

Recent Trends on Privacy-Preserving Technologies under Standardization at the IETF

Pratyush Dikshit¹, Jayasree Sengupta¹, and Vaibhav Bajpai¹

¹CISPA Helmholtz Center for Information Security

Abstract—End-users are concerned about protecting the privacy of their personal data generated while working on information systems. This extends to both the data they actively provide including personal identification in exchange for products and services as well as its related metadata such as unnecessary access to location. This is where Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) plays a major role by incorporating privacy on the evolving new technologies at the fundamental level. Thus, this paper offers an overview of the privacy-preserving mechanisms under standardization at the IETF including DNS-over-TLS (DoT), DNS-over-HTTP (DoH) and DNS-over-QUIC (DoQ) classified as DNS encryption. The paper also discusses Privacy Pass Protocol and its application in generating Private Access Tokens and Passkeys to replace passwords for authentication at the end-user's devices. To further protect the user privacy at the IP level, Private Relays and MASQUE are discussed. This aims to make designers, implementers and users of the Internet aware about the privacy-related design choices.

Index Terms—DNS Privacy, Privacy Pass Protocol, Private Access Token, Passkeys, Private Relay, MASQUE.

I. INTRODUCTION

The ever increasing privacy risks accompanied by the growing concern amongst the users, led the Internet Technical Community to focus on user needs as stated in RFC 0001. Later, as IETF was established, it published a mission over RFC 3935 focusing on better human society through the influence of Internet in communication, economics, and education. As highlighted in RFC 8890, IETF is engaged in prioritizing the end-users by expanding the engagement of Internet community, creating user focused systems and identifying and analyzing negative impact on end-users, etc. In order to retain its mission, IETF has undergone various technological advancements over the years to prevent unnecessary leakage of the user's private information.

Privacy is the right of a person to manage the distribution of his/her personal information. Often




Fig. 1: *Privacy-Preserving Protocols. Encrypted DNS for DNS Privacy, Private Access Token and Passkeys for End-User Privacy on mobile devices, Private Relays using proxies for Web Privacy*

such sensitive information maybe prone to intrusion. For example, traffic analysis, (e.g., correlation or measuring packet sizes), subverting the cryptographic keys used to secure protocols and presence of active or passive wiretaps can lead to intrusion gathering at a large scale in the device/network. These gatherings develop the trait to do widespread surveillance which is called Pervasive Monitoring (PM) and is declared as an attack in RFC 7258. With the surging rate at which data is being collected and digitally stored, it can lead to three major privacy concerns: Privacy issues in DNS queries, End-user privacy risks on personal devices and privacy concern while communicating with the server through the Web. Thus, this paper focuses on discussing the privacy attack on the client's device as well as during communication between client and the server. It further explains the mechanisms to

mitigate PM attacks in recent times.

Let us consider the Web infrastructure as shown in Fig. 1 where the user sends a DNS resolution request to the DNS server in plain-text [1]. Intruder (e.g. Internet Service Provider (ISP)) can view such requests and details of the requester which raises the concern of DNS Privacy. Encrypted DNS [2] using TLS [3], HTTP[4] and QUIC protocols described in RFC 9000 [2][5] act as a solution in this case. After fetching the IP address of the Web server from the DNS resolver, the user tries to communicate with the website through a browser. The website asks the user to authenticate itself using a Completely Automated Public Turing Test to Tell Computers and Humans Apart (CAPTCHA) challenge. The user also has to type-in the password onto the browser which goes to the server in obfuscated form. Despite being obfuscated, the password still needs to be secured as it can lead to privacy leakage. Such privacy issues can be resolved by replacing the CAPTCHA with a Token using Privacy Pass Protocol (Privacy Pass WG of IETF as in Table I) where the token is called Private Access Token. The replacement of passwords denoted as Passkeys [6] were first developed and implemented by Apple, Inc. Finally, the request packet from the user to the Web server contains server name and the user IP address which is another privacy threat to the users as explained in RFC 6973. The proposal of deploying proxy servers between the user and the Web server referred to as Private Relay [7] acts as a viable solution in this case.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. Section II discussed Encrypted DNS in details. Privacy Pass protocol along with Private Access Tokens are explained in Section III. Section IV provides a highlight on Passkeys. Private Relay is explained in Section V. Finally, Section VI concludes the paper.

II. DNS PRIVACY

Virtually the Web user is heading towards data privacy due to the increased privacy awareness [8]. Every communication on the Internet is preceded by DNS lookup which is performed without any traffic-level protection that leads to the surveillance, censorship, manipulation and rerouting [9]. Currently, third party such as ISPs can see every DNS request by the user. This issue can be solved by some

existing Technologies such as TOR and VPN, upto a certain level. They encrypt the first message of the DNS request and the message comes out only from the exit node of the TOR/ VPN server that makes the requester anonymous. But, this benefit comes at the cost of latency and security is limited to only the Tor/ VPN application. However DNS privacy has recently started gaining traction from academics and industries after IETF standardisation of DoT (RFC 7858), DoH (RFC 8484) and DoQ (RFC 9250) which encrypt DNS communications between the stub resolver and the recursive DNS server.

DNS-over-TLS (DoT): DoT has the IP address of the destination server, TCP running at port 853 to differentiate these requests from the unencrypted DNS request, and TLS protocol to encrypt the message. DoT is easy to differentiate from the normal traffic by filtering the port number.

IETF, in 2018, published RFC 8310 to describe an approach to initiate TLS for DNS which uses a dedicated DNS-over-TLS port. Encryption provided by TLS eliminates opportunities for eavesdropping on DNS queries in the network as discussed in RFC 7258. But this method requires a separate mechanism to upgrade a DNS-over-TCP connection over the standard port (TCP/53) to a DNS-over-TLS connection. Later, IETF proposed a simplified protocol in RFC 7858 which uses a well-known port 853 to specify TLS use, omitting the upgrade approach. Currently, IETF is working on challenges for DNS clients to use DNS records to discover a resolver's encrypted DNS configuration. This is being done by Discover of Designated Resolver (DDR) mechanism (Table I). In addition, IETF is also looking into the SVCB mapping for named DNS servers, allowing them to indicate support for encrypted transport protocols (Table I).

DNS-over-HTTP (DoH): DoH uses port 443 which is the same as the usual HTTP connection. TLS and HTTPs protocols are configured and send out GET/ POST request along with a path extension- "url/dns-request?dns=NAME". The Web server needs to take care of differentiating the HTTP request and the DNS request. RFC 8484 explains the integration of DNS protocol with HTTP that provides a transport medium suitable for both existing DNS clients and native Web applications requesting access to the DNS. While it is easy to block DoT traffic using port-based filtering [4][3],

WG	Document	Type	Reference
	Private Access Tokens	Expired I-D	draft-private-access-tokens
TLS	TLS Encrypted Client Hello	ACTIVE I-D	draft-ietf-tls-esni
ADD	Discovery of Designated Resolvers	ACTIVE I-D	draft-ietf-add-ddr
	DHCP and Router Advertisement Options for the Discovery of Network-designated Resolvers (DNR)	ACTIVE I-D	draft-ietf-add-dnr
	Service Binding Mapping for DNS Servers	ACTIVE I-D	draft-ietf-add-svcb-dns
Privacy Pass	Privacy Pass Issuance Protocol	ACTIVE I-D	draft-ietf-privacypass-protocol
	The Privacy Pass Architecture	ACTIVE I-D	draft-ietf-privacypass-architecture
MASQUE	IP Proxying Support for HTTP	ACTIVE I-D	draft-ietf-masque-connect-ip

TABLE I: List of IETF documents focussed on Privacy Protocols discussed in this paper.

it is infeasible to do the same for DoH traffic as it would also block normal Web traffic.

IETF had a few early proposals on end to end communication over HTTPs which lacked the agreement about what the appropriate formatting should be where they did not follow HTTP best practices. Later, IETF standardized RFC 8484 authored by P. Hoffman *et al.* as a protocol for sending DNS queries and getting DNS responses over HTTPS where each DNS query-response pair is mapped into an HTTP exchange.

DoH leads to a secure DNS traffic flow and third parties proxy an encrypted DNS request. Only users and Google/ Cloudflare (in this case), but not the third parties, can look into the DNS traffic. Secondly, DoH prevents DNS Spoofing. Though, DoH prevents eavesdroppers from directly reading the content of DNS messages, clients cannot send the request to the DNS server and receive the response without revealing their local IP address. Hence, revealing the identity. IETF proposed Oblivious DoH (ODOH) (RFC 9230) which is an enhanced mechanism to hide the client’s IP address while sending the DNS query. ODOH is built on DoH that allows proxied resolution, in which DNS message is encrypted and no single server is aware of both the IP and the message. Service providers such as Google/ Cloudflare can gather IP addresses at scale (if not message content) which leads to Data Centralisation problem. Moreover, eliminating the content-filtering is not favourable by a few country borders. Another limitation of DoH was proposed by Sandra *et al.* [9] by applying a machine learning approach on how an adversary can extract the traffic features and train the model to analyse the DNS activities based on the packet size, timing between two packets, TLS headers and the direction of the traffic.

Currently, there is a limited support of DNS-over-HTTPS. This can lead to Fallback Attack by which a malicious actor creates fake negotiations (e.g., through man-in-the-middle) between the client and server so that a less-secure protocol is used in their communication [1]. Thus, Google and Cloudflare are implementing DoH on their browsers (Chrome and Firefox, respectively).

DNS-over-QUIC (DoQ): IETF recently standardized DoQ (RFC 9250) as an added technology to DNS privacy, running on top of QUIC (RFC 9000). QUIC was developed by Google [5] to improve the Web performance. As such TCP, QUIC is connection-oriented and thus multiple channels can be created between the client and the server where channel/ path selection is independent of service provider’s selected path. However, QUIC is encapsulated in UDP datagram which leads to faster deployment in user-space, unlike the kernel-space in case of TCP. TLS 1.2 and TCP both require at least one round trip for the TCP handshake before the TLS handshake can happen. TLS 1.3 can establish the connection with 0-Round Trip Time (RTT). QUIC merges the transport (TCP) and cryptographic (TLS) handshakes into one, and is built on top of TLS 1.3, thus supporting 0-RTT as well. Hence, QUIC is at least 1-RTT faster than TCP with TLS.

The Network Working Group of IETF proposed a draft for the use of QUIC to provide transport privacy for DNS, in 2020. This draft also described the usage for the DNS protocol which can be broadly classified in three groups: stub to recursive resolver, recursive resolver to authoritative server, and server to server. But this design focuses only on the ”stub to recursive resolver” scenario. Later, IETF improved the protocol and published RFC 9250 which considers the usage of QUIC with DNS

protocol in all the three scenarios.

Recently, IETF standardised, RFC 9114, HTTP version 3 (HTTP/3) that provides a transport for HTTP semantics using the QUIC transport protocol and an internal framing layer similar to HTTP/2. While implementation, when a client learns that HTTP/3 is available on a server, it opens up the QUIC connection. Since, QUIC is the underlying protocol of HTTP/3 [10], QUIC negotiates with the client to setup a communication channel. HTTP/2 relies on in-order transmission of packet which QUIC does not guarantee, but HTTP/3 uses separate unidirectional streams to modify and track field table state. Hence, DNS-over-HTTP/3 (DoH3) assures in-order transmission of packets. At present, Cloudflare, Google, etc. have successfully implemented DoH3 on Firefox and on Android respectively.

The limitation of DoQ arises with TLS 1.3 (RFC 8446) which is not supported by most of the web platforms at present as discussed in [2] because of which QUIC protocol cannot be run over those carriers and providers. Moreover, an HTTP/3 implementation is limited to the maximum size of the message header. If a server receives a larger header packet, then it may discard the packet with an HTTP 431 error message. On the other hand, the first 'Hello' message is sent unencrypted in the mechanism proposed in RFC 9250. Recently, TLS Working Group proposed a draft of implementing Encrypted Client Hello (ECH) mentioned in Table I where the very first 'Hello' message is also encrypted under a server public key. This work is still in progress and seeking security analysis.

III. PRIVACY PASS PROTOCOL & PRIVATE ACCESS TOKENS

The Web services such as emails, search engines and APIs over the Internet have been experiencing threats from the Bots which was addressed by CAPTCHA to distinguish between the bot and the human. These CAPTCHAs are, indeed, proven mechanisms to anti-fraud protection for many websites but are tedious on the other hand. CAPTCHA hinders the user-experience and makes the websites less accessible. Privacy-minded folks at Fastly, Inc. developed Private Access Token (PAT) to replace CAPTCHA as an alternative mechanism for some supported platforms such as iOS. PAT uses Public Key Cryptography (PKC) where the authorization




Fig. 2: Architecture of Privacy Pass Protocol: The challenge is solved in Issuance Flow between the Client, the Attester, and the Issuer which will eventually be sent back to Origin/ server as a Response in Redemption Flow

process does not require human-interaction. These Tokens are developed by using Privacy Pass Protocol.

Privacy Pass Protocol interacts with the websites for anonymous user authentication. In some situations, it is only needed to check if the user is already authorised previously for the same service, without collecting any other information of the user to maintain the integrity in a real-time sensitive communication. The Privacy Pass protocol was introduced by IETF Charter Privacy Pass WG (Table I) for authorizing clients that had already been authorized in the past, without compromising their privacy. The initial version of the Privacy pass protocol on server-side support is implemented by Cloudflare, Inc. and client-side implementation already exists in Chrome and Firefox browser extension. Consider a client is attempting to authenticate itself to a server. The authorization mechanism does not reveal to the server anything about the client. The tokens are "privacy-preserving" in the sense that they cannot be linked back to the previous session where they were issued as proposed by Network Working Group of IETF (Table I). Privacy Pass is composed of two protocols: Issuance and Redemption. In architectural view, the issuance protocol runs between a Client and two network functions- Attestation and Issuance (Table I) as shown in Figure 2. The Issuer is trusted by the server/ origin and is responsible for issuing tokens in response to requests from Client. The Attester is responsible for attesting properties of the Client. The Issuance protocol is a 2-message protocol that takes as input a challenge from the redemption protocol and produces a token. Recent development took place in 2022, in privacy pass protocol for a 2-message issuance- provision of privately verifiable and publicly verifiable tokens as explained in the IETF draft of Issuance Protocol




Fig. 3: *Passkeys Based Authentication*. A client is capable of signing-in to another device in local proximity using Bluetooth and authenticated with the help of a relay server. Web server is not at all involved in signing process except providing challenge and validating the signature.

(Table I). The significance of having publicly verifiable issuance protocol is that any Origin can select a given Issuer to produce tokens, as long as the Origin has the Issuer’s public key, without explicit coordination from the Issuer.

In a nutshell, a user solves a random Internet challenge once for which she gets some randomly generated nonce values (Tokens) by the Privacy Pass which are cryptographically blinded (values are not feasibly linkable) and then sent to the Origin. If the response is found correct, then the provider signs the blinded token and returns them to the client. The privacy pass then unblind the tokens, called PAT, and store them for the future use. Privacy Pass is a challenge-response mechanism implemented by Content Delivery Networks (CDNs) that focuses on reducing the influx of malicious requests. As a result, if a CDN does not implement such security measures then the utility of Privacy Pass would be limited [11]. Moreover, due to limited support of DoH, Google and Cloudflare are implementing this protocol on their browsers. Privacy pass working group at IETF has an open challenge of setting-up a ceiling on the number of tokens issued in a single issuance phase to a client. If there is no limit, malicious clients could abuse this and cause excessive computation which leads to a Denial-of-Service attack as suggested by PrivacyPass WG (Table I). The future research can be done for preventing the Double-Spending of the Tokens by enhancing quick update times of the data storage.

IV. PASSKEYS

The traditional form of authentication requires a username and password. But this method poses certain security risks. Especially, phishing attacks can lead to the credentials getting exposed. This is why ‘Security Keys’ [12] was introduced as a device that facilitates access and strong authentication into other devices and applications and are also called Security Tokens. These are generally easy to use with a single or no click authentication. These are based upon Web Authentication API (WebAuthn) [13] standard which is more secure than traditional passwords. The WebAuthn allows servers to register and authenticate using PKC instead of a password.

Eventually researchers realised that authentication could be done seamlessly without any extra device/ authenticator. Thereby, researchers at Apple, Inc. introduced Passkeys which are a type of credentials that use cryptographic tools to leverage biometric features (e.g. face-recognition). Passkeys are replacement to the traditional password system for authentication that leads to improved user privacy. Passkeys are built on WebAuthn and new flexible UI options. Due to this, the Passkeys has inherited security features of WebAuthn [13]. When creating a passkey, a unique key-pair is generated which works only for the application it is created for. The public key is saved on the server and the private key stays on the device itself. The user sends a sign-in request to the server. The server sends a single-use challenge to the device as shown in Figure 3. This challenge is based on one of the WebAuthn algorithms (e.g. EAS 256 problem). The device produces the Digital Signature using the user’s private key and then sends this solution back to the server. The server validates the signature using the public key. If it is validated, the user gets logged-in. In this mechanism, the server is made sure that the user has the private key without learning any information of the private key by itself. Thus, the Passkeys cannot be threatened by phishing and is thereby less attractive to the attacker.

The same user account can be logged-in on the other devices as well without sharing the Passkeys. The client contains a QR code which has a single use encryption keys. The authentication device produces a Bluetooth advertisement containing the routing information for a relay server as shown in Figure 3. This local exchange allows selecting a




Fig. 4: *Communication through Private Relays. Client connects with the server using its GeoHash IP address through Proxy Relay Servers. Only the ingress can identify the client whereas only the egress knows the targeted server.*

server through which routing information is shared. It has two major advantages. It performs out of band key agreement which the server can't see. Secondly, the two devices are in physical proximity, hence, a remote attacker cannot have Bluetooth advertisement details. The relay server cannot learn any secret information as the devices follow standard encrypted Client To Authenticator Protocol (CTAP) operations [12]. For example, Account Manager creates Passkeys in iOS which is stored in the iCloud Chain that can be used in any Apple device authenticated by the same user.

While signing into another device using Bluetooth, there are a few attacks possible such as Man-in-the-middle attack, sniffing, jamming, packet-injection, session hijacking, etc. [6]. This is inherited from the limitations of Bluetooth technology. Moreover, there is a scope of improvement in Passkeys Recovery. If the device is lost and the Passkeys is not linked with the cloud, the recovery procedure would adapt traditional method which can be improved. Also, adopting WebAuthn at a scale to deploy the Passkeys could be a major enhancement.

V. PRIVATE RELAYS AND MASQUE

Private relay is a privacy enhancing mechanism when communicating with the cloud by establishing proxy server(s) between them. Private Relay claims to protect the user's privacy while browsing, seeking DNS queries, and running insecure HTTP traffic. Private relay separates client's IPs from servers and uses multi-hop MASQUE (Multiplexed Application Substrate over QUIC Encryption) proxy as described by MASQUE working Group, IETF in Table I for proxying IP packet, whereas oblivious DoH (RFC 9230) is used for other traffic. MASQUE proposes the use of QUIC as a substrate protocol, allowing arbitrary data to be tunneled over QUIC. Whereas, Oblivious DoH makes sure that the server does not get any information about the IP address of the client and the message content. Proxies are authenticated with TLS 1.3 raw public keys and clients are authenticated with RSA blind signatures. Recently, iOS 15 and macOS implemented the private relay for all Safari browser traffic, all DNS traffic, all unencrypted HTTP traffic and for Mail Pixel Trackers. The main goal of developing private relay is that not a single entity in the communication channel can have visibility of both - user's IP address and what the user is accessing. To design this mechanism, developers marked two hops is a minimum requirement for separation of connection data. Here, two hops signifies the two proxy servers. Clients select the hops, and have nested encryption for handshakes to the next hop. The hops are chosen to be run by separate proxies. But, collusion would be required to track user activities across the communication channel. Currently, this is handled by designing policies for not allowing the data sharing. Also, in order to understand the website/ server compatibility in Private Relay, rough geolocation is preserved, when user wants it. The egress proxy gets the hint of geohash of client and an appropriate egress IP/ Proxy2 is selected. Proxy1 (Ingress proxy) knows the actual IP address of the Client but does not know the destination address. Client requests the address of Proxy2. Proxy1 provides the GeoHash of the client's IP address and IP address of Proxy2. The Client communicates with the Proxy2 using its GeoHash provided by Proxy1. Here, Proxy2 can see the destination address of the Client and directs the client to the destination (cloud). Apple currently provides an implementation

for private relays on MacOS and iOS via a paid subscription. Sattler *et al.* [7] performed measurements to detect clients communicating via Apple’s Private Relay Network which described that iCloud Private Relay influences the operation of passive network analysis, and due to its workings, it can also impact intrusion detection systems (IDSs). Moreover, the ingress addresses can be used to identify relay traffic as a passive network observer. Kühlewind *et al.* [14] performed an evaluation of MASQUE-based Proxying and proposed that for mobile networks, this might provide an opportunity to accept network configurations with simpler link layer loss recovery schemes and only use local loss recovery when explicitly required by an application. The selection of Proxy servers is limited to the Private Relay protocol where the client has no option to chose the hops. The client should be able to select the combination of hops and discover hops. Private relay should expand the horizon to support MASQUE proxies by making an open, inter-operable network for privacy, by supporting ingress proxies in ISPs and carriers where all egress proxies located within content providers. Also, further standardisation work is needed to replace IP by geolocation and fraud prevention.

VI. CONCLUSION

This article offers a first impression of the recent privacy techniques addressed in IETF, and how their interplay extends user privacy challenges. Over the years, the privacy-preserving techniques are evolving. With DNS encryption at the core of this evolution, its future development will be built on the foundation of DoH and DoQ, thereby extending its reach to increasingly more supporting platforms. Also, considering the issues with secret key (or password) which is vulnerable to be stolen, misplaced or compromised in one way or the other, this paper discussed the Passkeys technology. Passkeys are capable of replacing the secret key (passwords) by a challenge-response conversation method between the user device and the server. While privacy at the user-end has multiple variations, private access token system promises to supersede traditional methods in order to prevent unnecessary data leakage. Several improvements have happened on the Web to separate client’s IP address from the origin, however, private relay and MASQUE using multi-hop

architecture have finally accomplished the goal. This will further enhance the rejuvenation of the Web, thus aiding the development of next-generation Web applications.

REFERENCES

- [1] Minzhao Lyu, Hassan Habibi Gharakheili, and Vijay Sivaraman. A survey on dns encryption: Current development, malware misuse, and inference techniques. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, jul 2022. Just Accepted.
- [2] Mike Kosek, Luca Schumann, Robin Marx, Trinh Viet Doan, and Vaibhav Bajpai. DNS privacy with speed?: evaluating DNS over QUIC and its impact on web performance. In Chadi Barakat, Cristel Pelsser, Theophilus A. Benson, and David Choffnes, editors, *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM Internet Measurement Conference, IMC 2022, Nice, France, October 25-27, 2022*, pages 44–50. ACM, 2022.
- [3] Rebekah Houser, Zhou Li, Chase Cotton, and Haining Wang. An Investigation on Information Leakage of DNS over TLS. In *CoNEXT*. ACM, 2019.
- [4] Levente Csikor, Himanshu Singh, Min Suk Kang, and Dinil Mon Divakaran. Privacy of DNS-over-HTTPS: Requiem for a Dream? In *IEEE EuroS&P*, pages 252–271. IEEE, 2021.
- [5] Adam Langley, Alistair Riddoch, Alyssa Wilk, Antonio Vicente, Charles Krasic, Dan Zhang, Fan Yang, Fedor Kouranov, Ian Swett, Janardhan R. Iyengar, Jeff Bailey, Jeremy Dorfman, Jim Roskind, Joanna Kulik, Patrik Westin, Raman Tenneti, Robbie Shade, Ryan Hamilton, Victor Vasiliev, Wan-Teh Chang, and Zhongyi Shi. The QUIC Transport Protocol: Design and Internet-Scale Deployment. In *SIGCOMM*. ACM, 2017.
- [6] Matthias Cäsar, Tobias Pawelke, Jan Steffan, and Gabriel Terhorst. A survey on bluetooth low energy security and privacy. *Comput. Networks*, 205:108712, 2022.
- [7] Patrick Sattler, Juliane Aulbach, Johannes Zirngibl, and Georg Carle. Towards a Tectonic Traffic Shift? Investigating Apple’s New Relay Network. In *IMC 2022*. ACM, 2022.
- [8] Chia-ling Chan et al. Monitoring TLS adoption using backbone and edge traffic. In *IEEE INFOCOM 2018*, 2018.
- [9] Sandra Siby, Marc Juárez, Claudia Díaz, Narseo Vallina-Rodriguez, and Carmela Troncoso. Encrypted DNS -> Privacy? A Traffic Analysis Perspective. In *NDSS*, 2020.
- [10] Kathrin Elmenhorst, Bertram Schütz, Nils Aschenbruck, and Simone Basso. Web censorship measurements of HTTP/3 over QUIC. In *IMC*. ACM, 2021.
- [11] Alex Davidson, Ian Goldberg, Nick Sullivan, George Tankersley, and Filippo Valsorda. Privacy pass: Bypassing internet challenges anonymously. *Proc. Priv. Enhancing Technol.*, 2018(3):164–180, 2018.
- [12] Nick Frymann, Daniel Gardham, Franziskus Kiefer, Emil Lundberg, Mark Manulis, and Dain Nilsson. Asynchronous remote key generation: An analysis of yubico’s proposal for W3C webauthn. In Jay Ligatti, Xinming Ou, Jonathan Katz, and Giovanni Vigna, editors, *CCS ’20: 2020 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, Virtual Event, USA, November 9-13, 2020*, pages 939–954. ACM, 2020.
- [13] Emil Lundberg Michael B Jones, Akshay Kumar. Web authentication: An api for accessing public key credentials level 3. <https://w3c.github.io/webauthn/>, 2022.
- [14] Mirja Kühlewind, Matias Carlander-Reuterfelt, Marcus Ihlar, and Magnus Westerlund. Evaluation of QUIC-based MASQUE Proxying. In *EPIQ 2021*. ACM, 2021.