point, α
- is routing data onion encrypted with a stream cipher, header ß
- is a MAC for β , and
- is the packet body onion encrypted with a wide-block cipher. δ



Question: Why is the body δ not MACed?

$$\underbrace{(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta)}_{\overset{\circ}{\overset{\circ}{\overset{\circ}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}{\overset{\circ}}}{\overset{\circ}}}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}}}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}}}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}}}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}}}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{\circ}}{\overset{$$

An unMACed stream cipher is dangerous

 $? = \delta' \oplus$ "Hello Eve, This is Alice's message."

but a wide-block cipher admits only a fractional bit tagging attack

Single-use Reply Blocks (SURBs)

Anonymous receivers matter: Journalistic sources Services: CENO, money, etc. Protocol ACKs!



Attack: Compromise

We want protocols to be forward-secure, aka have key erasure.

Problem: α is ephemeral, but the node's key X is not! Uh oh!

- Idea 1: Replay attacks necessitate a Bloom filter, which necessitates key rotation.. so rotate faster?
 - *Meh.* Don't stress the PKI. SURB lifetime = Node key lifetime

Can we do better?
Attack: Compromise

We want protocols to be forward-secure, aka have key erasure.

Problem: α is ephemeral, but the node's key X is not! Uh oh!

Idea 1: Replay attacks necessitate a Bloom filter, which necessitates key rotation.. so rotate faster?

Meh. Don't stress the PKI. SURB lifetime = Node key lifetime

Idea 2: Tor is forward-secure..so use more packets but not like Tor?George Danezis (2003): Use packets in different key epochs.

Jeff: First use a loop to get an answer.. and then double ratchet.

Meh. This is cheating. Not all hops.

Sphinx' opinions on key exchanges



FS PQ Sphinx Conjecture

There is a fast-ish efficient LWE key exchange with fast efficient blinding and punctures, but no scheme with hybrid blinding.



The case of the lost packet

The case of the lost ACK

Katzenpost: crypto layers

Mix Network Cryptographic Protocol Layers



Loopix: Alice sends a message to Bob



Loopix: Bob retreives message from his Provider.



Stronger location hiding properties.



Lake Proposal

Can both sender and receiver be protected by the mixnet? Yes!



Application: Money



Taler's RSA blind signatures have information theoretically secure blinding.



Zcash requires at least inverting hash functions

Application: Web-ish



Application: Relax!

We want to design applications so that users experience the latency as a benefit.. as productive disengagement.



"Work at a different speed" -Brian Eno, Oblique Strategies (1974)

Thanks to the following people:

Yawning Angel George Danezis Claudia Diaz Christian Grothoff Ania Piotrowska Katzenpost project page:

design docs, specifications and mailing lists https://katzenpost.mixnetworks.org/