# A Privacy-Preserving Information-Sharing Protocol for Federated Authentication

#### Francesco Buccafurri\*and Carmen Licciardi

University Mediterranea of Reggio Calabria, Reggio Calabria, Italy bucca, carmen.licciardi@unirc.it

#### Abstract

This paper presents a privacy-preserving protocol for identity registration and information sharing in federated authentication systems. The goal is to enable Identity Providers (IdPs) to detect duplicate or fraudulent identity enrollments without revealing users' personal data or enabling cross-domain correlation. The protocol relies on Oblivious Pseudorandom Functions (OPRFs) combined with domain-specific transformations, ensuring that each IdP generates independent pseudonymous identifiers derived from a shared cryptographic service while maintaining full input confidentiality. A central authority maintains a blind registry that records successful and failed identity verifications using only pseudonymous identifiers, allowing global consistency checks without exposing sensitive information or linking users across domains. The proposed construction provides a general and abstract framework suitable for a wide range of federated authentication systems, achieving strong privacy guarantees while supporting effective fraud-prevention mechanisms during identity registration.

# 1 Introduction

Federated authentication has become a fundamental paradigm for enabling seamless and secure access to distributed digital services. In this model, multiple independent Identity Providers (IdPs) authenticate users and issue assertions or tokens that Service Providers (SPs) can rely on without performing additional verification. This arrangement improves usability, reduces the proliferation of credentials, and allows organizations to maintain control over the authentication of their users while supporting interoperability across administrative domains.

Despite these advantages, federated authentication systems face structural challenges during the identity registration phase. Each IdP performs user onboarding autonomously, often relying on local procedures and heterogeneous verification levels. This decentralization creates opportunities for attackers to exploit inconsistencies across IdPs, attempting multiple registrations under the same real-world identity or impersonating legitimate users. At the same time, enabling IdPs to exchange detailed identity attributes to detect such behavior would violate core privacy principles and regulatory requirements aimed at minimizing personal data exposure.

Identity verification typically relies on Know Your Customer (KYC) procedures, where an IdP validates the user's identity through official documents, biometric evidence, or secure digital credentials. While KYC ensures accurate verification within each individual domain, it does not inherently prevent an attacker from registering the same identity at multiple IdPs. Without a coordination mechanism, repeated or fraudulent onboarding attempts remain undetected across the federation.

These limitations highlight a fundamental tension: preventing duplicate or fraudulent identity registrations requires some form of information sharing among IdPs, yet such sharing

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author

must not reveal personal data or enable cross-domain user tracking. As a result, designing privacy-preserving mechanisms for identity registration and information exchange has become an essential research direction in modern federated systems.

In this paper, we present a protocol that addresses this gap by enabling IdPs to coordinate identity registration through a central service while preserving user privacy. The key idea is to allow IdPs to submit blinded, domain-specific representations of user identifiers that cannot be linked or reversed by any party. A central coordinating service maintains a registry of these pseudonymous identifiers and can therefore detect whether an identity has been previously registered or whether a past verification attempt has failed, all without learning anything about the underlying personal data or correlating users across different IdPs. The solution preserves the autonomy of IdPs, respects the privacy constraints of modern regulatory frameworks, and introduces a novel, privacy-preserving mechanism for global identity consistency checks during registration.

The structure of the paper is the following. Section 2 introduces the relevant background on federated authentication and discusses the challenges that motivate our work. Section 3 presents the system model, the involved entities, and the notation used throughout the paper. Section 4 describes the proposed protocol, including first-time identity enrollment, subsequent registrations, and the cooperative global check mechanism. Section 5 reviews related work, and Section 6 concludes the paper and outlines directions for future research.

# 2 Background

#### 2.1 Oblivious Pseudorandom Functions

An Oblivious Pseudorandom Function (OPRF) enables a client to obtain  $F_K(x)$  from a server holding the secret key K, such that:

- The client learns only  $F_K(x)$ , not K;
- The server learns nothing about x.

The OPRF guarantees that from the perspective of the client,  $F_K(x)$  is computationally indistinguishable from the output of a random function, provided the server is honest.

#### 2.2 RSA-Based Instantiation

Let the server hold an RSA key pair K = (N, e, d). The OPRF can be instantiated as:

$$F_K(x) = H'(x^d \bmod N)$$

where H' is a hash mapping RSA outputs into a fixed domain. To compute  $F_K(x)$  obliviously, the client performs:

$$X = H(x) \cdot r^e \mod N,$$
  

$$Y = X^d \mod N,$$
  

$$F_K(x) = Y \cdot r^{-1} \mod N.$$

This ensures that  $F_K(x) = (H(x))^d \mod N$  without revealing x to the server.

### 2.3 Blind Signatures

Blind signatures [4] extend RSA to sign messages without revealing them to the signer. Given m, the requester blinds it as  $m' = m \cdot r^e \mod N$ , the signer returns  $(m')^d$ , and the requester unblinds to obtain  $m^d$ . This ensures unlinkability between signing and verification.

## 3 Notation and Entities

The protocol involves three entities:

- User: owns personal data including a unique personal identifier (UPI) and undergoes KYC at an IdP. For cryptographic purposes, the user is represented by the hashed value x = H(UPI), which is revealed only to the IdP performing the registration.
- Identity Provider (IdP<sub>i</sub>): verifies KYC, blinds x, and applies a domain-specific RSA transformation using its private exponent  $t_i$ . Each IdP<sub>i</sub> holds an RSA key pair  $(N_i, e_i, t_i)$  defining its domain, while the CTS stores only the public component  $(N_i, e_i)$ .
- Central Trusted Service (CTS): holds the master RSA key pair K = (N, e, d), evaluates blinded inputs, issues blind-signed tokens, and maintains a pseudonymous registry storing minimal KYC status information.

Whenever x = H(UPI) must be sent to the CTS, the IdP blinds it using a random factor  $r \in \mathbb{Z}_N^*$ , ensuring that no party other than the originating IdP learns the value of H(UPI). All OPRF evaluations by the CTS operate modulo N, so every pseudonymous identifier  $PID_i$  produced during enrollment also lies in  $\mathbb{Z}_N$ .

 $IdP_i$  uses its private exponent  $t_i$  to derive a domain-specific pseudonymous identifier  $PID_i$  through a cooperative RSA-OPRF interaction with the CTS. The same exponent is employed during the cooperative check phase, where  $IdP_i$  computes  $r^{t_i}$  mod  $N_i$  to enable unblinding of identifiers belonging to its domain.

Following a successful KYC verification at  $IdP_i$ , the CTS issues a blind signature over  $(PID_i, pk_u)$ , generating a token  $Token_i$  that binds the pseudonymous identifier to the user's public key. During subsequent registrations, the user proves ownership of the corresponding private key via a challenge–response procedure.

The blind registry maintained by the CTS stores only a minimal verification flag  $status_{KYC} \in \{ok, alarm\}$  for each pseudonym. No additional data is stored or revealed, ensuring strict privacy and data minimization.

The complete set of symbols used in the protocol is summarized in Figure 1.

#### 4 Protocol Definition

In this section, we present the privacy-preserving protocol that enables identity registration and consistency checks across a federated authentication system. The protocol is articulated into three main phases, each corresponding to a different state in which a user may interact with an Identity Provider (IdP).

In the first phase, a user with no prior credentials undergoes an initial enrollment, during which a domain-specific pseudonymous identifier is generated and an initial token is issued. This token serves as proof that the user has successfully completed a verified onboarding process at least once within the federation.

Symbol	Meaning
UPI	User's unique personal identifier.
x = H(UPI)	Hash of the identifier used for cryptographic processing.
r	Blinding factor in $\mathbb{Z}_N^*$ .
$t_i,\ (N_i,e_i)$	RSA private exponent $t_i$ and public key of IdP $i$ .
K = (N, e, d)	RSA key pair of the CTS.
$Blind(x) = x \cdot r^e \bmod N$	RSA blinding function (CTS modulus).
$Eval_K(X) = X^d \mod N$	OPRF evaluation performed by the CTS.
$PID_i = (H(UPI))^{d \cdot t_i} \mod N$	Pseudonymous identifier for IdP $i$ (always modulo $N$ ).
$Token_i = Sign_{CTS}(PID_i, pk_u)$	Blind signature binding user public key $pk_u$ to $PID_i$ .
$status_{KYC} \in \{ok, alarm\}$	Status stored in the blind registry.

Figure 1: Notation used throughout the protocol.

In the second phase, users performing subsequent registrations present their existing token to demonstrate prior successful verification. The IdP then generates a new pseudonymous identifier for its own domain while preserving unlinkability with past registrations.

In cases where no valid token is available, the IdP must determine—without learning or disclosing any sensitive information—whether the same user has already been registered at another provider. To accomplish this, the protocol incorporates a cooperative blind global check that allows IdPs to query a central coordinating service in a privacy-preserving manner.

The following subsections describe these three phases in detail.

#### 4.1 First-Time Identity Enrollment

Before a user can obtain a registered identity for the first time, they must undergo an initial enrollment procedure at an Identity Provider (IdP). This phase is special because the user does not yet possess any cryptographic token issued by the CTS, and therefore cannot prove prior verification. Consequently, the IdP must rely solely on the outcome of its own KYC process and on the cooperative RSA-OPRF interaction with the CTS to generate the user's first pseudonymous identifier.

The objective of this phase is twofold: (i) to bind the user's real-world identity (validated through KYC) to a domain-specific pseudonymous identifier  $PID_1$ , and (ii) to let the CTS issue the user's first blind-signed token. Importantly, the token is issued only after the user proves possession of the private key corresponding to the public key  $pk_u$  included in the message to be signed. This ensures that the token cannot be transferred or misused by an attacker.

The steps of the first-time enrollment are as follows.

- 1. The user provides UPI to IdP<sub>1</sub> and successfully completes the KYC procedure.
- 2.  $IdP_1$  computes x = H(UPI), selects a random blinding factor r, and computes the blinded input  $Blind(x) = x \cdot r^e \mod N$ .
- 3. The IdP applies its domain transformation by computing  $X_1 = Blind(x)^{t_1} \mod N$  and sends  $X_1$  to the CTS.
- 4. The CTS evaluates the OPRF by computing  $Y_1 = X_1^d \mod N$  and returns it to IdP<sub>1</sub>.

5.  $IdP_1$  unblinds:

$$PID_1 = Y_1 \cdot (r^{t_1})^{-1} \mod N.$$

6. The user (via IdP) sends  $(PID_1, pk_u)$  to the CTS, and proves possession of the private key associated with  $pk_u$  through a challenge–response protocol. Only if this proof succeeds, the CTS stores  $(PID_1, \text{status} = \text{ok})$  in its registry and issues to the user the blind-signed  $Token_1 = \text{Sign}_{CTS}(PID_1, pk_u)$ .

### 4.2 Subsequent Registration

After the user has successfully completed at least one identity enrollment, the CTS has already issued to them a blind-signed token  $Token_j$  for some j. Any future enrollment at a different Identity Provider (IdP) follows a similar cryptographic workflow to the first-time registration, with two important differences: (i) the user is expected to prove that they have already been verified at least once, and (ii) the IdP must rely on this proof to distinguish between a new legitimate enrollment and a potential impersonation attempt.

To register again at an IdP, the user begins by undergoing the same RSA-OPRF procedure to compute a new domain-specific pseudonymous identifier  $PID_i$ , exactly as in the initial enrollment. Before the IdP proceeds with KYC, the user must present a previously issued token  $Token_j$  together with a proof of possession of the corresponding private key. This is achieved through a standard challenge—response mechanism: the IdP sends a fresh challenge and the user returns its signature using the private key associated with the public key contained in  $Token_j$ . Since all valid tokens bind the same user public key  $pk_u$  to distinct pseudonyms, any previously issued token is acceptable, regardless of its age or of which IdP issued it.

This mechanism allows IdPs to verify that the user attempting a subsequent registration has already been successfully enrolled at least once, while preserving unlinkability: the IdP cannot determine when, where, or how many times the user was previously enrolled, and the CTS never learns the user's unique personal identifier or personal information. Clearly, if the registration to  $IdP_i$  succeeds, then a token  $Token_i$  is released to the user.

### 4.3 Cooperative Blind Global Check Protocol

When a user attempts a registration at  $IdP_i$  without presenting a valid token, the IdP must determine whether the same unique personal identifier has already been successfully registered at any other IdP, without ever learning any identifier outside its own domain. This is achieved through a cooperative blind global check involving  $IdP_i$ , all other IdPs, and the CTS. All computations are performed without exposing H(UPI), any PID belonging to another IdPs, or any sensitive information.

The protocol consists of three conceptual steps, in which multiple entities contribute to the computation.

#### **Blinded Submission**

 $IdP_i$  begins by computing the blinded value

$$X = H(UPI) \cdot r^e \mod N$$
,

where  $r \in \mathbb{Z}_N^*$  is random and known only to  $\mathrm{IdP}_i$ . The value X hides  $H(\mathrm{UPI})$  from the CTS and from all other  $\mathrm{IdP}_i$  sends X to the CTS.

#### **Distributed Domain Transformations**

To determine whether the same user has been registered under any  $IdP_j$ , the CTS forwards X to each  $IdP_j$ . Each  $IdP_j$  applies its domain exponent and returns:

$$T_i = X^{t_j} \mod N$$
.

Since all computations are modulo N, these values are compatible with the OPRF evaluation performed by the CTS. The CTS computes

$$Y_j = T_i^d \bmod N$$

for every  $IdP_j$  and returns  $Y_j$  to  $IdP_i$ . At this point, the CTS has evaluated the blinded input under every IdP domain without learning the underlying user identity.

### **Exponent Exchange**

To locally unblind  $Y_j$ ,  $IdP_i$  must obtain the value  $r^{t_j}$ , but  $IdP_j$  should not learn anything about r or H(UPI). The following RSA-based exchange allows  $IdP_i$  to obtain  $r^{t_j}$  blindly, using  $IdP_j$ 's own modulus  $N_j$  only for this auxiliary step.

For each  $IdP_i$ :

1.  $IdP_i$  samples a random  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_i}^*$  and computes

$$m = k^{e_j} \cdot r \bmod N_i$$
.

- 2.  $IdP_i$  sends m to  $IdP_i$ .
- 3.  $IdP_j$  computes

$$s = m^{t_j} \bmod N_i = k \cdot r^{t_j} \bmod N_i$$

and returns s to  $IdP_i$ .

4.  $IdP_i$  recovers

$$r^{t_j} = s \cdot k^{-1} \bmod N_i.$$

This step reveals no information about H(UPI) or about the PIDs across domains, while giving  $\text{IdP}_i$  exactly the quantity needed for unblinding.

# Local Unblinding and Registry Match

Given  $Y_i$  and  $r^{t_j}$ ,  $IdP_i$  reconstructs the pseudonymous identifier for the domain of  $IdP_i$ :

$$PID_j = Y_j \cdot (r^{t_j})^{-1} \bmod N.$$

 $IdP_i$  sends all reconstructed identifiers  $\{PID_j\}$  to the CTS. The CTS checks whether any of them appears in its registry with status ok.

If such a match exists, this indicates that the attempted registration corresponds to an identity already verified at another IdP, and  $IdP_i$  must reject the current procedure. In that case,  $(PID_i, status = alarm)$  is inserted into the CTS registry.

If no match exists,  $IdP_i$  proceeds with enrollment as for a first-time registration.

#### 5 Related Work

Research on privacy-preserving identity systems spans several decades, beginning with the foundational notions of blind signatures [4] and pseudonymous transactions [5]. These early primitives introduced the idea of obtaining attestations without revealing underlying data, paving the way for cryptographic privacy in identity management. Anonymous credential systems, most notably the Camenisch-Lysyanskaya construction [3], further developed these concepts by enabling unlinkable and non-transferable credentials. While such systems provide strong privacy guarantees during authentication, they do not address the problem of detecting duplicate or fraudulent identity registrations across independent domains.

Privacy concerns in federated identity management have also been extensively studied. Systems such as PRIMA [1] and related approaches focus on preventing cross-provider tracking by issuing unlinkable identifiers to users. Broader analyses of privacy threats in federated systems, including correlation attacks and metadata leakage, have been discussed in [6]. These works, however, primarily concentrate on the authentication phase and generally assume that identity enrollment is performed correctly at each provider, without offering mechanisms for detecting reuse of the same real-world identity across IdPs.

A parallel line of research examines OPRF-based anonymous token systems. Architectures such as Privacy Pass [7] and the emerging VOPRF standard [9] demonstrate how OPRFs and blind signatures can be combined to produce unlinkable tokens suitable for privacy-preserving authorization and rate-limiting. More advanced schemes, including Anon-Tokens [10] and OPRF-based adaptive anonymous credentials [2], illustrate the practical benefits of integrating OPRFs into credential issuance workflows. These approaches, however, generally target anonymous access control and do not address identity proofing or coordinated verification across multiple providers.

Operational and regulatory frameworks such as NIST SP 800-63-3 [8] highlight the challenges of identity proofing and the risks associated with inconsistent enrollment procedures across decentralized identity providers. Current federated architectures lack mechanisms to detect duplicate or fraudulent registrations without centralizing sensitive user information, creating a tension between security and privacy that remains unresolved.

In contrast to prior work, our protocol focuses explicitly on the enrollment phase in federated identity systems. We introduce a cooperative RSA-OPRF-based mechanism that enables a central coordinating service to detect duplicate or fraudulent registrations without ever learning personal identity attributes or enabling cross-provider correlation. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first approach to provide global consistency of identity verification outcomes while preserving full domain separation and strong privacy guarantees across independently operated Identity Providers.

#### 6 Conclusion

We presented a cooperative protocol for privacy-preserving identity registration in federated authentication systems. The construction enables a central coordinating service to detect duplicate or fraudulent registrations without learning users' personal identifiers or acquiring information that would allow correlation across Identity Providers (IdPs). By combining blinded evaluations, domain-specific transformations, and non-transferable verification tokens, the protocol provides a mechanism for ensuring global consistency of identity verification outcomes while preserving strong privacy guarantees.

The proposed architecture achieves properties that are rarely simultaneously supported in

existing federated identity systems: unlinkability across IdPs, blindness of the central authority, and reliable detection of identity reuse, all while preventing the misuse or transfer of verification tokens. These features contribute to a more robust foundation for identity enrollment, enabling federated services to coordinate without exposing sensitive information or relaxing their privacy constraints.

Although the protocol demonstrates that privacy and global consistency can coexist, several open directions remain. One avenue concerns integrating revocation mechanisms: legitimate users may need to invalidate compromised tokens, yet revocation must be performed without creating new correlation vectors. Another direction involves formalizing the security model under stronger adversarial assumptions, including malicious IdPs and adaptive attackers; a full cryptographic proof would further strengthen confidence in the approach. Operational questions also arise: evaluating scalability in environments with many IdPs and optimizing the multi-domain consistency check, for example through batching or threshold-based techniques, are important steps toward real-world deployment.

Finally, aligning this protocol with evolving federated identity architectures— including emerging digital identity frameworks and wallet-based models—offers a promising direction for future work. Introducing privacy-preserving coordination at the enrollment layer may significantly enhance the resilience of federated systems against identity fraud while maintaining strict protection of user information.

# Acknowledgments

This work is supported by Agenzia per la Cybersicurezza Nazionale under the programme for promotion of XL cycle PhD research in cybersecurity – C36E24000080005. The views expressed are those of the authors and do not represent the funding institutions.

#### References

- [1] Hassan Asghar, Honglu Lee, Suhaib Habib, and Giovanni Russello. Prima: Privacy-preserving federated identity management. In *Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS)*, 2016
- [2] Reza Baseri, Aditi Jain, and Amit Sahai. Adaptive anonymous credentials from oprfs. In IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, 2024.
- [3] Jan Camenisch and Anna Lysyanskaya. An efficient system for non-transferable anonymous credentials with optional anonymity revocation. In *Advances in Cryptology CRYPTO 2001*, pages 93–118. Springer, 2001.
- [4] David Chaum. Blind signatures for untraceable payments. In Advances in Cryptology: Proceedings of Crypto 1982, pages 199–203. Springer, 1983.
- [5] David Chaum. Security without identification: Transaction systems to make big brother obsolete. Communications of the ACM, 28(10):1030–1044, 1985.
- [6] George Danezis, Stephen Lewis, and Ross Anderson. Privacy issues in identity management systems. In DIM '05: Proceedings of the 2005 Workshop on Digital Identity Management, pages 35–43. ACM, 2005.
- [7] Alex Davidson, J Iyengar, Nick Sullivan, Filippo Valsorda, and Christopher Wood. Privacy pass: Bypassing internet challenges anonymously. IETF Draft draft-ietf-privacypass-architecture, 2020.
- [8] Paul A Grassi, Michael E Garcia, and James L Fenton. Digital identity guidelines. Technical Report NIST SP 800-63-3, National Institute of Standards and Technology, 2017.

- [9] Hugo Krawczyk and Christopher Wood. Oblivious pseudorandom functions (oprfs) and verifiable oprfs (voprfs). IETF Draft draft-irtf-cfrg-voprf, 2023.
- [10] Paulius Silde and Morten Strand. Anon-tokens: Privacy-preserving authorization with rsa blind signatures. In European Symposium on Research in Computer Security (ESORICS), pages 3–25. Springer, 2022.