How should we pay?

Introduction to GNU Taler

How does cut-and-choose work?

How to prove protocols secure with cryptographic games?

What are the future plans for GNU Taler?
Surveillance concerns

- Everybody knows about Internet surveillance.
- But is it **that** bad?
  - You can choose when and where to use the Internet
  - You can anonymously access the Web using Tor
  - You can find open access points that do not require authentication
  - IP packets do not include your precise location or name
  - ISPs typically store this meta data for days, weeks or months
This was a question posed to RAND researchers in 1971:

“Suppose you were an advisor to the head of the KGB, the Soviet Secret Police. Suppose you are given the assignment of designing a system for the surveillance of all citizens and visitors within the boundaries of the USSR. The system is not to be too obtrusive or obvious. What would be your decision?”
This was a question posed to RAND researchers in 1971:

“Suppose you were an advisor to the head of the KGB, the Soviet Secret Police. Suppose you are given the assignment of designing a system for the surveillance of all citizens and visitors within the boundaries of the USSR. The system is not to be too obtrusive or obvious. What would be your decision?”

“I think one of the big things that we need to do, is we need to get a way from true-name payments on the Internet. The credit card payment system is one of the worst things that happened for the user, in terms of being able to divorce their access from their identity.” –Edward Snowden, IETF 93 (2015)
Why is it worse?

- When you pay by CC, the information includes your name
- When you pay in person with CC, your location is also known
- You often have no alternative payment methods available
- You hardly ever can use someone else’s CC
- Anonymous prepaid cards are difficult to get and expensive
- Payment information is typically stored for 6-10 years!
3D secure ("verified by visa") is a nightmare:

- Complicated process
- Shifts liability to consumer
- Significant latency
- Can refuse valid requests
- Legal vendors excluded
- No privacy for buyers
- Global tech companies push oligopolies
- Privacy and federated finance are at risk
- Economic sovereignty is in danger
Predicting the future

- Google and Apple will be your bank and run your payment system.
- They can target advertising based on your purchase history, location, and your ability to pay.
- They will provide more usable, faster and broadly available payment solutions; our federated banking system will be history.
- After they dominate the payment sector, they will start to charge fees befitting their oligopoly size.
- Competitors and vendors not aligning with their corporate “values” will be excluded by policy and go bankrupt.
- The imperium will have another major tool for its financial warfare.
Digital cash, made socially responsible.

Privacy-Preserving, Practical, Taxable, Free Software, Efficient
What is Taler?

https://taler.net/en/features.html

Taler is

▶ a Free/Libre software \textit{payment system} infrastructure project
▶ ... with a surrounding software ecosystem
▶ ... and a company (Taler Systems S.A.) and community that wants to deploy it as widely as possible.

However, Taler is

▶ \textit{not} a currency
▶ \textit{not} a long-term store of value
▶ \textit{not} a network or instance of a system
▶ \textit{not} decentralized
▶ \textit{not} based on proof-of-work or proof-of-stake
▶ \textit{not} a speculative asset / “get-rich-quick scheme”
GNU Taler must ...

1. ... be implemented as free software.
2. ... protect the privacy of buyers.
3. ... must enable the state to tax income and crack down on illegal business activities.
4. ... prevent payment fraud.
5. ... only disclose the minimal amount of information necessary.
6. ... be usable.
7. ... be efficient.
8. ... avoid single points of failure.
9. ... foster competition.
Taler overview

- Exchange
  - verify
  - withdraw coins
  - deposit coins
- Customer
  - spend coins
- Merchant
- Auditor
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Architecture of Taler

1. Pay exchange
2. Wire transfer
3. Create coins
4. Withdraw coins
5. Spend coins
6. Deposit coins (in bulk)
7. Retire coins (in bulk)
8. Wire transfer

Central Bank or Exchange's Bank

Escrow

Customer's Bank

Merchant's Bank

Fees

Taler Exchange

Customer

Browser/Mobile Wallet

Webshop

Merchant

Auditor

Verify

9. View balance
https://demo.taler.net/

1. Install Web extension.
2. Visit the bank.demo.taler.net to withdraw coins.
3. Visit the shop.demo.taler.net to spend coins.
Taxability

We say Taler is taxable because:

- Merchant’s income is visible from deposits.
- Hash of contract is part of deposit data.
- State can trace income and enforce taxation.

Limitations:

- withdraw loophole
- sharing coins among family and friends

Other contemporary payment systems have similar limitations on identification, and thus these limitations should not be a legal issue.
It would be inefficient to pay EUR 100 with 1 cent coins!

- Denomination key represents value of a coin.
- Exchange may offer various denominations for coins.
- Wallet may not have exact change!
- Usability requires ability to pay given sufficient total funds.
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- Denomination key represents value of a coin.
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- Wallet may not have exact change!
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Key goals:

- maintain unlinkability
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Giving change

It would be inefficient to pay EUR 100 with 1 cent coins!

- Denomination key represents value of a coin.
- Exchange may offer various denominations for coins.
- Wallet may not have exact change!
- Usability requires ability to pay given sufficient total funds.

Key goals:
- maintain unlinkability
- maintain taxability of transactions

Method:
- Contract can specify to only pay *partial value* of a coin.
- Exchange allows wallet to obtain *unlinkable change* for remaining coin value.
1. Create private keys $c, t \mod o$
2. Define $C := cG$
3. Define $T := tG$
4. Compute DH:
   $$cT = c(tG) = t(cG) = tC$$
Given partially spent private coin key $c_{old}$:

1. Pick random $c_{new} \mod o$ private key
2. Compute $C_{new} := c_{new}G$ public key
3. Pick random $b_{new}$
4. Compute $f_{new} := FDH(C_{new}), m < n.$
5. Transmit $f'_{new} := f_{new}b_{new}^e \mod n$

... and sign request for change with $c_{old}$. 

Exchange
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NEXT, GENERATION, INTERNET
Given partially spent private coin key $c_{old}$:

1. Let $C_{old} := c_{old}G$ (as before)
2. Create random private transfer key $t \mod o$
3. Compute public transfer key $T := tG$
4. Compute $X := c_{old}(tG) = t(c_{old}G) = tC_{old}$
5. Derive $c_{new}$ and $b_{new}$ from $X$ using HKDF
6. Compute $C_{new} := c_{new}G$
7. Compute $f_{new} := FDH(C_{new})$
8. Transmit $f'_{new} := f_{new}b_{new}^e$
Cut-and-Choose

\[ c_{\text{old}} \rightarrow t_1 \]
\[ c_{\text{old}} \rightarrow t_2 \]
\[ c_{\text{old}} \rightarrow t_3 \]

\[ c_{\text{new},1} \rightarrow b_{\text{new},1} \]
\[ c_{\text{new},2} \rightarrow b_{\text{new},2} \]
\[ c_{\text{new},3} \rightarrow b_{\text{new},3} \]

\[ \text{transmit} \rightarrow \text{Exchange} \]
\[ \text{transmit} \rightarrow \text{Exchange} \]
\[ \text{transmit} \rightarrow \text{Exchange} \]
Exchange: Choose!

Exchange sends back random $\gamma \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ to the customer.
1. If $\gamma = 1$, send $t_2, t_3$ to exchange
2. If $\gamma = 2$, send $t_1, t_3$ to exchange
3. If $\gamma = 3$, send $t_1, t_2$ to exchange
Exchange: Verify ($\gamma = 2$)

$C_{old}$ $t_1$

$c_{new,1}$ $b_{new,1}$

$C_{old}$ $t_3$

$c_{new,3}$ $b_{new,3}$
Exchange: Blind sign change (RSA)

1. Take $f'_{\text{new}, \gamma}$.
2. Compute $s' := f'_{\text{new}, \gamma}d \mod n$.
3. Return signature $s'$.
1. Receive $s'$.
2. Compute $s := s'b_{new,\gamma}^{-1} \mod n$. 
Given $C_{old}$

return $T_\gamma$ and

$s := s' b_{new,\gamma}^{-1} \mod n$. 
1. Have $c_{\text{old}}$.
2. Obtain $T_{\gamma}, s$ from exchange
3. Compute $X_{\gamma} = c_{\text{old}} T_{\gamma}$
4. Derive $c_{\text{new}, \gamma}$ and $b_{\text{new}, \gamma}$ from $X_{\gamma}$
5. Unblind $s := s' b_{\text{new}, \gamma}^{-1} \mod n$
Refresh protocol summary

- Customer asks exchange to convert old coin to new coin
- Protocol ensures new coins can be recovered from old coin
  ⇒ New coins are owned by the same entity!

Thus, the refresh protocol allows:

- To give unlinkable change.
- To give refunds to an anonymous customer.
- To expire old keys and migrate coins to new ones.
- To handle protocol aborts.

Transactions via refresh are equivalent to *sharing* a wallet.
An *oracle* is a party in a game that the adversary can call upon to indirectly access information that is otherwise hidden from it. For example, **IND-CPA** can be formalized like this:

**Setup** Generate random key $k$, select $b \in \{0, 1\}$ for $i \in \{1, \ldots, q\}$.

**Oracle** Given $M_0$ and $M_1$ (of same length), return $C := \text{enc}(k, M_b)$.

The adversary wins, if it can guess $b$ with probability greater than $\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon(\kappa)$ where $\epsilon(\kappa)$ is a negligible function in the security parameter $\kappa$. 
Problem:

Verification of minimum age requirements in e-commerce.

Common solutions:

1. ID Verification
2. Restricted Accounts
3. Attribute-based
Age restriction in E-commerce
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Common solutions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Privacy</th>
<th>Ext. authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ID Verification</td>
<td>bad</td>
<td>required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Restricted Accounts</td>
<td>bad</td>
<td>required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>good</td>
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## Problem:

Verification of minimum age requirements in e-commerce.

### Common solutions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Privacy</th>
<th>Ext. authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ID Verification</td>
<td>bad</td>
<td>required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Restricted Accounts</td>
<td>bad</td>
<td>required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Attribute-based</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Principle of Subsidiarity is violated**
Principle of Subsidiarity

Functions of government—such as granting and restricting rights—should be performed at the lowest level of authority possible, as long as they can be performed adequately.
Functions of government—such as granting and restricting rights—should be performed at the lowest level of authority possible, as long as they can be performed adequately.

For age-restriction, the lowest level of authority is:

Parents, guardians and caretakers
1. Tie age restriction to the **ability to pay** (not to ID’s)
2. maintain **anonymity of buyers**
3. maintain **unlinkability of transactions**
4. align with **principle of subsidiarity**
5. be **practical and efficient**
Age restriction
Assumptions and scenario

- Assumption: Checking accounts are under control of eligible adults/guardians.
- **Guardians commit** to an maximum age
- **Minors attest** their adequate age
- **Merchants verify** the attestations
- Minors **derive** age commitments from existing ones
- **Exchanges compare** the derived age commitments
Searching for functions with the following signatures

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Commit} : & \quad (a, \omega) \mapsto (Q, P) & \quad N_M \times \Omega \rightarrow O \times P, \\
\text{Attest} : & \quad (m, Q, P) \mapsto T & \quad N_M \times O \times P \rightarrow T \cup \{\bot\}, \\
\text{Verify} : & \quad (m, Q, T) \mapsto b & \quad N_M \times O \times T \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2, \\
\text{Derive} : & \quad (Q, P, \omega) \mapsto (Q', P', \beta) & \quad O \times P \times \Omega \rightarrow O \times P \times B, \\
\text{Compare} : & \quad (Q, Q', \beta) \mapsto b & \quad O \times O \times B \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2,
\end{align*}
\]

with \( \Omega, P, O, T, B \) sufficiently large sets.

Basic and security requirements are defined later.

Mnemonics:
\( O = cOmmittments, Q = Q\text{-mitment} \) (commitment), \( P = P\text{roof}s, P = P\text{roof} \),
\( T = aT\text{testations}, T = aT\text{estation} \), \( B = B\text{blindings}, \beta = \beta\text{blind}ing \).
Simple use of Derive() and Compare() is problematic.

- Calling Derive() iteratively generates sequence \((Q_0, Q_1, \ldots)\) of commitments.
- Exchange calls Compare\((Q_i, Q_{i+1}, \ldots)\)

\[ \implies \text{Exchange identifies sequence} \]
\[ \implies \text{Unlinkability broken} \]
Simple use of Derive() and Compare() is problematic.

- Calling Derive() iteratively generates sequence \((Q_0, Q_1, \ldots)\) of commitments.
- Exchange calls Compare\((Q_i, Q_{i+1}, \ldots)\)

\(\Rightarrow\) Exchange identifies sequence
\(\Rightarrow\) Unlinkability broken
Achievingunlinkability

Define cut&choose protocol $\textbf{DeriveCompare}_\kappa$, using $\textbf{Derive()}$ and $\textbf{Compare()}$.

Sketch:

1. $\mathcal{C}$ derives commitments $(Q_1, \ldots, Q_\kappa)$ from $Q_0$ by calling $\textbf{Derive()}$ with blindings $(\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\kappa)$
2. $\mathcal{C}$ calculates $h_0 := H(H(Q_1, \beta_1) || \ldots || H(Q_\kappa, \beta_\kappa))$
3. $\mathcal{C}$ sends $Q_0$ and $h_0$ to $\mathcal{E}$
4. $\mathcal{E}$ chooses $\gamma \in \{1, \ldots, \kappa\}$ randomly
5. $\mathcal{C}$ reveals $h_\gamma := H(Q_\gamma, \beta_\gamma)$ and all $(Q_i, \beta_i)$, except $(Q_\gamma, \beta_\gamma)$
6. $\mathcal{E}$ compares $h_0$ and $H(H(Q_1, \beta_1) || \ldots || h_\gamma | | \ldots || H(Q_\kappa, \beta_\kappa))$ and evaluates $\textbf{Compare}(Q_0, Q_i, \beta_i)$. 
With $\text{DeriveCompare}_\kappa$

- $\mathcal{E}$ learns nothing about $Q_\gamma$,
- trusts outcome with $\frac{\kappa-1}{\kappa}$ certainty,
- i.e. $\mathcal{C}$ has $\frac{1}{\kappa}$ chance to cheat.

Note: Still need Derive and Compare to be defined.
Candidate functions

(Commit, Attest, Verify, Derive, Compare)

must first meet *basic* requirements:

- Existence of attestations
- Efficacy of attestations
- Derivability of commitments and attestations
Existence of attestations

\[ \forall a \in \mathbb{N}, \omega \in \Omega : \text{Commit}(a, \omega) =: (Q, P) \implies \text{Attest}(m, Q, P) = \begin{cases} T \in \mathbb{T}, & \text{if } m \leq a \\ \bot & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \]

Efficacy of attestations

\[ \text{Verify}(m, Q, T) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \exists P \in \mathbb{P} : \text{Attest}(m, Q, P) = T \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \]

\[ \forall n \leq a : \text{Verify}(n, Q, \text{Attest}(n, Q, P)) = 1. \]

etc.
Candidate functions must also meet security requirements. Those are defined via security games:

- Game: Age disclosure by commitment or attestation
  \(\leftrightarrow\) Requirement: Non-disclosure of age
- Game: Forging attestation
  \(\leftrightarrow\) Requirement: Unforgeability of minimum age
- Game: Distinguishing derived commitments and attestations
  \(\leftrightarrow\) Requirement: Unlinkability of commitments and attestations

Meeting the security requirements means that adversaries can win those games only with negligible advantage. Adversaries are arbitrary polynomial-time algorithms, acting on all relevant input.
Security requirements

Simplified example

Game $G_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{FA}}(\lambda)$—Forging an attest:

1. $(a, \omega) \leftarrow \mathcal{N}_{M-1} \times \Omega$
2. $(Q, P) \leftarrow \text{Commit}(a, \omega)$
3. $(m, T) \leftarrow \mathcal{A}(a, Q, P)$
4. Return 0 if $m \leq a$
5. Return Verify($m, Q, T$)

Requirement: Unforgeability of minimum age

$$\forall \mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{A}(N_M \times Q \times P \rightarrow N_M \times T) : \Pr[G_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{FA}}(\lambda) = 1] \leq \epsilon(\lambda)$$
To Commit to age (group) $a \in \{1, \ldots, M\}$

1. Guardian generates ECDSA-keypairs, one per age (group):
   \[ \langle (q_1, p_1), \ldots, (q_M, p_M) \rangle \]

2. Guardian then **drops** all private keys $p_i$ for $i > a$:
   \[ \langle (q_1, p_1), \ldots, (q_a, p_a), (q_{a+1}, \bot), \ldots, (q_M, \bot) \rangle \]
   - $\vec{Q} := (q_1, \ldots, q_M)$ is the **Commitment**,
   - $\vec{P}_a := (p_1, \ldots, p_a, \bot, \ldots, \bot)$ is the **Proof**

3. Guardian gives child $\langle \vec{Q}, \vec{P}_a \rangle$
Child has
- ordered public-keys $\vec{Q} = (q_1, \ldots, q_M)$,
- (some) private-keys $\vec{P} = (p_1, \ldots, p_a, \perp, \ldots, \perp)$.

To Attest a minimum age $m \leq a$:
Sign a message with ECDSA using private key $p_m$

Merchant gets
- ordered public-keys $\vec{Q} = (q_1, \ldots, q_M)$
- Signature $\sigma$

To Verify a minimum age $m$:
Verify the ECDSA-Signature $\sigma$ with public key $q_m$. 
Instantiation with ECDSA
Definitions of Derive and Compare

Child has $\vec{Q} = (q_1, \ldots, q_M)$ and $\vec{P} = (p_1, \ldots, p_a, \perp, \ldots, \perp)$.

To Derive new $\vec{Q}'$ and $\vec{P}'$: Choose random $\beta \in \mathbb{Z}_g$ and calculate

$$
\vec{Q}' := (\beta \cdot q_1, \ldots, \beta \cdot q_M),
$$
$$
\vec{P}' := (\beta p_1, \ldots, \beta p_a, \perp, \ldots, \perp)
$$

Note: $(\beta p_i) \cdot G = \beta \cdot (p_i \cdot G) = \beta \cdot q_i$

$\beta \cdot q_i$ is scalar multiplication on the elliptic curve.

Exchange gets $\vec{Q} = (q_1, \ldots, q_M)$, $\vec{Q}' = (q'_1, \ldots, q'_M)$ and $\beta$

To Compare, calculate: $(\beta \cdot q_1, \ldots, \beta \cdot q_M) \overset{?}{=} (q'_1, \ldots, q'_M)$
Functions (Commit, Attest, Verify, Derive, Compare) as defined in the instantiation with ECDSA

- meet the basic requirements,
- also meet all security requirements. Proofs by security reduction, details are in the paper.
Integration with GNU Taler
Key operations in the original system

- Coins are public-/private key-pairs \((C_p, c_s)\).
- Exchange blindly signs \(\text{FDH}(C_p)\) with denomination key \(d_p\).
- Verification:

\[
1 \overset{?}{=} \text{SigCheck}(\text{FDH}(C_p), D_p, \sigma_p)
\]

\((D_p = \text{public key of denomination and } \sigma_p = \text{signature})\)
To bind an age commitment $Q$ to a coin $C_p$, instead of signing $\text{FDH}(C_p)$, $\mathcal{E}$ now blindly signs

$$\text{FDH}(C_p, H(Q))$$

Verification of a coin now requires $H(Q)$, too:

$$1 \overset{?}{=} \text{SigCheck}(\text{FDH}(C_p, H(Q)), D_p, \sigma_p)$$
Integration with GNU Taler

Integrated schemes

Commit($a$)

withdraw, using $\text{FDH}(C_p, H(Q))$

deposit $+ H(Q)$

refresh $+ \text{DeriveCompare}_e$

$G$

$\mathcal{C}$

$\mathcal{M}$

purchase $+ (T_m, Q)$

Attest($m, Q, P_a$)

Verify($m, Q, T_m$)
Paper also formally defines another signature scheme: Edx25519.

- Scheme already in use in GNUnet,
- based on EdDSA (Bernstein et al.),
- generates compatible signatures and
- allows for key derivation from both, private and public keys, independently.

Current implementation of age restriction in GNU Taler uses Edx25519.
Discussion

- Approach can be used with any token-based payment scheme
- Subsidiarity requires bank accounts being owned by adults
- Scheme can be adapted to case where minors have bank accounts
  - Assumption: banks provide minimum age information during bank transactions.
  - Child and Exchange execute a variant of the cut&choose protocol.
GNU Taler:

- Gives change, can provide refunds
- Integrates nicely with HTTP, handles network failures
- Has high performance
- Is Free Software
- Includes formal security proofs
Many initiatives are currently at the level of requirements discussion:
1. Central bank issues digital coins equivalent to issuing cash
2. Architecture with consumer accounts at commercial banks
3. Withdrawal limits and denomination expiration
4. Income transparency and possibility to set fees
5. Revocation protocols and loss limitations
6. Privacy by cryptographic design not organizational compliance

Political support needed, talk to your representatives!
Ongoing work

- Post-quantum blind signatures
- Integration into more physical machines
- Integration with KYC/AML providers
- Deployment for regional currency in Basel
- Integration with Swiss Postfinance EBICS API
- Wallet backup and recovery with Anastasis
- Internationalization ⇒ https://weblate.taler.net/

https://bugs.taler.net/ tracks open issues.
Address remaining scalability challenges (multiple topics)
Porting to more platforms (Web shops, iOS, embedded, ...)
Integration with e-commerce frameworks (Prestashop, OpenCart, ...)
Currency conversion
SAP integration
Design and usability for illiterate and innumerate users
Federated exchange (wads)
...

Help needed, talk to us (e.g. at https://ich.taler.net/)
Be paid to read advertising, starting with spam
Give welfare without intermediaries taking huge cuts
Forster regional trade via regional currencies
Eliminate corruption by making all income visible
Stop the mining by making crypto-currencies useless for anything but crime
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Co-funded by the European Union (Project 101135475).

Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union.

Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.