

Marc Langheinrich

# A Survey of RFID Privacy Approaches

Received: date / Accepted: date

**Abstract** A bewildering number of proposals have offered solutions to the privacy problems inherent in RFID communication. This article tries to give an overview of the currently discussed approaches and their attributes.

**Keywords** RFID · privacy

---

## 1 Introduction

A July 2007 search for articles on RFID privacy and security in Google Scholar yields over 380 titles (184 titles mention *RFID* and *privacy*, but not *security*; 135 mention *RFID* and *security*, but not *privacy*; 67 mention all three keywords), while Gildas Avoine’s manually maintained *RFID Security & Privacy Bibliography* [2] still lists as many as 175 publications on this topic since 2003. There certainly seems to be no shortage of scholarly work in this area, yet a “solution” to these problems remains elusive. A June 2007 EU policy document [11] states that “effective action is needed so Europeans can trust that the various applications of RFID and related technologies are as safe, secure and privacy-friendly as they possibly can be.”

Why is the seemingly simple problem of securing the readout of a relatively short numeric identification code still unsolved? What issues still need to be address before “safe, secure and privacy-friendly” RFID tags have become a reality? This article attempts to summarize the existing body of knowledge and identify the issues and shortcomings of today’s proposals.

---

## 2 Uses and Threats

One problem that prevents a silver-bullet solution certainly is the wide range of applications and technology

---

M. Langheinrich  
Inst. for Pervasive Computing  
ETH Zurich, Switzerland  
E-mail: langhein at inf.ethz.ch

that the generic term “RFID” comprises. Want [41] provides an excellent overview of the various uses and technologies; Juels [22] offers valuable insights on the security and privacy implications of this. For the purpose of this article, we will focus on low-cost, battery-less (passive) systems, as these will most likely have the biggest impact on consumer privacy, due to their potentially large numbers and low computational resources.

The basic feature of an RFID system is the automatic *identification* of items [29]. In its simplest form, such identification can be binary, e.g., paid or not paid, useful for *alerting*. Modern tags allow hundreds of bits to be used for such an ID, and standardization bodies such as EPCglobal and GS1 have devices formats that allow for the automatic resolution of these IDs into product information. With multiple readers deployed, even unresolved IDs can still offer *monitoring* capabilities by tracking the movements of an item, e.g., goods in a manufacturing process. In contrast to bar codes, RFID tags can additionally offer on-chip computation, thus supporting cryptographic protocols for *authentication*. Especially relevant for privacy is the fact that these function can be accessed without a line-of-sight, i.e., both reader and tag can be completely hidden from view, making it difficult, if not impossible, to be aware of such a process taking place.

These four RFID use cases – alerting, monitoring, identification, and authentication – each can be subverted by a specific type of attack, which we will describe in the following subsections.

### 2.1 Authentication and Counterfeiting

RFID technology has its roots in the “identify friend or foe” (IFF) systems for fighter planes in the second world war [38], where non-forgable identities were vital. Today, RFID-based smart-cards are already in widespread use as payment and travel systems (e.g., the Japanese SUICA card or the Octopus card in Hong Kong), access control systems (such as skipasses or car immobilizers),

and most recently as national and international identification documents. Efforts are also underway to use RFID tags to fight product counterfeiting [39], in particular for medical drugs and luxury items such as watches. In all cases, it is imperative that the authenticity of the RFID tag cannot be compromised.

While the mere use of RFID chips already complicates the process of creating forged items, the widespread availability of writable or even reprogrammable tags means that the use of RFID alone does not offer enough protection from determined counterfeiters. Westhues [43] built what is practically an “RFID tape recorder”, which could record and play back replies from many commercial RFID-based access control systems. Consequently, tags and readers usually share a common secret and employ a challenge-response protocol to verify each other’s knowledge of the secret. Challenge-response protocols are a well-known problem in security literature, and many strong solutions exist. The particular challenge of RFID lies both in the low computational power of the tags, as well as their susceptibility to physical attacks, implying that RFID solutions must be both of low complexity and resistant to physical memory analysis [42].

While forged RFID tags certainly represent a security problem, they are not in the focus of RFID privacy concerns. Forged *reader* authentications, however, are much more relevant, as the next section will show.

## 2.2 Identification and Sniffing

The core RFID privacy problem is that of unauthorized tag readout: with the help of wireless communication, third parties can in principle read the tags of personal items from large distances, and without any indication that such a readout is taking place. Controlling access to tag data is thus of prime importance.

By default, most RFID tags are indiscriminate: upon entering a sufficiently powered reader field, they will reply to any well-formed reader request with their full ID. With standardized ID formats, such as EPCglobal’s tag data specification [10], this ID can be resolved into a particular tag issues, a manufacturer, a product name, and even a serial number. A typical concern is thus that “chatty” RFID tags disclose the possession of certain personal items normally hidden from view, e.g., the brand of underwear one is wearing, the presence of a wig or hip replacement, or even a particular medicine one is carrying [29]. When in 2003 the European Central Bank considered the use of RFID tags in Banknotes [32], criminal scenarios quickly surfaced in which clever robbers would screen their victims first in order to assess the amount of cash carried. Similar concerns surround the use of RFID in travel documents, where a chatty passport might disclose the citizenship of its bearer and thus allow the construction of “smart bombs” that would only blow up if a worthwhile target passes by.

Clearly, this act of *sniffing out* the data on an RFID tag can only be prevented if tags disclose their identity only to authorized readers, i.e., those that are under the control of the item owner or another authorized party. Authenticating readers, or more generally speaking, the interrogating party, is thus the primary technical issue for RFID privacy. Note that care must be taken that an unauthorized party could not simply listen in to an unsecured communication between a tag and a legitimate reader.

## 2.3 Monitoring and Tracking

It is important to realize that privacy can also be violated without actually identifying individual items. Once a specific tag or a set of tags can be associated with a particular person, the mere presence of this tag in a particular reader field already implies a (most likely unwanted) location disclosure. Combining several such sightings across multiple logs can easily *track* a person over longer periods of time. The fact that RFID tags are typically unique exacerbates the problem, yet Weis [42] already noted that even non-unique IDs can uniquely identify a person by virtue of the particular *constellation* they are carried in.

It is thus not sufficient to simply scramble an ID to prevent the identification of an item – tags must either frequently update their ID in a non-predictable (and preferably non-traceable) manner, or remain completely silent upon inquiries from illegitimate readers. The latter approach, while intuitively appealing, is difficult in practice: in order to prove its authenticity to a particular tag, a reader would need to know which tag to prove it to (i.e., which secret to use in the authentication algorithm). Without some sort of initial reply from the tag, this is difficult.<sup>1</sup>

## 2.4 Alerting and Denial of Service

In its simplest form, an RFID tag simply announces its presence, e.g., to an anti-theft gate in a bookstore. Sold items get their embedded RFID tag killed at checkout so that only unpaid items will be detected.

To completely alleviate privacy concerns of RFID tags, a irreversible tag deactivation is necessary. Current industry protocols like EPCglobal’s Class-1 Gen-2 [9] already require compliant tags to offer a *Kill-command* that completely silences the tag once issued. As post-sales benefits of tagged items increase (e.g., smart washing machines or RFID-enabled returns), however, permanently disabling tags might force the consumer to

<sup>1</sup> The alternative of using the same secret for all of its tags typically lowers the strength of the authentication algorithm significantly.

choose between privacy and convenience. Temporary silencing a tag (e.g., only between the supermarket to the home, where it can be reactivated) might improve this, yet incurs high password management costs [21], as reactivation must necessarily be restricted to authorized readers only. Such credentials would need to be passed on from vendor to consumer, and potentially further on to other family members or friends, for whom a certain item might have been bought – a technical feat that would require practically all point-of-sale-systems to seamlessly exchange such data with just about any personal electronic device (e.g., a mobile phone or wireless smart card), and in turn with the plethora of home-installed RFID systems and readers out there. Assuming, of course, that all consumers would carry and use such an electronic device in the first place.

Tag silencing offers significant privacy gains, yet it directly conflicts with many commercial security concerns, such as theft. A simple aluminum-foil lined bag is often enough to hide tagged items in there, a personal jamming device that prevents readers from “coming through” might work equally well.

---

### 3 Privacy Issues and Options

Westin defines privacy as “the claim of individuals . . . to determine for themselves when, how, and to what extent information about them is communicated to others” [44]. Sniffing and tracking RFID tags thus violates this control, whether it involves actual data disclosure (in the form of meaningful IDs) or simply presence indication (through meaningless but trackable IDs).

Short of killing tags at checkout, only two technical options remain:

- *Encrypting, Rewriting*: Tag data is rendered meaningless to unauthorized readers. In order to prevent tracking, even meaningless data must be updated periodically.
- *Hiding, Blocking*: Tags are effectively silenced, either by jamming the radio channel or by having them reply only to readers that present proper credentials.

The following sections will discuss the various solutions discussed in the literature, with a particular focus on deployment: If a solution requires costly rewritable tags, or even the implementation of special crypto circuitry, the odds of a large scale deployment of this approach diminish rapidly. Solutions that can be readily implemented on standard EPCglobal-conformant tags are particularly appealing. Also the operational costs, i.e., the required infrastructure for both vendors and consumers, and the individual effort for using the system, must be taken into account.

#### 3.1 Hiding and Blocking

Karjoth and Moskowitz [26] propose to physically clip tags at checkout, using perforated tear-off antennas. Tags remain functional, yet their range is effectively reduced to few centimeters. While the technology has been commercially licensed [40], its applicability is limited to items with non-embedded tags. A proposal by Inoue and Yasuura [19] suggests the use of two tags, with one tag holding the unique serial number being peeled away at purchase time, effectively reducing the granularity of the identification.<sup>2</sup> A number of vendors such as Emvelope Inc.<sup>3</sup> have begun selling aluminum lined wallets and pouches for keeping RFID-enabled credit cards and passports safe from unwanted readouts.

For items that do not fit in pouches nor have detachable labels, Juels et al. [24] proposed the so-called *blocker-tag*, a simple RFID tag that overloads a reader’s anti-collision protocol by answering to every single read request with a jammed signal. While the blocker-tag could be manufactured cheaply (as it is more or less a particularly programmed RFID tag), its operation depends greatly on its orientation: if misaligned, it could cease operating due to lack of power from a reader’s field and thus expose all of its blocked tags.

Rieback et al. [37] also point out that differential signal analysis could differentiate between blocker-tag-only jamming signals and those were both a blocker-tag and a real tag reply. They instead propose a battery powered device, the *RFID Guardian* [36], which not only produces a randomly modulated jamming signal, but also allows the user to upload access control lists indicating which party can perform what operation on which tags.<sup>4</sup> Sanjay Sarma, co-founder of MIT’s Auto-ID center, has proposed a similar device called the *Vindictive Sentinel*, albeit with a simpler configuration: all valid readers would be registered and all others would be blocked completely.<sup>5</sup>

#### 3.2 Rewriting and Encryption

Encryption is often seen as the obvious solution for securely controlling access to one’s tags. Juels rightly refers to this as “siren song of encryption” [21]: This is because many proposals ignore the practical problems of key management, i.e., how the required keys for hundreds of mundane objects such as underwear, DVD-cases,

---

<sup>2</sup> Note that such items could still be traceable as particular *constellations* [42].

<sup>3</sup> See [www.emvelope.com](http://www.emvelope.com)

<sup>4</sup> To allow for selective jamming, the RFID Guardian requires the use of a deterministic protocol like ISO-15693, where tags reply in a pre-defined timeslot (based on their ID) to reader requests.

<sup>5</sup> See slides of his invited talk at [events.iaik.tugraz.at/RFIDSec06/Program/](http://events.iaik.tugraz.at/RFIDSec06/Program/)

chewing gum packs, or soft drinks could possibly be securely and reliably exchanged between stores and their customers, as well as consumers and their friends and families. Consequently, encryption might only work well in controlled systems such as payment cards and identification systems, not with cheap everyday artifacts.

In its simplest form, cryptographically controlled access was first proposed by Weis et al. [42] in the form of *hash locks*: tag data is only released if the correct key is given, which is stored in hashed form directly on the tag. This hash value can be read out by any reader, yet only authorized ones would be able to look up the tag’s key in a database of key-hash pairs. Tags would be able to verify a key using an integrated hash function that compare the key hash with the stored hash value. While this protects the actual data on the tag, Weis et al. realized that a static hash value would still be traceable, and thus proposed an extension using random values: Instead of simply sending their static hash value, tags choose a random value  $r$  and send the pair  $(r, h(ID||r))$  to the reader, prompting the reader to brute-force its inventory for any ID that matches the given hash if concatenated with  $r$  [42].

Using randomized hash locks prevents readers from tracking an unknown item, yet it also complicates the reader’s search for the correct key. In practice, Weis et al.’s scheme requires readers to linearly search through its list of tags. Many proposals exist to avoid such brute-force searches, while keeping the untraceability property of seemingly random tag replies. The general idea is to keep a counter on both the tag and the reader loosely in sync, and including this value in tag replies. The reader can then keep a few possible tag values for each tag, and update its database whenever it successfully identified a tag. One of the first such proposals was by Ohkubo et al. [35], who proposed to use *hash-chains* and precompute  $m$  such tag outputs in a look-up table. By limiting the length of hash-chains to  $m$ , readers could store those efficiently. While this scheme provides *forward security*,<sup>6</sup> it is vulnerable to replay attacks [3]. Henrici and Müller [17] use a  $\Delta c$  in each tag that counts the read attempts since the last successful reader authentication. Sending  $\Delta c$  to readers eliminates the vulnerability of the Ohkubo scheme to replay attacks, without hampering quick authentication. Malicious readers may artificially inflate  $\Delta c$  and thus be able to track a tag. Dimitriou [7] uses *mutual* authentication of both tags and readers to limit ID updating, thus keeping both readers and tags always in perfect synchronization. If no authorized reader updates the tag value, however, its value stays constant and can thus be tracked again.

A different approach is followed by Molnar and Wagner [34], who propose a tree-based approach: Tags hold not a single key, but a set of keys arranged in a tree. Each tag stores all keys of a single particular path in

the tree, with authorized readers knowing all keys in the tree. The reader can then use a challenge-response protocol to step through the tree from its root to the leaves, checking whether the tag in question contains a key, e.g., in the left or the right part of the tree (in case of a binary tree). This scheme has logarithmic lookup properties, but at the expense of security, as tags share large parts of the keyspace: if one or more tag-secrets are compromised, the security of the remaining tags is affected. This general idea has since been extended by Buttyan et al. [4], Dimitriou [8], and Lu et al. [31], yet tree-based approaches typically lack key-updating, due to their shared keyspace.

A large body of work is also concerned with lowering the requirements for cryptographic functions implemented on RFID hardware, such as the the HB<sup>+</sup>-protocol by Juels and Weis [25], or the work by Felhofer et al. [12] on using AES. Some researchers target the limited hardware capabilities of standard EPCglobal-tags, providing algorithms that only rely on simple XOR operations [27] or the presence of a random number generator [5].

### 3.3 Keyless Approaches

As an alternative to blocking and encryption approaches, Fishkin et al. [13] proposed the use of signal strength-measurements directly on the tag, in order to assess the distance between a tag and its reader. Following the general principle of “distance implies distrust”, the authors propose several disclosure levels: no replies to far away readers, presence (e.g., a single bit) to closer ones, product IDs for close-by readers, and unique serial for near contact. While elegant in principle, both the problem of performing reliable measurements on low-cost RFID hardware, as well as the difficult predictability of the disclosure policy (how close is “very close”?) render the proposal difficult in practice.

Juels [20] points out that typical attack models need to be significantly relaxed in real-world RFID environments, as adversaries typically do not have 24/7-access to a tag, but rather minutes or seconds. Juels argues that a simple list of pseudonyms that cycles to a new ID upon every read request might be sufficient in many cases. By limiting the number of IDs that can be read out, an attacker has a much lower probability of re-encountering an ID, while at the same time not being able to resolve the (random) pseudonym. While certainly cheap to implement on a tag, Juels’ scheme still requires the exchange of lookup tables to allow legitimate readers the resolving of pseudonyms. Langheinrich and Marti [30] extend Juels’ “minimalist cryptography” with bit-throttling and shared secrets, effectively wrapping the tag data into several encryption layers that require continuous read access for significant amounts of time. At the same time, however, legitimate owners are able to use simple caching strategies to identify their items instantaneously.

<sup>6</sup> Forward security means that a compromised tag does not disclose the entire history of tag sightings.

### 3.4 Policy

Many authors have noted that RFID reading does not happen in a legal vacuum. Readers are physical devices that emit significant amounts of radiation – attacks on RFID tags are thus much more difficult to hide than, say, server attacks on the Internet.

Floerkemeier et al. [14] propose the use of “transparency protocols” within RFID standards, requiring readers to explicitly state their operators, data collectors, collection purpose, and data recipients. This would at the very least allow consumer interest groups and privacy commissioners to inspect and verify the proper operation of such systems. In addition, interested users might carry personal devices able to read such statements (so-called “watchdog tags”) and keep personal data disclosure logs or even control access to personal tags. A similar approach is proposed by Juels and Brainard [23], who call this device a *tag privacy agent* (TaPA). Molnar et al. [33] propose to build reader devices around a trusted computing module and thus receive an auditable attestation about the proper functioning of each reader.

---

## 4 Summary and Outlook

Much work in RFID privacy is concerned with secure and efficient cryptographic algorithms. This, however, does only address a fraction of the issues encountered in real-world RFID system. As most of today’s proposals require a shared secret between readers and tags, they are difficult to deploy in a general consumer setting.<sup>7</sup>

In order to “solve” the privacy problem for the countless smart shopping scenarios, much more is needed than a cryptographic protocol. Unless key management is significantly simplified, only keyless approaches seem to stand a chance of success. Similarly, any such solution requires strong regulatory support, either in the form of active self-regulation [15] or effective legal enforcement of existing laws [6]. Last but not least, the scope of the envisioned data collections will most certainly require equally large efforts in areas of privacy databases [1] and profile management [28] to be complete.

---

## References

1. Rakesh Agrawal, Jerry Kiernan, Ramakrishnan Srikant, and Yirong Xu. Hippocratic databases. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Very Large Databases (VLDB 2002)*, pages 143–154, Hong Kong, August 2002. Morgan Kaufmann.
2. Gildas Avoine. Bibliography on security and privacy in RFID systems. Available online at [lasecwww.epfl.ch/~gavoine/rfid/](http://lasecwww.epfl.ch/~gavoine/rfid/), 2006.
3. Gildas Avoine, Etienne Dysli, and Philippe Oechslin. Reducing time complexity in RFID systems. In Bart Preneel and Stafford Tavares, editors, *Selected Areas in Cryptography – SAC 2005*, volume 3897 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 291–306, Kingston, Canada, August 2005. Springer-Verlag.
4. Levente Buttyán, Tamás Holczer, and István Vajda. Optimal key-trees for tree-based private authentication. In Gene Tsudik, Paul Syverson, and Elisa Bertino, editors, *Privacy Enhancing Technologies – 6th International Workshop, PET 2006, Cambridge, UK, June 28-30, 2006, Revised Selected Papers*, volume 4258 of *LNCS*, pages 332–350, Berlin Heidelberg New York, 2006. Springer.
5. Hung-Yu Chien and Che-Hao Chen. Mutual authentication protocol for RFID conforming to EPC class 1 generation 2 standards. *Computer Standards & Interfaces, Elsevier Science Publishers*, 29(2):254–259, February 2007.
6. Data Protection Commissioners. Resolution on radio frequency identification. 25th International Conference of Data Protection and Privacy Commissioners, November 2003.
7. Tassos Dimitriou. A lightweight RFID protocol to protect against traceability and cloning attacks. In *Conference on Security and Privacy for Emerging Areas in Communication Networks – SecureComm*, Athens, Greece, September 2005. IEEE.
8. Tassos Dimitriou. A secure and efficient rfid protocol that could make big brother (partially) obsolete. In *PERCOM ’06: Proceedings of the Fourth Annual IEEE International Conference on Pervasive Computing and Communications (PERCOM’06)*, pages 269–275, Washington, DC, USA, 2006. IEEE Computer Society.
9. EPCglobal. Class-1 generation-2 UHF RFID protocol for communications at 860 MHz–960 MHz, version 1.0.9. EPC radio-frequency identity protocols, January 2005. See [www.epcglobalinc.org/standards/Class\\_1\\_Generation\\_2\\_UHF\\_Air\\_Interface\\_Protocol\\_Standard\\_Version\\_1.0.9.pdf](http://www.epcglobalinc.org/standards/Class_1_Generation_2_UHF_Air_Interface_Protocol_Standard_Version_1.0.9.pdf).
10. EPCglobal. EPC tag data specification 1.3. EPCglobal Standard, March 2006. See [www.epcglobalinc.org/standards/EPCglobal\\_Tag\\_Data\\_Standard\\_TDS\\_Version\\_1.3.pdf](http://www.epcglobalinc.org/standards/EPCglobal_Tag_Data_Standard_TDS_Version_1.3.pdf).
11. European Union. European policy outlook RFID (draft version). Working document, German Federal Ministry of Economics and Technology, June 2007. See [www.nextgenerationmedia.de/Nextgenerationmedia/Navigation/en/rfid-conference.html](http://www.nextgenerationmedia.de/Nextgenerationmedia/Navigation/en/rfid-conference.html).
12. Martin Feldhofer, Sandra Dominikus, and Johannes Wolkerstorfer. Strong authentication for RFID systems using the AES algorithm. In Marc Joye and Jean-Jacques Quisquater, editors, *Workshop on Cryptographic Hardware and Embedded Systems – CHES 2004*, volume 3156 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 357–370, Boston, Massachusetts, USA, August 2004. IACR, Springer-Verlag.
13. Kenneth Fishkin, Sumit Roy, and Bing Jiang. Some methods for privacy in RFID communication. In Claude Castelluccia, Hannes Hartenstein, Christof Paar, and Dirk Westhoff, editors, *Security in Ad-hoc and Sensor Networks – First European Workshop, ESAS 2004, Heidelberg, Germany, August 6, 2004, Revised Selected Papers*, volume 3313 of *LNCS*, pages 42–53, Berlin Heidelberg New York, August 2005. Springer.
14. Christian Flörkemeier, Roland Schneider, and Marc Langheinrich. Scanning with a purpose – Supporting the fair information principles in RFID protocols. In Hitomi Murakami, Hideyuki Nakashima, Hideyuki Tokuda, and Michiaki Yasumura, editors, *Ubiquitous Computing Systems – Second International Symposium, UCS Tokyo, Japan, November 8–9, 2004, Revised Selected Papers*,

---

<sup>7</sup> Given the gaping security holes [18] in many deployed RFID-based applications such as RFID-credit cards and ePassports, however, this research is nevertheless timely and highly relevant.

- volume 3598 of *LNCS*, pages 214–231, Berlin Heidelberg New York, June 2005. Springer.
15. Simson Garfinkel. RFID rights. *Technology Review*, 107(9), November 2004.
  16. Simson Garfinkel and Beth Rosenberg, editors. *RFID: Applications, Security, and Privacy*. Addison-Wesley, July 2005.
  17. Dirk Henrici and Paul Müller. Hash-based enhancement of location privacy for radio-frequency identification devices using varying identifiers. In Francis Lau and Hui Lei, editors, *Proceedings of the Second IEEE Annual Conference on Pervasive Computing and Communications Workshops*, pages 149–153, Orlando, FL, USA, March 2004. IEEE Computer Society.
  18. Thomas S. Heydt-Benjamin, Dan V. Bailey, Kevin Fu, Ari Juels, and Tom OHare. Vulnerabilities in first-generation RFID-enabled credit cards. Technical report, University of Massachusetts Amherst, October 2006. Draft manuscript in submission.
  19. Sozo Inoue and Hiroto Yasuura. RFID privacy using user-controllable uniqueness, July 2005.
  20. Ari Juels. Minimalist cryptography for RFID tags. In Carlo Blundo, editor, *Security of Communication Networks (SCN)*, Amalfi, Italy, September 2004.
  21. Ari Juels. RFID privacy: A technical primer for the non-technical reader. In Katherine Strandburg and Daniela Stan Raicu, editors, *Privacy and Technologies of Identity: A Cross-Disciplinary Conversation*. Springer, Berlin Heidelberg New York, 2005.
  22. Ari Juels. RFID security and privacy: A research survey. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, 24(2):381–394, February 2006.
  23. Ari Juels and John Brainard. Soft blocking: Flexible blocker tags on the cheap. In Sabrina De Capitani di Vimercati and Paul Syverson, editors, *Workshop on Privacy in the Electronic Society – WPES*, pages 1–7, Washington, DC, USA, October 2004. ACM, ACM Press.
  24. Ari Juels, Ronald L. Rivest, and Michael Szydlo. The blocker tag: Selective blocking of RFID tags for consumer privacy. In Sushil Jajodia, Vijay Atluri, and Trent Jaeger, editors, *Proceedings of the 10th ACM Conference on Computer and Communication Security*, pages 103–111, Washington, D.C., USA, 2003. ACM Press.
  25. Ari Juels and Stephen Weis. Authenticating pervasive devices with human protocols. In Victor Shoup, editor, *Advances in Cryptology – CRYPTO’05*, volume 3126 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 293–308, Santa Barbara, California, USA, August 2005. IACR, Springer.
  26. Günter Karjoth and Paul A. Moskowitz. Disabling RFID tags with visible confirmation: clipped tags are silenced. In Vijay Atluri, Sabrina De Capitani di Vimercati, and Roger Dingledine, editors, *Proceedings of the 2005 ACM Workshop on Privacy in the Electronic Society (WPES 2005)*, pages 27–30, Alexandria, VA, USA, 2005. ACM Press.
  27. Sindhu Karthikeyan and Mikhail Nesterenko. RFID security without extensive cryptography. In *Workshop on Security of Ad Hoc and Sensor Networks – SASN’05*, pages 63–67, Alexandria, Virginia, USA, November 2005. ACM, ACM Press.
  28. Alfred Kobsa and Jörg Schreck. Privacy through pseudonymity in user-adaptive systems. *ACM Transactions on Internet Technology*, 3(2):149–183, 2003.
  29. Marc Langheinrich. RFID and privacy. In Milan Petkovic and Willem Jonker, editors, *Security, Privacy, and Trust in Modern Data Management*, pages 433–450. Springer, Berlin Heidelberg New York, July 2007.
  30. Marc Langheinrich and Remo Marti. Practical minimalist cryptography for RFID privacy. Submitted for publication, April 2007. Available online at [www.vs.inf.ethz.ch/publ/papers/shamirtags07.pdf](http://www.vs.inf.ethz.ch/publ/papers/shamirtags07.pdf).
  31. Li Lu, Jinsong Han, Lei Hu, Yunhao Liu, and Lionel M. Ni. Dynamic key-updating: Privacy-preserving authentication for rfid systems. In Tom La Porta, Matt Mutka, Claudio Pinhanez, and Peter Steenkiste, editors, *Proceedings of the Fifth Annual IEEE International Conference on Pervasive Computing and Communications (PerCom’07)*, March 19–23, 2007, White Plains, NY, USA, pages 13–22. IEEE Press, 2007.
  32. Janis Mara. Euro scheme makes money talk. *Wired News*, July 9, 2003. See [www.wired.com/news/privacy/0,1848,59565,00.html](http://www.wired.com/news/privacy/0,1848,59565,00.html).
  33. David Molnar, Andrea Soppera, and David Wagner. Privacy for rfid through trusted computing. In *WPES ’05: Proceedings of the 2005 ACM workshop on Privacy in the electronic society*, pages 31–34, New York, NY, USA, 2005. ACM Press.
  34. David Molnar and David Wagner. Privacy and security in library RFID: Issues, practices, and architectures. In Birgit Pfitzmann and Peng Liu, editors, *Conference on Computer and Communications Security – ACM CCS*, pages 210–219, Washington, DC, USA, October 2004. ACM, ACM Press.
  35. Miyako Ohkubo, Koutarou Suzuki, and Shingo Kinoshita. Cryptographic approach to “privacy-friendly” tags. In Garfinkel and Rosenberg [16].
  36. Melanie Rieback, Bruno Crispo, and Andrew Tanenbaum. RFID guardian: A battery-powered mobile device for RFID privacy management. In Colin Boyd and Juan Manuel González Nieto, editors, *Australasian Conference on Information Security and Privacy – ACISP’05*, volume 3574 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 184–194, Brisbane, Australia, July 2005. Springer-Verlag.
  37. Melanie Rieback, Bruno Crispo, and Andrew Tanenbaum. Keep on blockin’ in the free world: Personal access control for low-cost RFID tags. In *Security Protocols, 13th International Workshop, Cambridge, UK, April 20–22, 2005. Revised Selected Papers.*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Berlin Heidelberg New York, 2007. Springer. To appear.
  38. Melanie R. Rieback, Bruno Crispo, and Andrew S. Tanenbaum. The evolution of RFID security. *IEEE Pervasive Computing*, 05(1):62–69, January-March 2006.
  39. Thorsten Staaake, Frédéric Thiesse, and Elgar Fleisch. Extending the EPC network – the potential of RFID in anti-counterfeiting. In *Proceedings of the 2005 ACM Symposium on Applied Computing*, pages 1607–1612, New York, NY, USA, 2005. ACM Press.
  40. Claire Swedberg. Marnlen makes privacy-friendly tags for retail items. *RFID Journal*, November 2006. See [www.rfidjournal.com/article/articleprint/2803/-/1/1/](http://www.rfidjournal.com/article/articleprint/2803/-/1/1/).
  41. Roy Want. An introduction to RFID technology. *IEEE Pervasive Computing*, 5(1):25–33, January-March 2006.
  42. Stephen A. Weis, Sanjay E. Sarma, Ron L. Rivest, and Daniel W. Engels. Security and privacy aspects of low-cost radio frequency identification systems. In Dieter Hutter, Günter Müller, Werner Stephan, and Markus Ullmann, editors, *Security in Pervasive Computing – First International Conference, Boppard, Germany, March 12–14, 2003, Revised Papers*, volume 2802 of *LNCS*, pages 201–212, Berlin Heidelberg New York, 2004. Springer.
  43. Jonathan Westhues. Hacking the prox card. In Simson Garfinkel and Beth Rosenberg, editors, *RFID: Applications, Security, and Privacy*, pages 291–300. Addison-Wesley, 2005.
  44. Alan F. Westin. *Privacy and Freedom*. Atheneum, New York, USA, 1967.