

# SePCAR: A Secure and Privacy-Enhancing Protocol for Car Access Provision

Iraklis Symeonidis<sup>1(✉)</sup>, Abdelrahman Aly<sup>1</sup>, Mustafa Asan Mustafa<sup>1</sup>,  
Bart Mennink<sup>2</sup>, Siemen Dhooghe<sup>1</sup>, and Bart Preneel<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> imec-COSIC, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium  
{iraklis.symeonidis,abdelrahman.aly,mustafa.mustafa,  
siemen.dhooghe,bart.preneel}@esat.kuleuven.be

<sup>2</sup> Radboud University, Nijmegen, The Netherlands  
b.mennink@cs.ru.nl

**Abstract.** We present an efficient secure and privacy-enhancing protocol for car access provision, named SePCAR. The protocol is fully decentralised and allows users to share their cars conveniently without sacrificing their security and privacy. It provides generation, update, revocation, and distribution mechanisms for access tokens to shared cars, as well as procedures to solve disputes and to deal with law enforcement requests, for instance in the case of car incidents. We prove that SePCAR meets its appropriate security and privacy requirements and that it is efficient: our practical efficiency analysis through a proof-of-concept implementation shows that SePCAR takes only 1.55 s for a car access provision.

## 1 Introduction

As opposed to the traditional car ownership, the idea of car sharing, which allows users to share their cars in a convenient way, is gaining popularity. Statistics have shown that the worldwide number of users for car sharing services has grown from 2012 to 2014 by 170% (4.94 million) [15] with a tendency to increase by 2021 [7]. With the use of portable devices and in-vehicle telematics, physical car keys are slowly becoming obsolete. Keyless car Sharing Systems (KSSs) allow car owners to rather use their portable devices such as smartphones to distribute temporary digital car keys (access tokens) to other users. Several companies (including Volvo [48], BMW [8], Toyota [47], and Apple [46]) have started investing in such systems. Moreover, unlike traditional car rental companies, KSSs can provide a relatively inexpensive alternative to users who need a car occasionally and on-demand [49]. Their use can also contribute to a decrease in the number of cars, effectively reducing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions [39] and the need for parking space [32].

In spite of these advantages, information collection in car sharing systems does not only jeopardise a system’s security, but also the users’ privacy. Uber used a tool called “Hell” to spy on their rival company drivers [41], whereas their mobile app *always* tracks their users’ location [13]. Moreover, it is possible to reach high identification rates of drivers, from 87% to 99% accuracy, based on data collected by the sensors of a car from 15 min of open-road driving [16].

In short, an adversary may try to eavesdrop and collect information exchanged within the KSS, tamper with the car sharing details, extract the key of a car stored in untrusted devices, generate a rogue access token to maliciously access a car or to deny having accessed a car. Regarding users' privacy, an adversary may try to correlate and link two car sharing requests of the same user or the car, to identify car usage patterns and deduce the users' sharing preferences. These preferences can be established by collecting information about sharing patterns such as rental time, duration, pickup location, when, where and with whom someone is sharing a car. An adversary may even attempt to infer sensitive information about users such as racial and religious beliefs [37] or their health status, by identifying users who use cars for disabled passengers. Sensitive personal data are related to *fundamental rights and freedoms*, and merit protection regarding the collection and processing as articulated in the new EU General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) [9]. In addition, a KSS may introduce various other concerns with respect to connectivity issues [15], car key revocations when a user's device is stolen [21], and the fact that malicious users may attempt to manipulate or even destroy potential forensic evidence on the car or their devices.

**Related Work.** Troncoso et al. [44] proposed a pay-as-you-drive scheme to enhance the location privacy of drivers by sending aggregated data to insurance companies. Balasch et al. [2] proposed an electronic toll pricing protocol where a car's on-board unit calculates locally the driver's annual toll fee while disclosing a minimum amount of location information. For colluding (dishonest) users [2], Kerschbaum et al. [27] presented a privacy-preserving spot checking protocol that allows observations in public spaces. Mustafa et al. [31] proposed an anonymous electric vehicle charging protocol with billing support. EVITA [17] and PRESERVE [34] are designated projects on the design and specification of the secure architecture of on-board units. Driven by the PRESERVE instantiation, Raya et al. [36] described the need for a Vehicular Public-Key Infrastructure (VPKI), and Khodaei et al. [28] proposed a generic pseudonymization approach to preserve the unlinkability of messages exchanged between vehicles and VPKI servers. None of these solutions provides a full-fledged keyless car sharing system.

Our work is closely related to the protocol proposed by Dmitrienko and Plappert [15]. They designed a centralised and secure free-floating car sharing system that uses two-factor authentication including mobile devices and RFID tags, e.g., smart-cards. However, in contrast to our solution, their protocol assumes a fully trusted car sharing provider who has access to the master key of smart-cards and also collects and stores all the information exchanged between the car provider and their users for every car access provision.

**Our Contributions.** We design a concrete and fully decentralised secure and privacy-enhancing protocol for car access provision, named SePCAR. The protocol provides generation and distribution of access tokens for car access provision, as well as update and revocation operations used for facilitating mutually agreed modifications of the booking details and protecting against misbehav-


ing consumers, respectively. It internally uses secure multiparty computation to facilitate forensic evidence provision in the case of car incidents or at the request of law enforcement. SePCAR is described in detail in Sect. 4.

We prove that the protocol fulfils the desired security and privacy requirements bound to the standards of connected cars. First, departing from Symeonidis et al. [40], we give a detailed list of security and privacy requirements in Sect. 2. Then, in Sect. 5, we prove that SePCAR meets its security and privacy requirements as long as its underlying cryptographic primitives (listed in Sect. 3) are secure. Our theoretical complexity and practical efficiency analysis in Sect. 6 demonstrates SePCAR’s competitiveness. In particular, we implemented a prototype as a proof-of-concept in C++ and we achieved a car access provision in  $\approx 1.55$  s.

## 2 System Model and Requirements

We describe the system model and functionalities of a KSS. Moreover, we specify the threat model, the security, privacy and functional requirements which it needs to satisfy, and our assumptions about the system.

**System Model.** We follow the KSS system model of Symeonidis et al. [40] (see also Fig. 1). *Users* are individuals who are willing to share their cars, *owners* ( $u_o$ ), and use cars which are available for sharing, *consumers* ( $u_c$ ); both use of *Portable Devices* (PDs) such as smartphones. An *On-Board Unit* (OBU) is an embedded or a standalone hardware/software component [25] that is part of the secure access management system of a car. It has a wireless interface such as Bluetooth, NFC or LTE. The *Car manufacturer* (CM) is responsible for generating and embedding a digital key into each car. These keys are used for car sharing and are stored in the manufacturers’ *Database* (DB). The *Keyless Sharing Management System* (KSMS) is a complex of multiparty computation (MPC) *servers* that assists owners with car access token generation, distribution, update and revocation. Each *server* individually retrieves its share of the car key,



**Fig. 1.** System model of a physical Keyless car Sharing System (KSS) [40].

$K^{car}$ , and the servers jointly encrypt the booking details,  $M^B$ , to generate an access token,  $AT^{car}$ . The access token is published on a *Public Ledger* (PL), which serves as a public bulletin board that guarantees the integrity of the data [30]. The booking details are typically agreed upon by owner and consumer prior to the beginning of the protocol.

**Threat Model.** Within the KSS, the KSMS, the CM and the PL are considered honest-but-curious entities. They will perform the protocol honestly, but they are curious to extract private information about users. Owners are passive adversaries while consumers and outsiders may be malicious. The car's OBU is trusted and equipped with a Hardware Security Module (HSM) [34,45] that supports secure key storage and cryptographic operations such as symmetric and public-key encryption, following the EVITA [17] and PRESERVE [34] specifications. Users' PDs are untrusted as they can get stolen, lost or broken.

**Protocol Design Requirements.** The keyless car sharing system should satisfy the following security, privacy and functional requirements [40], which we denote by  $SR$ ,  $PR$  and  $FR$ , respectively. Here, we recall that  $M^B$  refers to the booking details,  $AT^{car}$  the access token to the car and  $K^{car}$  the car key.

- $SR1$  - *Confidentiality of  $M^B$* . No one but the shared car,  $u_o$  and  $u_c$  should have access to  $M^B$ .
- $SR2$  - *Authenticity of  $M^B$* . The shared car should verify the origin and integrity of  $M^B$  from  $u_o$ .
- $SR3$  - *Confidentiality of  $AT^{car}$* . No one but the shared car and  $u_c$  should have access to  $AT^{car}$ .
- $SR4$  - *Confidentiality of  $K^{car}$* . No one but the shared car and the CM should have access to  $K^{car}$ .
- $SR5$  - *Backward and forward secrecy of  $AT^{car}$* . Compromise of a key used to encrypt any  $AT^{car}$  should not compromise other tokens (future and past) published on the PL of any honest  $u_c$ .
- $SR6$  - *Non-repudiation of origin of  $AT^{car}$* . The  $u_o$  should not be able to deny it has agreed to the terms of  $M^B$ , and participated in providing the respective  $AT^{car}$ .
- $SR7$  - *Non-repudiation of delivery of  $AT^{car}$* . The  $u_c$  should not be able to deny it has obtained and used the  $AT^{car}$  to open the car (once it has done so).
- $PR1$  - *Unlinkability of  $u_c$  and the car*. No one but the shared car,  $u_o$  and  $u_c$  should be able to link two booking requests of the same  $u_c$  for the car.
- $PR2$  - *Anonymity of  $u_c$  and the car*. No one but the shared car,  $u_o$  and  $u_c$  should learn the identity of  $u_c$  and the car.
- $PR3$  - *Undetectability of  $AT^{car}$  operation*. No one but the shared car,  $u_o$  and  $u_c$  (if necessary) should be able to distinguish between  $AT^{car}$  generation, update and revocation.

- *PR<sub>4</sub> - Forensic evidence provision.* The KSMS should be able to provide authorities with the transaction details of an access provision to a car at the request of law enforcement without violating the other users' privacy.
- *FR<sub>1</sub> - Offline authentication.* Access provision should be provided for locations where cars have limited (or no) network connection.

**Assumptions.** For SePCAR, we assume that before every evaluation, the booking details are agreed upon by owner and consumer, but that both keep these booking details confidential against external parties. SePCAR relies on a PKI infrastructure [34], and we assume that each entity has her private/public-key pair with their corresponding digital certificates. The communication channels are secure and authenticated among entities using SSL-TLS and NFC. OBU is equipped with a HSM [34, 45], and it is designed to resist deliberate or accidental physical destruction (i.e., black box). The MPC servers are held by non-colluding organisations, i.e., organisations with conflicting interests such as authorities, car owner unions and car manufacturers.

### 3 Cryptographic Building Blocks

This section specifies, the cryptographic functionalities that are used across this paper, as well as the MPC functionalities and cryptographic building blocks.

**Cryptographic Functionalities.** SePCAR uses the following cryptographic building blocks. The suggested instantiations are the ones used in our proof-of-concept implementation.

- $\sigma \leftarrow \text{sign}(Sk, m)$  and  $\text{true/false} \leftarrow \text{verify}(Pk, m, \sigma)$  are public-key operations for signing and verification respectively. These can be implemented using RSA as defined in the PKCS #1 v2.0 specifications [23].
- $z \leftarrow \text{prf}(K, \text{counter})$  is a pseudo-random function (PRF) that uses as input a key and a counter. This function can be implemented using CTR mode with AES (as the message input is small).
- $c \leftarrow \text{enc}(Pk, m)$  and  $m \leftarrow \text{dec}(Sk, c)$  are public-key encryption and decryption functions. These can be implemented using RSA as defined in the RSA-KEM specifications [24].
- $c \leftarrow E(K, m)$  and  $m \leftarrow D(K, c)$  are symmetric key encryption and decryption functions. These can be implemented using CTR mode with AES.
- $v \leftarrow \text{mac}(K, m)$  is a symmetric key MAC function. This function can be implemented using CBC-MAC with AES.<sup>1</sup>
- $z \leftarrow \text{hash}(m)$  is a cryptographic hash function. This function can be implemented using SHA-2 or SHA-3.

<sup>1</sup> CBC-MAC is proven to be secure as long as it is *only* evaluated on equal-size messages (or on prefix-free messages) [5], which is the case for SePCAR. For variable length messages, one should resort to *encrypted* CBC-MAC or replace the key for the last block [22].

We will furthermore use the notation  $z \leftarrow \text{query}(x, y)$  to denote the retrieval of the  $x$ th value from the  $y$ th database  $DB$  (to be defined in Sect. 4), and  $z \leftarrow \text{query\_an}(y)$  to denote the retrieval of the  $y$ th value from the PL through an anonymous communication channel such as Tor [43], aiming to anonymously retrieve a published record submitted using the  $\text{publish}(y)$  function.

**Multiparty Computation.** Ben-Or et al. [6] (commonly referred to as BGW) proved that it is possible to calculate any function with perfect security in the presence of active and passive adversaries under the information-theoretic model, as long as there is an honest majority: 1/2 for passive and 2/3 for active adversaries. The former can be achieved by assuming the use of private channels among the servers and the latter using Verifiable Secret Sharing.

Our protocol is *MPC-agnostic*, meaning that it does not depend on the solution that implements the MPC functionality; example protocols that could be executed within our protocol are SPDZ [12] or MASCOT [26]. However, the three-party protocol for Boolean circuits that was introduced by Araki et al. [1, 18] is fairly suited for our current needs, given its performance and threshold properties. Hence, we use this protocol in our simulation. It can perform non-linear operations with relatively high throughput and somewhat low latency (when tested on 10 Gbps connections). The scheme provides threshold security against semi-honest and malicious parties.

**On an Incremental Setup for KSMS.** Our protocol can support an incremental setup and deployment where an ( $l > 2$ )-case of KSMS servers is trivial, e.g., using BGW [6]. The 2-party case setting could also be achieved with MPC protocols such as SPDZ [12], however, the forensic properties of our setup would no longer be attainable.

**Multiparty Computation Functionalities.** SePCAR uses the following cryptographic functionalities for MPC:

- $[x] \leftarrow \text{share}(x)$  is used to secretly share an input. This function can be instantiated using Araki et al.’s sharing functionality.
- $x \leftarrow \text{open}([x])$  reconstructs the private input based on the secret shares.
- $[z] \leftarrow \text{XOR}([x], [y])$  outputs a secret shared bit, representing the XOR of secret shared inputs  $[x]$  and  $[y]$ . Note that for both arithmetic or Boolean circuits, such functionality could be implemented without requiring any communication cost.
- $[z] \leftarrow \text{AND}([x], [y])$  outputs a secret shared bit, representing the AND of two secret shared inputs  $[x]$  and  $[y]$ . This function can be instantiated using Araki et al.’s AND operation.
- $[z] \leftarrow \text{eqz}([x], [y])$  outputs a secret shared bit, corresponding to an equality test of two secret shared inputs  $[x]$  and  $[y]$ . This is equivalent to computing  $[z] \leftarrow [x] \stackrel{?}{=} [y]$  where  $z \in \{0, 1\}$ .

- $[C] \leftarrow E([K], [M])$  secretly computes a symmetric encryption from a secret shared key  $[K]$  and a secret shared message  $[M]$ . We include a succinct review on how to implement AES below.
- $[V] \leftarrow \text{mac}([K], [M])$  secretly computes a MAC from a secret shared key  $[K]$  and a secret shared message  $[M]$ .

**On the Secure Equality Test.** Various protocols have been proposed to implement the equality tests (previously referred to an *eqz* functionality). Common approaches provide either constant rounds or a logarithmic number of them in the bit size of its inputs, which could be proven more efficient for sufficiently small sizes. Furthermore, they also offer different security levels, i.e., perfect or statistical security [10, 29]. In this paper we assume the use of any logarithmic depth construction, which matches the current state of the art.

**On AES over MPC.** AES has been the typical functionality used for benchmarking MPC protocols during the last few years. This fact and its usability for MPC based applications have motivated faster and leaner MPC implementations of the cipher. As it was previously stated, they consider the case where the MPC parties hold a secret shared key  $K$  and a secret shared message  $M$ . The product of the operation is a secret shared AES encrypted ciphertext. Note that in this paper we assume the use of the methods proposed by Damgård and Keller [11] with some minor code optimisations.

## 4 SePCAR

This section provides a detailed description of SePCAR. For simplicity and without loss of generality, we consider a single owner, consumer and a shared car. The description straightforwardly scales to a larger set of owners, consumers, and cars.

SePCAR consists of four steps: *session keys generation and data distribution*, *access token generation*, *access token distribution and verification* and *car access*. We will discuss these steps in detail in the remainder of the section. We first discuss a few *prerequisite* steps which have to be performed. After the discussion of the fourth (and last) step, we complete the section with an overview of the possible operations after SePCAR: *access token update and revocation*.

**Prerequisite.** Before SePCAR can commence, two prerequisite steps need to take place: *car key distribution* and setting the details for the *car booking*.

*Car key distribution* takes place immediately after the  $x$ th owner,  $ID_x^{u_o}$ , has registered her  $y$ th car,  $ID_y^{car_{u_o}}$ , with the KSMS. The KSMS forwards  $ID_y^{car_{u_o}}$  to the CM to request the symmetric key,  $K_y^{car_{u_o}}$ , of the car. The CM retrieves  $K_y^{car_{u_o}}$  from its DB,  $DB^{CM}$  and generates  $\ell$  secret shares of  $K_y^{car_{u_o}}$  and  $ID_y^{car_{u_o}}$ , denoted by  $[K_y^{car_{u_o}}]$  and  $[ID_y^{car_{u_o}}]$ , respectively. Then, it forwards each share to the corresponding KSMS server, i.e.,  $S_i$ . Upon receipt of the shares, each  $S_i$  stores  $ID^{u_o}$  together with the shares,  $[ID_y^{car_{u_o}}]$  and  $[K_y^{car_{u_o}}]$ , in its local DB,  $DB^{S_i}$ .

The representations of the DB of CM and  $S_i$  are shown in Fig. 2. For simplicity, in some parts of SePCAR we will use  $ID^{u_o}$ ,  $ID^{car}$  and  $K^{car}$  instead of  $ID_x^{u_o}$ ,  $ID_y^{car_{u_o}}$  and  $K_y^{car_{u_o}}$ .

$$DB^{CM} = \begin{pmatrix} ID_1^{u_o} & ID_1^{car_{u_o}} & K_1^{car_{u_o}} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ ID_x^{u_o} & ID_y^{car_{u_o}} & K_y^{car_{u_o}} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ ID_m^{u_o} & ID_n^{car_{u_o}} & K_n^{car_{u_o}} \end{pmatrix} \quad DB^{S_i} = \begin{pmatrix} ID_1^{u_o} & [ID_1^{car_{u_o}}] & [K_1^{car_{u_o}}] \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ ID_x^{u_o} & [ID_y^{car_{u_o}}] & [K_y^{car_{u_o}}] \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ ID_m^{u_o} & [ID_n^{car_{u_o}}] & [K_n^{car_{u_o}}] \end{pmatrix}$$

Fig. 2. The DB of CM (left) and the DB of the  $i$ th server  $S_i$  (right).

*Car booking* allows  $u_o$  and  $u_c$  to agree on the booking details, i.e.,  $M^B = \{\text{hash}(Cert^{u_c}), ID^{car}, L^{car}, CD^{u_c}, AC^{u_c}, ID^B\}$ , where  $\text{hash}(Cert^{u_c})$  is the hash of the digital certificate of  $u_c$ ,  $L^{car}$  is the pick-up location of the car,  $CD^{u_c}$  is the set of conditions under which  $u_c$  is allowed to use the car (e.g., restrictions on locations, time period),  $AC^{u_c}$  are the access control rights under which  $u_c$  is allowed to access the car and  $ID^B$  is the booking identifier. Recall that it is assumed that an owner and a consumer agree on the booking details beforehand.

**Step 1: Session Keys Generation and Data Distribution.**  $u_c$  generates two symmetric session keys,  $K_1^{u_c}$  and  $K_2^{u_c}$ . Key  $K_1^{u_c}$  will be used by each  $S_i$  to encrypt the access token, such that only  $u_c$  has access to it.  $K_2^{u_c}$  will be used to generate an authentication tag which will allow  $u_c$  to verify that the access token contains  $M^B$  which was agreed upon during the *car booking*. In addition,  $u_o$  sends the necessary data to each  $S_i$ , such that the access token can be generated. In detail, as shown in Fig. 3,  $u_o$  sends a session-keys-generation request,  $SES\_K\_GEN\_REQ$ , along with  $ID^B$  to  $u_c$ . Upon receipt of the request,  $u_c$  generates  $K_1^{u_c}$  and  $K_2^{u_c}$  using the  $\text{prf}()$  function instantiated by  $u_c$ 's master key, i.e.,  $K^{u_c}$  and  $counter$  and  $counter + 1$ . Then,  $u_c$  transforms these into  $\ell$




Fig. 3. Step 1: session keys generation and data distribution.



secret shares,  $[K_1^{u_c}]$  and  $[K_2^{u_c}]$ , one for each  $S_i$  in such a way that none of the servers will have access to the keys but that they can jointly evaluate functions using these keys securely. Then, it encrypts  $[K_1^{u_c}]$  and  $[K_2^{u_c}]$  with the public-key of each  $S_i$ ,  $C^{S_i} = \text{enc}(Pk^{S_i}, \{[K_1^{u_c}], [K_2^{u_c}]\})$ , such that only the corresponding  $S_i$  can access the corresponding shares. Finally,  $u_c$  forwards to  $u_o$  an acknowledgment message,  $SES\_K\_GEN\_ACK$ , along with  $ID^B$  and  $\{C^{S_1}, \dots, C^{S_l}\}$ .

While waiting for the response of  $u_c$ , the owner  $u_o$  signs  $M^B$  with her private key, i.e.,  $\sigma^{u_o} = \text{sign}(Sk^{u_o}, M^B)$ . In a later stage, the car will use  $\sigma^{u_o}$  to verify that  $M^B$  has been approved by  $u_o$ . Then  $u_o$  transforms  $M^{u_c} = \{M^B, \sigma^{u_o}\}$  into  $\ell$  secret shares, i.e.,  $[M^{u_c}]$ . Upon receipt of the response of  $u_c$ ,  $u_o$  forwards to each  $S_i$  an access-token-generation request,  $AT\_GEN\_REQ$ , along with  $ID^{u_o}$ , the corresponding  $C^{S_i}$  and  $[M^{u_c}]$ .

**Step 2: Access Token Generation.** The servers generate an access token and publish it on the PL. In detail, as shown in Fig. 4, upon receipt of  $AT\_GEN\_REQ$  from  $u_o$ , each  $S_i$  uses the  $ID^{u_o}$  to extract  $[K^{car}]$  from  $DB^{S_i}$  as follows. Initially, each  $S_i$  uses  $ID^{u_o}$  to retrieve the list of identities of all cars and car key shares related to the set of records that correspond to  $u_o$ . The result is stored in a vector  $\vec{D}^{u_o}$  of size  $n \times 3$ , i.e.,

$$\vec{D}^{u_o} = \begin{pmatrix} ID^{u_o} & [ID_1^{car_{u_o}}] & [K_1^{car}] \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ ID^{u_o} & [ID_y^{car_{u_o}}] & [K_y^{car}] \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ ID^{u_o} & [ID_n^{car_{u_o}}] & [K_n^{car}] \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $n$  is the number of cars which  $u_o$  has registered with the KSS.




Fig. 4. Step 2: access token generation.

To retrieve the record for the car to be shared, each  $S_i$  extracts  $[ID^{car}]$  from  $[M^{u_c}]$  and performs a comparison with each of the  $n$  records of  $\vec{D}^{u_o}$  using the  $\text{eqz}()$  function. The comparison outcomes 0 for mismatch and 1 for identifying the car at position  $y$ . The result of each iteration is stored in a vector  $\vec{D}^{car}$  of length  $n$ , i.e.,

$$\vec{D}^{car} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ [0] \dots [0] [1] [0] \dots [0] \end{pmatrix}.$$


Each  $S_i$  then multiplies  $\vec{D}^{car}$  and  $\vec{D}^{u_o}$  to generate a third vector of length 3, i.e.,

$$\vec{D}^{car} \times \vec{D}^{u_o} = \left( ID^{u_o} [ID_y^{car_{u_o}}] [K_y^{car_{u_o}}] \right),$$

from which the share of the car's secret key,  $[K^{car}]$ , can be retrieved. Then, the KSMS servers  $S_i$  collaboratively encrypt  $[M^{u_c}]$  using the retrieved  $[K^{car}]$  to generate an access token for the car in shared form,  $[AT^{car}]$ .

As  $AT^{car}$  and  $ID^{car}$  need to be available only to  $u_c$ , a second layer of encryption is performed using  $K_1^{u_c}$ . To retrieve the shares of the session keys,  $\{[K_1^{u_c}], [K_2^{u_c}]\}$ , each  $S_i$  decrypts  $C^{S_i}$  using its private key. Then, the servers encrypt  $[AT^{car}]$  and  $[ID^{car}]$  with  $[K_1^{u_c}]$  to generate  $[C^{u_c}]$ . In addition, they generate an authentication tag,  $[C^B]$ , using the  $\text{mac}()$  function with  $[K_2^{u_c}]$  and  $[M^B]$  as inputs. Finally, each  $S_i$  sends to PL an access-token-publication request,  $AT\_PUB\_REQ$ , along with  $[C^B]$  and  $[C^{u_c}]$ .


**Step 3: Access Token Distribution and Verification.** The PL publishes the shares of the encrypted access token which are then retrieved by  $u_c$ . Once retrieved,  $u_c$  can obtain the access token and use it to access the car. In detail, as shown in Fig. 5, upon receipt of  $AT\_PUB\_REQ$ , PL publishes  $[C^B]$ ,  $[C^{u_c}]$  and  $TS_i^{Pub}$ , which is the time-stamp of the publication of the encrypted token. Then PL sends an acknowledgement of the publication,  $AT\_PUB\_ACK$ , along with  $TS_i^{Pub}$  to at least one  $S_i$  which forwards it to  $u_o$  who, in turn, forwards it to  $u_c$ .



**Fig. 5.** Step 3: access token distribution and verification.

Upon receipt of  $AT\_PUB\_ACK$ ,  $u_c$  uses  $TS_i^{Pub}$  and the  $\text{query\_an}()$  function to anonymously retrieve  $[C^{u_c}]$  and  $[C^B]$  from PL, such that PL cannot identify  $u_c$ . Then,  $u_c$  uses the  $\text{open}()$  function to reconstruct  $C^B$  and  $C^{u_c}$  using the retrieved shares. Next,  $u_c$  verifies the authentication tag  $C^B$  locally using the  $\text{mac}()$  function with  $K_2^{u_c}$  and  $M^B$  as inputs. In the case of successful verification,  $u_c$  is assured that the token contains the same details as the ones agreed during *car booking*. Then,  $u_c$  decrypts  $C^{u_c}$  using  $K_1^{u_c}$  to obtain the access token and the car identity,  $\{AT^{car}, ID^{car}\}$ .

**Step 4: Car Access.** The consumer uses the access token to obtain access to the car. In detail,  $u_c$  sends  $\{AT^{car}, ID^{car}, Cert^{u_c}\}$  to the car using a secure and close range communication channel such as NFC or Bluetooth (see Fig. 6). Upon receipt, the car's OBU obtains  $M^{u_c} = \{M^B, \sigma^{u_o}\}$  by decrypting  $AT^{car}$  with  $K^{car}$ . It then performs three verifications. It checks if the access attempt satisfies the conditions specified in  $M^B$ . Then, it verifies  $\sigma^{u_o}$  to be assured that the booking details,  $M^B$ , have not been modified and have been indeed approved by the car owner. Finally, it verifies the identity of  $u_c$ . For the last verification, as the OBU receives  $Cert^{u_c}$  (along with the  $\text{hash}(Cert^{u_c})$  in  $M^B$ ), it can use any challenge-response protocol based on public/private key [14] and RFIDs [15]. If any of these verifications fails, the OBU terminates the car access process and denies access to the car. Otherwise, it grants  $u_c$  access to the car, signs  $\{M^B, TS_{Access}^{car}\}$ , where  $TS_{Access}^{car}$  is the time-stamp of granting the access and asynchronously sends  $\text{msg}\{\sigma_{Access}^{car}, TS_{Access}^{car}\}$  to  $u_o$ .



**Fig. 6.** Step 4: car access. Dashed lines represent close range communication.

**Access Token Update and Revocation.** Upon an agreement between  $u_o$  and  $u_c$  to update or revoke an access token, SePCAR can be performed as described in steps 1–3. The values of an update request can be changed according to new booking details,  $\hat{M}^B$ , whereas for revocation, each of the parameters in  $\hat{M}^B$  can receive a predefined value indicating the revocation action. However, there are occasions when  $u_o$  may need to enforce an update or revocation of an access token. To prevent  $u_c$  from blocking such operations, SePCAR should be executed only by  $u_o$ , without the involvement of  $u_c$ . More specifically,  $u_o$  generates session keys, requests an access token, queries the PL, and sends the token to the car using long range asynchronous communication channel such as LTE.

## 5 Security and Privacy Analysis

We prove that SePCAR satisfies the security and privacy requirements of Sect. 2, provided that its underlying cryptographic primitives are sufficiently secure. The theorem statement and the proof given below are informal; a formal description of the security models and the proof is given in the full version of the paper.

**Theorem 1.** *If communication takes place over private channels, the MPC is statistically secure,*

- the signature scheme **sign** is multi-key existentially unforgeable [20],
- the pseudo-random function **prf** is multi-key secure [19],
- the public-key encryption scheme **enc** is multi-key semantically secure [3],
- the symmetric key encryption scheme **E** is multi-key chosen-plaintext secure [4],
- the MAC function **mac** is multi-key existentially unforgeable [20], and
- the hash function **hash** is collision resistant [38],

then SePCAR fulfils the security and privacy requirements of Sect. 2.

Note that, indeed, for each of the keyed cryptographic primitives we require security in the *multi-key* setting, as these are evaluated under different keys. For example, **sign** is used by all owners, each with a different key; **enc** is used for different keys, each for a different party in the KSMS, and **E** and **mac** are used for independent keys for every fresh evaluation of the protocol. We refer to Bellare et al. [3] for a discussion on generalizing semantic security of public-key encryption to multi-key security; the adaptation straightforwardly generalizes to the other security models.

*Proof (sketch).* We treat the security and privacy requirements, and discuss how these are achieved from the cryptographic primitives, separately. We recall that consumer and owner have agreed upon the booking details prior to the evaluation of SePCAR, hence they know each other.

**SR1 - Confidentiality of  $M^B$ .** In one evaluation of the protocol,  $u_c$ ,  $u_o$ , and the shared car learn the booking details by default or design. The KSMS servers only learn shares of the booking data, and under the assumption that the MPC is statistically secure, nothing about the booking data is revealed during the MPC. The outcomes of the MPC are  $C^B$  and  $C^{u_c}$  satisfying

$$C^B = \text{mac}(K_2^{u_c}, M^B), \quad (1)$$

$$C^{u_c} = \text{E}(K_1^{u_c}, \{\text{E}(K_y^{car_{u_o}}, \{M^B, \sigma^{u_o}\}), ID^{car}\}), \quad (2)$$

both of which reveal nothing about  $M^B$  to a malicious outsider due to the assumed security of **mac**, **E**, and the independent uniform drawing of the keys  $K_1^{u_c}$  and  $K_2^{u_c}$ . The nested encryption **E** does not influence the analysis due to the mutual independence of the keys  $K_1^{u_c}$  and  $K_y^{car_{u_o}}$ .

**SR2 - Authenticity of  $M^B$ .** An owner who initiates the access token generation and distribution, first signs the booking details using its private key before sending those to the KSMS in shares. Therefore, once the car receives the token and obtains the booking details, it can verify the owner's signature on the booking details. In other words, the car can verify the source of the booking details, the owner and their integrity. Suppose, to the contrary, that a malicious consumer can get access to a car of an owner  $u_o$ . This particularly means that it created a tuple  $(M^B, \sigma^{u_o})$  such that  $\text{verify}(Pk^{u_o}, M^B, \sigma^{u_o})$  holds. If  $\sigma^{u_o}$  is new,

this means that  $u_c$  forges a signature for the secret signing key  $Sk^{u_o}$ . This is impossible by assumption that the signature scheme is existentially unforgeable. On the other hand, if  $(M^B, \sigma^{u_o})$  is old but the evaluation is fresh, this means a collision  $\text{hash}(Cert^{u_c}) = \text{hash}(Cert^{u_c'})$ , which is computationally infeasible as  $\text{hash}$  is collision resistant.

**SR3 - Confidentiality of  $AT^{car}$ .** The access token is generated by the KSMS servers obviously (as the MPC is statistically secure), and only revealed to the public in encrypted form, through  $C^{u_c}$  of (2). Due to the uniform drawing of the key  $K_1^{u_c}$  (and the security of the public-key encryption scheme used to transmit this key), only the legitimate user can decrypt and learn the access token. It shares it with the car over a secure and private channel.

**SR4 - Confidentiality of  $K^{car}$ .** Only the car manufacturer and the car itself hold copies of the car key. The KSMS servers learn these in shared form, hence learn nothing about it by virtue of the statistical security of the MPC. Retrieving a car key from encryptions made under this key constitutes a key recovery attack, which in turn allows to break the chosen-plaintext security of the symmetric key encryption scheme.

**SR5 - Backward and forward secrecy of  $AT^{car}$ .** The access token is published on the public ledger as  $C^{u_c}$  of (2), encrypted under symmetric key  $K_1^{u_c}$ . Every honest consumer generates a fresh key  $K_1^{u_c}$  for every new evaluation, using a pseudo-random function  $\text{prf}$  that is secure, i.e., that is indistinguishable from a random function. This implies that all session keys are drawn independently and uniformly at random. In addition, the symmetric encryption scheme  $E$  is multi-key secure. Concluding, all encryptions  $C^{u_c}$  are independent and reveal nothing of each other. (Note that nothing can be said about access tokens for malicious users who may deviate from the protocol and reuse one-time keys.)

**SR6 - Non-repudiation of origin of  $AT^{car}$ .** The car, who is a trusted identity, verifies the origin through verification of the signature,  $\text{verify}(Pk^{u_o}, M^B, \sigma^{u_o})$ . The consumer  $u_c$  verifies the origin through the verification of the MAC algorithm,  $C^B \stackrel{?}{=} \text{mac}(K_2^{u_c}, M^B)$ . Note that the consumer does not effectively verify  $AT^{car}$ , but rather  $C^B$ , which suffices under the assumption that the MPC servers evaluate their protocol correctly. In either case, security fails only if the asymmetric signature scheme or the MAC function are forgeable.

**SR7 - Non-repudiation of delivery of  $AT^{car}$ .** The owner can verify correct delivery through the verification of the message sent by the car to the owner,  $\text{verify}(Pk^{car}, \{M^B, TS_{Access}^{car}\}, \sigma_{Access}^{car})$  at the end of the protocol. Security breaks only if the signature scheme is forgeable.

**PR1 - Unlinkability of  $u_c$  and the car.** The only consumer-identifiable data is in the consumer's certificate included in the booking details. Note that these are agreed upon between the consumer and the owner, so the owner learns the identity of the consumer by default. Beyond that, the consumer only communicates with the car, which is supposed to learn the consumer's identity so that it can perform proper access control. The consumer consults the public ledger over an anonymous channel. The booking details are transferred to and from the

KSMS, but these are encrypted and do not leak by virtue of their confidentiality (security requirement SR1).

**PR2 - Anonymity of  $u_c$  and the car.** The reasoning is identical to that of PR1.

**PR3 - Undetectability of  $AT^{car}$  operation.** Access token generation, update, or revocation is performed using the same steps and the same type of messages sent to the KSMS and PL. Hence, outsiders and system entities cannot distinguish which operation has been requested.

**PR4 - Forensic evidence provision.** In the case of disputes, the information related to a specific transaction (and only this information) may need to be reconstructed. This reconstruction can be done only if the KSMS servers collude and reveal their shares. In our setting, these servers have competing interests, thus they would not collude unless law authorities enforce them to do so. Due to the properties of threshold secret sharing, the private inputs can be reconstructed by a majority coalition. This is, if the KSMS consists of three parties, it suffices two of such parties to reconstruct the secrets (for semi-honest and malicious cases).

**FR1 - Offline authentication.** Note that steps 1–3 of the protocol require a network connection, but step 4, car access, is performed using close range communication and with no need of a network connection. The decryption and verification of the access token can be performed by the car offline (it has its key  $K^{car}$  and the owner's public-key  $Pk^{u_o}$  stored). Sending the confirmation signature  $\sigma_{Access}^{car}$  can also be done offline.  $\square$

## 6 Performance Evaluation

Below we analyse the theoretical complexity and efficiency of SePCAR.

**Theoretical Complexity.** The complexity of MPC protocols is typically measured by the number of communication rounds produced by non-linear operations, as linear operations can usually be performed without any information exchange and are virtually free of charge. In one evaluation of SePCAR, the non-linear operations performed by the KSMS servers are (i) the retrieval of the car key through multiple calls of the `eqz` functionality using the  $ID^{car}$  and their counterparts in  $\vec{D}^{car}$  as parameters, and (ii) have two evaluations of the encryption scheme `E` and one evaluation of `mac`.

For (i) the evaluations of the `eqz` functionality, we consider a multiplicative depth of  $\lceil \log(|ID^{car}|) \rceil + 1$ , where  $|ID^{car}|$  is the amount of bits in  $ID^{car}$ . Note that we can parallelize the `eqz` call for all  $\vec{D}^{car}$  entries. Therefore, the bulk of the overhead of extracting the car key comes from implementing the equality test in logarithmic depth [29]. Besides executing the `eqz` tests, we also have to perform an extra communication round since we need to multiply the result of each equality test with its corresponding car key. The total number of communication rounds for (i) is thus  $\lceil \log(|ID^{car}|) \rceil + 1$ .

For (ii) the two evaluations of the encryption scheme  $E$  and the single evaluation of  $\text{mac}$  we use, as mentioned in Sect. 3, CTR mode with AES and CBC-MAC with AES, respectively. Note that in a single AES evaluation the number of non-linear operations equals the number of S-Boxes evaluated in these functions, but many can be parallelized. Denote by  $\nu$  the number of communication rounds needed to encrypt a single 128-bit block using AES. The two evaluations of CTR mode can be performed in parallel, and cost  $2 \cdot \nu$  rounds. The evaluation of CBC-MAC is inherently sequential and costs  $\left\lceil \frac{|M^B|}{128} \right\rceil \cdot \nu$  communication rounds. The total number of communication rounds can thus be expressed as:

$$\left( \lceil \log(|ID^{car}|) \rceil + 1 \right) + 2 \cdot \nu + \left\lceil \frac{|M^B|}{128} \right\rceil \cdot \nu. \quad (3)$$

**Efficiency.** Our protocol is agnostic towards the underlying multiparty protocol. In our experiments we have incorporated the 3-party semi-honest protocol by Araki et al. [1], given its relative efficiency of AES calls compared to alternatives such as, [12, 26]. The upshot of our experiments is that SePCAR needs only 1.55 s for a car access provision. We elaborate on our simulation below, following the steps of Sect. 4. An allocation of the time on the different steps is provided in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Performance of SePCAR, where time is averaged over 1000 runs.

Phase	Description	Time (in sec)
Step 1	Sharing the booking details and keys	$0.220 \pm 0.027$
Step 2	Extracting car key and making access token	$1.274 \pm 0.032$
Step 3	Verifying the access token	$0.055 (+1 \text{ Tor } [42])$
Total		$1.551 \pm 0.043 (+1 \text{ Tor})$

**Step 1.** Recall that step 1 handles the preparation and sharing of the booking details and generation of keys. For  $\text{enc}$  we use RSA with 2048-bit keys ( $\approx 2$  ms) and for  $\text{sign}$  we use RSA with SHA-2 with a 512-bit output ( $\approx 50$  ms). The  $\text{prf}$  is implemented using AES in CTR mode ( $\approx 2 \mu\text{s}$ ). For all these functions we use OpenSSL [33]. The  $\text{share}$  function is implemented by the sharing primitive introduced by Araki et al. [1].

**Step 2.** In this step, the KSMS servers retrieve the car key and perform the corresponding encryption and other subroutines linked to generating the MAC. We consider the following message configuration size:  $\text{hash}(\text{Cert}^{u_c})$  of 512-bits,  $ID^{car}$  of 32-bits,  $L^{car}$  of 64-bits,  $CD^{u_c}$  of 96-bits,  $AC^{u_c}$  of 8-bits,  $ID^B$  of 32-bits and  $\sigma^{u_o}$  of 512-bits. The booking details  $M^B$  are of size 768-bits (including padding) and the final access token  $AT^{u_c}$  is of size 1408-bits (including padding). For the  $\text{dec}$  function we use RSA with 2048-bit keys ( $\approx 2$  ms). The symmetric

encryption  $E$  is implemented in CTR mode and the  $\text{mac}$  in CBC mode. As mentioned before, the functions  $E$ ,  $\text{mac}$ , and  $\text{eqz}$  use the primitives proposed by Araki et al. [1], and we use the multiparty AES method of Damgård and Keller [11]. Using this method, a single S-Box evaluation takes 5 communication rounds. A single evaluation of AES consists of 20 sequential evaluations of an S-Box, where we included the key expansion and took into account that parallelizable S-Boxes do not add up to the number of communication rounds, hence encryption requires  $\nu = 100$  communication rounds. From (3) we obtain that in our simulation the total number of communication rounds is

$$(5 + 1) + 2 \cdot 100 + 6 \cdot 100 = 806.$$

Key expansion for different keys needs to be performed only once, and for multiple evaluations of SePCAR for the same car the round complexity reduces.

**Step 3.** In this step the consumer retrieves, reconstructs, and verifies the assigned access token. The PL is implemented using SQLite. The implementation of  $\text{open}$  again follows the primitive of Araki et al. [1], and  $\text{mac}$  is implemented using AES in CBC mode ( $\approx 13$  ms).

**Step 4.** The final step consists of a challenge-response protocol between  $u_c$  and the car, but it does not directly affect the performance of SePCAR and we omit it from our implementation.

**Environment Settings.** We implemented our simulation for SePCAR in C++ and evaluated it using a machine equipped with an Intel *i7*, 2.6 Ghz CPU and 8 GB of RAM.<sup>2</sup> The communication within the KSMS was simulated using socket calls and latency parameters. We used the setting from Araki et al. [1] to simulate the LAN latency ( $\approx 0.13$  ms) and from Ramamurthy et al. [35] for Wi-Fi ( $\approx 0.50$  ms). We did not assume any specific network configuration for our experimentation.

## 7 Conclusion

SePCAR is proven to be secure and privacy-enhancing, efficiently performing in  $\approx 1.55$  s for a car access provision. We presented a formal analysis of the security and privacy requirements of our protocol and we designed a prototype as proof-of-concept. SePCAR provides a complementary solution to physical keys, aiming for those that hold portable devices and want a dynamic and efficient way to access to a car. As future work, we plan to extend SePCAR to support additional operations such as booking and payment. It would also be interesting to investigate potential modifications of the protocol, in order to provide security and privacy guarantees while KSMS, CM, and PL are active adversaries.

**Acknowledgments.** This work was supported in part by the Research Council KU Leuven: C16/15/058 and GOA TENSE (GOA/11/007). Bart Mennink is supported by a postdoctoral fellowship from the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO) under Veni grant 016.Veni.173.017.

<sup>2</sup> The implementation can be obtained from <https://bitbucket.org/Siemen11/sepcar>.



## References

1. Araki, T., Furukawa, J., Lindell, Y., Nof, A., Ohara, K.: High-throughput semi-honest secure three-party computation with an honest majority. In: Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC CCS, pp. 805–817 (2016)
2. Balasch, J., Rial, A., Troncoso, C., Preneel, B., Verbaauwhede, I., Geuens, C.: PrETP: privacy-preserving electronic toll pricing. In: USENIX, pp. 63–78 (2010)
3. Bellare, M., Boldyreva, A., Micali, S.: Public-key encryption in a multi-user setting: security proofs and improvements. In: Preneel, B. (ed.) EUROCRYPT 2000. LNCS, vol. 1807, pp. 259–274. Springer, Heidelberg (2000). doi:[10.1007/3-540-45539-6\\_18](https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-45539-6_18)
4. Bellare, M., Desai, A., Jokipii, E., Rogaway, P.: A concrete security treatment of symmetric encryption. In: FOCS, pp. 394–403 (1997)
5. Bellare, M., Kilian, J., Rogaway, P.: The security of the cipher block chaining message authentication code. J. Comput. Syst. Sci. **61**(3), 362–399 (2000). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jcss.1999.1694>
6. Ben-Or, M., Goldwasser, S., Wigderson, A.: Completeness theorems for non-cryptographic fault-tolerant distributed computation. In: STOC, pp. 1–10. ACM (1988)
7. Bert, J., Collie, B., Gerrits, M., Xu, G.: What’s ahead for car sharing?: the new mobility and its impact on vehicle sales. <https://goo.gl/ZmPZ5t>. Accessed June 2017
8. BMW: DriveNow Car Sharing. <https://drive-now.com/>. Accessed Nov 2016
9. Council of the EU Final Compromised Resolution: General Data Protection Regulation. <http://www.europarl.europa.eu>. Accessed Feb 2015
10. Damgård, I., Fitzi, M., Kiltz, E., Nielsen, J.B., Toft, T.: Unconditionally secure constant-rounds multi-party computation for equality, comparison, bits and exponentiation. In: Halevi, S., Rabin, T. (eds.) TCC 2006. LNCS, vol. 3876, pp. 285–304. Springer, Heidelberg (2006). doi:[10.1007/11681878\\_15](https://doi.org/10.1007/11681878_15)
11. Damgård, I., Keller, M.: Secure multiparty AES. In: Sion, R. (ed.) FC 2010. LNCS, vol. 6052, pp. 367–374. Springer, Heidelberg (2010). doi:[10.1007/978-3-642-14577-3\\_31](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-14577-3_31)
12. Damgård, I., Pastro, V., Smart, N., Zakarias, S.: Multiparty computation from somewhat homomorphic encryption. In: Safavi-Naini, R., Canetti, R. (eds.) CRYPTO 2012. LNCS, vol. 7417, pp. 643–662. Springer, Heidelberg (2012). doi:[10.1007/978-3-642-32009-5\\_38](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-32009-5_38)
13. Fireball, D.: Regarding Uber’s New ‘Always’ Location Tracking. <https://goo.gl/L1Elve>. Accessed Apr 2017
14. Diffie, W., van Oorschot, P.C., Wiener, M.J.: Authentication and authenticated key exchanges. Des. Codes Crypt. **2**(2), 107–125 (1992). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00124891>
15. Dmitrienko, A., Plappert, C.: Secure free-floating car sharing for offline cars. In: ACM CODASPY, pp. 349–360 (2017)
16. Enev, M., Takakuwa, A., Koscher, K., Kohno, T.: Automobile driver fingerprinting. PoPETs **2016**(1), 34–50 (2016)
17. EVITA: E-safety Vehicle Intrusion Protected Applications (EVITA). <http://www.evita-project.org/>. Accessed Nov 2016
18. Furukawa, J., Lindell, Y., Nof, A., Weinstein, O.: High-throughput secure three-party computation for malicious adversaries and an honest majority. In: Coron, J.-S., Nielsen, J.B. (eds.) EUROCRYPT 2017. LNCS, vol. 10211, pp. 225–255. Springer, Cham (2017). doi:[10.1007/978-3-319-56614-6\\_8](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-56614-6_8)

19. Goldreich, O., Goldwasser, S., Micali, S.: How to construct random functions. *J. ACM* **33**(4), 792–807 (1986)
20. Goldwasser, S., Micali, S., Rivest, R.L.: A digital signature scheme secure against adaptive chosen-message attacks. *SIAM J. Comput.* **17**(2), 281–308 (1988)
21. GOV.UK: reducing mobile phone theft and improving security. <https://goo.gl/o2v99g>. Accessed Apr 2017
22. International Organization for Standardization: ISO/IEC 9797-1:2011. <https://www.iso.org/standard/50375.html>. Accessed June 2017
23. Internet Engineering Task Force: PKCS #1: RSA Cryptography Specifications Version 2.0. <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc2437>. Accessed June 2017
24. Internet Engineering Task Force: Use of the RSA-KEM Key Transport Algorithm in the Cryptographic Message Syntax (CMS). <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc5990>. Accessed June 2017
25. INVERS: Make Mobility Shareable. <https://invers.com/>. Accessed Apr 2017
26. Keller, M., Orsini, E., Scholl, P.: MASCOT: faster malicious arithmetic secure computation with oblivious transfer. In: *ACM SIGSAC*, pp. 830–842 (2016)
27. Kerschbaum, F., Lim, H.W.: Privacy-preserving observation in public spaces. In: Pernul, G., Ryan, P.Y.A., Weippl, E. (eds.) *ESORICS 2015*. LNCS, vol. 9327, pp. 81–100. Springer, Cham (2015). doi:[10.1007/978-3-319-24177-7\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-24177-7_5)
28. Khodaei, M., Jin, H., Papadimitratos, P.: Towards deploying a scalable & robust vehicular identity and credential management infrastructure. *CoRR* (2016)
29. Lipmaa, H., Toft, T.: Secure equality and greater-than tests with sublinear online complexity. In: Fomin, F.V., Freivalds, R., Kwiatkowska, M., Peleg, D. (eds.) *ICALP 2013*. LNCS, vol. 7966, pp. 645–656. Springer, Heidelberg (2013). doi:[10.1007/978-3-642-39212-2\\_56](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-39212-2_56)
30. Micali, S.: Algorand: the efficient and democratic ledger (2016). [arXiv:1607.01341](https://arxiv.org/abs/1607.01341)
31. Mustafa, M.A., Zhang, N., Kalogridis, G., Fan, Z.: Roaming electric vehicle charging and billing: An anonymous multi-user protocol. In: *IEEE SmartGridComm*, pp. 939–945 (2014)
32. Naphade, M.R., Banavar, G., Harrison, C., Paraszczak, J., Morris, R.: Smarter cities and their innovation challenges. *IEEE Comput.* **44**(6), 32–39 (2011)
33. OpenSSL: Cryptography and SSL/TLS Toolkit. <https://www.openssl.org/>. Accessed Apr 2017
34. PRESERVE: Preparing Secure Vehicle-to-X Communication Systems (PRESERVE). <https://www.preserve-project.eu/>. Accessed Nov 2016
35. Ramamurthy, H., Prabhu, B., Gadh, R., Madni, A.M.: Wireless industrial monitoring and control using a smart sensor platform. *IEEE Sens. J.* **7**(5), 611–618 (2007)
36. Raya, M., Papadimitratos, P., Hubaux, J.: Securing vehicular communications. *IEEE Wirel. Commun.* **13**(5), 8–15 (2006)
37. reddit: identifying Muslim cabbies from trip data and prayer times. <https://goo.gl/vLrW1s>. Accessed Apr 2017
38. Rogaway, P., Shrimpton, T.: Cryptographic hash-function basics: definitions, implications, and separations for preimage resistance, second-preimage resistance, and collision resistance. In: Roy, B., Meier, W. (eds.) *FSE 2004*. LNCS, vol. 3017, pp. 371–388. Springer, Heidelberg (2004). doi:[10.1007/978-3-540-25937-4\\_24](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-25937-4_24)
39. Shaheen, S.A., Cohen, A.P.: Car sharing and personal vehicle services: worldwide market developments and emerging trends. *Int. J. Sustain. Transp.* **7**(1), 5–34 (2013)
40. Symeonidis, I., Mustafa, M.A., Preneel, B.: Keyless car sharing system: a security and privacy analysis. In: *IEEE ISC2*, pp. 1–7 (2016)

41. Guardian, T.: Hell of a ride: even a PR powerhouse couldn't get Uber on track. <https://goo.gl/UclihE>. Accessed Apr 2017
42. Tor: METRICS. <https://metrics.torproject.org/torperf.html>. Accessed Apr 2017
43. Tor Project: protect your privacy. Defend yourself against network surveillance and traffic analysis. <https://www.torproject.org/>. Accessed Apr 2017
44. Troncoso, C., Danezis, G., Kosta, E., Balasch, J., Preneel, B.: PriPAYD: privacy-friendly pay-as-you-drive insurance. *IEEE TDSC* **8**(5), 742–755 (2011)
45. Trusted Computing Group: TPM 2.0 Library Profile for Automotive-Thin. <https://goo.gl/fy3DxD>. Accessed June 2016
46. United States Patent, Trademark Office. Applicant: Apple Inc.: accessing a vehicle using portable devices. <https://goo.gl/a9pyX7>. Accessed June 2017
47. USA TODAY: Toyota will test keyless car sharing. <https://goo.gl/C9iq34>. Accessed Nov 2016
48. Volvo: Worth a Detour. <https://www.sunfleet.com/>. Accessed Nov 2016
49. Wielinski, G., Trépanier, M., Morency, C.: Electric and hybrid car use in a free-floating carsharing system. *Int. J. Sustain. Transp.* **11**(3), 161–169 (2017)