Transparency Overlays and Applications

Melissa Chase (Microsoft Research Redmond) Sarah Meiklejohn (University College London)















































































(icons by parkjisun from noun project)



(icons by parkjisun from noun project)









events in the system can be
-data access by user
-data access by third party
-data creation by user



events in the system can be
-data access by user
-data access by third party
-data creation by user
transparency: bad events are exposed









which systems?



which systems?



system

system







system



system

GenEventSet















which systems?



consistency






non-frameability (related to [DGHS'16])





accountability



accountability



which systems?



which systems?



(aka tamper-evident log [CW'09]) (aka authenticated data structure [AGT'01,PSTY'13]) (aka rolling hash chain or Merkle tree [M'89])

















basic

Com CheckCom Append

all events?

ProveAppend CheckAppend

specific event? ProveIncl

CheckIncl (can't omit events)



system

<u>basic</u>

Com CheckCom Append

all events?

ProveAppend CheckAppend

specific event?

ProveIncl CheckIncl



system







inconsistent?

DemoInconsistent CheckInconsistent

-"your commitment c does not represent the state of my list at time t"



inconsistent?

DemoInconsistent CheckInconsistent non-inclusion? DemoNotIncl CheckNotIncl

-"your commitment c does not represent the state of my list at time t"
















































































security

ability to carry out DemoInconsistent, ProveAppend, and ProveIncl \Rightarrow

consistency

unforgeability of DemoInconsistent, DemoNotIncl*, and signature scheme \Rightarrow

non-frameability

ability to carry out DemoNotIncl* ⇒ accountability

*uses pledged version in which Auditor keeps track of failed events and gossips about them with Monitor to produce new type of evidence



+ auditors determine if these events are in the log



+ auditors determine if these events are in the log



+ auditors and monitors ensure consistent view of log



+ auditors determine if these events are in the log



+ auditors and monitors ensure consistent view of log
⇒ (by consistency+accountability)

event is in monitor's view of the log







Certificate Transparency







Bitcoin blockchain sender miner receiver Log CheckEvidence log server log CheckEntry Inspect auditor (snap monitor (E) BE snap evidence Gossip double spending is exposed ... provably! sender and receiver don't need to store blockchain

Bitcoin



(CT+Bitcoin)



(CT+Bitcoin)



(CT+Bitcoin)



(CT+Bitcoin)







dynamic list commitment (dlc)
basic Com CheckCom Append

basic Com CheckCom Append



basic Com CheckCom Append



basic Com CheckCom Append $e_1 e_2$ $e_1 e_2$ $Com(e_1 e_2) = H(e_2 || H(e_1))$ CheckCom(c, $e_1 e_2$) = (c = H(e_2 || H(e_1)))

basic Com CheckCom Append $e_1 e_2$ $com(e_1 e_2) = H(e_2 || H(e_1))$ $CheckCom(c, e_1 e_2) = (c = H(e_2 || H(e_1)))$ $Append(e_3 e_4, c_{12}) = H(e_4 || (H(e_3) || c_{12}))$



basic Com CheckCom Append

all events?

ProveAppend CheckAppend

 $\begin{array}{c|c} e_1 & e_2 \\ \hline & Com(\begin{bmatrix} e_1 & e_2 \end{bmatrix}) = H(e_2 || H(e_1)) \\ \hline & CheckCom(c, e_1 & e_2) = (c = H(e_2 || H(e_1))) \\ \hline & Append(\begin{bmatrix} e_3 & e_4 \end{bmatrix}, c_{12}) = H(e_4 || (H(e_3) || c_{12})) \\ \hline & e_1 & e_2 & e_3 & e_4 \end{array}$

basic Com CheckCom Append all events?

ProveAppend CheckAppend

 $\begin{array}{c|c} e_{1} & e_{2} \\ \hline Com(e_{1} & e_{2}) = H(e_{2} || H(e_{1})) \\ \hline CheckCom(c, e_{1} & e_{2}) = (c = H(e_{2} || H(e_{1}))) \\ \hline Append(e_{3} & e_{4}, c_{12}) = H(e_{4} || (H(e_{3}) || c_{12})) \\ \hline e_{1} & e_{2} & e_{3} & e_{4} \end{array}$ ProveAppend(c₁₂, c₁₂₃₄, e_{1} & e_{2} & e_{3} & e_{4}) = e_{3} & e_{4}







