# DeTor: Provably Avoiding Geographic Regions in Tor



Zhihao Li, Stephen Herwig, Dave Levin

### Tor Network Aims to provide *anonymous* communications



### source



### source



Entry











### source





### source

### Tor Network Aims to provides *unlinkable* communications







### Tor Network Aims to provides unlinkable communications



### Tor Network Aims to provides unlinkable communications





Adversary cannot link source with destination

































### Vulnerable to traffic correlation attacks



### Vulnerable to traffic correlation attacks



### Vulnerable to traffic correlation attacks





### Vulnerable to traffic correlation attacks



### Vulnerable to traffic correlation attacks



- Adversaries can:
  - launch various attacks when on the path

  - attract routes to their administrative domains

• hide from network topology measurement (e.g. traceroute)

- Adversaries can:
  - launch various attacks when on the path

  - attract routes to their administrative domains

• hide from network topology measurement (e.g. traceroute)

- Adversaries can:
  - launch various attacks when on the path

  - attract routes to their administrative domains
- Adversaries cannot:
  - violate cryptographic assumptions

hide from network topology measurement (e.g. traceroute)

- Adversaries can:
  - launch various attacks when on the path

  - attract routes to their administrative domains
- Adversaries cannot:
  - violate cryptographic assumptions

hide from network topology measurement (e.g. traceroute)

Fundamental assumption: We know the geographic boundaries wherein the attackers reside



### DeTor

With smart circuit selection, it is possible to provably avoid geographic regions with Tor



### DeTor

With smart circuit selection, it is possible to provably avoid geographic regions with Tor



### DeTor

With smart circuit selection, it is possible to provably avoid geographic regions with Tor





### DeTor

With smart circuit selection, it is possible to provably avoid geographic regions with Tor





### DeTor

With smart circuit selection, it is possible to provably avoid geographic regions with Tor





### DeTor

With smart circuit selection, it is possible to provably avoid geographic regions with Tor





### DeTor

With smart circuit selection, it is possible to provably avoid geographic regions with Tor



### DeTor

With smart circuit selection, it is possible to provably avoid geographic regions with Tor



### DeTor

With smart circuit selection, it is possible to provably avoid geographic regions with Tor





### DeTor

With smart circuit selection, it is possible to provably avoid geographic regions with Tor





### DeTor

With smart circuit selection, it is possible to provably avoid geographic regions with Tor


Never-once



# DeTor

With smart circuit selection, it is possible to provably avoid geographic regions with Tor

Never-twice



Never-once

never traverse specified regions

> Provide per-packet proof of avoidance

# DeTor

With smart circuit selection, it is possible to provably avoid geographic regions with Tor

Never-twice

entry & exit legs never traverse the same regions

### Allow users to avoid adversaries with smart circuits selection





# DeTor goals

### Allow users to avoid adversaries with smart circuits selection

# DeTor goals

### Allow users to avoid adversaries with smart circuits selection

# DeTor goals

Without having to know underlying routes

### Allow users to avoid adversaries with smart circuits selection

# DeTor goals

Without having to know underlying routes

Without modifications to Internet routers

### Allow users to avoid adversaries with smart circuits selection

# DeTor goals

Without having to know underlying routes

Without modifications to Internet routers

> Without changes to Tor's protocol

# Proof











































# Proof



### Provide proofs of avoidance

## Measurement of roundtrip time





## The shortest possible RTT = 2 d / cthru to



# $\frac{\text{Measured}}{\text{RTT}} \ll \frac{\text{The shortest possible RTT}}{\text{thru} to} = 2 d / c$



# $\frac{\text{Measured}}{\text{RTT}} \ll \frac{\text{The shortest possible RTT}}{\text{thru} \text{ to }} = \frac{2 \text{ d}}{c}$

 $\Rightarrow$  The packet could not have traversed  $\bigcirc$  to  $\bigcirc$ 



## Measured « The shortest possible RTT = 2 d / c RTT = 2 d / c

 $\Rightarrow$  The packet could not have traversed  $\bigcirc$  to  $\bigcirc$ 



**Alibi Condition** 











## $\Rightarrow$ The packet reached



## $\Rightarrow$ The packet reached



## $\Rightarrow$ The packet reached



## $\Rightarrow$ The packet reached

## The packet could not &



Never-once

never traverse specified regions



# DeTor

With smart circuit selection, it is possible to provably avoid geographic regions with Tor

Never-twice

entry&exit legs never traverse the same regions

Provide per-packet proof of avoidance



Never-once

never traverse specified regions



# DeTor

With smart circuit selection, it is possible to provably avoid geographic regions with Tor

Never-twice

entry&exit legs never traverse the same regions

Provide per-packet proof of avoidance

# DeTor: never-once avoidance Avoid user specified geographic regions



# DeTor: never-once avoidance The shortest possible RTT thru and to



### shortest distance $= d_1$

# DeTor: never-once avoidance The shortest possible RTT thru and to









# The shortest possible RTT = $2 \min{\{d_i\}}/c$ thru and to



# 





# 

### $\Rightarrow$ The packet could not have traversed ( to



# DeTor: never-once avoidance Achieving provable avoidance








# $\Rightarrow \begin{array}{c} \text{The packet traversed } \overleftarrow{\bullet} \\ \text{and reached} \end{array}$



# $\Rightarrow \begin{array}{c} \text{The packet traversed } \overleftarrow{\bullet} \\ \text{and reached} \end{array}$



# $\Rightarrow \begin{array}{c} \text{The packet traversed } \overleftarrow{\bullet} \\ \text{and reached} \end{array}$



# $\Rightarrow \begin{array}{c} \text{The packet traversed } \overleftarrow{\bullet} \\ \text{and reached} \end{array}$

 $\Rightarrow \begin{array}{c} \text{The packet could not} \\ \text{have traversed} & \text{and} \end{array}$ 



Never-once

never traverse specified regions



# DeTor

With smart circuit selection, it is possible to provably avoid geographic regions with Tor

Never-twice

entry&exit legs never traverse the same regions

Provide per-packet proof of avoidance



Never-once

never traverse specified regions



# DeTor

With smart circuit selection, it is possible to provably avoid geographic regions with Tor

Never-twice

entry&exit legs never traverse the same regions

Provide per-packet proof of avoidance

















#### Measured RTT = shortest possible RTT + extra



#### Measured RTT = $\sum$ shortest possible RTT + $\sum$ extra



#### Measured RTT = $\sum$ shortest possible RTT + $\sum$ extra



#### Measured RTT = $\sum$ shortest possible RTT + $\sum$ extra





#### Upper bound RTT $\geq 2(a+b)/c$



D

The packet could possibly reach any point in the ellipse





#### Compute the worst-case scenarios for both entry and exit legs, separately







![](_page_98_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_99_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_100_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_101_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_102_Picture_1.jpeg)

#### no country intersects with both ellipses

![](_page_103_Picture_1.jpeg)

#### no country intersects with both ellipses

 $\bigcup$ 

![](_page_104_Picture_1.jpeg)

#### no country intersects with both ellipses

packet over entry/exit legs could not have traversed the same country

![](_page_105_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_106_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_107_Picture_1.jpeg)












For each country intersects with both ellipses as





For each country intersects with both ellipses as

The shortest possible RTT thru Tor and entry & exit legs traverse





For each country intersects with both ellipses as

The shortest possible RTT thru Tor and entry & exit legs traverse





For each country intersects with both ellipses as



The shortest possible Measured K RTT thru Tor and entry & exit legs traverse





For each country intersects with both ellipses as



The shortest possible Measured K RTT thru Tor and entry & exit legs traverse

> The packet could not have traversed over entry & exit legs



# **Evaluation** Through simulation

## Evaluation Through simulation

- 50 random real Tor nodes
  - with GPS locations and pair-wise RTTs using Ting



# choose sources and destinations among these nodes

## Evaluation Through simulation

- 50 random real Tor nodes

  - with GPS locations and pair-wise RTTs using Ting choose sources and destinations among these nodes
- Eight countries to avoid for never-once: 0 China, India, PR Korea, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Japan, US





#### How successful is DeTor?

- How well do DeTor circuits perform?
- How diverse are the DeTor circuits?

## Evaluation

#### Never-once success rate



Successful with DeTor

- Theoretically avoid, but failed with real RTTs
- No circuits could provably avoid
- No trusted Tor nodes
- Source/Destination in Forbidden region

#### Never-once success rate

#### Most src-dst pairs can successful find never-once circuits



Successful with DeTor

- Theoretically avoid, but failed with real RTTs
- No circuits could provably avoid
- No trusted Tor nodes
- Source/Destination in Forbidden region

#### Never-once success rate



Failure typically arises when users are in or close to the regions to avoid

Successful with DeTor

Theoretically avoid, but failed with real RTTs

- No circuits could provably avoid
- No trusted Tor nodes
- Source/Destination in Forbidden region



#### Never-once —









# Number of never-once circuits Half of src-dst pairs have over 500 never-once circuits



# Cumulat of Sro

#### Never-once



#### Tor with no Chinese relays provably avoids China less than 10% of the time

Never-once





#### Client-side RTTs might be enough to address many attacks

#### DeTor circuits tends to have lower RTTs





#### Avoiding China

400 600 800 1000 1200 1400 **Round-trip Time (msec)** 

#### DeTor circuits tends to have lower RTTs





#### 400 600 800 1000 1200 1400 **Round-trip Time (msec)**

## DeTor: never-once avoidance Achieving provable avoidance

# $\begin{array}{ll} \mbox{Measured} \\ \mbox{RTT} \end{array} & \ll \begin{tabular}{l} \mbox{The shortest possible RTT} \\ \mbox{thru} & \end{tabular} \end{tabular} \end{tabular} = 2 \mbox{min{d_i}/ c} \end{tabular} \end{tabular} \end{tabular}$





#### DeTor: never-once avoidance Achieving provable avoidance

# $\ll \frac{\text{The shortest possible RTT}}{\text{thru}} = 2 \min\{d_i\}/c$

## Other results

- DeTor circuits usually have higher bandwidth
- DeTor introduces slight node selection bias
- Most nodes serve on few DeTor circuits
- Possible to predict whether a circuit will achieve provable avoidance



Never-once

never traverse specified regions

- Proofs of avoidance verify that packets over DeTor circuits have avoided geographic regions
- DeTor circuits
  - are successful for most src-dst pairs
  - have better performance
  - introduce small node selection bias

#### DeTor

With smart circuit selection, it is possible to provably avoid geographic regions with Tor

Never-twice

entry & exit legs never traverse the same regions

Code and data available at: detor.cs.umd.edu



Never-once

never traverse specified regions

- Proofs of avoidance verify that packets over DeTor circuits have avoided geographic regions
- DeTor circuits
  - are successful for most src-dst pairs
  - have better performance
  - introduce small node selection bias

#### DeTor

With smart circuit selection, it is possible to provably avoid geographic regions with Tor

Never-twice

entry & exit legs never traverse the same regions

Code and data available at: detor.cs.umd.edu