

You Still See Me: How Data Protection Supports the Architecture of ML Surveillance

Rui-Jie Yew, Lucy Qin, Suresh Venkatasubramanian
Brown University

1 Introduction

Human data [40] forms the backbone of machine learning (ML). Data protection laws thus have strong influence on ML development. These laws govern the *processing* (typically involving the collection or possession¹) of personal data. Personal data, data that is covered under these regulations, typically includes data that is *identifying*², *identifiable*³, or *sensitive*⁴. The greater the identifiability of data, the more onerous the requirements accompanying its use [71, 95]. As Veale [84] explains, “rights hinging on personal data being processed typically end when such data no longer becomes personal, falling out of scope of the relevant law”.

Given that most requirements accompany the processing of personal data, organizations have an incentive to keep their data out of legal scope—e.g., by transforming personal data into non-personal data or by changing the premise of data processing or collection. This spurs the development and application of certain privacy-preserving techniques—*data protection techniques*—as an important strategy for ML development. These techniques can be used to distill data until it potentially falls outside the scope of data protection laws—and then used for ML development and application under their radar. Techniques such as differential privacy (DP) or private

set intersection (PSI) could challenge the premise of the data at-hand as being inherently *identifying*, or *identifiable*, and techniques such as federated learning could challenge the premise of data *collection*, *processing*, and *possession*.

While there are technical intricacies and computational costs to the implementation of data protection techniques, their development and application hold the potential to poke holes into otherwise significant data protection frameworks. Kearns and Roth [42] tellingly write of the adoption of differential privacy at Apple and Google: “both deployments [of differential privacy] were used to privately gather data that the companies had previously not been gathering at all, rather than implementing differential privacy on top of datasets that they already had available to them.”

Even as the exact scope of protections for personal data remains contested [25], data protection techniques for ML systems continue to be researched [15, 79] and wielded⁵ for compliance with data protection and privacy regulation. Our goal is to examine the impact of a rhetoric that deems data wrapped in privacy-preserving techniques as data that is “good-to-go”. Namely, we consider instances where data protection techniques serve as an avenue to consolidate data that might otherwise be unavailable, inaccessible, or too burdensome to collect – data protection techniques where they are a prospective tool to gather more data rather than a retrospective tool applied on existing data. This generally excludes cases where data protection techniques are used to support existing system functionalities. To that end, we examine the use of a number of privacy-preserving techniques as part of three stages of system development: (1) dataset curation, (2) model computation, and (3) model application.

First, we consider the use of PSI for dataset alignment [50] for dataset curation. In particular, we detail how this technique enables the combination of data previously held in different silos, while guarding each entity’s dataset from each other.

¹This is the case for Illinois BIPA [33], which has seen some of the largest settlement amounts for computer vision ML technologies [94], and other state biometric information privacy laws.

²The U.S. Video Privacy Protection Act defines personal information as “information which identifies a person.” Many data breach laws also employ this definition [71]. The CCPA [10], for example, embeds a private right of action in the case of an information security breach and when the data was “non-redacted” or “unencrypted”—following the identifying data model for the provision.

³Identifiable is a stronger definition than identifying, because it includes all the ways data can be combined to identify an individual. The EU GDPR adopts this definition for personal data, and [30] notes that this is a dominant approach globally in the definition of personal data.

⁴Article 6 of the GDPR, for example, lays out a set of requirements for the lawful processing of *personal* data, with additional requirements when *sensitive* personal data is processed. Japan and Colombia also have laws surrounding sensitive data, with their definitions emphasizing individual data that can be used to discriminate [73].

⁵“Federated learning is an innovative approach to machine learning for compliance. It enables multiple organizations to come together and train better quality models, while helping them to achieve their respective data privacy and security standards.” [55].

This allows multiple entities to combine information about individuals across different contexts. The increased granularity of each individual’s information through PSI then sets the stage for the rest of the “privacy-preserving” ML pipeline.

Second, we explain how federated learning and homomorphic encryption can be applied as part of model computation. In the security literature, these techniques are seen as avenues toward greater user control over their data. However, these techniques can be applied to subvert relationship structures imposed by models of data protection, namely the controller-processor-subject model of data protection, and provides another avenue through which intrusive computations can be conducted without the knowledge or control of data subjects [84].

Third, when otherwise unavailable data is obtained through the use of data protection techniques, we question the grounds of the technical privacy-utility trade-off [64] for anonymization during model application and inference. The hallmark of a good privacy-preserving mechanism is one that straddles this trade-off—conferring the right amount of privacy protection while maintaining utility. However, the inherent relationality [86] and collective [29] nature of data could result in instances where in fact the trade-off does not exist and high-level patterns in the population gleaned from data can in fact be *better* used to target individuals.

With data accumulation at the core of how the ML pipeline is configured [40], we show that data protection techniques can be instrumentalized to ultimately support infrastructures of surveillance—not necessarily to protect individuals associated with data. We propose technology and policy strategies to evaluate data protection techniques in light of the protections they actually confer. To conclude, we appeal to the role security researchers and technologists may play in developing regulations that implicate privacy-preserving and data protection techniques. The adversarial mindset crucial to assessing the utility of data protection techniques may also play important roles in modelling, mitigating, and shaping the effects of policies on technology development.

2 Background

Privacy-Preserving ML and Data Protection Techniques

Privacy-preserving machine learning (PPML) is a set of techniques for ML systems that aim to protect against model *attacks* and *leakages* that extract information about the training data or model parameters [8, 60]. Privacy protections for ML are dependent on the stage of ML development and use at which they are applied [64, 93]. For instance, DP can be applied at multiple steps of development and deployment [64]. The application of DP during model training controls for the influence that a piece of data has on the resulting model. DP can also be applied to database queries and model outputs. Federated learning is typically used to coordinate model training and can be used in conjunction with differential privacy

protections on input data. For a more comprehensive overview on PPML, see, for example, [93]. We focus on PPML techniques that apply to stages in development. This follows from data protection frameworks’ focus on the *process* of how data is collected and interacted with.

Definitions of Surveillance Surveillance has been described as the “the focused, systematic and routine attention to personal details for purposes of influence, management, protection or direction” [52]. Surveillance also encapsulates how targeted subjects are made “amenable to observations, prediction, and suggestion” [14]. This may include how specific information pertaining to an individual may be collected and leveraged, as well as how information about a collective group of people may be leveraged to influence or direct-to target—individuals.

Specific high-risk *applications* of ML systems such as biometric systems, facial recognition, and educational technology have been recognized as surveillance technologies—and there are increasingly policy guardrails aim to protect against these applications [24, 91]. We focus instead on the informational *infrastructures* that could support surveillance. As a pathway to more kinds of data and computations, data protection techniques can refine mechanisms of surveillance, which include how these systems consolidate information about individuals and then leverage that information to target, manipulate, and influence them. The effects of surveillance may not necessarily implicate a breach of traditional notions of individual privacy harms or data security harms: a person’s data may not be leaked such that their identity could be stolen or such that they could be identified by a person. These effects may be more diffuse. Surveillance has been tied to influence, discrimination, and long-term “social sorting” [51]—the reinforcement of social differences between groups. For instance, [51] describes that zip codes, data that does not necessarily imply a particular individual, can be used to further “social-sorting” in how they can be commonly used by marketers to determine the level of service or quality to provide, as well as discounts and incentives for purchasing the products. For a more detailed overview of the effects of surveillance, see [31, 67].

Scope of Policy Analysis We consider the development of “privacy-preserving” ML systems as a response to the staircase of rights that attach to data as part of numerous approaches to data protection and privacy policies. Personally identifying or identifiable information is a gateway to the application of numerous privacy laws in the United States [71]. Schwartz [71] discusses how federal and state statutes rely on this distinction in its application—including the Children’s Online Privacy Protection Act, the Video Privacy Protection Act, as well as state security data breach notification statutes. Similarly, the EU’s approach to data protection, most prominently the GDPR [23], also relies on staggering protections to

data, with the most requirements falling on the processing of personal data, then pseudonymous data, then anonymous data. This staggering of protections may also be present as part of approaches to data protection in Japan and Colombia, which each have policies that pay additional attention to sensitive data⁶. For more details on the potential effects of privacy-preserving techniques on the scope of data protections, see Table 1.

3 Seeing Through the Data-Protected Layers of the PPML Pipeline

In this section, we show how the layering of data protection techniques in the ML development pipeline can bolster surveillance. We consider three major stages of ML development and the data protection techniques that may be used as part of each: (1) dataset curation in Section 3.1, (2) model computation in Section 3.2, and (3) model updating and application in Section 3.3.

We outline how, at each point, the development and application of data protection techniques may not only fail to be protective of the individuals that are computed on, but can instead refine mechanisms by which individuals are monitored.⁷ In Section 3.1, we examine the use of PSI, a type of multi-party computation (MPC), for dataset alignment. PSI aids in the joining of datasets across entities. We consider the potential downstream consequences of a base training dataset that contains an even richer set of features of the individuals that live in each dataset. In Section 3.2, we analyze the uses of federated learning and homomorphic encryption. As part of this analysis, we re-examine the narrative prevalent in the security community that data subjects lack control when their information is loaded onto company servers, and computation done by data subjects are “privacy-preserving”. Spoiler alert: data subjects may still not have that much control over how their information is processed and entities can off-load computations of user data while exploiting relational




Figure 1: This illustration is from [50]. It shows that Party A and Party B have the same samples, but different features of those samples. Private set intersection, which is a pre-processing phase for vertical federated learning aligns the datasets from Party A and Party B to capture richer features for the samples that they share. Thus, for instance, if Party A has information that a data subject viewed an advertisement and Party B has information that a data subject bought the product served in the advertisement, then that information can be combined for training a resulting model.

conceptions imposed by data protection frameworks. Finally, in Section 3.3, we challenge how privacy-preserving measures for model deployment are framed in model updating. Overall, we find that privacy-preserving techniques that are incentivized to implementation by data protection—*data protection techniques*—can be used to support ML development that bolsters surveillance. Harkening back to the definitions of surveillance we present, data protection techniques used as part of the ML pipeline can nonetheless enable “increased attention” to personal detail in the base dataset of these systems, and model computation and updating can not only allow subjects to eventually be “reached and influenced” but to in fact *optimize* toward subjects being “reached and influenced”.

3.1 “Privacy-Preserving” Dataset Curation (You see even more of me.)

Private set intersection (PSI) is a cryptographic technique that enables the sharing of data across entities in the development of shared datasets. Given two entities that each hold an encrypted dataset, PSI can be used to compute the intersection of the two datasets without either entity ever needing to reveal their dataset to the other [16]. This can then be used to combine datasets based on features, such as the intersection of individuals who live in the same zip code between two datasets. While PSI focuses on the specialized function of computing the set intersection of private inputs, secure multi-party computation (MPC) can be used to compute a generic function on private inputs without revealing them to any party [16].⁸

⁸PSI and MPC have been proposed to train models using data from multiple sources to perform financial fraud detection [87]. They have also researched for the joint sharing of sensitive medical data to compute analytics and further medical research [41].

⁶See footnote 37 in [73].

⁷We also note that ML and security researchers have been keen to identify how even the privacy guarantees that are made through the use of these techniques may be broken [7, 18]. Assumptions that are made as part of data protection techniques do not always square with how they are used as part of ML development and deployment. This can lead to the system being used to extract insight from data subjects—whether during training or at deployment. For example, [7] show that models trained with federated learning can still leak information about the individual subjects during model training. [8] also note that differential privacy, a common anonymization technique, makes assumptions about the structure of training data that natural language training data does not always have. For example, differential privacy techniques require a clear boundary over where the privacy protections are applied. Where the boundaries of protectable information lie in the context of natural language text may not always be so clear. When differential privacy is applied in these cases, this can then leak secrets of the data subjects as part of model output.

We do not focus on the intrusions that occur when data protection techniques fail to live up to their technical promise. We focus on cases when data protection techniques are in fact applied as intended.

The use of these techniques is heavily researched in the realm of online advertising, but their impacts on surveillance go even further when used to gain access to individual information across contexts as far-ranging as food consumption to insurance prices. A central goal for advertisers and retailers is accurately measuring ad conversion (whether an ad led to an online or offline purchase). This goal has sparked research in “privately” linking data on ad viewership and purchases. In 2018, MasterCard sold Google customer data so that Google could understand how its ads affected in-person shopping. A Google spokesperson described this method as a “double-blind encryption technology that prevents both Google and our partners from viewing our respective users’ personally identifiable information” [54]. In the same vein, as part of a talk at the Real World Cryptography conference in 2022, the head of Meta’s private computation team cites increased data regulations as a reason for Meta’s enthusiasm in building “privacy-preserving” ad conversion (which includes the use of PSI and differential privacy) [35]. The emphasis on a lack of access to identifying information can be important from a security standpoint, but it can once again potentially allow for these computations to once again evade the eyes of data protection. For instance, [89] note that “most adoptions of MPC to date involve data that is not subject to privacy protection under the law.”⁹ And, with a private data-sharing method like PSI, not only do digital platforms who choose to use them have access to search histories and a user’s ad views, they can then understand whether that data leads to *what* someone buys in-person, *when* they buy it, and *how* much they spend. Its application provides further means of monetizing advertising and user spending data. The outcomes allow retailers and advertisers to move their tracking of consumer behavior beyond digital platforms into the physical world.

Beyond advertising, insurance companies may be able to cooperate with multiple businesses to determine their clients’ spending habits and food consumption patterns. This information can then be leveraged to set their insurance prices, in possible contravention to state insurance privacy legislation. The user information from health tracking apps can be “privately” linked with datasets from medical manufacturers and location data.¹⁰

Contextual integrity, a foundational framework for reasoning about privacy and surveillance, may further help to illuminate the surveillant consequences of these operations [59].

⁹For a more nuanced analysis of how different data privacy laws might (not) apply to data used as part of MPC, see Section 4 in [89].

¹⁰PSI allows for the creation of a dataset that verifies the existence of a person across these datasets. Crucially, companies must cooperate regarding the datasets they put forth. So, a debt collector may have a dataset of the people who have interacted with it and a credit card company might have a dataset of people who use its credit card. For PSI to be successful, each entity must be putting forth the dataset they say they are putting forth. PSI can only include information in the resulting dataset about who lives across the datasets that have been put forth. Arguably, rationally, as part of this data exchange, parties have the incentive to provide an honest description of the dataset they are putting forth for PSI.

“A central tenet of contextual integrity is that there are no arenas of life not governed by norms of information flow, no information or spheres of life for which ‘anything goes’” [59]. **PSI provides the technical infrastructure to collapse those contexts into one, allowing models to be trained with unobstructed insight into information about people in diverse contexts.** Resulting systems are often referred to as “privacy-preserving” [44] because the underlying dataset does not have to be outright revealed to the entities performing the joint computation. The incorporation of the link between a clicked advertisement and a payment, a doctor’s visit and a person’s dietary habits, whether done physically or online, enables a new and even more targeted form of individualization. The increased granularity of individual information through PSI operations in the resulting dataset then sets the stage for the rest of the “privacy-preserving” ML pipeline as the data is ingested into further algorithmic training.

3.2 “Privacy-Preserving” Model Training and Computation (You’re protecting you.)

There is recognition within the privacy and security community that storing data on company servers leads to a loss of user control over how user data is processed and used—and, specifically, the data’s vulnerability to external parties. As Wang [90] notes: “unfortunately, there is a disadvantage to migrating application code and user data from a user’s local machine to a remote data center server: the user loses control over where her data is stored, how it is computed upon, and how the data (and its derivatives) are shared with other services.” There have been several responses to this problem from an ML privacy standpoint: (1) one approach has been to process user data locally or “on-device” and perform private immediate model training steps, typically through the use of techniques in on-device processing. This approach leverages *federated learning* (FL) [97] and intermediate steps for may also be protected through the use of *differential privacy* (DP) [76], and (2) there has also been a significant amount of research in leveraging *homomorphic encryption* to compute models on encrypted data [3].

Under data protection and, in many instances, privacy laws, interfacing with covered data is the gateway to liability attribution. But embedded in many of these policies is also an imposition of a relational structure through which data is exchanged.¹¹ In 1996, Nissenbaum [58] warned of “the problem of many hands” in complicating how accountability is determined from resulting problems. These methods, through exchanging data and computations in private forms through arguably no hands (in the case of FL) or many hands (in the case of homomorphic encryption), could deflect liability, at

¹¹The EU GDPR discusses controllers, processors, and subjects [23]. As another example, the CCPA adopts a relationship model involving businesses and service providers [10], but adopts similar definitions as the GDPR.

each point of data use for model training, for why privacy intrusions are not theirs to handle. Going back to the motivation for the adoption of these techniques in the security community, the potential deflection of responsibility can continue to make it difficult for users to exert control for how their data is processed as the data continues to accumulate during model training and computation.

As part of (1), FL is a popular privacy-preserving technique that allows computations for model training to be decentralized. Typically, FL coordinates training individually on user devices and model weights are then aggregated and sent to a centralized server to train a global model [45]. Model updates can also be noised with DP before they are coordinated through a central server. However, when FL is treated as an avenue to more types of model computations, users may not have awareness over the fact that their data is being processed or how the resulting model is sent to corporate servers [84]. **From a legal standpoint, data subjects may also then unwittingly become data controllers or processors processing data on their own devices under the EU GDPR [84]. Under a controller-processor-subject framework of data protection, controllers and processors owe responsibilities to data subjects. If data subjects are instead classified as controllers or processors, this could confound the attribution for harms resulting from and relating to data collection and processing [84]—the users are surveilling themselves!**

As part of (2), the use of homomorphic encryption has been offered up as a solution to model training that preserves the privacy of the training data as the model is being computed. Traditionally, computation on encrypted data requires data to be decrypted for the function to be applied. This leads to security vulnerabilities in the sense that users’ plaintext data is revealed when the function is applied. In the case you are encrypting your own data to be computed, your plaintext data need not be revealed to any intermediary parties. Acar [2] presents the example where you the data owner would like a third-party to compute a function on your message. The data owner would (a) encrypt the message, (b) send it to the server, (c) get the encrypted result of the computation back, and (d) decrypt the encrypted result. Where the data owner directly interfaces with the third-party, the data owner never reveals the message to anyone.

In the “confidential” machine learning setting [69], however, model developers generally rely on the computational infrastructure of high-resource actors [20]. There is a broader ecosystem of actors—some who may interface with plaintext data and some who may not. The model developer may have the dataset, but the model developer could off-load model computation onto the cloud provider and the cloud provider only ever works with the encrypted dataset. Such a developmental process could result in a conceptualization where no one interfaced with data at all. Notably, the resulting model trained with homomorphic encryption is just as susceptible

to attacks that attempt to recover training data or uses of the model that target those in the training set or beyond. However, liability attribution for resulting model behavior and privacy intrusions may be further complicated because it can be argued that no actor ever *directly* interfaced with plaintext personal data as part of model training and computation.

3.3 “Privacy-Preserving” Model Application and Inferences (Don’t use them against me!)

Dwork [21] highlights: “the things that statistical databases are designed to teach can, sometimes indirectly, cause damage to an individual, even if this individual is not in the database.” The influence of one person’s data on another is increasingly recognized as a point that data protection laws have overlooked. The collective influence [49] of data is perhaps made glaringly clear in the context of genetic data. In 2023, 23&Me announced that it had suffered a data breach. It suffered this data breach to its “DNA Relatives” feature, and this data breach has an effect not only the subjects directly affected by the breach, but also on their relatives who might not even be aware that 23&Me possesses their information [85].

The collective influence of data is also reflected in how technical operations are performed on it. In the case of recommender systems, the popular technique of collaborative filtering [77] explicitly leverages data about other people’s online experiences to analyze how it can be used to shape *yours*—weighting the preferences and experiences of those that are most similar to you the highest. Inferences are drawn from others to be made about you. Recent work has also pointed to the importance of shifting from understanding privacy in ML models through the lens of identifiability to understanding privacy through the impacts of their inference. For instance, it has been shown that language models can be used to *infer* sensitive information from text that may not appear to have any identifying information [75]. Staab [75] show that from a seemingly innocuous text passage: “there is this nasty intersection on my commute, I always get stuck there waiting for a hook turn”, language models could infer that the author of the passage is likely from Melbourne because of their use of the term “hook turn”.

This relationality [86] inherent in both data itself and the techniques that use them to shape our online experiences challenge an individualistic conception of anonymity. A common trade-off when applying anonymization techniques is the privacy-utility or the privacy-accuracy trade-off: how much utility or accuracy in the resulting model do you want to sacrifice to preserve the privacy of data subjects used to train the model?¹² Typically, the more privacy protection a technique

¹²See, e.g., [64]: “Generally, there is a trade-off between ϵ and the utility of the mechanism (e.g., accuracy of a neural network); smaller ϵ ’s typically lead to lower utility if other variables like the dataset size and batch size remain constant.”

confers to data subjects, the less useful the result becomes—whether the result is a private statistic or an ML model. When privacy-preserving techniques are applied in practice, decisions must be set about the parameters that correspond to the degree of privacy protection. For example, in the application of differentially private algorithms, the value of ϵ must be carefully chosen so that results still have utility. The hallmark of a good privacy-preserving mechanism is one that straddles this trade-off—conferring privacy protection while maintaining good utility. However, there are instances where this trade-off may not even exist. The application of data protection techniques can *help* learning [22, 61]. Privacy-preserving generalization from collective data can, in some instances, be even better for learning. Depending on what the model is learning toward, data protection techniques may help systems generalize and infer characteristics to target better. In other words, knowing about others *like* you can help ML models hone in on you. This begs the question of how privacy and utility should be formulated when anonymization techniques are applied. Particularly, there may be certain data flows toward the production of an ML system. In which a large degree of utility can itself represent a collective privacy intrusion no matter how individual privacy protection is conferred in the application of these techniques.

4 Regulating PPML: Technology and Policy Strategies

Rather than be applied to protect individuals, data protection techniques can be applied to both extract value from previously untouched crevices of data while limiting liability for the consequences of those extractions. The layering of techniques at each stage of the development pipeline can lead to ML architectures that bolster surveillance. In this section, we provide technical and policy strategies to address the regulation of these developments and uses. Data protection techniques may themselves be important tools that can be wielded to protect against collective surveillance and protect individual privacy. Crucially, data protection continues to be at the core of upcoming privacy and data regulations with relevance to ML¹³, making these strategies urgent to consider.

4.1 Regulating PPML as the Extraction of Data Value

The application of data protection techniques may be motivated by the *value* [62] of the resulting data that is gained through its application. For example, Jones and Tonetti [37] describe encryption as a technique that can be leveraged to control and monitor access to data as a resource. By leverag-

¹³The United States, for instance, will see data protection policies in Delaware [19], New Jersey [57], and Texas [78] (among others) come into effect in the next few years.

ing techniques such as encryption, the value of data can be manipulated and increased by excluding access to that data from others. Similarly, the use of differential privacy in industry to access new kinds of datasets as discussed in [42] increases value by allowing access to new kinds of data that could not be accessed before. As discussed earlier in the dataset alignment stage, the use of PSI can allow multiple firms to unlock the value of their data in how it can be synthesized with other bodies of data during the training of machine learning models. [62, 86] have discussed the value of data that is overlooked in the regulation of data privacy. In this section, we consider technical strategies that could leverage the principles of purpose limitation to control value extraction. Additionally, we consider policy strategies for capturing the power relationship firms have in the accumulation of collective data that impacts individuals.

Purpose Limitation and Specification Purpose limitation is an oft-discussed privacy principle [26]. Yet, in the context of data protection, it is largely understood to only apply to personal data. For instance, purpose limitation has been described as a principle that personal data “must be collected for specified, explicit and legitimate purposes and not further processed in a way incompatible with those purposes” [26]. However, value accumulates through the relational and social nature of data [62]. System users also conceptualize privacy harms not in terms of identifiability but in terms of *use*. One study on user expectations and secure multi-party computation [38] found that there were concerns that the use of the data, regardless of whether in plaintext or encrypted form, could be inherently privacy-invasive. Notably, one of their study participants voiced that, “*If you’re using my data, then there’s no privacy... if there’s privacy, then you’re not using my data.*”

The value of relational data may still be expressed in ways that are amenable to technical, cryptographic notions of purpose limitation—for instance, through limiting the amount of times that a particular piece of data is accessed, limiting the time period that data is made accessible, as well as through limiting the types computations that be made. There is a body of research on the development and use of ephemeral data structures or self-destructing data structures [63, 68, 72, 96], which could be helpful in the enforcement of purpose limitations along the axis of time. These proposals seek to guarantee time-based data deletion even when the data is stored by an untrusted entity that does not explicitly perform any deletion operations (e.g. deleting entries from a database). This is one direction of work that seeks to apply direct accountability and limitation to how data is accessed (and then used). Future research could explore similar solutions for PPML that enshrine technical guarantees around the time period (or number of times) data can be used, or the data flows that surround the use of data for model training.

Another way purpose limitation could be implemented is

through limiting the types of computations that can be performed on data. A few MPC-based systems for collaborative analytics on datasets from different sources have proposed integrating mechanisms for checking query compliance against a set of pre-defined policies [6, 17, 88]. For example, this could be used to limit *any* computation on specified demographics to prevent targeting. This could also allow individual entities to set their own policies around how their data is used and computed on. Since this would require a preemptive specification of allowable computation, it may increase transparency around how data is used to help users make informed decisions. These ideas could similarly be adapted to PPML systems, and there may also be privacy implications for the growing body of research on limiting dual uses of ML systems [32], particularly pre-trained foundation models.

How our data implicates my system use Data accrues value *at scale* and *in relation* to others [53]. Yet, the communication of the mechanics and privacy guarantees of data protection techniques have focused on individual promises regarding individual pieces of data.¹⁴ Similarly, data protection and privacy laws have adopted an individualistic conception of privacy intrusions.

Because of the power that is inherent in architecting the relationship between data more broadly and user experiences, fiduciary privacy duties to personal data are an increasingly popular approach to regulate the accumulation of data in ways that intrude on privacy. However, linking these duties to an individual’s personal data can neglect to account for how collective data is leveraged to shape individual’s online experience. We propose that carve-outs from duties surrounding how personal data is processed and used should be additionally conditioned upon a duty to *system subjects*.

Recent legal scholarship propose fiduciary duties [4], and specifically, duties of loyalty [66] and care [13], to address the privacy harms that persist in light of current models of data protection. These duties encompass a recognition of relationships that hold power imbalances, and its core principles can be extended across many different types of relationships, such as both interpersonal and professional relationships [56]—such as relationships with a parent, doctor, or teacher. A duty of loyalty’s main principles include a prohibition of self-dealing [66], preventing conflicts of interests [28], and duties to disclose information [28]. By capturing asymmetric power relations between data collectors and data subjects [66], these proposed duties represent an important step in preventing surveillant privacy harms to data subjects.¹⁵ However, pro-

¹⁴For example, descriptions of differential privacy guarantees focus on identifying an individual in a database or dataset. But system subjects, who may or may not be in the dataset, are also implicated when anonymization techniques are used. It can be important to consider the impacts of data dressed in data protection techniques on user system experiences even when data protection.

¹⁵However, there remains contention about where a duty of loyalty fits in relationship to other duties and obligations [28, 43]. [66] argues that the

posed duties as part of privacy law are often still tethered to a data subject’s *personal* or *identifying* information. Such is the case even in [66]’s proposals, which discusses a “duty of loyalty for personal information”. In the proposed United States Data Care Act, each duty is scoped to individual identifying data or inferences that are drawn from individual identifying data [80].¹⁶ A duty of loyalty is included as part of the ADPPA [81] emphasizes the minimization of covered data: data that “identifies or is linked or reasonably linkable to an individual” [81]. This scoping can fail to capture surveillant intrusions when associated data that is not identifying or personal, such as through targeted profiling [46]. A duty of loyalty or care scoped this way implicitly links a particular individual’s online experience with only *their* respective collected data. But, as we discuss in Section 3.3, data and the techniques that are used to extract value from data are inherently relational.

To capture the power relations that firms have in leveraging data, be they exclusively tied to an individual or collectively ours, to curate each individual’s online experiences, it may be important to condition carve-outs for anonymized data upon a duty to system subjects (whether or not those system subjects are contained in the dataset)—recognizing the power that others’ data holds over individual experiences with online systems. This would include a recognition of not just how individual data is leveraged, but also how others’ data is leveraged to impact individuals. To that end, we echo proposals surrounding a collective perspective into the effects of data. Gordon [29] emphasizes the importance of a “collective perspective” in understanding the ways that collective data is leveraged in the process of personalization. This collective perspective is built through not just best practices or requirements in how data is collected, but through insight and monitoring of how that data is used [49]. Koops [46] makes an argument in a similar spirit that the focus should be on how data profiles are *used* than in the data pre-processing stages. But, perhaps contradictorily, this would require a level of information about user behavior and how this behavior triggers the content that is fed back to them. The use of data protection techniques can and should be incentivized toward this end. Gordon [29] highlights the role that data protection techniques such as differential privacy can play in protecting the privacy of individuals in obtaining this insight. Research that supports the monitoring content presentation on platforms [11] could also provide insight into both how user interactions prompt certain pieces of content as well as the types of content that are presented to many people as a whole. In the case of surveillant privacy harms built up by data protection techniques, data cooperatives could negotiate

possibility for “conflicting loyalties” are already embedded as part of a duty of loyalty and may be overcome through carefully scoping the duty.

¹⁶The Data Care Act contains a duty of care, a duty of loyalty, and a duty of confidentiality. Each of these duties are scoped to “individual identifying data” or, in the case of a duty of loyalty, “data derived from individual identifying data”.

for increased transparency regarding how a collective body of data is concentrated to impact individuals.

The individual impacts on system subjects is also apparent in the instance of local processing that we discuss in Section 3.2. In certain privacy-preserving system designs, for instance, randomly selected users may be responsible for providing the computational infrastructure for collective computations. This may very well be welcome under instances where data is processed for legitimate purposes and for serving better user experiences. However, the burden of computation is shifted onto users for unwelcome operations. We echo [84]’s proposal for devices to be accountable to their users, which could include extending devices to be considered agents of the corporations orchestrating computations. There is some recognition of this, even as part of data protection laws. As part of *Hazlitt v. Apple* under Illinois’ Biometric Information Privacy Act (BIPA), the District Court for the Southern District of Illinois ruled that data processed on user’s devices was still considered to be in possession by the company because of a lack of user control over how the data was processed [94].

Regulatory agencies and could also play an important role in mapping the trajectory of collective data. Van Loo [82] defines regulatory monitors as “those whose core power is to regularly obtain nonpublic information from businesses outside the legal investigatory process.” Van Loo [82] notes that, in addition to rule-making and enforcement, agencies increasingly play a role in monitoring and information collection. A tighter feedback loop of insight into data use can provide incentives that preempt uses of data protection techniques to support surveillance infrastructure.

4.2 Regulating PPML as Liability Management

Data protection techniques may also allow firms to construct barriers from condemning information and, thus, build boundaries against liability from that information. If platforms can claim that they do not possess fine-grained enough data to provide that information, or that the majority of that information is spun through local devices, they may be considered off the hook for protecting against predictive and targeting privacy intrusions. As an example, to protect against being found to make biased or discriminatory decisions [47, 83], financial institutions have limited their collection of certain types of data under the guise of increased privacy. This has led to challenges to developing ML algorithms that account for impacts to individuals. Additionally, in section 3.2, we describe how local processing or homomorphic encryption for model training can serve to complicate liability attribution for resulting model characteristics and use. Indeed, privacy-preservation can be wielded as a pretext [83] and as a form of liability shielding rather than confer meaningful protections to associated individuals [65]. This raises the question of how

to promote incentives in using data protection techniques in ways that are protective to individuals while holding developers accountable for the effects of that data and how it is used against individuals. In this section, we consider standards of proof and the development of infrastructures for collective transparency.

Standards of proof In light of ways that privacy can be used as a pretext, Van Loo [83] proposes that there should be higher standards of proof when data is considered withheld from regulators—requiring firms to motivate that the risk of privacy intrusion is great and truly requires that the data be withheld. Where data protection techniques are used, perhaps the more relevant question may instead be whether data protection techniques truly create a barrier to the the investigation of data and system effects—such as how the resulting system can be used to manipulate or discriminate against system subjects. There is a growing amount of research that addresses how auditing can be performed even through data protection [34]. The way that privacy-preserving system architectures may shield liability from potentially condemning information hearken to dynamics in patent law, under which firms may try to design *around* existing patents to prevent liability for infringement [9]. The doctrine of equivalents is the principle that “a substitution that performs the same function in the same way with the same result as a patented item, even if not formally within the text of the claims, still infringes by equivalents, if not literally” [9]. Burk [9] notes that the doctrine of equivalents helps to separate meaningful inventing around from “wasteful” inventing around. Similarly, standards for the use of data protection techniques may differentiate their use to protect individual privacy from their use to prevent liability for harmful impacts to individual users. An analogous standard in light of data protection techniques might ask whether a particular “privacy-preserving” architecture confers meaningful individual protections in light of the ultimate purpose/use of the system.

5 Adversarial Compliance

Compliantly winding around rules while subverting their goals has been recognized in several ways. *Avoision* “describes conduct which seeks to exploit the differences between a law’s goals and its self-defined limits [27].” Burk [9] terms *perverse innovation* as a form of technological development designed to avoid regulation in response to the inescapable existence of loopholes in regulation. Schneier [70] additionally describes this conduct as a sort of legal *hack*—specifically noting that, while hacks are traditionally connoted as a way for underdogs to fight against the powerful, hacks to the legal system are often exploited by those who are most powerful. Crucially: *perverse innovation*, *avoision*, and *hacks* are different from simply breaking a rule and thereby evad-

ing enforcement. They are ways that rules may be evaded altogether, hence bypassing enforcement. Software and technology more broadly has historically played a key role in such conduct.¹⁷ Wu [92] challenges the notion that code is law [48] and proposes an alternative framing of code as a form of avoidance of the law. This calls to mind the framing of anonymity presented in [5], that “anonymity obliterates the link between data and a specific person not so much to protect privacy but, in a sense, to bypass it entirely.” With data protection regulating data by tiers of identifiability and sensitivity, anonymization is a way that rules surrounding data protection may attempt to be bypassed.

The properties of how this mismatch between anonymization techniques and data protection laws occur may, in part, be modelled by tools that are already familiar to security technologists. Security is often conceptualized as a never-ending cat-and-mouse game between systems builders and hackers. Law has been conceptualized as a similarly never-ending cat-and-mouse game between the regulator and the regulated. When technology plays a large role in how regulation is determined, so, too, may be the relationship between technologists and regulators. Choi [12], for instance, discusses the relationship between copyright liability and the design of peer-to-peer networks as a cat-and-mouse game. With each copyright verdict hinging on the design of peer-to-peer networks, their design quickly shifted to limit resulting liability—eventually leading to the “Grokster dead-end”.

Adversarial thinking may be helpful to bring to bear the relationship between how data protection techniques extract value of data, a policy’s intent, and how the written rules may or may not bring us to those goals. Schneier [70] similarly advocates for red-teaming to test the robustness of laws in order to combat legal hacks. For instance, in the field of tax law, Schneier [70] suggests that tax lawyers be at the table when tax laws are designed with a ready eye for potential “hacks” or loopholes. Similarly, there may also be a place for privacy and security technologists in considering the design of data-protected systems in light of policy intentions. How might that technology be used to subvert the spirit of a particular regulation? Many research papers that architect privacy-preserving systems are explicitly motivated by compliance with data protection laws such as the GDPR [1, 36]. However, for the design of robust policies and systems that do respect user privacy, it may also be crucial to bring the adversarial mindset inherent to the security profession to the policy-making drawing board.

6 Conclusion

Data protection is an important prong of data regulation because of its breadth. As long as personal data is processed

¹⁷ [92] describes code and specifically the development of peer-to-peer networks as a way of bypassing and challenging copyright law altogether.

or used, data protection kicks in. However, on the other side of this breadth, is a potentially equally broad carve-out for when personal data is *not* collected, processed, or used. If data protection techniques can run a truck through this carve-out, the development of “privacy-preserving” ML systems can be developed to optimize for the leveraging of collective data in ways that could nonetheless support individual intrusions and surveillance. Importantly, data protection law is not alone in how it is being challenged by the ways ML leverages and optimizes with collective data. ML development challenges individualistic notions of data regulation across multiple levers.¹⁸ The development and application of data protection laws represent an important opportunity to conceptualize the role of data for ML systems more broadly.

In this paper, we examine the interaction between the incentives put forth by a data protection approach to regulating data and “privacy-preserving” ML development. The same techniques that have been incentivized to implementation by data protection and privacy laws can be leveraged refine the ML surveillance pipeline. We discuss techniques that may be used at each stage of ML development, including PSI, federated learning, and homomorphic encryption. Carve-outs for the use of data protection techniques hinge on an implicit promise to protect individuals. From the developments and uses we highlight, however, we draw out two overarching principles that data protection techniques are used toward instead—value extraction and liability management. We provide technology and policy strategies to think through how to regulate how data protection techniques are used in each. Finally, we highlight the role of technologists in thinking through and devising policies for privacy-preserving techniques.

7 Acknowledgements

We thank Kris Shrishak, Rebecca Spiewak, Alla Goldman Seiffert, Taylor Lynn Curtis, Gabe Kaptchuk, Zheng Dai, and Victor Youdom Kemmoe for helpful conversations and feedback.

References

- [1] Zahra Abbas, Sunila Fatima Ahmad, Madiha Haider Syed, Adeel Anjum, and Semeen Rehman. Exploring deep federated learning for the internet of things: A gdpr-compliant architecture. *IEEE Access*, 2023.
- [2] Abbas Acar, Hidayet Aksu, A Selcuk Uluagac, and Mauro Conti. A survey on homomorphic encryption

¹⁸In copyright law, for instance, the burden of proof lies on individual artists to defend their rights. Proposed legal evaluations of what it means for ML systems to copy a work during training hinge on a conception of the training process that takes specifically from individual works—when, in reality, generated works are impacted by multiple works, some that may even be unexpected to the human eye.

- schemes: Theory and implementation. *ACM Computing Surveys (Csur)*, 51(4):1–35, 2018.
- [3] Amazon. Enable fully homomorphic encryption with amazon sagemaker endpoints for secure, real-time inferencing. <https://aws.amazon.com/blogs/machine-learning/enable-fully-homomorphic-encryption-with-amazon-sagemaker-endpoints-for-secure-real-time-inferencing/>, 2023.
- [4] Jack M Balkin. Information fiduciaries and the first amendment. *UCDL Rev.*, 49:1183, 2015.
- [5] Solon Barocas and Helen Nissenbaum. Big data’s end run around anonymity and consent. *Privacy, big data, and the public good: Frameworks for engagement*, 1:44–75, 2014.
- [6] Ben Getchell and Mayank Varia. CCD-MPC, 2019.
- [7] Franziska Boenisch, Adam Dziedzic, Roei Schuster, Ali Shahin Shamsabadi, Ilia Shumailov, and Nicolas Papernot. When the curious abandon honesty: Federated learning is not private. In *2023 IEEE 8th European Symposium on Security and Privacy (EuroS&P)*, pages 175–199. IEEE, 2023.
- [8] Hannah Brown, Katherine Lee, Fatemehsadat Mireshghallah, Reza Shokri, and Florian Tramèr. What does it mean for a language model to preserve privacy? In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 2280–2292, 2022.
- [9] Dan L Burk. Perverse innovation. *Wm. & Mary L. Rev.*, 58:1, 2016.
- [10] California State Legislature. 1.81.5. california consumer privacy act of 2018 [1798.100 - 1798.199.100], 2018.
- [11] Annie Y Chen, Brendan Nyhan, Jason Reifler, Ronald E Robertson, and Christo Wilson. Subscriptions and external links help drive resentful users to alternative and extremist youtube channels. *Science Advances*, 9(35):eadd8080, 2023.
- [12] Bryan H Choi. The grokster dead-end. *Harv. JL & Tech.*, 19:393, 2005.
- [13] Danielle Citron. *The Fight for Privacy: Protecting Dignity, Identity, and Love in the Digital Age*. Random House, 2022.
- [14] Julie E Cohen. Surveillance vs. privacy: effects and implications. *Cambridge Handbook of Surveillance Law*, eds. David Gray & Stephen E. Henderson (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2017), pages 455–69, 2017.
- [15] Rachel Cummings and Deven Desai. The role of differential privacy in gdpr compliance. In *FAT’18: Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, page 20, 2018.
- [16] David Evans, Vladimir Kolesnikov, and Mike Rosulek. *A Pragmatic Introduction to Secure Multi-Party Computation*. NOW Publishers, December 2018.
- [17] Roberta De Viti, Isaac Sheff, Noemi Glaeser, Baltasar Dinis, Rodrigo Rodrigues, Jonathan Katz, Bobby Bhattacharjee, Anwar Hithnawi, Deepak Garg, and Peter Druschel. CoVault: A Secure Analytics Platform. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.03784*, 2022.
- [18] Edoardo Debenedetti, Giorgio Severi, Nicholas Carlini, Christopher A Choquette-Choo, Matthew Jagielski, Milad Nasr, Eric Wallace, and Florian Tramèr. Privacy side channels in machine learning systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.05610*, 2023.
- [19] Delaware State Legislature. Delaware personal data privacy act. <https://legiscan.com/DE/text/HB154/id/2807502/Delaware-2023-HB154-Draft.html>, 2024.
- [20] Ravit Dotan and Smitha Milli. Value-laden disciplinary shifts in machine learning. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 294–294, 2020.
- [21] Cynthia Dwork. A firm foundation for private data analysis. *Communications of the ACM*, 54(1):86–95, 2011.
- [22] Cynthia Dwork, Vitaly Feldman, Moritz Hardt, Toni Pitassi, Omer Reingold, and Aaron Roth. Generalization in adaptive data analysis and holdout reuse. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 28, 2015.
- [23] EU Legislature. General data protection regulation, 2018.
- [24] European Union Legislature. Eu ai act. <https://artificialintelligenceact.eu/the-act/>, 2021.
- [25] Michèle Finck and Frank Pallas. They who must not be identified—distinguishing personal from non-personal data under the gdpr. *International Data Privacy Law*, 10(1):11–36, 2020.
- [26] Nikolaus Forgó, Stefanie Hänold, and Benjamin Schütze. The principle of purpose limitation and big data. *New technology, big data and the law*, pages 17–42, 2017.
- [27] Rebecca Giblin and Jane C Ginsburg. On aereo and ‘aovision’. 2014.

- [28] Andrew S Gold. The fiduciary duty of loyalty. *The Oxford Handbook of Fiduciary Law (New York: Oxford University Press, 2019)*, 2019.
- [29] Ayelet Gordon-Tapiero, Alexandra Wood, and Katrina Ligett. The case for establishing a collective perspective to address the harms of platform personalization. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Symposium on Computer Science and Law*, pages 119–130, 2022.
- [30] Graham Greenleaf. California’s ccpa 2.0: Does the us finally have a data privacy act? 2020.
- [31] Woodrow Hartzog, Evan Selinger, and Johanna Gunawan. Privacy nicks: How the law normalizes surveillance. 2023.
- [32] Peter Henderson, Eric Mitchell, Christopher Manning, Dan Jurafsky, and Chelsea Finn. Self-destructing models: Increasing the costs of harmful dual uses of foundation models. In *Proceedings of the 2023 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, pages 287–296, 2023.
- [33] Illinois State Legislature. (740 ilcs 14/) biometric information privacy act., 2008.
- [34] Basileal Imana, Aleksandra Korolova, and John Heidemann. Having your privacy cake and eating it too: Platform-supported auditing of social media algorithms for public interest. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 7(CSCW1):1–33, 2023.
- [35] James Reyes. Building the next generation of digital advertising in MPC, April 2022.
- [36] Di Jiang, Conghui Tan, Jinhua Peng, Chaotao Chen, Xueyang Wu, Weiwei Zhao, Yuanfeng Song, Yongxin Tong, Chang Liu, Qian Xu, et al. A gdpr-compliant ecosystem for speech recognition with transfer, federated, and evolutionary learning. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology (TIST)*, 12(3):1–19, 2021.
- [37] Charles I Jones and Christopher Tonetti. Nonrivalry and the economics of data. *American Economic Review*, 110(9):2819–2858, 2020.
- [38] Bailey Kacsmar, Vasisht Duddu, Kyle Tilbury, Blase Ur, and Florian Kerschbaum. Comprehension from Chaos: Towards Informed Consent for Private Computation. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 210–224, Copenhagen Denmark, November 2023. ACM.
- [39] Bailey Kacsmar, Basit Khurram, Nils Lukas, Alexander Norton, Masoumeh Shafieinejad, Zhiwei Shang, Yaser Baseri, Maryam Sepehri, Simon Oya, and Florian Kerschbaum. Differentially private two-party set operations. In *2020 IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy (EuroS&P)*, pages 390–404. IEEE, 2020.
- [40] Pratyusha Ria Kalluri, William Agnew, Myra Cheng, Kentrell Owens, Luca Soldaini, and Abeba Birhane. The surveillance ai pipeline, 2023.
- [41] Liina Kamm, Dan Bogdanov, Sven Laur, and Jaak Vilo. A new way to protect privacy in large-scale genome-wide association studies. *Bioinformatics*, 29(7):886–893, 2013.
- [42] Michael Kearns and Aaron Roth. *The ethical algorithm: The science of socially aware algorithm design*. Oxford University Press, 2019.
- [43] Lina M Khan and David E Pozen. A skeptical view of information fiduciaries. *Harvard Law Review*, 133(2):497–541, 2019.
- [44] Lea Kissner and Dawn Song. Privacy-preserving set operations. In *Annual International Cryptology Conference*, pages 241–257. Springer, 2005.
- [45] Jakub Konečný, H Brendan McMahan, Daniel Ramage, and Peter Richtárik. Federated optimization: Distributed machine learning for on-device intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.02527*, 2016.
- [46] Bert-Jaap Koops. Some reflections on profiling, power shifts, and protection paradigms. *PROFILING THE EUROPEAN CITIZEN*, Hildebrandt & Gutwirth, eds., Springer, 2008.
- [47] I Elizabeth Kumar, Keegan E Hines, and John P Dickerson. Equalizing credit opportunity in algorithms: Aligning algorithmic fairness research with us fair lending regulation. In *Proceedings of the 2022 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, pages 357–368, 2022.
- [48] Lawrence Lessig. Code is law. *Harvard magazine*, 1:2000, 2000.
- [49] Katrina Ligett and Kobbi Nissim. We need to focus on how our data is used, not just how it is shared. *Communications of the ACM*, 66(9):32–34, 2023.
- [50] Yang Liu, Yan Kang, Tianyuan Zou, Yanhong Pu, Yuanqin He, Xiaozhou Ye, Ye Ouyang, Ya-Qin Zhang, and Qiang Yang. Vertical federated learning: Concepts, advances and challenges, 2023.
- [51] David Lyon. *Surveillance as social sorting: Privacy, risk, and digital discrimination*. Psychology Press, 2003.

- [52] David Lyon. Surveillance studies: An overview. 2007.
- [53] Evan Malmgren. Resisting “big other”: What will it take to defeat surveillance capitalism? In *New Labor Forum*, volume 28, pages 42–50. SAGE Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA, 2019.
- [54] Mark Bergen and Jennifer Surane. Google and Mastercard Cut a Secret Ad Deal to Track Retail Sales. *Bloomberg*, August 2018.
- [55] Microsoft. Federated learning with azure machine learning: Powering privacy-preserving innovation in ai. <https://techcommunity.microsoft.com/t5/ai-machine-learning-blog/federated-learning-with-azure-machine-learning-powering-privacy/ba-p/3824720>, 2023.
- [56] Paul B Miller. The identification of fiduciary relationships. *The Oxford Handbook of Fiduciary Law (New York: Oxford University Press, 2019)*, 2019.
- [57] New Jersey State Legislature. Sb332. <https://www.njleg.state.nj.us/bill-search/2022/S332>, 2023.
- [58] Helen Nissenbaum. Accountability in a computerized society. *Science and engineering ethics*, 2:25–42, 1996.
- [59] Helen Nissenbaum. Privacy as contextual integrity. *Wash. L. Rev.*, 79:119, 2004.
- [60] Nicolas Papernot, Patrick McDaniel, Arunesh Sinha, and Michael P Wellman. Sok: Security and privacy in machine learning. In *2018 IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy (EuroS&P)*, pages 399–414. IEEE, 2018.
- [61] Papernot, Nicholas and Thakurta, Guha Abhradeep. How to deploy machine learning with differential privacy, 2021.
- [62] Amanda Parsons and Salome Viljoen. Valuing social data. *U of Colorado Law Legal Studies Research Paper*, (23-16), 2023.
- [63] Radia Perlman. The ephemerizer: Making data disappear, 2005.
- [64] Natalia Ponomareva, Hussein Hazimeh, Alex Kurakin, Zheng Xu, Carson Denison, H Brendan McMahan, Sergei Vassilvitskii, Steve Chien, and Abhradeep Guha Thakurta. How to dp-fy ml: A practical guide to machine learning with differential privacy. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 77:1113–1201, 2023.
- [65] David E Pozen. Privacy-privacy tradeoffs. *The University of Chicago Law Review*, pages 221–247, 2016.
- [66] Neil Richards and Woodrow Hartzog. A duty of loyalty for privacy law. *Wash. UL Rev.*, 99:961, 2021.
- [67] Neil M Richards. The dangers of surveillance. *Harv. L. Rev.*, 126:1934, 2012.
- [68] Roxana Geambasu, Tadayoshi Kohno, Amit A. Levy, and Henry M. Levy. Vanish: increasing data privacy with self-destructing data. In *Proceedings of the 18th USENIX Security Symposium*, Montreal, Canada, August 2009. USENIX Association.
- [69] Sharma Sagar and Chen Keke. Confidential machine learning on untrusted platforms: a survey. *Cybersecurity*, 4(1):1–19, 2021.
- [70] Bruce Schneier. *A Hacker’s Mind: How the Powerful Bend Society’s Rules, and how to Bend Them Back*. WW Norton & Company, 2023.
- [71] Paul M Schwartz and Daniel J Solove. The pii problem: Privacy and a new concept of personally identifiable information. *NYUL rev.*, 86:1814, 2011.
- [72] Seny Kamara. Crypto for the People, August 2020.
- [73] Daniel J Solove. Data is what data does: Regulating use, harm, and risk instead of sensitive data. *118 Northwestern University Law Review (Forthcoming)*, 2023.
- [74] Gerald Spindler and Philipp Schmechel. Personal data and encryption in the european general data protection regulation. *J. Intell. Prop. Info. Tech. & Elec. Com. L.*, 7:163, 2016.
- [75] Robin Staab, Mark Vero, Mislav Balunović, and Martin Vechev. Beyond memorization: Violating privacy via inference with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.07298*, 2023.
- [76] Branislav Stojkovic, Jonathan Woodbridge, Zhihan Fang, Jerry Cai, Andrey Petrov, Sathya Iyer, Daoyu Huang, Patrick Yau, Arvind Sastha Kumar, Hitesh Jawa, et al. Applied federated learning: Architectural design for robust and efficient learning in privacy aware settings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.00807*, 2022.
- [77] Xiaoyuan Su and Taghi M Khoshgoftaar. A survey of collaborative filtering techniques. *Advances in artificial intelligence*, 2009, 2009.
- [78] Texas State Legislature. Texas data privacy and security act. <https://capitol.texas.gov/BillLookup/Text.aspx?LegSess=88R&Bill=HB4>, 2023.
- [79] Amos Treiber, Dirk Müllmann, Thomas Schneider, and Indra Spiecker genannt Döhmann. Data protection law and multi-party computation: Applications to information exchange between law enforcement agencies. In

- Proceedings of the 21st Workshop on Privacy in the Electronic Society*, pages 69–82, 2022.
- [80] United States Congress. S.919 - data care act of 2021. <https://www.congress.gov/bill/117th-congress/senate-bill/919>, 2021.
- [81] U.S. Legislature. H.r.8152 - american data privacy and protection act, 2022.
- [82] Rory Van Loo. Regulatory monitors. *Columbia Law Review*, 119(2):369–444, 2019.
- [83] Rory Van Loo. Privacy pretexts. *Cornell L. Rev.*, 108:1, 2022.
- [84] Michael Veale. Rights for those who unwillingly, unknowingly and unidentifiably compute! 2023.
- [85] The Verge. 23andme admits hackers accessed 6.9 million users’ dna relatives data. <https://www.theverge.com/2023/12/4/23988050/23andme-hackers-accessed-user-data-confirmed>, 2023.
- [86] Salome Viljoen. A relational theory of data governance. *Yale LJ*, 131:573, 2021.
- [87] Visa. Secure collaborative machine learning. <https://usa.visa.com/dam/VCOM/regional/na/us/about-visa/research/documents/secure-collaborative-machine-learning.pdf>, 2022.
- [88] Nikolaj Volgushev, Malte Schwarzkopf, Ben Getchell, Mayank Varia, Andrei Lapets, and Azer Bestavros. Conclave: secure multi-party computation on big data. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth EuroSys Conference 2019*, pages 1–18, Dresden Germany, March 2019. ACM.
- [89] Julissa Milligan Walsh, Mayank Varia, Aloni Cohen, Andrew Sellars, and Azer Bestavros. Multi-regulation computing: Examining the legal and policy questions that arise from secure multiparty computation. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Symposium on Computer Science and Law*, pages 53–65, 2022.
- [90] Frank Wang, Ronny Ko, and James Mickens. Riverbed: Enforcing user-defined privacy constraints in distributed web services. In *16th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 19)*, pages 615–630, 2019.
- [91] White House. Blueprint for an AI Bill of Rights. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/Blueprint-for-an-AI-Bill-of-Rights.pdf>.
- [92] Tim Wu. When code isn’t law. *Virginia Law Review*, pages 679–751, 2003.
- [93] Runhua Xu, Nathalie Baracaldo, and James Joshi. Privacy-preserving machine learning: Methods, challenges and directions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.04417*, 2021.
- [94] Rui-Jie Yew and Alice Xiang. Regulating facial processing technologies: Tensions between legal and technical considerations in the application of illinois bipa. In *2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 1017–1027, 2022.
- [95] Tal Z Zarsky. Privacy and manipulation in the digital age. *Theoretical Inquiries in Law*, 20(1):157–188, 2019.
- [96] Lingfang Zeng, Zhan Shi, Shengjie Xu, and Dan Feng. Safevanish: An improved data self-destruction for protecting data privacy. In *2010 IEEE Second International Conference on Cloud Computing Technology and Science*, pages 521–528. IEEE, 2010.
- [97] Chen Zhang, Yu Xie, Hang Bai, Bin Yu, Weihong Li, and Yuan Gao. A survey on federated learning. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 216:106775, 2021.

Table 1: Data Protection Techniques and Potential Implications For Legal Scope

Technique	Protection Goals	Potential Implications for Legal Scope
Encryption	The goal of encryption schemes is to hide plaintext data. The encrypted text looks random, but can be decrypted with a secret key that a trusted party has access to.	Where protected data is scoped to <i>identifying</i> data, the use of encryption may fall out of scope. This is because the data in ciphertext form no longer identifies the data subject. Encryption may also be used in combination with on-device processing techniques. However, the information can still be decrypted to identify the subject. Moreover, computations may still be possible on encrypted data that can link data subjects. This may mean that the use of encryption alone does not hold up when personal data is scoped to include <i>identifiable</i> data. [74] considers the protections granted to encrypted data under different interpretations of the EU GDPR.
Differential Privacy	The goal of differential privacy is to protect against membership inference attacks. This can be useful in the case of publishing private statistics. Published private statistics with differential privacy provide some guarantee about the identification of people who live in the published statistic.	The application of differential privacy can render data neither <i>identifying</i> nor <i>identifiable</i> . It can also be combined with the use of on-device processing techniques, such as in the case of local differential privacy, when noise is added to data before it leaves the user’s device.
Secure Multi-Party Computation (Private Set Intersection)	The goal of secure multi-party computation is to jointly confirm, verify, or compute without releasing data to the joint computers.	The use of multi-party computation may result in a carve-out when the definition of personal data is scoped to <i>identifying</i> data. It may be able to be combined with other techniques, such as differential privacy [39], so that individuals are no longer <i>identifiable</i> . Additionally, some forms of multi-party computation can be performed on-device, potentially with that data being <i>collected</i> or <i>possessed</i> in the first place.
Federated Learning (on-device processing)	The application of federated learning techniques decentralizes data in model development. Typically, this is done through computations on each user device.	Federated learning challenges the applicability of provisions relating to data <i>collection</i> and <i>possession</i> . It can also be combined with other techniques such as differential privacy so that anonymized aggregation is performed on devices and anonymized results are what are sent to servers—thus, only <i>non-personal</i> data is collected, and, again, this data may fall outside the scope of privacy regulations.