

Secure Distributed *Human* Computation

Zulfikar Ramzan

DoCoMo Labs USA

Collaborators:

Craig Gentry (DoCoMo Labs USA) Stuart Stubblebine (Stubblebine Labs)

Rump Session, Asiacrypt 2004



The Internet enabled the possibility of creating a giant distributed computing system by harnessing idle CPU cycles around the world.

Notable examples include:

- ✓ SETI@Home's search for extra terrestrials.
- ✓ Entropia.com's Giant Internet Mersenne Prime search.
- ✓ Distributed.net's cryptosystem attacks.

Of course, many problems are difficult for even very powerful computers; e.g., "AI-complete problems" from:

- ✓ Natural language processing;
- ✓ Image analysis;

✓ Voice analysis, etc, etc.

Perhaps instead of only having computers be end clients in a distributed system, we should also consider having *human* clients....

Maybe this sounds crazy... but...

Examples of Dist. Human Computation...

- ✤ Vipul's razor
 - \checkmark Collaborative filtering product for anti spam
 - \checkmark If enough humans vote that email is spam, it's thrown in junk folder
- * Finding solutions to CAPTCHAs.
 - \checkmark CAPTCHAs: puzzles seen when registering for free email accounts.
 - ✓ Spammers who want to create spamming accounts get humans to solve these captchas in exchange for illicit content.

✤ ESP game

- \checkmark Two humans in different locations are shown same image.
- ✓ Each is asked to submit words that describe image. If words are both same, then points are received.
- ✓ At the end, game owner has labels for many pictures (useful for image search)

Cyphermint check cashing kiosks (located in public places).

✓ Humans at "back end" perform facial recognition to prevent fraud.

© 2003 DoCoMo Communications Laboratories USA, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

Relations to Crypto/Security + Other Fields

"Cryptography is concerned with the construction of schemes that withstand any abuse. Such schemes are constructed so as to maintain a desired functionality, even under malicious attempts aimed at making them deviate from their prescribed functionality."

-Oded Goldreich

 Not quite Secure Multi-party computation: ✓ Human vs. computer clients; provide candidate answers vs. function inputs. ✓ Computation may be facilitated by semi-trusted server' ✓ Input privacy may be less relevant. ✓ Answer may not be clear cut. 	 Also related to: ✓ E-cash ✓ Distributed Computation with Payout ✓ Voting ✓ Reputation Systems
In concred, come interacting questions security/converts as well as in	

In general, some interesting questions security/crypto as well as in Algorithms (how to redesign algos for human input) and Human Computer Interaction (how to design interfaces).

© 2003 DoCoMo Communications Laboratories USA, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

Preliminary Thoughts and Final Remarks

- Can show majority vote of humans is better (more secure) than Bayesian Combination of Classifiers.
- Can use basic decision theory tools to derive design principles for Distributed Human Computation schemes for deterring cheaters.
 - \checkmark Give human clients a rating and provide payouts for correct answers that are proportional to this rating.
 - ✓ Decrease client rating substantially for errors, but increase it slowly for correct answers
 - ✓ Monitor "high-utility" for cheating situations more carefully.

Overall, this seems to be an untapped research area, and could hold much promise for interesting research questions and directions.

© 2003 DoCoMo Communications Laboratories USA, Inc. All Rights Reserved.