

BISON: Blind Identification with Stateless scOped pseudoNyms

Jakob Heher, Stefan More
Graz University of Technology
and Secure Information Technology Center Austria (A-SIT)
{jakob.heher,stefan.more}@iaik.tugraz.at

Lena Heimberger
Graz University of Technology
lena.heimberger@iaik.tugraz.at

Abstract—Delegating authentication to identity providers like Google or Facebook, while convenient, compromises user privacy. These identity providers can record users’ every move; the global identifiers they provide also enable internet-wide tracking.

We show that neither is a necessary evil by presenting the BISON pseudonym derivation protocol, inspired by Oblivious Pseudorandom Functions. It hides the service provider’s identity from the identity provider yet produces a trusted, scoped, immutable pseudonym. Colluding service providers cannot link BISON pseudonyms; this prevents user tracking. BISON does not require a long-lived state on the user device and does not add additional actors to the authentication process.

BISON is practical. It is easy to understand, implement, and reason about, and is designed to integrate into existing authentication protocols. To demonstrate this, we provide an OpenID Connect extension that allows OIDC’s PPID pseudonyms to be derived using BISON. Additionally, BISON uses lightweight cryptography. Pseudonym derivation requires a total of four elliptic curve scalar-point multiplications and four hash function evaluations, taking ≈ 3 ms in our proof of concept implementation. Thus, BISON’s privacy guarantees can be realized in practice.

This makes BISON a crucial stepping stone towards the privacy-preserving internet of tomorrow.

I. INTRODUCTION

In today’s internet, nary a day passes without being prompted to create an account for a newsletter, a website, or simply to keep reading an interesting article. Users tend to value comfort and usability, and just want to get back to what they were doing. They will often take the more convenient route and just “Sign in with Google”, “Log in with Facebook”, “Use your Microsoft Account”, or “Sign in with Apple” [28], [57]. The promise is as simple as it is tempting: forget remembering all these different passwords – access the entire internet, with just one set of credentials to worry about.

Of course, the flip side isn’t talked up as much: whichever service you use to serve as “your identity” gets involved every time you log in – anywhere. Troves of highly personalized association data are at its fingertips. This includes valuable information about users’ behavior; which is attractive for profiling, marketing, and worse. In the internet of authentication, it’s no surprise that everyone wants to be the identity provider.

But – do we need this? Is it really necessary for identity providers to learn where their accounts are being used, and which services their users frequent? Can privacy only be

provided by highly complex systems struggling to find real-world adoption? In this work, we can answer these questions with a resounding “no”. It does not have to be this way.

A. Challenges

In Section II-B, we will identify a number of goals. These goals map loosely to two fundamental challenges in delegated authentication, which our work addresses. To help orient the reader, we will now provide a brief overview.

Challenge 1: Portability. Users are fickle, unpredictable beings [3]. They don’t just use their accounts on a single, stable device, or even on some predictable set of user devices. Sometimes they’ll log in from their friends’ house, or from a hotel lobby, or from a shared computer at the school library.

In all of these cases, they still expect their accounts to be there, just one short authentication process away [54], [27]. This reality is in sharp contrast with some academic work [12], [42], [59], [45], [37], which envisions secret key material being stored “on the user’s device”. Without access to this material, authentication is rendered a cryptographic impossibility.

This is a significant barrier to practical adoption, where a seamless user experience is valued above all else. In this work, we will instead aim for a reality-proof solution, by embracing *statelessness* of the user device.

Challenge 2: Privacy. *Who you’re talking to* is highly sensitive information. Maybe you’re getting confidential medical advice from a specialist, seeking help with interpersonal conflict, or contacting a self-help group for an illness. Either way, nobody except *you* and *them* should know about it; the two of you should enjoy *relationship anonymity* [44], [9], [2].

At the same time, *who you are* is also highly sensitive information. Let’s say you log in to an internet forum, and you log in to a shopping platform. The shopping platform might be interested in the messages you post on the forum, so they can know which products to advertise to you [38]. Maybe you even want this, and might consent to it. But these parties should not be able to correlate your information automatically; you should enjoy *pseudonym unlinkability* [47], [53], [44], [8].

In this work, we will aim to safeguard *both* of these privacy properties. As we will outline in more detail in Section II-B, this is an especially tricky challenge; many naïve solutions to one problem simultaneously preclude solving the other.

B. Contributions

We introduce BISON, a stateless pseudonym derivation protocol that prevents profiling by identity providers and tracking by service providers. It produces pseudonyms that are scoped, immutable, and stable across multiple authentications.

BISON takes inspiration from Oblivious Pseudo-Random Functions (OPRFs), a well-researched cryptographic primitive, and applies it to a novel context. As a result, it is straightforward to understand and implement. Additionally, BISON is lightweight, only requiring four hash function evaluations and four elliptic curve point-scalar multiplications per derivation. It does not introduce any additional actors into the established authentication flow, and does not require any long-lived state to be stored on the user device. We provide a security proof, showing that BISON exhibits the claimed properties.

We then show that the existing OpenID Connect protocol, widely used in federated authentication, can be easily augmented to use BISON for pseudonym derivation. This allows user agents to take an active role in safeguarding user privacy in federated authentication. As browser vendors are currently deliberating the adoption of novel solutions to federated authentication across isolated browsing contexts, this further demonstrates that BISON can be practically deployed in real-world scenarios. We provide a full demonstrator implementing our extension, and make its source code available.

C. Outline

The remainder of this work is composed of two main parts. First, in Section II, we describe **the abstract BISON protocol**; we introduce our goals (Sections II-A to II-C) and necessary background (Section II-D), then present the BISON derivation protocol (Section II-E). In Section III, we **prove BISON’s security** (Section III-A) and discuss external considerations (Section III-B) and protocol details (Section III-C). Next, in Section IV, we **integrate BISON derivation into OpenID Connect**; we introduce OpenID Connect (Section IV-A), specify our extension (Section IV-D) and how it meets security requirements (Section IV-E). We describe our implementation (Section IV-F), show that it has negligible overhead (Section IV-G), and discuss the implications (Section IV-H). Finally, we compare to existing solutions (Section V) and conclude (Section VI).




Figure 1: The basic authentication flow. Using BISON derivation does not alter this flow; it does not add actors or messages.

II. THE BISON PROTOCOL

In this first part of our work, we introduce the BISON protocol for pseudonym derivation. It provides *pseudonym unlinkability* against multiple colluding service providers, *User-SP relationship anonymity* against a malicious identity provider,

and *Sybil resistance* against a malicious user while requiring *no persistent state* on the user device.

A. Definitions

We first define the three protocol actors and the roles they fulfill, and make some clarifications regarding terminology and notation. Note that we do not require actors beyond those common in existing authentication protocols [49], [15].

User/User Device. The *user* is a party with the primary objective of proving their identity to some service securely and efficiently, ideally in a privacy-preserving manner.

When necessary, we will distinguish between the human “user”, and the “user device” they are operating, which will, e.g., perform cryptographic operations on their behalf.

Service Provider (SP). The *service provider* is a party that requires the user to authenticate, as part of an authorization decision to access some service or resource. There are many different service providers, which may offer wildly disparate services. An internet message board, a virtual storefront, a health provider’s appointments software, a bank’s online banking application, and a government bureau’s web portal, are very different kinds of service providers, with different needs.

Almost all service providers share a need to (re-)identify users. If a user visits a message board, they should have the ability to edit messages they have previously sent; if they visit a storefront, they should be able to see their pending orders; if they visit their health provider, they should be able to see and cancel their appointments; and so forth. It is thus necessary to perform an authentication process of some kind, which results in a trusted persistent identifier for the user.

Authenticating a user is not a trivial task. Depending on the method, the server might need to securely store persistent information – passwords, shared secrets, or recovery codes – for each user. Conversely, users will then also need to remember many different credentials for different service providers.

To summarize, authentication is a burdensome task for both service providers and users. This has led to a desire to delegate the actual authentication process to a dedicated third party.

Identity Provider (IdP). The *identity provider* is a party that is trusted to perform user authentication. It decides on the authentication factors to use, and stores any information necessary to (re-)authenticate the user using these factors, such as password digests, shared secrets, or public keys.

The identity provider then assigns each *user account* a “global” identifier, which is only unique within the context of this particular IdP. Some identity providers may use truly global identifiers, such as email addresses; but not all do.

Depending on the context, possession of an account at a certain identity provider may carry particular implications, such as membership in a certain organization, which is verified by the identity provider. In such a case, the service provider delegates not only authentication, but implicitly also verification of these properties, to the identity provider.

Audience. In BISON, a user holds a particular stable, unique, and non-reassignable pseudonym which is scoped to a specific *audience*.

What constitutes an audience scope is highly context-specific. At a naïve level, each service provider might form its own audience. However, related service providers, which should be permitted to share data, might be grouped to form a single audience. By contrast, a single service provider might also be split into different audiences, for example to prevent data aggregation across divisions of a large corporation.

A particular audience is identified by a byte string, called an *audience identifier*; going forward, we will refer to these identifiers as audiences for brevity. In BISON, we assume that the user device can use some context-specific method to determine whether a service provider is authorized for a particular audience value. For example, this decision might be based on a certificate issued by the identity provider, or it might be based on already-available trusted information. We discuss this requirement further in Section III-B.

Alternate Terminology. We have chosen the terms above for use throughout this work in an attempt to avoid ambiguity. However, identity management is a broad field, and different sub-fields have adopted different terminologies for related concepts. To ease the reader’s understanding, we briefly mention such alternative terms that may appear in related work.

The *user device* may also be referred to as a *client*, a *user agent*, or a *wallet*. The *user* may be called *resource owner*.

The *service provider* is often also called a *relying party*. In OpenID Connect-related contexts, the service provider may – somewhat confusingly – also be referred to as a *client* [49].

The *identity provider* is, based on context, referred to as (*authorization*) *server*, (*credential*) *issuer*, or (*claims*) *provider*.

A Note on Notation. For the sake of clarity, we briefly outline the mathematical notation used throughout the remainder of this work. $(\mathbb{G}, +)$ is a group of prime order $p = \text{ord}(\mathbb{G})$. The group operation is written additively. We use \mathbb{G}^+ to refer to the non-identity elements of \mathbb{G} , i.e., $\mathbb{G}^+ := \mathbb{G} \setminus \{0_{\mathbb{G}}\}$. The repeated application of the group operation, written as $s \cdot X$ for $s \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\times, X \in \mathbb{G}$, corresponds to $X + X + X + X + \dots$ repeated s times. We will use uppercase (such as X or AudienceId) to denote elements of \mathbb{G}^+ , and lowercase (such as r or userId) for elements of \mathbb{Z}_p^\times .

Hardness Assumptions. We assume that, on \mathbb{G} , both the Decisional Diffie-Hellman Problem (DDHP) and the Discrete Logarithm Problem (DLP) are computationally infeasible for an attacker to decide/solve. This is a common assumption, which is widely believed to hold for common cryptographic groups, such as EC groups and $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^\times$ [10], [41].

B. Goals

We now explicitly state our goals for the protocol. In doing so, we will use the terminology of Pfitzmann and Hansen [44].

Pseudonym Unlinkability. Delegating authentication to a central provider is convenient, but enabling a link between otherwise-disparate user accounts is a significant privacy risk.

At a basic level, consider a “normal” centralized authentication process, as shown in Figure 1. The service provider redirects the user to the identity provider, and the user authenticates there. The service provider is then provided

with some assurance, signed by the identity provider, that the user was authenticated. This includes the user’s identifier, which is commonly a (unique) account name, email address, or similar. The same user identifier is then provided to each service provider that the user authenticates to. This allows different service providers, or other entities that they share data with, to link together the user’s actions without their consent.

Commonly, there is no legitimate need for such cross-provider tracking. Thus, *in general*, there is no reason for every service provider to obtain this same global identifier. Some authentication delegation schemes recognize this, and support service provider-specific pseudonyms [49], [15]. Here, the identity provider generates a persistent pseudonymous identifier for each service provider. A given user’s identifiers at different service providers are unrelated to one another, and cannot be linked. Thus, they cannot be used for tracking.

We formalize this concept of *pseudonym unlinkability* as follows: Two service providers, A and B , each request authentication, which is completed by user accounts X and Y respectively. As a result, they obtain pseudonyms $P_{X,A}$ and $P_{Y,B}$. It should be impossible for them to decide whether the two pseudonyms refer to the same user account ($X = Y$), or to different user accounts ($X \neq Y$).

User-SP Relationship Anonymity. The use of a central identity provider also means that this identity provider will commonly learn the identity of any service provider(s) that the user authenticates to. This is, once again, a significant privacy risk, with identity providers gathering a significant amount of data regarding their users’ associations.

An identity provider necessarily needs to identify the particular user that is authenticating. Furthermore, it is generally legitimate for the identity provider to control which service providers can use its authentication service. However, it is *not* generally necessary for the identity provider to learn *which particular user* is authenticating to *which particular service provider*. The link between a particular service provider and a particular user is the sensitive information at risk.

This, too, is a privacy risk that is well-known, both in literature and practice; ways to authenticate at an unknown service provider already exist [16], [43], [25]. Yet, combining this property with the previous *pseudonym unlinkability* goal offers a unique challenge. After all, if the identity provider does not know the service provider’s identity, how can it derive a service provider-specific pseudonym for the user?

We formalize this concept of *relationship anonymity* as follows: An authentication request R is received by the identity provider. They should learn no additional information about the service provider’s identity. Expressing this in terms of probabilities, for each service provider A , $\mathbb{P}(A|R) = \mathbb{P}(A)$.

Sybil Resistance. It is generally desirable for many internet services to place some barrier on the creation of fresh user accounts. Failing to do so may lead to the proliferation of spam, subversion of reputation or accountability systems, and other related issues. This is commonly referred to as a *Sybil attack*, and systems preventing this are termed *Sybil-resistant* [22].

Services that try to obtain Sybil-resistance commonly require some in-person contact or a verifiable link to a real-world identifier that is not easy to obtain. Examples include

phone number verification, scans of identification documents, or in-person account registration. By their very nature, these interactions are highly invasive to a user’s privacy.

Some approaches to privacy-preserving authentication attempt to prevent user tracking by both the service provider and the identity provider. They do this by relying on the user to associate pseudonyms to particular service providers. In such a scheme, the identity provider simply allows the user to authenticate using one of any number of pseudonyms; the user device can then re-use the same pseudonym when re-authenticating to the same service provider [19].

This completely voids any Sybil-resistance efforts by the identity provider. Since a single user account can present multiple unlinkable identifiers to the same service provider, a single verified user at the identity provider can spawn an arbitrary number of “identities” at the service provider. As a result, the service provider would need to begin its own Sybil-resistance efforts. This defeats the point of delegated authentication and, by necessitating an invasive verification process, nullifies any privacy gains towards the service provider.

We therefore aim for *Sybil resistance*, and formalize this goal as follows: Given a user account X and service provider A , there exists some stable pseudonym $P_{X,A}$ such that an authentication by X at A always results in $P_{X,A}$.

No persistent user device state. While storing secret information on the user’s device can be very convenient for protocol design, it presents many practical challenges.

Devices may break or be misplaced, leading to the irrevocable loss of any cryptographic information stored. Backing up such information while keeping it truly private is an open challenge, to which no perfect solution appears to exist [60].

Users may also wish to log in on a shared computer, or on a friend’s device. The process of transferring cryptographic key material to such a device is often complex, and exposing key material to a potentially-untrusted device is undesirable.

We side-step all of these issues by requiring no persistent state on the user device. All state kept on the user device should be ephemeral to a single authentication process, and should be able to be discarded after the process completes. This matches existing protocols deployed in the real world, and avoids complications when integrating our scheme.

Soundness & Validity. Finally, we explicitly state the two implicit goals of any delegated authentication scheme.

First, we require *soundness*. If a user successfully completes an authentication process, this should guarantee that they have successfully authenticated to the identity provider as the user corresponding to the resulting pseudonym. In other words, a malicious user should not be able to – without the identity provider’s cooperation – impersonate benign users towards a service provider.

Second, we require *user account validity*. It should be possible for the identity provider to suspend or delete a user account, disabling that user’s ability to authenticate.

C. Threat Model

We assume the *user* to be fully malicious. We consider two possible goals for a malicious user. First, obtaining a different

pseudonym for the same user-audience combination. This can either be the pseudonym of a particular genuine user (targeted), or just a blank-slate Sybil identity (untargeted). Second, completing the authentication without querying the identity provider, while resulting in the user’s genuine pseudonym. This would then allow a user to complete authentication using, for instance, a suspended user account.

We assume the *service provider* to be fully malicious. We consider three possible goals of malicious service providers. First, obtaining the user’s global identifier, which may be identifying information such as an email address. Second, correlating the pseudonyms of users across different audiences. Third, impersonating a user towards another service provider.

We do not consider the implications of the service provider and identity provider colluding against the user. In real-time authentication protocols without long-lived state on the user device, such collusion can always de-anonymize the user. We argue this point further in Section III-C.

Since the *identity provider* is tasked with performing opaque, context-specific steps to authenticate the user, they are the ultimate authority for who a user is. Them being able to issue false attestations, or create make-believe identities, is baked into the fundamental assumptions of the system. As a result, a fully malicious identity provider could trivially violate a number of the goals of an authentication scheme.

We will therefore assume that the identity provider is honest(-but-curious) with respect to Sybil resistance and soundness, and fully malicious otherwise. This is a common assumption, for the reasons stated above. We therefore consider only a single goal of our malicious identity provider: breaking User-SP relationship anonymity.

D. Background: Oblivious Pseudorandom Functions

In privacy-preserving computation, two parties may wish to compute a function where both parties input some data, but do not learn the other party’s input. This idealized functionality is realized by *Oblivious Pseudo-Random Functions* (OPRFs). An OPRF is a two-party protocol between a “client” and a “server” [14]. The server contributes some secret key k , and the client contributes a value X . After performing the protocol, the client learns $\text{OPRF}_k(X)$, but learns nothing else about OPRF_k or k . Meanwhile, the server learns no additional information; in particular, it does not learn X or $\text{OPRF}_k(X)$.

This very simple primitive is useful in a variety of applications; as a result, there are ongoing standardization efforts by the IRTF’s Crypto Forum Research Group [17].

In this work, we borrow operations from the specific class of Hashed Diffie-Hellman OPRFs over prime-order groups. This is a widely-researched class of OPRFs [14], which can be conceptualized as a sequence of three operations:

Blind(X, r) $:= r \cdot X$: A client function which uses a randomly-sampled $r \in_R \mathbb{Z}_p^\times$ to blind the input value¹ X for transmission to the server.

¹If X is not already a group element of the prime-order group, it is transformed to an element of \mathbb{G}^+ by applying a suitable hash function.




Figure 2: Simplified visual representation of the BISON protocol.

$\text{BlindEval}(A, k) := k \cdot A$: A server function that evaluates the blinded input value to a blinded output value using the server's secret² k .

$\text{Unblind}(B, r) := r^{(-1)} \cdot B$: A client function that removes the blinding from the output value to produce³ the final output.

The output $\text{OPRF}_k(X) = \text{Unblind}(\text{BlindEval}(\text{Blind}(X, r), k), r)$ is then $r^{(-1)} \cdot k \cdot r \cdot X = k \cdot X$.

We believe that it would be possible to generalize our approach to other types of OPRFs. However, our security proof of pseudonym unlinkability in Section III-A relies on properties of this particular OPRF construction. Thus, we leave this as potential future work and do not pursue it further here.

E. BISON Pseudonym Derivation

BISON applies OPRFs, introduced in the preceding section, to the three-party problem of pseudonym derivation. The audience, selected by the service provider and authenticated by the user device, is hashed to obtain $\text{AudienceId} \in \mathbb{G}^+$, which serves as the client input X . The $\text{userId} \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\times$, only known to the identity provider, serves as the server input k . We also add signatures to convince the service provider that the user truthfully performed the OPRF. This allows the SP to trust the OPRF's output, which then serves as the user's BISON pseudonym.

The resulting BISON protocol is shown in full as Protocol 1. We use the Blind, BlindEval, and Unblind operations of Hashed Diffie-Hellman OPRFs, as described in Section II-D. A simplified visual representation is provided as Figure 2.

Protocol 1 The BISON protocol as a sequence of steps.

SERVICE PROVIDER

- 1) send desired audience to user

USER DEVICE

- 2) receive audience from SP

²Similarly, if k is not already of the appropriate form, it is first transformed to an element of \mathbb{Z}_p^\times by applying a hash function.

³The result is then commonly hashed again. This, conveniently, also destroys any algebraic structure in the output.

- 3) authenticate SP for audience ▷ see Section III-B
- 4) derive $\text{AudienceId} = H(\text{audience})$
- 5) sample $r \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_p^\times$
- 6) calculate blinded AudienceId : $A = \text{Blind}(\text{AudienceId}, r)$
- 7) send A to IdP

IDENTITY PROVIDER

- 8) receive A from user
- 9) authenticate user and obtain $\text{userId} \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\times$
- 10) calculate blinded pseudonym: $B = \text{BlindEval}(A, \text{userId})$
- 11) sign (A, B) to obtain signature sig
- 12) send $(\text{sig}, (A, B))$ to user

USER DEVICE

- 13) receive $(\text{sig}, (A, B))$ from IdP
- 14) send $(r, \text{sig}, (A, B))$ to SP

SERVICE PROVIDER

- 15) receive $(r, \text{sig}, (A, B))$ from user
 - 16) check $A = \text{Blind}(\text{AudienceId}, r)$ ▷ this validates r
 - 17) verify signature sig over (A, B) ▷ see Section III-B
 - 18) derive pseudonym as $\text{Unblind}(B, r)$
-

III. BISON EVALUATION

A. Protocol Analysis

We now provide a security proof, and thus demonstrate that the BISON protocol fulfills the requirements of Section II-B.

We note that we intentionally do not include protections against message replay in the core protocol described above. This allows for easier integration into existing authentication protocols. Such protocols must already mitigate message replay; work which we would duplicate. We argue this point further in Section III-B. If desired, the core BISON protocol can be easily augmented to include such protection.

We also do not mandate a particular method of authenticating service providers for a given audience. This is because different methods will be appropriate depending on the context in which BISON is used. We also discuss this requirement, and some possible solutions, further in Section III-B.

Finally, we do not specify how the identity provider authenticates the user. This is common for authentication protocols.

Pseudonym Unlinkability. Two service providers belonging to different audiences each perform an authentication process, and obtain pseudonyms $\text{userld}_1 \cdot \text{Audience}_{A_1}$ and $\text{userld}_2 \cdot \text{Audience}_{B_2}$ respectively. Since the user has performed context-specific steps⁴ to authenticate each SP for their Audience, we know that $\text{Audience}_{A_1} \neq \text{Audience}_{B_2}$. We show that the two service providers cannot decide whether $\text{userld}_1 = \text{userld}_2$.

To do this, we first observe that Audience_{A_1} and Audience_{B_2} are obtained by applying a cryptographic hash function to audience_{A_1} and audience_{B_2} . Therefore, we can model Audience_{A_1} and Audience_{B_2} as being sampled at random from \mathbb{G}^+ . Additionally, we note that userld_1 and userld_2 were also sampled randomly from \mathbb{Z}_p^\times with sufficient entropy, as discussed in Section III-C. This allows us to state Lemma 1.

LEMMA 1. *If, given the quadruple $(\text{Audience}_{A_1}, \text{Audience}_{B_2}, \text{userld}_1 \cdot \text{Audience}_{A_1}, \text{userld}_2 \cdot \text{Audience}_{B_2})$, an attacker is capable of deciding whether $\text{userld}_1 = \text{userld}_2$, that attacker can also decide the Decisional Diffie-Hellman Problem (DDHP) [10].*

Proof: We are given an instance of DDHP, which is a tuple $(a \cdot G, b \cdot G, c \cdot G)$ for $(a, b, c) \in_R \mathbb{Z}_p^\times$ and generator $G \in \mathbb{G}^+$. To decide DDHP, we need to decide whether $c \cdot G = (a \cdot b) \cdot G$. We map this to an instance of our problem as follows: let $\text{Audience}_{A_1} := G$, $\text{Audience}_{B_2} := a \cdot G$, $\text{userld}_1 \cdot \text{Audience}_{A_1} := b \cdot G$, $\text{userld}_2 \cdot \text{Audience}_{B_2} := c \cdot G$. It immediately follows that $\text{userld}_1 = b$. As per our assumption, our attacker can now decide whether $\text{userld}_2 = \text{userld}_1$.

If $\text{userld}_2 = \text{userld}_1$, then $c \cdot G = \text{userld}_2 \cdot \text{Audience}_{B_2} = \text{userld}_1 \cdot \text{Audience}_{B_2} = b \cdot \text{Audience}_{B_2} = b \cdot a \cdot G = (a \cdot b) \cdot G$. Furthermore, due to G 's nature as a generator, $\text{userld}_2 \neq \text{userld}_1$ similarly implies $c \cdot G \neq (a \cdot b) \cdot G$.

Thus, our attacker can decide DDHP. ■

We assumed deciding the DDHP on \mathbb{G} to be hard.

User-SP Relationship Anonymity. The authentication process results in the identity provider learning $r \cdot \text{Audience}$ and $\text{userld} \cdot r \cdot \text{Audience}$. The identity provider knows userld , and we also assume it has a full list of potential Audiences to test, small enough to be reasonably iterated.

Nevertheless, this is not a concern.

LEMMA 2. *If $r \in_R \mathbb{Z}_p^\times, \forall X \in \mathbb{G}^+ : \mathbb{P}(r \cdot \text{Audience} = X) = \frac{1}{p-1}$ regardless of choice of $\text{Audience} \in \mathbb{G}^+$.*

Proof: Recall that we assumed \mathbb{G} to have prime order. In a prime-order group, any non-identity element is a generator of the group. Since Audience is a non-identity element, Audience generates \mathbb{G} . Therefore, $\star_{\text{Audience}} : \mathbb{Z}_p^\times \rightarrow \mathbb{G}^+$ defined by $x \mapsto x \cdot \text{Audience}$ is a bijection. $r \in_R \mathbb{Z}_p^\times$ was chosen uniformly at random, i.e., $\forall x \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\times : \mathbb{P}(r = x) = \frac{1}{p-1}$. As a result, $\forall X \in \mathbb{G}^+ : \mathbb{P}(\star_{\text{Audience}}(r) = X) = \frac{1}{p-1}$. This is true independently of the choice of Audience . Now recall that $\star_{\text{Audience}}(r) = r \cdot \text{Audience}$. ■

To summarize: due to the random nature of the unknown r , the blinded input $r \cdot \text{Audience}$ actually contains no information

about Audience . It is thus impossible for the identity provider to gain any information from the blinded values, as long as they do not learn r .

Sybil Resistance. The authentication process results in the service provider learning $(r \cdot \text{Audience}, \text{userld} \cdot r \cdot \text{Audience})$, signed by the identity provider and therefore trustworthy. They then receive an untrusted claimed value of r from the user, which we will refer to as r' . Using these values, the user's pseudonym is derived as $(r')^{-1} \cdot \text{userld} \cdot r \cdot \text{Audience}$.

Before doing so, they verify that $r \cdot \text{Audience}$ (as signed by the IdP) equals $r' \cdot \text{Audience}$ (for r' as claimed by the user). We show that this is sufficient.

LEMMA 3. *For all $r, r' \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\times$, if $r \cdot \text{Audience} = r' \cdot \text{Audience}$ holds, it follows that $r = r'$.*

Proof: Following the argument used for Lemma 2 above, recall that $\star_{\text{Audience}} : x \mapsto x \cdot \text{Audience}$ is a bijection from \mathbb{Z}_p^\times to \mathbb{G}^+ . It follows that $\star_{\text{Audience}}(r) = r \cdot \text{Audience} = r' \cdot \text{Audience} = \star_{\text{Audience}}(r')$ if and only if $r = r'$. ■

As a result, $(r')^{-1} = (r)^{-1}$, and thus we can be sure that the learned pseudonym is actually $\text{userld} \cdot \text{Audience}$. This value is constant across authentication processes for this fixed Audience , as we assume that the identity provider honestly chooses the correct userld per Section II-C.

No persistent user device state. Our protocol does not require any state on the user's device. We consider this to be self-evident from the description in Section II-E.

Soundness & Validity. During the authentication process, the service provider obtains the tuple (A, B) , signed by the identity provider. We assume⁵ that the service provider can validate that this was indeed signed by the genuine identity provider; a malicious user cannot forge such a signed tuple.

Furthermore, we also assume⁵ that the service provider can validate that the response presented is fresh, and intended to be part of the ongoing authentication process. Therefore, even a malicious user can only obtain a valid tuple in real time from the genuine identity provider. Per Section II-C, we assume that the genuine identity provider only issues such tuples after successful user authentication for userld . As part of this process, it can also validate that the user's account is not suspended or deleted.

As shown in Lemma 3, the service provider's validation of $A = r \cdot \text{Audience}$ ensures that the result of the derivation is indeed the user's BISON pseudonym, $\text{userld} \cdot \text{Audience}$. Therefore, a malicious user cannot produce an authentication response for any userld except their own.

B. External Considerations

For BISON to meet our stated goals, we rely on the "host" protocol, which embeds BISON derivation, to provide certain guarantees. These are guarantees that are either context-specific, or already a necessary part of existing authentication protocols. Thus, we choose not to mandate a particular way of achieving them. Instead, we merely list these requirements here, and expect the host protocol to ensure they are met.

⁴see Section III-B

⁵see Section III-B

Replay. It may be possible for a malicious user to have knowledge of signed (A, B) tuples from a previous authentication process; for example, they may have previously compromised a legitimate user’s account, their previously-registered account may have been suspended by the identity provider, or they may have compromised a user’s device. The host protocol needs to ensure that the malicious user cannot *replay* such a previously-issued tuple to the service provider, instead of having a fresh one issued by the identity provider. This attack would allow them to complete the authentication process without needing to authenticate to the identity provider.

Replay attacks are not unique to BISON, but are a challenge that any authentication protocol needs to solve. Therefore, any host protocol embedding BISON derivation will already have some means of guaranteeing response freshness. This is commonly done by including a one-time redemption step [49], or adding a challenge nonce to the message that must be signed by the IdP [48]. Adding such a step to the core BISON protocol would be redundant.

We thus decided not to add additional replay safeguards to the core BISON protocol, which we described in Section II-E above. However, if replay protection as part of the BISON derivation is desired, it can easily be added as follows: have the service provider sample blinding randomness r , and provide it to the user device. The user device then does not sample its own randomness, but is instead required to use the randomness provided by the service provider. This randomness, and therefore the blinded audience identifier A , will be different and unpredictable for each authentication process. Since A is part of the identity provider’s signed response, this forces the signed response to be freshly generated as part of this particular authentication process, and prevents message replay.

IdP Authentication. The BISON protocol has the identity provider sign an (A, B) tuple, which is forwarded by the user to the service provider. The service provider then needs to somehow be able to validate the signature over this tuple.

How the necessary key material is obtained, and how its authenticity is assured, is context-specific. This is a challenge that is not unique to BISON. Instead, it is the same challenge that any other delegated authentication protocol needs to solve. Thus, once again, any host protocol embedding BISON derivation will already have the necessary mechanisms in place.

Additionally, care must be taken to tie the signed data to the underlying protocol’s authentication process. An attacker must not be able to take a BISON tuple from one authentication process, and transplant it onto a second parallel authentication process. The means by which this binding is achieved are protocol-specific; to give an example, in OpenID Connect, A and B could be embedded into the monolithic “ID token” signed by the identity provider. This concrete instantiation will be discussed further in Section IV-D.

SP Authentication. The BISON protocol makes the user device responsible for verifying that the service provider is authorized for the requested audience. Failure to do so would allow a monster-in-the-middle (MitM) attack; a malicious entity could forward the genuine service provider’s request to the user, and forward the user’s response to the service provider. The service provider would then believe that the malicious entity has successfully authenticated as that user.

Additionally, we also note that if multiple service providers are permitted to share an audience, they are able to link the requests of their user. Further, there is potential for them to perform a MitM attack on connections to each other. In contexts where such SPs do not always implicitly trust each other, the authentication process should also be bound to a particular service provider instance, such as by including a randomized commitment in the data signed by the IdP.⁶

How a service provider is authenticated is context-specific. Therefore, the BISON protocol does not mandate any particular method of audience authentication. This may be derived from an existing trust scheme, such as a DNS hostname listed in a Web PKI X.509 certificate,⁶ or a new context-specific trust scheme, such as certificates issued by a central authority.

Finally, we caution that authentication must be tied to information authenticated by an encapsulating transport protocol, such as TLS. If appropriate care is not taken here, the MitM attack originally outlined may still be possible.

C. Protocol Discussion

In this section, we highlight the risks of predictably-chosen `userid` values. We also discuss how a user could verify that the IdP is not misbehaving.

Collusion between IdP and SP. The BISON pseudonym obtained by service providers is `userid · Audienceld`. The identity provider never learns this pseudonym.

But – what happens if a SP provides IdP with a pseudonym and the corresponding `Audienceld`? The IdP has a list of their registered users and the corresponding `userIds`; they can iterate over them, perform trial calculations, and easily determine the `userid` underlying the pseudonym.

This is not a limitation of BISON in particular. Instead, *any* protocol \mathcal{P} with stable pseudonyms, without persistent user device state, which allows the IdP to authenticate users through arbitrary unspecified means, must exhibit this limitation.

Assume that a service provider A colludes with the identity provider, and provides them with pseudonym $P_{X,A}$ for unknown user X . The identity provider by necessity has a list of possible values of X . For any candidate user X' , the identity provider can now run \mathcal{P} locally, impersonating both the service provider A and user X' . This must be possible – X' has no persistent state, and the identity provider can always “authenticate” itself for X' , since \mathcal{P} places no constraints on the authentication method(s). As a result, the identity provider therefore learns $P_{X',A}$. Repeating this process for each candidate user X' will inevitably find X , the only user where $P_{X',A} = P_{X,A}$.

Therefore, we argue that susceptibility to IdP-SP collusion is a necessary limitation of a protocol meeting BISON’s goals.

Entropy of global user IDs. As shown in Section III-A, correlating two BISON pseudonyms would usually require deciding the Decisional Diffie-Hellman Problem (DDHP). Similarly, calculating the `userid` from the BISON pseudonym (`userid · Audienceld`) requires solving the Discrete Logarithm Problem (DLP). We assume both of these problems to be hard.

⁶This is the approach we use in our demonstrator in Section IV-F.

However, there is a fundamental assumption baked into these statements – that the `userId` is sufficiently unpredictable to be essentially random. This is not the case if, for example, a simple auto-incrementing database key is used as the `userId`; naïve iteration over the integers could then allow the SP, knowing audience, to determine the `userId`.

Therefore, the IdP must ensure that `userId` carries sufficient entropy. One straightforward approach is sampling a random byte string of length similar to that of the group order; though depending on the context, others may be preferred.

This issue is not unique to BISON; it is shared by any similar pseudonym derivation scheme.

Verifiability. In BISON, the user relies on the IdP using the correct `userId` in the pseudonym derivation. The user can, to some extent, verify that the IdP is behaving correctly in this regard: they can remember their pseudonym for any audience they have previously authenticated to, and (see Section IV-H) can verify that the IdP-provided tuple produces that pseudonym. Note that the IdP learns no information regarding the audience involved with any given authentication process; in particular, the IdP cannot know whether this is an audience the user has previously authenticated to, rendering malfeasance detectable.

This ability could be extended to previously-unused audiences by borrowing from so-called *verifiable* OPRFs [17]. Here, the server (i.e., the IdP) calculates a noninteractive zero-knowledge proof of discrete logarithm equivalence; in BISON terms, they could produce a proof that the multiplications $\text{userId} \cdot r \cdot \text{AudienceId}$ and $\text{userId} \cdot G$ used the same scalar multiplier `userId` without disclosing it. The user device could verify this proof, and could thus ensure that the IdP always uses the same `userId` for the same user. However, this also only provides verifiability *by the user*; the same scenario already covered by the argument we made in the previous paragraph.

In particular, it still does not prevent a malicious user and identity provider colluding against a service provider. Therefore, we did not adopt this idea for BISON as described in this work.

D. Performance Evaluation

A full BISON derivation process consists of sampling of some randomness r and the procedures `Blind`, `BlindEval`, `Blind` (again, to verify), and `Unblind`. When using a prime-order OPRF over an elliptic curve group, this process requires 4 elliptic-curve scalar-point multiplications and 4 hash function evaluations.

When applied in an authentication protocol (cf. Section IV), SP, User, and IdP need to perform BISON derivation in addition to the established authentication process and network communication. To maintain usability, it is thus important that BISON does not slow down the process. To evaluate the performance impact of BISON, we develop a proof of concept implementation in Kotlin. We instantiate BISON on the `ristretto255` curve using the SHA-512 hash function and benchmark the implementation using the JMH benchmarking framework.⁷ We run the benchmarks on a standard office laptop – a Lenovo ThinkPad T14 G2, with a 2.8 GHz Intel Core i7-1165G7 processor, and typical background load.

On our reference machine, the full BISON derivation process takes ≈ 3 milliseconds. We took no particular steps to improve the benchmark’s performance. Therefore, based on these results, we conclude that usage of BISON derivation has a completely negligible performance impact.

IV. BISON-AUGMENTED OPENID CONNECT

In this second part of our work, we demonstrate the practical feasibility of BISON derivation. To do this, we specify an extension to the widely-used OpenID Connect authentication protocol. This enables it to support BISON pseudonyms.

A. Background: OpenID Connect (OIDC)

OpenID Connect (OIDC) is one of the most widely used authentication protocols on the current internet. Building on the underlying OAuth 2.0 authorization protocol, it adds an authentication layer, allowing service providers to obtain a user identifier suitable for re-authentication [49], [40]. It has vast adoption: Amazon, Apple, DropBox, Facebook, Google, IBM, LinkedIn, Microsoft, and Yahoo all implement OpenID Connect in their respective identity providers [52], [1].

The goal of an OIDC authentication process is for the service provider to obtain a so-called *ID Token*. This token is a signed, JSON-encoded set of key-value pairs, called *claims*, about the user. One such claim is the user’s *subject identifier* (sub claim). The ID Token is signed by the identity provider, and its integrity can be verified using the identity provider’s previously-published public key. A traditional OAuth 2.0 access token may also result from this process. It can be used to access privileged resources on behalf of the user. This is unrelated to our work, and we do not consider it further.

Conceptually, the process starts with the service provider, often reacting to a user action, creating an *Authentication Request*. As part of this request, the service provider identifies itself (using a `client_id`), specifies where the user should be returned to (the `redirect_uri`), and commonly also includes a `nonce` to prevent message replay. It then typically issues an HTTP redirect, or submits an HTML form, making the user device contact the selected identity provider with the request.

In reaction to the request, the identity provider prompts the user for any necessary authentication factors to verify their identity. It then prompts them for consent to forward their information to the requesting service provider. If consent is granted, the identity provider issues the aforementioned ID Token. The token includes the user’s subject identifier, alongside information used to mitigate various attacks – such as the IdP (`iss`) and SP (`aud`) identifiers, expiry time (`exp`), and time of issuance (`iat`). If requested, it also includes the challenge nonce (`nonce`). Once the ID Token has been created, the user device is redirected back to the service provider.

OpenID Connect supports different *operation flows*, which change how exactly the service provider now obtains the signed ID Token. In *implicit* flow, the ID Token is immediately included when redirecting back to the service provider. The service provider’s identity is only validated implicitly, as the user is redirected back to a known HTTPS-enabled URI.

By contrast, in *authorization code* flow, a one-time-use code is included when redirecting back to the service provider. The

⁷<https://github.com/openjdk/jmh>

service provider can then redeem this one-time-use code for the ID Token via a back channel to the identity provider. This redemption process often also includes authorization of the service provider’s identity via a pre-shared “client secret”.

Our proof of concept uses the implicit flow. We discuss factors motivating this choice in Section IV-H.

B. Background: Pairwise Pseudonymous Identifiers (PPIDs)

The OpenID Connect specification [49] allows for the use of *pairwise pseudonymous identifiers* (PPIDs). Here, the identity provider derives a pseudonymous identifier for a particular audience, and substitutes it for the user’s global identifier. For example, Apple’s “Sign in with Apple” OpenID provider generates a different pseudonymous identifier based on the service provider’s associated Apple Developer Account [1].

The particular derivation method, and audience delineation, are left up to the identity provider. Commonly, a hash digest of the user’s global identifier concatenated with some audience identifier is calculated and used as the user’s PPID [49, Sec 8.1]. Traditional PPID derivation envisions the IdP knowing which audience that the user is authenticating to. It enshrines the need for the IdP to learn sensitive association data with each login. Traditional PPID derivation and User-SP relationship anonymity towards the identity provider cannot coexist.

C. Background: FedCM & Browser-augmented OIDC

Traditional OpenID Connect authentication flows, as described above, assume, and work around, a protocol-unaware user device. This is achieved by leveraging general-purpose technologies, such as HTTP redirects and HTML form submissions, to trigger the user’s browser into forwarding opaque information between logically unrelated remote servers.

Recently, many such technologies have come under scrutiny. This comes in the wake of web browsers limiting the traditional ways of tracking user behavior across disparate web origins, such as third-party cookies, which have long been misused by the online advertising sector. In reaction, privacy adversaries have explored new ways of associating user interactions; this includes the use of message-carrying redirects to make the browser identify itself to an advertising tracker. In response, Browser manufacturers propose limiting such *stateful redirects*. This would eliminate the technology that OpenID Connect, and similar use cases, depend on.

The current W3C proposal to solve this conundrum is the *FedCM API* [36], [35]. It envisions browsers being conceptually aware of authentication processes, and taking an active role in negotiating user authentication. This represents a paradigm shift away from the traditional OIDC-unaware user device.

D. BISON OIDC Extension

We build on the existing OIDC infrastructure by specifying BISON pseudonym derivation as an alternative opt-in PPID derivation method. For our prime-order group, we choose the *ristretto255* elliptic curve group [18]. As our hash function, we choose SHA512. We note that our choices match the parameters of the OPRF instantiation in RFC 9497 [17], and will motivate them further in Section IV-H.

We will group our extension’s changes into *substantial* and *boilerplate* changes. The substantial changes, that integrate BISON into OpenID Connect, are as follows. (I). If the service provider opts into BISON derivation, the user device modifies the OIDC authorization request in three ways. (a). It replaces OIDC’s existing service provider identifier field (`client_id`) with BISON’s Blind-ed audience identifier; (b). it replaces the return location (`redirect_uri`) with a browser-local URI that does not expose the actual value; (c). and it replaces the SP’s chosen `nonce` with the hash digest of the current secure origin⁸ and the `nonce`. (II). If BISON derivation has been requested, the identity provider BlindEval-s the provided `client_id` value alongside the user’s global identifier. The resulting blinded pseudonym is stored in the existing subject field (`sub` claim) of the resulting signed JWT, while the input blinded audience identifier is stored in the existing audience field (`aud` claim). (III). When redirecting back to the service provider, the user device adds the randomly selected blind as an (unsigned) `blind` parameter. (IV). After the service provider has verified the signed ID Token, it performs BISON derivation. (a). It re-calculates Blind and validates that `aud` is correct. (b). It verifies that the value of `nonce` is as expected. (c). It derives the user’s BISON pseudonym by Unblind-ing `sub`.

To support opt-in negotiation of the pairwise identifier derivation method, we also add the necessary boilerplate. (V). We add a new optional `pairwise_subject_types` array to the identity provider’s existing OpenID Connect Discovery metadata [50]. This array advertises the cryptographic derivation methods supported. We define `bison` as one possible value for this array. (VI). The service provider may opt into any of the derivation methods listed by specifying the chosen method in the `pairwise_subject_type` field of the authentication request. If it specifies `bison`, derivation proceeds as described above. (VII). The identity provider includes the used derivation method (in our case, `bison`) as a `pairwise_subject_type` claim in the signed ID Token.

E. BISON-OIDC Analysis

We now discuss how our integration into OIDC meets the host protocol security criteria described in Section III-B.

Taking inspiration from existing web standards, such as Web Authentication [48], we bind audience identifier authorization to the underlying HTTPS browsing context. We limit use of BISON derivation to secure browsing contexts, such as top-level windows serving content via HTTPS.⁹ This implies that the browser has validated the current page’s TLS certificate using its internal trust store. Thus, under the assumption that the Web PKI can be trusted, the current page origin is trusted information. We leverage it for audience validation.

We define acceptable audience values to be either the current page origin, or a registrable domain suffix of the current page origin. This mirrors the limitation placed on the relying party identifier field in Web Authentication [48]. For example, `login.example.com` and `app.example.com` may derive a shared pseudonym by using the `example.com` audience.

⁸This is necessary because the current origin may be different from the audience. See Section IV-E for details on audience authentication.

⁹For a more detailed definition of this term of art, we refer to <https://w3c.github.io/webappsec-secure-contexts>.

However, `login.example.com` and `login.unrelated.com` cannot derive a shared pseudonym, as `.com` is not registrable.¹⁰

We then limit the return address to being on the same web origin as the current page origin. When combined, these two steps achieve both audience identifier authentication and binding to the underlying encrypted TLS transport.

We do not need to take any additional steps to prevent message replay. OpenID Connect already includes replay protection in the form of a random challenge nonce, chosen by the service provider. We also leverage this nonce for SP commitment, to mitigate the same-audience MitM attack outlined in Section III-B. We do this by combining both the SP-chosen nonce and the current user-facing secure web origin – not the audience – to form the nonce sent to the IdP. This nonce is included in the signed ID Token that the identity provider issues, and can then be verified by the service provider.

F. Implementation

We present a full implementation of the OIDC extension described in Section IV-D. It takes the form of a BISON-aware service provider and identity provider, as well as a browser extension for the Firefox browser responsible for handling user device tasks. The source code is available on GitHub.¹¹

The demonstrator models a minimal authentication flow in OIDC implicit flow. The service provider, on initial startup, requests the identity provider’s key material using OIDC Discovery. Since the IdP indicates support for BISON derivation, the SP decides to use it going forward.

When the user indicates a desire to log in, the service provider generates a random nonce value and a random state value. It sends these values, alongside the desired return location, the identity provider entry point, and the desired audience identifier, to the browser extension. It retains the random nonce value and desired audience identifier, indexed by the random state value, linked to the user device’s local session.

The browser extension validates that the values provided are permissible under the criteria described in Section IV-E. It then prompts the user for consent to proceed to the identity provider. When doing so, it also displays the service provider’s origin, as well as the requesting audience. This is depicted in Figure 3. If consent is withheld, the extension returns to the service provider with an appropriate OIDC failure message. If consent is given, it instead proceeds as follows.

The extension generates a suitable random blind, and a new random state value. It performs the OPRF Blind operation on the audience identifier as described in Section IV-D. It also derives a new nonce by combining the service provider’s nonce and user-visible web origin. It then redirects the user to the identity provider’s OIDC endpoint as specified by the service provider in its request. To mask the service provider’s identity, it specifies a web-accessible extension page as the return URI. The extension retains the original state value and return URI, as well as the random blind. These values are stored in temporary storage, indexed by the new state value.

¹⁰For a detailed definition, we refer to <https://html.spec.whatwg.org/multipage/browsers.html>.

¹¹<https://github.com/iaik-jheher/BISON>




Figure 3: The BISON consent dialog.

When the user arrives at our demonstrator identity provider, it performs mock “authentication” by allowing the user to choose between one of three pre-defined identities. Once a choice is made, the IdP performs the OPRF BlindEval operation as described in Section IV-D. It then creates an appropriate ID Token, signed using ECDSA on P-256. The IdP then submits the token to the specified return URI (which is a browser extension page) alongside the (extension’s) state.

Based on the specified state, the browser extension looks up the appropriate service provider state value, random blind, and original return URI. It then automatically forwards the received ID Token to the original return address. It includes the original state, and the random blind that was used.

The service provider validates the ID Token’s authenticity using the ECDSA public key material originally received as part of the identity provider’s OIDC discovery metadata. It then looks up the expected nonce value and expected audience identifier based on the state value. It validates that the nonce claim in the received ID Token matches the expected value.¹²

It then calculates Blind for the expected audience identifier and claimed blind value, and validates that the result matches the `aud` claim in the ID Token. Finally, if all of these steps have succeeded, it can derive the user’s BISON pseudonym by Unblinding the ID Token’s `sub` claim. The user has now been privately and securely authenticated.

G. Evaluation

We compare our OpenID Connect extension, and our implementation of it, against a “traditional” OIDC-based authentication flow. For overhead induced by the abstract BISON protocol, we refer to our prior evaluation in Section III-D. Instead, we focus on differences unique to browser-based login.

We consider the changed user experience of BISON-augmented authentication. In BISON, the identity provider is no longer aware of the service provider’s identity. Therefore, its UX also cannot ask the user’s consent for the authentication. Instead, this step needs to be done by the browser. In our proof of concept implementation, we have designed a dedicated dialog, shown in Figure 3, for this purpose.

This dialog is displayed before the user is redirected to the identity provider, and presents an additional step compared to

¹²These steps are not particular to our implementation; it is how OpenID Connect guarantees freshness of the response in implicit flow.

traditional, non-BISON OIDC. However, in a traditional UX flow, after the user device authenticates to the IdP, the IdP would then commonly present an additional page requesting user consent. This additional page is unnecessary in BISON, as consent has already been obtained by the user device. Therefore, we conclude that BISON-augmented OIDC does not require additional user interaction compared to traditional OIDC; it merely changes the sequence of user interaction, shifting user consent to be before authentication.

Additionally, we note that BISON-augmented OIDC, in contrast to unaugmented OIDC, now requires a protocol-aware browser. We discuss this further in Section IV-H.

H. Discussion

This section lists some additional subtle distinctions between BISON-augmented and unaugmented OIDC. We address these differences' impact on the practical use of BISON, and also motivate our choice of cryptographic parameters.

Protocol Awareness in Browsers. One crucial benefit of OpenID Connect, which has contributed to its widespread adoption, is that it does not require the user device to be aware of its existence. BISON-augmented OIDC does not offer this benefit. It requires the web browser to take an active role: verify the audience, perform blinding operations, and obtain user consent using built-in dialog windows. This requires the web browser to be aware of OpenID Connect's existence.

We argue that a protocol-aware browser is needed to achieve relationship anonymity, pseudonym unlinkability, and sybil resistance simultaneously. To show this, we model authentication as a two-party protocol between a service provider and an identity provider; they use a protocol-unaware browser as a communication channel. Assume that we have two distinct service providers, A and B, and a user, X. The identity provider now receives an authentication request AuthReq. At this point, AuthReq must not allow the identity provider to determine whether it originated from A or B; if this were possible, we would lose relationship anonymity. After some user interaction to authenticate X, some data is returned to the originator, which results in pseudonym P. Since we assume Sybil resistance, P needs to be stable across authentication requests. However, recall that AuthReq might have originated from either A or B; therefore, it cannot provide pseudonym unlinkability.

A few years ago, the need for a protocol-aware browser would have relegated our work chiefly into the realm of purely academic wish-casting; a castle on a cloud, never to be realized in practice. But the internet moves along, and so does practicality. Browsers are moving towards standardizing federated authentication; using semantics to decide between legitimate and illegitimate uses of technology. We described these efforts in Section IV-C.

In this environment, we believe the requirement for active browser engagement in authentication is no longer disqualifying. We believe the time has come for browsers to take an active role in safeguarding their users' privacy – and we believe that BISON is the tool to do it with.

Choice of OIDC flow. OpenID Connect envisions different ways (called “flows”, cf. Section IV-A) to transmit the signed *ID Token* from the identity provider to the service provider.

In our PoC, we use *implicit* flow, even though *authorization code* flow is common in practice. This has multiple reasons.

Most obviously, authorization code flow uses a “back-channel”, a direct connection between the SP and IdP, to exchange the ID Token. This back-channel presents an obvious challenge to our relationship anonymity goal; the ID Token corresponds to a particular user's login process, while the entity requesting it is the service provider they logged in at. To maintain relationship anonymity, the service provider would thus need to connect to the identity provider without revealing its identity. While such an anonymous connection is possible [21], realizing this in practice is not trivial.

We now consider the primary benefit of authorization code flow compared to implicit flow: service provider authentication. When redeeming the authorization code for the ID Token, the service provider commonly provides a pre-shared secret to authenticate itself. This prevents a malicious user, or service provider impersonator, from obtaining the ID Token and identifying information. In BISON, however, the service provider cannot authenticate to the identity provider – this would be antithetical to an anonymous connection to the identity provider. Instead, *the user* authenticates the service provider for the given audience; authentication towards the identity provider is thus rendered unnecessary.

Therefore, we do not consider the use of implicit flow to be a downside, assuming standard safety measures – such as the use of POST redirects with the ID Token – are taken.¹³

User obtains their pseudonym. In traditional OpenID Connect, when using the authorization code flow, the ID Token (and the claims contained therein) are invisible to the user. This means that the user does not learn the pseudonym that is exposed (in the *sub* claim) to the service provider.

When using OpenID Connect using implicit flow, as happens with BISON-augmented OIDC for the reasons described previously, the user learns the ID Token. Since the user also knows *r*, they can also derive their BISON pseudonym $\text{userId} \cdot \text{AudienceId}$ using the same method as the SP.

We do not view this as a weakness of BISON; we believe that users *in general* should have awareness of what information about them is exchanged. Regardless, we still note this departure from the knowledge model of traditional OIDC.

However, we also note that the user still does not obtain their *userId*; this information is always private to the IdP.

Choice of cryptographic parameters. When instantiating BISON, we use *ristretto255* as a prime-order group for two reasons: First, it is compatible with the widely used Curve25519. Second, and consequently, *ristretto255* had existing available Java¹⁴ and JavaScript¹⁵ implementations.

In general, BISON can be instantiated over any prime-order group on which the DLP and DDHP are hard. Prime-Order OPRFs have similar requirements; here, RFC 9497 suggests, in addition to *ristretto255*, the *decaf448*, *P-256*, *P-384*, and

¹³We also refer to previous work by Kroschewski and Lehmann[39] for additional discussion on the implicit flow as a privacy-enabling tool.

¹⁴<https://github.com/cryptography-cafe/curve25519-elisabeth>

¹⁵<https://github.com/facebook/ristretto255-js>

Table I: Overview of privacy-focused SSO systems. Property supported ●, partially supported ○, or unsupported ○

| | | Relationship Anonymity | Pseudonym Unlinkability | Sybil Resistance | Stateless | Client Unmodified |
|--------------|-----------|------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------|-------------------|
| OIDC | [49] | ○ | ○ | ● | ● | ● |
| OIDC w/ PPID | [49, 8.1] | ○ | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| Shibboleth | [15] | ○ | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| BrowserID* | [43] | ● | ○ | ● | ○ | ○ |
| PseudoID | [19] | ○ | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| POIDC | [31] | ○ ¹ | ○ ² | ● | ● | ● |
| SPRESSO | [25] | ● | ○ | ● | ● | ● |
| UPPRESSO | [30] | ○ ¹ | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| EL PASSO | [59] | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| BISON | | ● | ● | ● | ● | ○ ³ |

* Broken and discontinued [23], [24].

1. Only when assuming a very generous definition of a honest-but-curious identity provider.
2. Only in the “Pairwise POIDC” variant, which requires ZK-proofs.
3. We discuss OIDC protocol awareness in browsers in Section IV-H.

P-521 curve groups [17]. Our particular choice of ristretto255 is made solely out of operational convenience.

The choice of SHA-512 also matches the CFRG draft, and is a natural fit for the ristretto255 group. Since SHA-512 is a standardized cryptographic hash function, fast, secure implementations of it are widely available.

V. RELATED WORK

We survey existing protocols for delegated authentication, and in Table I, compare them against our privacy goals.

We begin with protocols that are currently, or were previously, being used in real-world applications.

Baseline *OpenID Connect* (OIDC) [49] is not private. It discloses the service provider’s identity to the identity provider, and the user’s identity to the service provider. OIDC optionally supports *Pairwise Pseudonymous Identifiers* (PPIDs) to enable unlinkability between colluding SPs.¹⁶ This fundamentally requires the IdP to be aware of the SP’s identity.

Shibboleth is a SSO system based on SAML. It supports pseudonym unlinkability by means of “persistent identifiers”, which are unique to the combination of SP, IdP, and user.¹⁷ Just like OpenID Connect’s PPIDs, the derivation process can only be performed if the SP’s identity is known to the IdP.

BrowserID [43] was a short-lived initiative by the Mozilla Foundation (branded as *Mozilla Persona*) to embed secure delegated authentication in the browser. In contrast to the systems mentioned above, it succeeded in protecting User-SP relationship anonymity; but it did not even attempt to provide pseudonym unlinkability, choosing to identify users by their email address. Further, Fett et al. discovered attacks against BrowserID [23]. They also exploit design flaws in BrowserID to allow arbitrary parties to query users’ login status [24]. Mozilla decommissioned the service in 2016.

Next, we will move on from protocols employed in existing software, and list approaches explored in academic literature.

PseudoID [19] uses blind signatures to extend OpenID, the precursor of OpenID Connect, with privacy features. It introduces a *blind signer* that issues pseudonym tokens to a user, that the user then uses to authenticate at the IdP. This enables unlinkability since a user can use a separate pseudonym for each SP. However, while the IdP does not learn which “real” user is authenticating at a specific SP, it nevertheless can link multiple visits of the same *pseudonymous* user.

BrowserID inspired *SPRESSO* [25]. It provides user-SP relationship anonymity, but not pseudonym unlinkability, as email addresses continue to be used as user identifiers.

POIDC [31] extends OIDC to prevent the IdP from learning at which SPs users authenticate. It then extends this to *pairwise POIDC*, which uses zero-knowledge proofs to prevent colluding SPs from tracking users. Zero-knowledge proofs introduce nontrivial complexity to implementations. This complexity, and a lack of standardization, often hinders a protocol’s adoption in practice, or inclusion in other standards [55]. Further, ZKPs have non-trivial calculation overhead, exceeding that of BISON by orders of magnitude; pairwise POIDC with SHA-256 requires 110ms, as opposed to BISON’s 3ms (see Section III-D). This is needed, as in POIDC the IdP does not participate in the computation of the pseudonym. Further, POIDC avoids browser modifications by requiring the SP and IdP to provide trustworthy JavaScript code to the user. This strains the definition of a honest-but-curious identity provider; instead of merely performing authentication truthfully, POIDC’s IdPs actively act contrary to their own data collection interests. By contrast, BISON does not expose sensitive privacy-breaking information to code controlled by the identity provider.

The idea of using blinded evaluation to derive pseudonyms has also independently been explored by *UPPRESSO* [30]. However, its design is inflexible, and narrowly tailored to its use case. By contrast, BISON is flexible, and can be easily adapted to fit any protocol. *UPPRESSO*, like *POIDC*, asks the IdP to provide trustworthy JavaScript code to the user, which

¹⁶see Section IV-A

¹⁷<https://shibboleth.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/SHIB/pages/1929379856/IdPUserAuthnConfig>

then acts to protect the user from the IdP’s own behavior.

EL PASSO [59] is a complex delegated authentication system that achieves both relationship anonymity and pseudonym unlinkability. In exchange, it requires storing a user secret on the client device. As discussed in Section II-B, this is a significant downside in general; the same is true of *EL PASSO*. If a user secret is lost, it envisions an out-of-band procedure to “replace” the user secret while updating a commitment at the identity provider. This limits Sybil resistance, as the user obtains a new set of pseudonyms as a result of the replacement.

Bender et al. discuss the pseudonym scheme of the German identity card [7]. By deriving a domain-specific pseudonym, the scheme provides unlinkability between different SPs or domains/audiences (“cross-domain anonymity”). Since it is smartcard-based, the scheme does not involve the IdP/issuer in the authentication process. This is a property similar to the one achieved by credential-based schemes (discussed below). While this design enables unobservability, the scheme relies on a persistent local state and special hardware.

Other approaches rely on blockchains [6], distributed IdPs [4], [5], [26], or hardware features like TEE or SGX [29], [58]. Reaching further, credential-based “user-centric” systems are often proposed as an alternative to delegated authentication approaches, e.g., Idemix [13], [12], U-Prove [42], ABC4Trust [46], and ZKclaims [51]. Those user-centric systems store the login information (credentials) on the user device and don’t involve the IdP in the authentication process. This need for a state on the user client, and the difficulty of key management and key backups [33], [32] have limited their practical adoption thus far [31]. This is also a limitation of other user-centric systems like Isaakidis’ UnlimitID [34]. Several works survey and evaluate privacy aspects of SSO systems in the wild, e.g., [56], [57], [20]. Finally, Brandão et al. [11] discuss nation-scale identification and authentication systems for credential management. The paper analyzes the US’ *Federal Cloud Credential Exchange* and the UK’s *gov.uk verify*, which propose a brokered ID architecture but suffer from serious privacy and security shortcomings.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this work, we have solved a fundamental challenge of delegated authentication: how to derive a privacy-preserving scoped pseudonym in a trustworthy manner, when at the same time the identity provider must not learn its audience.

These two privacy goals, each of which is clearly desirable in its own right, seemed to be at odds in a naïve approach: if the identity provider does not know the audience or the pseudonym, how can they produce a signature over either? Many existing solutions deployed in the real world, such as OpenID Connect, do not address this question, and instead treat the identity provider as a fully trustworthy “super-party” to the protocol. This has wide-ranging privacy implications, as it allows a single central party to amass large amounts of highly sensitive association data during regular operation.

To address this shortcoming, we presented the BISON protocol for pseudonym derivation. Inspired by Oblivious Pseudo-Random Functions, it enables User-SP relationship anonymity towards the identity provider while maintaining

other desirable properties, such as pseudonym unlinkability, Sybil resistance, and statelessness. BISON is lightweight and uses only simple cryptographic operations. Therefore, it is easy to understand, implement, and reason about. BISON also does not add any additional parties or requests to the standard authentication flow. For each goal, we provided a security proof, demonstrating that BISON provides the listed security properties.

We went on to outline how BISON can be integrated into any existing authentication protocol. Assuming a small well-defined set of requirements is fulfilled, BISON then provides its privacy guarantees to the underlying “host” protocol. We also showed that this integration has negligible overhead; BISON only requires four elliptic curve scalar-point multiplications and four hash function evaluations. When instantiated using common cryptographic parameter choices, a full BISON derivation takes ≈ 3 milliseconds on an average office laptop, even without any effort having been expended towards optimizing its performance.

We then further illustrated BISON’s practicality by specifying an extension to the widely-used OpenID Connect authentication protocol. This extension allows opt-in BISON-based derivation for pseudonyms, entirely within OIDC’s existing message structure. At a time when browser vendors are moving towards standardizing delegated authentication on the web, this is an important contribution. We provided a demonstrator for our extension. It consists of a service provider, identity provider, and browser extension for the Firefox browser.

We believe BISON represents an important milestone on the road towards a privacy-preserving internet.

AVAILABILITY

As mentioned in Section IV-F, our work includes a full implementation of our OIDC extension; this consists of BISON-aware service and identity providers (in Kotlin), as well as a browser extension for the Firefox browser (in JavaScript). The source code is publicly available on GitHub.¹⁸

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under grant agreement № 101020416 (ERATOSTHENES). Further, we are grateful to Maria Eichlseder and Stefan Kreiner for inspirational discussions.

REFERENCES

- [1] “Authenticating users with Sign in with Apple,” https://developer.apple.com/documentation/sign_in_with_apple/sign_in_with_apple_rest_api/authenticating_users_with_sign_in_with_apple, accessed: 2023-09-04.
- [2] “Relationship anonymity,” in *Encyclopedia of Cryptography and Security (2nd Ed.)*. Springer, 2011, p. 1041.
- [3] P. Abel, “Consumer perceptions of online registration and social sign-in,” *Blue Research for Janrain Inc. Retrieved on*, 2012.
- [4] S. Agrawal, P. Miao, P. Mohassel, and P. Mukherjee, “PASTA: password-based threshold authentication,” in *CCS*. ACM, 2018, pp. 2042–2059.

¹⁸<https://github.com/iaik-jheher/BISON>

- [5] C. Baum, T. K. Frederiksen, J. Hesse, A. Lehmann, and A. Yanai, "PESTO: proactively secure distributed single sign-on, or how to trust a hacked server," in *EuroS&P*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 587–606.
- [6] Y. Belfaik, Y. Sadqi, Y. Maleh, S. Safi, L. A. Tawalbeh, and K. Salah, "A novel secure and privacy-preserving model for openid connect based on blockchain," *IEEE Access*, vol. 11, pp. 67 660–67 678, 2023.
- [7] J. Bender, Ö. Dagdelen, M. Fischlin, and D. Kügler, "Domain-specific pseudonymous signatures for the german identity card," in *ISC*, ser. LNCS, vol. 7483. Springer, 2012, pp. 104–119.
- [8] G. Bleumer, "Unlinkability," in *Encyclopedia of Cryptography and Security (2nd Ed.)*. Springer, 2011, p. 1350.
- [9] —, "Untraceability," in *Encyclopedia of Cryptography and Security (2nd Ed.)*. Springer, 2011, pp. 1351–1352.
- [10] D. Boneh, "The decision diffie-hellman problem," in *Algorithmic Number Theory*, J. P. Buhler, Ed. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1998, pp. 48–63.
- [11] L. T. A. N. Brandão, N. Christin, G. Danezis, and anonymous, "Toward mending two nation-scale brokered identification systems," *Proc. Priv. Enhancing Technol.*, vol. 2015, no. 2, pp. 135–155, 2015.
- [12] J. Camenisch and E. V. Herreweghen, "Design and implementation of the *idemix* anonymous credential system," in *CCS*. ACM, 2002, pp. 21–30.
- [13] J. Camenisch and A. Lysyanskaya, "An efficient system for non-transferable anonymous credentials with optional anonymity revocation," in *EUROCRYPT*, ser. LNCS, vol. 2045. Springer, 2001, pp. 93–118.
- [14] S. Casacuberta, J. Hesse, and A. Lehmann, "SoK: Oblivious pseudorandom functions," in *2022 IEEE 7th European Symposium on Security and Privacy (EuroS&P)*, 2022, pp. 625–646.
- [15] S. Consortium, "Shibboleth," <https://www.shibboleth.net/products/>, 2023.
- [16] F. Corella and K. P. Lewison, "Nstic, privacy and social login," *W3C Workshop on Identity in the Browser*, 2011.
- [17] A. Davidson, A. Faz-Hernández, N. Sullivan, and C. A. Wood, "Oblivious pseudorandom functions (oprfs) using prime-order groups," *RFC*, vol. 9497, pp. 1–61, 2023.
- [18] H. de Valence, J. Grigg, M. Hamburg, I. Lovecruft, G. Tankersley, and F. Valsorda, "The ristretto255 and decaf448 groups," <https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-irtf-cfrg-ristretto255-decaf448/>, 2020.
- [19] A. Dey and S. Weis, "Pseudoid: Enhancing privacy in federated login," in *Hot Topics in Privacy Enhancing Technologies*, 2010, pp. 95–107. [Online]. Available: <http://www.pseudoid.net>
- [20] Y. Dimova, T. van Goethem, and W. Joosen, "Everybody's looking for something: A large-scale evaluation on the privacy of oauth authentication on the web," *Proc. Priv. Enhancing Technol.*, vol. 2023, no. 4, pp. 452–467, 2023.
- [21] R. Dingledine, N. Mathewson, and P. F. Syverson, "Tor: The second-generation onion router," in *USENIX*. USENIX, 2004, pp. 303–320.
- [22] J. R. Douceur, "The sybil attack," in *IPTPS*, ser. LNCS, vol. 2429. Springer, 2002, pp. 251–260.
- [23] D. Fett, R. Küsters, and G. Schmitz, "An expressive model for the web infrastructure: Definition and application to the browserid SSO system," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1403.1866, 2014.
- [24] —, "Analyzing the browserid SSO system with primary identity providers using an expressive model of the web," in *ESORICS (1)*, ser. LNCS, vol. 9326. Springer, 2015, pp. 43–65.
- [25] —, "SPRESSO: A secure, privacy-respecting single sign-on system for the web," in *CCS*. ACM, 2015, pp. 1358–1369.
- [26] T. K. Frederiksen, J. Hesse, B. Poettering, and P. Towa, "Attribute-based single sign-on: Secure, private, and efficient," *Proc. Priv. Enhancing Technol.*, vol. 2023, no. 4, pp. 35–65, 2023.
- [27] R. Gafni and D. Nissim, "To social login or not login? exploring factors affecting the decision," *Issues in Informing Science and Information Technology*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 57–72, 2014.
- [28] M. Ghasemisharif, A. Ramesh, S. Checkoway, C. Kanich, and J. Polakis, "O single sign-off, where art thou? an empirical analysis of single sign-on account hijacking and session management on the web," in *USENIX*. USENIX Association, 2018, pp. 1475–1492.
- [29] C. Guo, F. Lang, Q. Wang, and J. Lin, "Up-sso: Enhancing the user privacy of sso by integrating ppid and sgx," in *2021 International Conference on Advanced Computing and Endogenous Security*, 2022, pp. 01–05.
- [30] C. Guo, J. Lin, Q. Cai, F. Li, Q. Wang, J. Jing, B. Zhao, and W. Wang, "UPPRESSO: untraceable and unlinkable privacy-preserving single sign-on services," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2110.10396, 2021.
- [31] S. Hammann, R. Sasse, and D. A. Basin, "Privacy-preserving openid connect," in *AsiaCCS*. ACM, 2020, pp. 277–289.
- [32] F. Hörandner and F. Nieddu, "Cloud data sharing and device-loss recovery with hardware-bound keys," in *ICISS*, ser. LNCS, vol. 11952. Springer, 2019, pp. 196–217.
- [33] F. Hörandner and C. Rabensteiner, "Horcruxes for everyone - A framework for key-loss recovery by splitting trust," in *TrustCom/BigDataSE*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 50–57.
- [34] M. Isaakidis, H. Halpin, and G. Danezis, "Unlimitid: Privacy-preserving federated identity management using algebraic macs," in *WPES@CCS*. ACM, 2016, pp. 139–142.
- [35] L. Jannett, M. Westers, T. Wich, C. Mainka, A. Mayer, and V. Mladenov, "Sok: Sso-monitor—the current state and future research directions in single sign-on security measurements," in *EuroS&P*. IEEE, 2024.
- [36] E. Kitamura, "Federated credential management api," <https://developer.chrome.com/docs/privacy-sandbox/fedcm/>, 2022.
- [37] M. Korir, S. Parkin, and P. Dunphy, "An empirical study of a decentralized identity wallet: Usability, security, and perspectives on user control," in *SOUPS @ USENIX*. USENIX Association, 2022, pp. 195–211.
- [38] J. Krämer, D. Schnurr, and M. Wohlfarth, "Winners, losers, and facebook: The role of social logins in the online advertising ecosystem," *Manag. Sci.*, vol. 65, no. 4, pp. 1678–1699, 2019.
- [39] M. Kroschewski and A. Lehmann, "Save the implicit flow? enabling privacy-preserving RP authentication in openid connect," *Proc. Priv. Enhancing Technol.*, vol. 2023, no. 4, pp. 96–116, 2023.
- [40] C. Mainka, V. Mladenov, J. Schwenk, and T. Wich, "Sok: Single sign-on security - an evaluation of openid connect," in *EuroS&P*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 251–266.
- [41] K. S. McCurley, "The discrete logarithm problem," in *Proc. of Symp. in Applied Math*, vol. 42. USA, 1990, pp. 49–74.
- [42] W. Mostowski and P. Vullers, "Efficient u-prove implementation for anonymous credentials on smart cards," in *SecureComm*, ser. Lecture Notes of the Institute for Computer Sciences, Social Informatics and Telecommunications Engineering, vol. 96. Springer, 2011, pp. 243–260.
- [43] Mozilla Identity Team, "Persona / browserid," <https://github.com/mozilla/persona>, 2016.
- [44] A. Pfützmann and M. Hansen, "A terminology for talking about privacy by data minimization: Anonymity, unlinkability, undetectability, unobservability, pseudonymity, and identity management," 2010, v0.34.
- [45] B. Podgorelec, L. Alber, and T. Zefferer, "What is a (digital) identity wallet? A systematic literature review," in *COMPASAC*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 809–818.
- [46] K. Rannenberg, J. Camenisch, and A. Sabouri, Eds., *Attribute-based Credentials for Trust: Identity in the Information Society*. Springer, 2015.
- [47] J. R. Rao and P. Rohatgi, "Can pseudonymity really guarantee privacy?" in *USENIX*. USENIX Association, 2000.
- [48] W. Recommendation, "Web authentication: An api for accessing public key credentials," <https://www.w3.org/TR/webauthn-2/>, 2021.
- [49] N. Sakimura, J. Bradley, M. B. Jones, B. de Medeiros, and C. Mortimore, "Openid connect core 1.0," https://openid.net/specs/openid-connect-core-1_0.html, 2014.
- [50] N. Sakimura, J. Bradley, M. B. Jones, and E. Jay, "Openid connect discovery 1.0," https://openid.net/specs/openid-connect-discovery-1_0.html, 2014.
- [51] M. Schanzenbach, T. Kilian, J. Schütte, and C. Banse, "Zkclaims: Privacy-preserving attribute-based credentials using non-interactive zero-knowledge techniques," in *ICETE (2)*. SciTePress, 2019, pp. 325–332.
- [52] A. Sharif, R. Carbone, G. Sciarretta, and S. Ranise, "Best current practices for oauth/oidc native apps: A study of their adoption in popular providers and top-ranked android clients," *Journal of Information Security and Applications*, vol. 65, p. 103097, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S221421262100274X>

- [53] S. Steinbrecher and S. Köpsell, “Modelling unlinkability,” in *Privacy Enhancing Technologies*, ser. LNCS, vol. 2760. Springer, 2003, pp. 32–47.
- [54] S. Sun, E. Pospisil, I. Muslukhov, N. Dindar, K. Hawkey, and K. Beznosov, “What makes users refuse web single sign-on?: an empirical investigation of openid,” in *SOUPS*. ACM, 2011, p. 4.
- [55] X. Tang, L. Shi, X. Wang, K. Charbonnet, S. Tang, and S. Sun, “Zero-knowledge proof vulnerability analysis and security auditing,” *IACR Cryptol. ePrint Arch.*, p. 514, 2024.
- [56] K. Wang, G. Bai, N. Dong, and J. S. Dong, “A framework for formal analysis of privacy on SSO protocols,” in *SecureComm*, ser. Lecture Notes of the Institute for Computer Sciences, Social Informatics and Telecommunications Engineering, vol. 238. Springer, 2017, pp. 763–777.
- [57] M. Westers, T. Wich, L. Jannett, V. Mladenov, C. Mainka, and A. Mayer, “Sso-monitor: Fully-automatic large-scale landscape, security, and privacy analyses of single sign-on in the wild,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/2302.01024, 2023.
- [58] R. Xu, S. Yang, F. Zhang, and Z. Fang, “MISO: legacy-compatible privacy-preserving single sign-on using trusted execution environments,” in *EuroS&P*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 352–372.
- [59] Z. Zhang, M. Król, A. Sonnino, L. Zhang, and E. Rivière, “EL PASSO: efficient and lightweight privacy-preserving single sign on,” *Proc. Priv. Enhancing Technol.*, vol. 2021, no. 2, pp. 70–87, 2021.
- [60] M. Zinkus, T. M. Jois, and M. Green, “Sok: Cryptographic confidentiality of data on mobile devices,” 2021.

Paper history:

- 2023 October: Unsuccessful submission to USENIX '24 (Fall)
- 2024 May: Publication of revised paper as pre-print
- 2024 July: Updated pre-print (DOI 10.48550/arXiv.2406.01518)