### Who tracks the trackers? Balancing privacy and stalker detection for Apple's AirTags

**Talk based on** "Abuse-Resistant Location Tracking: Balancing Privacy and Safety in the Offline Finding Ecosystem" by **Gabrielle Beck**, Harry Eldridge, Matthew Green, Nadia Heninger, and Abhishek Jain. https://eprint.iacr.org/2023/1332.pdf









#### • Tracks physical objects: keys, luggage, pets, etc.







- Tracks physical objects: keys, luggage, pets, etc.
- Works via Find My







- Tracks physical objects: keys, luggage, pets, etc.
- Works via Find My
  - crowd-sourced location tracking system







- Tracks physical objects: keys, luggage, pets, etc.
- Works via Find My
  - crowd-sourced location tracking system
  - uses no GPS, no Internet







Tag



Tag Owner

Pair()





Tag

Tag Owner



































 $\leftarrow \text{Broadcast}(\ \ensuremath{\ref{eq: broadcast}}, e)$ 







 $\leftarrow \text{Broadcast}(\ \ensuremath{\ref{eq: broadcast}}, e)$ 









































Server

 Retrieve()



 Retrieve()



 Retrieve()



# Sounds great, what could go wrong?

An adversary who sees multiple bxs from the same device could link them together







An adversary who sees multiple bxs from the same device could link them together









An adversary who sees multiple bxs from the same device could link them together









An adversary who sees multiple bxs from the same Seen: could link them together









An adversary who sees multiple bxs from the same Seen: could link them together









An adversary who sees multiple bxs from the same Seen: could link them together




















### **Potential Safety Risks - Stalking?**







### Privacy is built in.

Only you can see where your AirTag is. Your location data and history are never stored on the AirTag itself. Devices that relay the location of your AirTag also stay anonymous, and that location data is encrypted every step of the way. So not even Apple knows the location of your AirTag or the identity of the device that helps find it.

AirTag is designed to discourage unwanted

tracking. If someone else's AirTag finds its way into your stuff, your iPhone will notice it's traveling with you and send you an alert. After a while, if you still haven't found it, the AirTag will start playing a sound to let you know it's there.

Of course, if you happen to be with a friend who has an AirTag, or on a train with a whole bunch of people with AirTag, don't worry. These alerts are triggered only when an AirTag is separated from its owner.

Apple. https://www.apple.com/airtag/. Accessed on: Wayback Machine. April 2021

### Broadcast produces pseudorandom value based on and epoch e

- Broadcast produces pseudorandom value based on
  - Small epoch duration = good privacy for tag user

### **lom** value based on rivacy for tag user

and epoch e

- Broadcast produces pseudorandom value based on
  - Small epoch duration = good privacy for tag user
- What about stalker detection??

### **lom** value based on rivacy for tag user

and epoch e

- Broadcast produces pseudorandom value based on
  - Small epoch duration = good privacy for tag user
- What about stalker detection??
  - ... make epoch longer?

### **lom** value based on rivacy for tag user

and epoch e

- Broadcast produces pseudorandom value based on
  - Small epoch duration = good privacy for tag user
- What about stalker detection??
  - ... make epoch longer?

# and epoch e

#### Currently, epoch duration is 24 hrs for separated mode



are opaque and confusing

Despite long tracking period, conditions for alerting users to stalking



- are opaque and confusing
- Honest tag users have low privacy

Despite long tracking period, conditions for alerting users to stalking



- are opaque and confusing
- Honest tag users have low privacy
  - Can be tracked for 24 hrs.

Despite long tracking period, conditions for alerting users to stalking



## **DULT IETF Draft**

Proposed standards for protection against unwanted trackers/stalking tags • Would apply to all trackers (e.g. Apple's, Google's, Tile's, Samsung's, etc.)

### **DULT IETF Draft**

#### 3.5.1. Rotation policy

An accessory SHALL rotate its address on any transition from nearowner state to separated state as well as any transition from separated state to near-owner state.

When in near-owner state, the accessory **SHALL** rotate its address every 15 minutes. This is a privacy consideration to deter tracking of the accessory by non-owners when it is in physical proximity to the owner.

When in a separated state, the accessory **SHALL** rotate its address every 24 hours. This duration allows a platform's unwanted tracking algorithms to detect that the same accessory is in proximity for some period of time, when the owner is not in physical proximity.

### **DULT IETF Draft**

#### 3.5.1. Rotation policy

An accessory SHALL rotate its address on any transition from nearowner state to separated state as well as any transition from separated state to near-owner state.

When in near-owner state, the accessory **SHALL** rotate its address every 15 minutes. This is a privacy consideration to deter tracking of the accessory by non-owners when it is in physical proximity to the owner.

When in a separated state, the accessory SHALL rotate its address every 24 hours. This duration allows a platform's unwanted tracking algorithms to detect that the same accessory is in proximity for some period of time, when the owner is not in physical proximity.

Is this really all we can do?



privacy



- privacy
  - Will be efficient enough to use in practice\*



- privacy
  - Will be efficient enough to use in practice\*

\* According to us



- privacy
  - Will be efficient enough to use in practice\*

Protocol	Epoch duration	Broadcasts per epoch	Stalker detection?	Tracking privacy	Continuous Proximity	Stalker detection
Apple FindMy [2] / IETF [32]:						
Near-owner mode	$15 \min$	450	×	n/a	n/a	
Separated mode	24 hrs	43,200	•	n/a	×	$15\text{-}60  \min^\dagger$
This work $(\S4)$ :						
2-second epochs / 1-hour window	$2  \sec$	1	•	$40-46 \min^*$	•	$60 \min$
4-second epochs / 1-hour window	$4  \sec$	1	•	$39-46  \mathrm{min}^*$	•	$60 \min$
1-minute epochs / 1-hour window	$60  \sec$	15	•	$41-47 \min^*$	•	$60 \min$

\* According to us



- privacy
  - Will be efficient enough to use in practice\*

ProtocolEpoch durationBroadcasts per epochStalker detection?Tracking privacyContinuous ProximityStalker dApple FindMy [2] / IETF [32]:IETF	
durationper epochdetection?privacyProximitydApple FindMy [2] / IETF [32]: $15 \min$ $450$ $\times$ $n/a$ $n/a$ Near-owner mode15 min $450$ $\times$ $n/a$ $n/a$ Separated mode24 hrs $43,200$ $\bullet$ $n/a$ $\times$ $150$ This work (§4): $15$ $150$ $150$ $150$ $150$	Stalker
Apple FindMy [2] / IETF [32]:Near-owner mode15 min450Xn/an/aSeparated mode24 hrs43,200•n/aX15This work (§4): $(15, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10$	letection
Near-owner mode15 min450Xn/an/aSeparated mode24 hrs43,200 $\bullet$ n/aX15This work (§4):	
Separated mode24 hrs43,200 $n/a$ $X$ 15This work ( $\frac{5}{4}$ ):	
This work $(\S4)$ :	$5-60 \min^{\dagger}$
2-second epochs / 1-hour window 2 sec 1 $\bullet$ 40 - 46 min <sup>*</sup> $\bullet$	$60 \min$
4-second epochs / 1-hour window 4 sec 1 $\bullet$ $39-46 \min^*$	60 min
1-minute epochs / 1-hour window 60 sec 15 $\bullet$ 41 - 47 min <sup>*</sup> $\bullet$	60 min

\* According to us



### What makes this problem hard?

### What makes this problem hard?

#### Potential stalking victim and tracking adversary have the same goal

### What makes this problem hard?

- - want to detect repeated contact with the same tag

Potential stalking victim and tracking adversary have the same goal

### Tracking adv. and stalking victims are not the same







### Tracking adv. and stalking victims are not the same



#### Seen by stalking victim

### Tracking adv. and stalking victims are not the same



#### Seen by stalking victim Seen by tracking adversary





























### A new primitive: Multi-Dealer Secret Sharing S S S sh<sub>n</sub> sh<sub>n</sub> sh<sub>n</sub> $sh_1$ $sh_1$ $sh_1$










## A new primitive: Multi-Dealer Secret Sharing S S S sh<sub>n</sub> sh<sub>n</sub> sh<sub>n</sub> $sh_1$ $sh_1$ $sh_1$







New property, *unlinkability:* 

# A new primitive: Multi-Dealer Secret Sharing S S sh<sub>n</sub> sh<sub>n</sub> $sh_1$





























































20





20















## MDSS.Recover(





# MDSS.Recover( ) $\rightarrow$





















## Privacy for honest users follows from MDSS unlinkability property



• Easy to construct a MDSS scheme...



- Easy to construct a MDSS scheme...
  - Use Shamir secret-sharing where  $sh_i = (\alpha_i, p(\alpha_i))$

- Easy to construct a MDSS scheme...
  - Use Shamir secret-sharing where  $sh_i = (\alpha_i, p(\alpha_i))$ 
    - unlinkable when  $\alpha_i$  sampled **uniformly** at random

- Easy to construct a MDSS scheme...
  - Use Shamir secret-sharing where  $sh_i = (\alpha_i, p(\alpha_i))$ 
    - unlinkable when  $\alpha_i$  sampled **uniformly** at random
    - do recovery using RS list-decoding algorithm [GS98]

- Easy to construct a MDSS scheme...
  - Use Shamir secret-sharing where  $sh_i = (\alpha_i, p(\alpha_i))$ 
    - unlinkable when  $\alpha_i$  sampled **uniformly** at random
    - do recovery using RS list-decoding algorithm [GS98]
      - \*\* works if dealer's shares make up  $\geq (1 \rho)$  fraction of input

## Unfortunately...

## Unfortunately...

Unlinkability for MDSS degrades quickly with more dealers 

## Unfortunately...

- Unlinkability for MDSS degrades quickly with more dealers •
- To avoid this ...
## Unfortunately...

- Unlinkability for MDSS degrades quickly with more dealers
- To avoid this ...
  - Need to list decode near capacity

## Unfortunately...

- Unlinkability for MDSS degrades quickly with more dealers
- To avoid this ...
  - Need to list decode near capacity  $\bullet$



• What if we use a different type of RS code?

• What if we use a different type of RS code?

• 
$$sh_i = (\alpha, p_1(\alpha), \dots, p_c(\alpha))$$

- What if we use a different type of RS code?
  - $sh_i = (\alpha, p_1(\alpha), \dots, p_c(\alpha))$
- degradation

## **[BKY03, CS03, CH11]** - by increasing *c*, **could** avoid unlinkability

- What if we use a different type of RS code?
  - $sh_i = (\alpha, p_1(\alpha), \dots, p_c(\alpha))$
- $\bullet$ degradation
  - But...  $\bullet$

## [BKY03, CS03, CH11] - by increasing C, could avoid unlinkability

- What if we use a different type of RS code?
  - $sh_i = (\alpha, p_1(\alpha), \dots, p_c(\alpha))$
- $\bullet$ degradation
  - But...
    - Proofs only for random error model

## **[BKY03, CS03, CH11]** - by increasing *c*, **could** avoid unlinkability

- What if we use a different type of RS code?
  - $sh_i = (\alpha, p_1(\alpha), \dots, p_c(\alpha))$
- degradation
  - But...
    - Proofs only for random error model  $\bullet$

## [BKY03, CS03, CH11] - by increasing C, could avoid unlinkability



- What if we use a different type of RS code?
  - $sh_i = (\alpha, p_1(\alpha), \dots, p_c(\alpha))$
- [BKY03, CS03, CH11]) by increasing *c*, could avoid unlinkability degradation
  - But...
    - Proofs only for random error model



## A better MDSS scheme Modify [CH11] to (*heuristically*) handle recovering multiple dealers secrets

- What if we use a d
  - $sh_i = (\alpha, p_1(\alpha), \ldots)$
- [BKY03, CS03, CH11] ) by increasing c, could avoid unlinkability degradation
  - But...
    - Proofs only for random error model





What if we use a d 

(If you're interested in this come talk to me!! Please!)

- $sh_i = (\alpha, p_1(\alpha), \ldots, p_c(\alpha))$
- [BKY03, CS03, CH11] ) by increasing *c*, could avoid unlinkability degradation
  - But...
    - Proofs only for random error model

## Modify [CH11] to (*heuristically*) handle recovering multiple dealers secrets





## Efficiency

- Most aggressive parameters of 4 sec epoch duration
  - Stalker detection on laptop < 30 sec (No stalkers < 4 sec), Raspberry Pi < 6 min (No stalkers < 1 min)
- For 60 sec epoch duration
  - Raspberry Pi < 1.27 sec (No stalkers .48 sec)</li>
- Reminder: Apple's epoch duration is 15 min

## Efficiency

- Most aggressive parameters of 4 sec epoch duration
  - Stalker detection on laptop < 30 sec (No stalkers < 4 sec), Raspberry Pi < 6 min (No stalkers < 1 min)</li>
- For 60 sec epoch duration
  - Raspberry Pi < 1.27 sec (No stalkers .48 sec)</li>
- Reminder: Apple's epoch duration is 15 min

## In conclusion...

- Not impossible to come up with schemes which allow for stalker detection while still giving privacy to honest tag users
- Would be nice to see other solutions in this space

Eprint: https://eprint.iacr.org/2023/1332

Dying social media platform: <u>https://twitter.com/gabrie\_beck</u>