PRIVACY OF IDEAS IN PEER 2 PEER NETWORKS

Speaker: Dieter Brunotte

Proseminar "Peer-to-Peer Information Systems"



- Motivation
- Privacy of Ideas
- Basic Technics for Liane
- Liane
- Experiments
- Summary

Motivation

- At the search you leak your information need
 - especially for very specific Information
- The Problem is that others get potential information about unpublished ideas for research

-> need for anonymized search engines

Leakage

- Unwanted revealing of an idea is called leakage
- while performing a query you don't hide the query itself
- The query can be analized to get the current idea of the user
- Queries without results are very interessant because the idea seems to be a new one

Privacy of ideas

• Definition:

A service assures Privacy of ideas if it can be fully used while not leaking information that can be easily assembled for learning the current ideas of a user.

- This is not the same as Anonymity
- also anonymous user can leak the idea
- need a method that hides the query

Basic Procedure for Privacy

- For avoiding privacy leaks we will have to
- (1) split the query into small subqueries
 - Every Query should have at least one document within the collection.
- (2) decorrelate the subqueries in time
- (3) anonymize sending and receiving of each query result
 - For this we use Tarzan.
- (4) build a final result from the results of the subqueries.

Tarzan

- offers anonymiced connections over P2P-networks using asymmetric encryption
 - every node has a public key
- a node N_{sender} who wants to send a message chooses n nodes (N₁,...,N_n) from Tarzan network
- to send a anonymiced message the sender encrypts the message with the public keys of N₁,...,N_n in n layers

Tarzan

Tarzan message



encrypted with pk of N_1

encrypted with pk of N_2

encrypted with pk of N_{n-1} encrypted with pk of N_n

. . .

Tarzan





Tarzan: way back

- on the way back the same Tarzan-chain is used, but in the reverse direction
- every node adds an layer of encrytion
- decryption will be performed by N_{sender}

Inverted files

- "Bag of words" assumption: Documents are sets of words
- for each word we have a list of document in which the word appears
 - -> inverted files
- Ioad the inverted files for the words of your query

Liane

- We combine Tarzan, Chord and inverted files to Liane
- Every inverted list of a word is stored at a Chord-Node
- for a query Q={q₁,q₂,...,q_m} the corresponding Chord-Nodes must be contacted to get the inverted files

Liane

- The queriing Peer must open |Q| anonymized connections using Tarzan to |Q| random-choosed Nodes
- This Peer perform the partial queries over the Chord-Ring to locate the inverted lists
- Result are the nodes containing the inverted list
- the inverted list are loaded again using Tarzan

Liane's weakness

- An attacker within the Liane network that owns many inverted lists can perform correlation attacks
 - theoretical attack
 - counter measure: dummy-queries, caching, ...
- Bigger Problem: Waste of resources
 - complexity of a Liane Query:

$$Comp_{dist} = O\left(c_{connect} \cdot |Q| \cdot \log N + c_{transfer} \cdot \sum_{\varphi \in Q} |InvListe(\varphi)|\right)$$

Optimization of Liane

- A query is not split into |Q| parts anymore
 - split the query in many subqueries with several terms
 - reduces size of the results of the subqueries
 - Iower bandwidth
- low number of subqueries (many query terms) is a risk for leakage
- Optimization with cost model

Cost model for Liane

- We consider 2 main cost factors
 - c_{net}: cost of transferring a document reference over the network
 - c_{leak}: cost for the leakage of our idea
- We have costs of

 $c_{total}(Q) = c_{leak} \cdot P(leak) + c_{net} \cdot |RR|$

expressed as sum of subqueries

$$c_{total}(Q) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} c_{total}(Q_j)$$

Cost model for Liane

We can compute P(leak)

$$P(leak_{Q_j}) = \left(1 - \prod_{q_i \in Q_j} \frac{|InvList(q_i)|}{|Coll|}\right)^{|Coll||} \approx e^{-|Coll||\prod_{q_i \in Q_j} \frac{|InvList(q_i)|}{|Coll||}}$$

we get

$$c_{total}(Q_{j}) = c_{leak} \cdot e^{-|Coll \cdot |\prod_{q_{i} \in Q_{j}} \frac{|InvList(q_{i})|}{|Coll \cdot |}} + c_{net} \cdot |Coll \cdot | \cdot \prod_{q_{i} \in Q_{j}} \frac{|InvList(q_{i})|}{|Coll \cdot |}$$

Cost model

- Observations
 - the costs caused by leakage decreases exponentially with the number of documents found by the subquery
 - communication costs increase linearly with the number of documents found by the subqueries
- to minimize c_{total} we have to find a good Partitioning of the query into subqueries

Experiments: Setup

- Simulation of a PlanetP like P2P-network
- Document-Collection: 170000 News articles (Reuters Collection)
 - size of ~1-3 Kbyte per document
 - stopwords are removed
- The Queries contain:
 - n_k terms, that appear in at least k documents of the collection
 - n_{all} terms choosed from all terms of the collection

Experiments: Setup

- variation of k, n_{all} , n_k , c_{leak}/c_{net}
- use of a simple optimization-algorithm to divide the query into subqueries
- for every combination of values 1000 runs were averaged



Variation of highfrequent terms

• constant: k = 100, $c_{leak}/c_{net} = 100000$, 5 query terms



Variation of frequencythreshold k

• const.: $n_{all} = 0$, $n_k = 5$, $c_{leak}/c_{net} = 10000$, 5 query terms



Future work

- It misses experiments with real users to verify this definition of a new idea
- How many rare/high frequent terms are typical for a user query
- techniques for reducing the amount of data to send

Summary

- Privacy of ideas
 - definition of an new idea (empty query)
- Tarzan
 - anonymous data transmission
- Liane(=Tarzan + chord + inverted files)
 - System providing Privacy of ideas
 - Optimization with cost model
- Experiments on news article collection

End of Presentation

Questions !?

Thank for your attention!