

Privacy-Enhancing Technologies for Artificial Intelligence-Enabled Systems

Liv d'Aliberti
Leidos Inc.
Arlington, VA, USA
olivia.daliberti@leidos.com

Evan Gronberg
Leidos Inc.
Riverside, CA, USA
evan.m.gronberg@leidos.com

Joseph Kovba
Leidos Inc.
Reston, VA, USA
joseph.g.kovba@leidos.com

ABSTRACT

Artificial intelligence (AI) models introduce privacy vulnerabilities to systems. These vulnerabilities may impact model owners or system users; they exist during model development, deployment, and inference phases, and threats can be internal or external to the system. In this paper, we investigate potential threats and propose the use of several privacy-enhancing technologies (PETs) to defend AI-enabled systems. We then provide a framework for PETs evaluation for a AI-enabled systems and discuss the impact PETs may have on system-level variables.

KEYWORDS

Privacy, Confidentiality, Data In Use, Fully Homomorphic Encryption, Federated Learning, Trusted Execution Environments, Artificial Intelligence

ACM Reference Format:

Liv d'Aliberti, Evan Gronberg, and Joseph Kovba. 2023. Privacy-Enhancing Technologies for Artificial Intelligence-Enabled Systems. In *Proceedings of IWSPA '24, June 21, 2024, Porto, Portugal*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 8 pages.

1 INTRODUCTION

Standard means of data protection provide strong security guarantees for data at rest and in transit. Encryption, access control, identity management, secure tunnels, firewalls, traffic monitoring, multi-factor authentication, and device management are all examples of current-generation practices that help ensure data remains protected and only accessible to its intended users. However, while all of these techniques fulfill their purpose of ensuring data is protected at rest and in transit, none of them address the protection of data in use.

To be used, data typically must be converted to its unprotected form (i.e., its plaintext). This applies equally to the use of data by humans and the use of data by machines. The plaintext must be accessible and available in both cases. Unfortunately, this creates an opportunity for data to be exposed to unauthorized parties, whether intentionally by malicious actors or unintentionally by careless users.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

IWSPA '24, June 21, 2024, Porto, Portugal,

© 2024 Association for Computing Machinery.

Due to the increase of real-world artificial intelligence (AI)-enabled systems, [1] it is now more important than ever to address data-in-use concerns. This is because AI-enabled systems are uniquely reliant on data-in-use processes, whereas traditional systems typically rely on explicit, pre-programmed instructions to carry out tasks. The data used with AI-enabled systems both in training and in inference, as well as AI models themselves, are all involved in data-in-use processes. To address this concern, AI engineers are turning to next-generation protections for their systems: namely, privacy-enhancing technologies (PETs).

1.1 Data in Use for AI-Enabled Systems

The term "data in use" refers to any data that is actively being processed (created, accessed, updated, or erased) by a human or a machine. In the context of AI, a human process could be performing data analysis; a machine process could be model training or performing model inference.

Attacks against data-in-use processes at large have been well researched, [20, 46] and these general attacks certainly pose a threat to AI-enabled systems. However, AI-enabled systems also have their own unique set of potential attack vectors, such as those described below.

- An AI model trained on private data could be used in ways that are unintended by the people who provided the data. A major component of privacy is control over how and when personal information is used. Technical guarantees need to be put in place to ensure that models trained on private data will only be used as permitted by the data owners.
- An AI model trained on private data could be inappropriately shared and used to extract information about the data used to train the model. Protections need to be established to ensure that models will only be distributed and accessed in ways that are permitted by the data owners.
- An AI model trained on private data could be manipulated in ways that may impact the behavior of the model. Models are highly refined, structured, and trained representations of data; both the way a model is structured and its training curriculum are key to its performance. Defenses need to be created to ensure the model, even in its intended system, is only executed as permitted by the data owners.

Ideally, AI models will only be run by model owners, as explicitly permitted by data owners, in a way that guarantees the data owner's privacy. This is difficult, because AI models have the potential to be attacked at any point in the model's lifecycle: data set creation, model development, model deployment, user access, or user execution. Protections need to be put in place at each of these stages to ensure the system does not violate data owner privacy.

1.2 Privacy and Confidentiality

Not all sensitive data is the same. Level of sensitivity and, consequently, level of protection required differ depending on specific use case and associated legal standards. These distinctions are important because they lead to different requirements for a system's architecture. Two important, high-level concepts when dealing with sensitive data are privacy and confidentiality.

- **Privacy** is control over the extent, timing, and circumstances of sharing personal information. Respecting privacy requires special protections around the ways personal information is collected, used, retained, disclosed, and destroyed. [44]
- **Confidentiality** is the protection of any information that an entity has disclosed in a relationship of trust with the expectation that it will not be divulged to unintended parties. [15]

The primary difference between privacy and confidentiality is that the former concerns personal information and the latter concerns any data considered sensitive. Moreover, confidentiality concerns the unauthorized use of information already in the hands of an organization, [40] whereas privacy concerns the rights of an individual to control the information that an organization collects, uses, and shares with others.

Of particular concern is Personally Identifiable Information (PII), "[a]ny representation of information that permits the identity of an individual to whom the information applies to be reasonably inferred by either direct or indirect means." [43] PII data has legal, contractual, and ethical requirements that restrict its disclosure, and its use is controlled by data privacy regulations (e.g., HIPAA [42], GDPR [54]).

1.3 Privacy-Enhancing Technologies (PETs)

PETs are technologies that aim to protect data-in-use processes without preventing the system from accomplishing any of its necessary functions. Specifically, PETs are designed to do the following:

- Allow parties to collaborate while guaranteeing that any shared data will be used only for its intended purposes.
- Glean insights from private data without revealing the sensitive contents of the data.
- Carry out trusted computation in an untrusted environment.
- Secure access to shared artificial intelligence (AI) models without revealing sensitive data.
- Add quantum-resistant data protections to the system.
- Enhance the ability of data owners to maintain control of their data throughout its lifecycle.

All of the aforementioned tasks are concerned with the protection of sensitive data and addressing data layer vulnerabilities. In practice, the term "privacy-enhancing technologies" encompasses a wide variety of tools – whether implemented via hardware or software, on premises or in the cloud – that are all designed to protect data-in-use processes. Figure 1 organizes various PETs by their primary characteristics and demonstrates the breadth of tools and functionalities that fall under the "PETs" umbrella.

Multiple PETs may operate in tandem to address a particular security concern or set of security concerns more fully. As Figure 2




Figure 1: A selection of PETs organized into groups based on each technology's primary characteristic.

shows, each PET has its own strengths and weaknesses; there is no "one size fits all" PET.

PET Name	Degree of Privacy	Encryption	Scalability	Data Type Compatibility	Speed	AI/ML Training/Inference	No Masking and Hashing	Hardware Dependencies	Quantum Resistance
Zero-Knowledge Proof (ZKP)	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Potentially Viable	Potentially Viable	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit
Trusted Execution Environments (TEE)	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit
Split Learning (SL)	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit
Secure Multi-Party Compute (SMPC)	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit
Query Obfuscation	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit
Privacy-Preserving Blockchain	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit
Federated Learning (FL)	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit
Fully Homomorphic Encryption (FHE)	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Show Stopper	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit
Differential Privacy (DP)	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit	Perfect Fit

Legend: Perfect Fit (Green), Potentially Viable (Yellow), Show Stopper (Red)

LS NCS PETs-02

Figure 2: A selection of PETs evaluated against important system-level characteristics.

The columns in the figure represent system-level characteristics that could be affected by the addition of a given PET. The primary capabilities of each PET are shown in this chart as a "Perfect Fit." The "Potentially Viable" assignment means that, while the PET in its standard form could pose a problem, it can be modified to perform better in that category. The chart also shows why a given PET ought not to be used. For example, fully homomorphic encryption (FHE) can be very detrimental to a system's speed and scalability, so it is classified as a "Show Stopper" for systems dependent upon those features.

PETs have great potential to improve the security of existing systems. Perhaps more notably, though, they have the potential to enable new systems that were previously not feasible due to data protection concerns. In particular, with PETs, new sources of data can be leveraged while still maintaining PII protections.

2 THREATS TO AI-ENABLED SYSTEMS

AI-enabled systems require the protection of two high-level assets: the AI model itself and the data that is used in conjunction with that model. Opportunities for attacks against these assets exist throughout the system's lifecycle:

- During development, researchers should be aware that certain model architectures are more vulnerable to privacy attacks, [57] and data sets can be manipulated to control the behavior of trained AI models, [16] thus delivering false or even harmful results.
- During deployment, access to model architecture, parameters, and/or ontology [37] may result in the exfiltration of sensitive information. [53]
- During inference, intentional misuse of data or a model could result in a re-linking [13, 38, 47] or adversarial attack [26]

and may result in privacy violations or unexpected model behavior.

The nature of a privacy-threatening attack will depend on the threat’s motivation and level of access to the system, as determined by their association with the organization that owns the system. Below we have identified three broad threat types:

- Careless Insider: A person who has approved access to the system and has no malicious intent, but who nonetheless uses or leaks system information in unintended ways.
- Malicious Insider: A person who has approved access to the system and intends to abuse that access to harm the system or wrongfully distribute its contents.
- Outsider: A person who does not have approved access to the system, but who nonetheless intends to access it and harm the system or wrongfully distribute its contents.

Each of these threat types behaves uniquely and presents their own set of challenges. In the following sections, we elucidate potential attacks that each of them pose to AI-enabled systems.

2.1 Insider Threats

Insiders are responsible for 55% of cybersecurity incidents. Of this 55%, 57% attack intentionally and 43% act inadvertently. [8] Insider incidents within non-AI-enabled systems are managed using practices like the principle of least privilege, user and entity behavior analytics (UEBA) [14], and general data loss prevention (DLP) practices [36]. However, the rise of AI-enabled systems offers new ways for insider threats to manifest themselves in an organization.

For example, data leaks can occur when sensitive information is sent to a third-party AI model owner, as seen in Figure 3. A well-known example of a publicly available third-party model is OpenAI’s ChatGPT. [45] As it stands, ChatGPT must have access to plaintext prompts to be able to produce responses. This requirement poses a confidentiality concern, since user input is necessarily exposed during ChatGPT’s inference process. Organizations that own models, like OpenAI, thus have direct access to the data sent by users.




Figure 3: Example of an insider threat where a careless insider exposes potentially sensitive data to an external model.

The risk of careless insiders unintentionally revealing confidential data to AI-enabled services has led companies such as Samsung [24] and Northrop Grumman [21] to establish policies for the careful use of ChatGPT and other publicly available large language models (LLMs). However, the existence of policy does not provide guarantees that employees will follow procedure. Employees still have the ability to inadvertently expose sensitive data to external services without realizing the impact of their actions.

Another unique challenge in the era of AI is that internal model developers now have access to an increased amount of data, some of which may be highly sensitive. For reference, an LLM like ChatGPT required a corpus size of 300 billion words, [27] whereas previous-generation models, like BERT only required 3.3 billion words. [19] Access to big data opens up the potential for malicious insiders to exfiltrate and release large swaths of information. Careless insiders may also leak these data sets, albeit inadvertently, but it is the concentration of so much data in the hands of potentially malicious people that particularly demands our concern. Furthermore, while malicious insiders may also feed sensitive data to external services like ChatGPT, truly malicious actors will turn their attention toward much higher impact leaks such as model training sets and collected inference data.

Figure 4 shows how data, even data that is secured through standard, recommended security protocols, must normally be decrypted for any form of analysis, putting the data at risk of being distributed. Policy-based solutions, such as least access principles, are also often applied to this problem to minimize access to sensitive data, but few technological methods have been employed to ensure that malicious insiders do not have the ability to gather and distribute model data sets or inject poisoned data into a curated data set.




Figure 4: Example of an insider threat where a malicious insider exposes sensitive data to unauthorized parties via some messaging service.

2.2 Outsider Threats

Outsiders are responsible for the remaining 45% of cybersecurity incidents. [8] Outsider incidents with non-AI-enabled systems are managed using practices like intrusion detection and prevention systems (IDPS), standard encryption (i.e., in transit and at rest), firewalls, and robust authentication and access control. These work well to defend static data and maintain permissions boundaries. AI-enabled systems work differently though, because the data interaction is not static. Instead of connecting to deterministic end services that have been tightly defined, users are interacting directly with non-deterministic models. This interaction has the potential to be abused through reverse engineering, by untrusted third-party hosts, or as part of an adversarial attack.

A major privacy threat when deploying AI models is that models can potentially be reverse-engineered to reveal sensitive characteristics both about the model itself [53] (which is a problem if the model is proprietary) and about the data that was used to train the model. Those characteristics may even enable someone to re-link the data that was used to create the model to PII data in the model’s

training set. This scenario could result in an unintentional release of sensitive data, like in the Netflix Prize, a challenge in which researchers were able to take an anonymized data set and re-link people to their ratings of television shows. [38]

Also, training AI models can be a very computationally intensive process. The training of ChatGPT costs 3,640 PetaFLOP days. [9] Thus, compute is regularly outsourced to third parties. If we place sensitive data on third-party servers, we put a high amount of trust that the compute provider will not observe, collect, or tamper with data in unapproved ways.

A final threat posed by outsiders is an adversarial attack. Like any other data, AI models are vulnerable to manipulation, and adversarial attacks manipulate models by sending them examples that are specifically crafted to fool the model (see Figure 5). For instance, researchers highlighted the impact of adversarial attacks by confusing a Tesla Model S and forcing it to moving into oncoming traffic. [25]




Figure 5: Example of an outsider threat where an outsider attempts to confuse an AI model by sending malformed data.

2.3 Summary of Risks

A typical, deployed AI-enabled system concerns two types of personnel, system owner and system user, and both are subject to privacy risks.

The owner of the system seeks to protect both the AI model and the data that was used to train it. Protecting the model means keeping its characteristics private, but it also includes maintaining the integrity of the model and its predictions against inputs purposefully engineered to fool or otherwise tamper with the model. Protecting the training data means preventing users from using the model to discover characteristics about the data. It also means preventing any data, whether with respect to the model or the training set, from being improperly leaked by those who develop and/or maintain the system.

The user of the system seeks to protect the data that is sent to and processed by the system. When a user requests an inference over private data from an AI-enabled system, they need to be assured that their personal data will not be exposed – and in many cases this means not having the data exposed even to the owner of the system. AI-enabled systems are often capable of learning the characteristics and behaviors of users over time, thus it is important that users be assured that their data will not be used for purposes they do not intend or desire.

PETs are effective tools for defending against system owner and system user vulnerabilities. Different PETs address different attacks from the different adversary types, and multiple PETs can be

combined to either address multiple vulnerabilities or more robustly address a single vulnerability.

3 PETS FOR AI-ENABLED SYSTEM ARCHITECTURES

PETs can be used to address the threats discussed above. The particular PETs listed below are some of the leading, most effective PETs for defending the vulnerabilities particular to AI-enabled systems. They are not the only PETs that be used for this purpose, but serve as great examples of the impact PETs can have toward next-generation security.

3.1 Trusted Execution Environments (TEEs)

A TEE is an isolated compute space, separate from its host instance, that relies on hardware-based encryption to protect both data in memory and application-level code. Entities outside a TEE, including the host instance, are unable to see or alter the code or data used during execution. A program running inside a TEE is cryptographically attested to be the program that is intended to run. [35] Figure 6 shows how a TEE could be deployed to ensure that data sent to a model is neither seen nor tampered with during inference.




Figure 6: Example of a TEE Architecture for a Data Protection Scenario.

Using a TEE ensures that systems are protected from external compute providers, which is of great concern to system owners. Using a TEE also provides guarantees to system users, ensuring that their data is not logged or stored in ways outside of its intended use.

3.2 Fully Homomorphic Encryption (FHE)

FHE allows users to perform computation on encrypted data and models; that is, data in use is never decrypted. However, in its current-day state, it is very time- and space-intensive, so it must be implemented very conscientiously. Within the context of AI, a realistic use case for FHE is performing secure AI inference over smaller models in cases where increased inference latency is permissible. For example, DARPA is currently working on a program called Data Protection in Virtual Environments (DPRIVE) which aims to run inference over a 7-layer convolutional neural network performing inference against CIFAR-10 dataset in under 25 ms. [18] Figure 7 shows how FHE could be used to privatize an external, inference process.

FHE allows encrypted interaction with an AI model and data sharing without risking misuse. There is strong potential that the




Figure 7: Example of an FHE Architecture for an Inference Data Protection Scenario.

time and space requirements of FHE will be improved through algorithmic [34], software, [6, 33] and hardware [12] developments. It is expected that upcoming developments in FHE will result in speed-ups of at least five orders of magnitude [11], and we expect to see further improvements as the technology continues to mature.

3.3 Federated Learning (FL)

Federated learning (FL) uses multiple clients' data to build a shared AI model while keeping each client's training data local; no client can access any other client's data. Each client trains a model locally then sends that model (along with the number of examples that were used to train the model) to the server. The server then performs a weighted aggregation of all the models and sends the aggregated model to each client in the federation. This architecture relies on edge nodes with enough compute capacity to update their local model and may risk data de-anonymization [23, 56] if not used in tandem with another PET. Figure 8 shows an example of how FL could be used in a centralized system to update client models without sharing client data.




Figure 8: Example of an FL Architecture for a Data Protection Scenario.

FL directly addresses the concern of malicious insiders within the context of a collaborative group. Normally, distinct parties would be very hesitant to work together on AI models, because then all parties' data needs to be shared. One party could reveal the sensitive contents of others' data, even if that party had previously

been deemed an "insider." FL greatly reduces the amount of trust required to collaborate on AI models.

With FL, the collaborators typically use a third-party server to perform the aggregation of their models. They can leverage an outsider for this because only model weights are sent to the server, not any data. However, to prevent the server from reverse-engineering these model weights, another PET such as FHE can be incorporated.

3.4 Summary of PETs Selection

The three PETs in this section have been selected for both their high utility and their wide applicability to a range of AI-related use cases. TEEs and FHE are both especially useful for securing the inference process. [17, 39] With them, an organization can make an AI model available to a group people without ever seeing the data those people send to the model. FL is particularly useful for the training process; data from many parties can be leveraged without being revealed. TEEs and FHE can also be used for the training process, although the time and space demands of FHE in particular make training very difficult to scale. [52] The use of TEEs for training is more feasible than the use of FHE, but (1) it does not provide the same distributed computing benefit that FL does and (2) current, leading implementations of TEEs only isolate CPU and RAM (that is, they cannot leverage GPUs, and they do not have non-RAM storage, so they have very high memory requirements). [5, 51]

These three PETs were thus selected because together they cover the main phases of the AI-enabled systems lifecycle, development/training and deployment/inference. There are, however, other PETs that can also be useful to AI-enabled systems:

- Synthetic Data Generation: Data generated by humans is not used for training. Instead, "fake" data that is statistically similar to human data is used. [4]
- Differential Privacy: Statistical "noise" is added to training data in order to obfuscate its finer, potentially sensitive, details. [41]
- Split Learning: The overall AI model is split such that the first portion of the model (typically a small portion) is placed on clients and the second portion of the model (typically a large portion) is placed on a server. The model is trained by sending client portion outputs to the server portion, which calculates the model updates. Thus raw client data is never shared. [50]

These PETs were not described in detail because they pose more serious tradeoffs compared to TEEs, FHE, and FL, particularly in regards to model performance. They are, however, still worth consideration if implemented conscientiously.

3.5 PETs for Model Integrity

The above PETs address the confidentiality of data and models, but they do not address the integrity of model behavior. In the same way that current-generation cryptographic methods are used to ensure the integrity of data at rest and in transit (e.g., hashing), next-generation PET protections ought to address the integrity of AI models. The goal of hashing is to validate that data will accomplish its intended purpose, and it is important to carry this parallel into AI-related data-in-use scenarios.

As mentioned in section 2.2, adversarial attacks are a great example of a threat to the integrity of model behavior. Existing methods for addressing this threat include randomizing inference input data, [55], purposefully including adversarial examples in training data, [7] regularizing models to prevent input data sensitivity, [32] or simply attempting to detect adversarial inputs directly. [2] However, none of these methods provide formal guarantees that the model will behave as expected, and such guarantees are important for high risk models such as those used by autonomous vehicles. This, then, is an important gap that future PETs could help fill.

4 EVALUATING PETS

Turning our attention to PETs as a whole, it is important to have a way to evaluate the fitness of any given PET for any given AI-enabled system. Although they all increase privacy, not all PETs perform the same function or provide the same level of protection and performance. Previously, in Figure 2, we listed many system-level characteristics to consider when designing a PETs solution for data layer security. We now outline a holistic framework for determining PET fitness.

4.1 Use Case Applicability

The first step of integrating a PET into an AI-enabled system is to clearly understand the system's use case and formally define the utility that the PET would provide. The technical objective, the threats to the system, and all relevant privacy and security requirements should be documented. AI system architects with experience using PETs will be able to select an appropriate PET (or set of PETs) to protect against data-in-use vulnerabilities. To leverage this experience, many organizations are collaborating to collect, curate, and publish use case repositories for open consumption. [22] Consider the following questions to guide a use case applicability assessment:

- Does the given PET adequately address security requirements while maintaining the necessary level of AI model performance?
- Does the use case include specific privacy or confidentiality requirements?
- With what chief mechanism does the given PET operate: encryption, obfuscation, anonymization, or another mechanism?

4.2 System Impact

PETs provide innovative protections, but they may also require performance tradeoffs. A clear set of standards for PET performance characteristics is still under development, although significant progress has been made in the past five years. [3, 31] These up-and-coming standards aim to define cryptographic schemes and security parameters. Furthermore, standards for security and privacy best practices for AI-enabled systems in general are actively being developed. [30] A key step toward implementing PETs in these systems is understanding new standards and how they relate to existing system requirements.

From an integration perspective, one must consider how the introduction of PETs affects the current system security level. PETs are still in their relative infancy, and new attacks against them will likely be developed in the future. PETs must be integrated in a way

that allows for cryptographic agility; otherwise, they may have a net-negative impact on system security in the long run. However, with thoughtful design and a flexible integration plan, PETs have the potential to greatly enhance overall system security.

Currently, privacy and performance are typically at odds with each other; enhanced privacy can come at the cost of downgraded performance, and vice versa. PETs have the potential to undermine intended system functionality, and it is important to consider that tradeoff during evaluation. Consider the U.S. Census Bureau's effort to minimize disclosure risk via differential privacy (DP). [10] Though DP is effective at protecting the identities of individuals represented in a dataset, the "noise" that it injects into data necessarily perturbs it and can reduce statistical accuracy. The Census Bureau determines voting districts and allocates federal funding based on population statistics. Small perturbations in census data have the potential to produce outsized impacts on real-world decisions. Thus, in this case, statistical safeguards that protect the fidelity of data must be put in place to ensure the appropriate balance of privacy and accuracy. Another example might be a healthcare use case in which a doctor needs immediate access to records from another hospital as part of patient care. If the use of a PET introduces increased latency into a system, it could be detrimental to patient outcomes. Thus, it is critically important to be mindful of how the performance characteristics of a PET effect a given use case. The following questions are helpful in evaluating PET-related tradeoffs.

- Does the type of security provided by the PET integrate well with existing, standard security measures already provided by the system?
- How flexible is the system in its ability to trade time, space, compute capacity, and other performance-related characteristic for added data protections?
- Where is the system hosted? On premises, in the cloud, or across both?
- Who controls the data collection process?
- Is the system centralized or decentralized?

4.3 Implementation Readiness

Implementation readiness concerns both the readiness of the technology itself and the readiness of an organization to adopt the technology. PETs are currently in a transitional state as they go from being prototyped in a lab to being deployed in the real world. Organizations pushing PETs toward deployment include large companies—such as Intel Corporation, a leader in TEEs [28], specialized FHE hardware [12], and remote attestation [29]—and small companies—such as Duality [48], a vendor with mature service offerings based on contributions to open-source FHE. [49] While typical measures for software acceptance (e.g., static and dynamic code analysis, fuzzing, penetration testing) are important for guaranteeing the security of such systems, their cryptographic nature also requires formal guarantees of their functional characteristics. Organizations adopting PETs should implement formal verification methods to ensure that the system operates as expected. To aid in such efforts, some organizations are publicly publishing PET maturity assessments to reduce the level of effort required to fully assess a PET's readiness level. [22] An organization must also carefully consider its own readiness for adopting PETs. Though PETs

focus on data security and privacy, they have wide-ranging implications for enterprise data architecture, data governance policies, potentially multinational legal requirements, and ethical matters (which greatly affect customer confidence). Moreover, an organization must consider standard technical matters, such as staffing needs (at the development, integration, deployment, and maintenance levels), security analysis and accreditation, and technological strategy around data and AI/ML. These two groups of factors, organizational and technical, must be evaluated jointly to ensure the most effective adoption of PETs. The following questions could help guide a discussion about adoption readiness:

- Has the underlying mechanism been deployed in other real-world scenarios?
- Does the PET provider have a proven record of deploying software?
- How mature is the PET?

5 CONCLUSION

PETs represent the next step forward for cybersecurity. No longer can we only protect data at rest and in transit. We must also protect data in use, thus closing the final gap and providing true end-to-end security. Here we have highlighted how relevant PETs are to another technological leap: artificial intelligence. If the rise of AI-enabled systems is accompanied by the rise of PET-based protection, then the privacy risks associated with these systems can be greatly diminished. Overall, PETs directly pursue one of the foremost ethical principles of technology: "do no harm." In the era of AI, we believe that PETs are especially relevant to that goal.

REFERENCES

- [1] 2022. *IBM Global AI Adoption Index 2022*. IBM Technology Adoption Report. IBM Corporation, Armonk, NY.
- [2] Morteza Ahmadi, Rouhollah Dianat, and Hossein Amirkhani. 2021. An adversarial attack detection method in deep neural networks based on re-attacking approach. *Multimedia Tools and Applications* 80 (03 2021), 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11042-020-10261-5>
- [3] Martin Albrecht, Melissa Chase, Hao Chen, Jintai Ding, Shafi Goldwasser, Sergey Gorbunov, Shai Halevi, Jeffrey Hoffstein, Kim Laine, Kristin Lauter, Satya Lokam, Daniele Micciancio, Dustin Moody, Travis Morrison, Amit Sahai, and Vinod Vaikuntanathan. 2018. *Homomorphic Encryption Security Standard*. Technical Report. HomomorphicEncryption.org, Toronto, Canada.
- [4] Gerard Andrews. 2021. What is Synthetic Data? *NVIDIA* (2021). <https://blogs.nvidia.com/blog/2021/06/08/what-is-synthetic-data/>
- [5] Microsoft Azure. 2022. SGX enclaves. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/azure/confidential-computing/confidential-computing-enclaves>
- [6] Ahmad Al Badawi, Jack Bates, Flavio Bergamaschi, David Bruce Cousins, Saroja Erabelli, Nicholas Genise, Shai Halevi, Hamish Hunt, Andrey Kim, Yongwoo Lee, Zeyu Liu, Daniele Micciancio, Ian Quah, Yuriy Polyakov, Saraswathy R.V., Kurt Rohloff, Jonathan Saylor, Dmitriy Suponitsky, Matthew Triplett, Vinod Vaikuntanathan, and Vincent Zucca. 2022. OpenFHE: Open-Source Fully Homomorphic Encryption Library. *Cryptology ePrint Archive*, Paper 2022/915. <https://eprint.iacr.org/2022/915>
- [7] Tao Bai, Jinqi Luo, Jun Zhao, Bihan Wen, and Qian Wang. 2021. Recent Advances in Adversarial Training for Adversarial Robustness. [arXiv:2102.01356 \[cs.LG\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2102.01356)
- [8] Nick Bradley. 2015. The Threat Is Coming From Inside the Network: Insider Threats Outrank External Attacks. <https://securityintelligence.com/the-threat-is-coming-from-inside-the-network/>
- [9] Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Language Models are Few-Shot Learners. [arXiv:2005.14165 \[cs.CL\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2005.14165)
- [10] The Population Reference Bureau, the U.S. Census Bureau’s 2020 Census Data Products, and Dissemination Team. 2023. Why the Census Bureau Chose Differential Privacy. *U.S. Census Bureau* (2023). <https://www2.census.gov/library/publications/decennial/2020/census-briefs/c2020br-03.pdf>
- [11] Rosario Cammarota. 2022. Intel HERACLES: Homomorphic Encryption Revolutionary Accelerator with Correctness for Learning-Oriented End-to-End Solutions. In *Proceedings of the 2022 on Cloud Computing Security Workshop* (Los Angeles, CA, USA) (CCSW’22). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 3. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3560810.3565290>
- [12] Ro Cammarota. 2023. Intel Labs Continues Focused Research and Standards Efforts to Make FHE Viable. *Intel* (2023).
- [13] Nicholas Carlini, Florian Tramèr, Eric Wallace, Matthew Jagielski, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Katherine Lee, Adam Roberts, Tom Brown, Dawn Song, Ulfar Erlingsson, Alina Oprea, and Colin Raffel. 2021. Extracting Training Data from Large Language Models. [arXiv:2012.07805 \[cs.CR\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2012.07805)
- [14] Nick Cavallancia. 2020. User and Entity Behavior Analytics (UEBA) explained. *AT&T* (2020). <https://cybersecurity.att.com/blogs/security-essentials/user-entity-and-behavior-analytics-explained>
- [15] Mike Chapple. 2019. Privacy vs Confidentiality vs Security: What’s the Difference? <https://edtechmagazine.com/higher/article/2019/10/security-privacy-and-confidentiality-whats-difference>
- [16] Antonio Emanuele Cinà, Kathrin Grosse, Ambra Demontis, Battista Biggio, Fabio Roli, and Marcello Pelillo. 2023. Machine Learning Security against Data Poisoning: Are We There Yet? [arXiv:2204.05986 \[cs.CR\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.05986)
- [17] Liv d’Aliberti, Joe Kovba, Manbir Gulati, Sami Hoda, and Ben Snively. 2023. Enable fully homomorphic encryption with Amazon SageMaker endpoints for secure, real-time inferencing. *AWS Machine Learning Blog* (2023). <https://aws.amazon.com/blogs/machine-learning/enable-fully-homomorphic-encryption-with-amazon-sagemaker-endpoints-for-secure-real-time-inferencing/>
- [18] DARPA. 2020. Data Protection in Virtual Environments (DPRIVE).
- [19] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. [arXiv:1810.04805 \[cs.CL\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.04805)
- [20] Cynthia Dwork, Adam Smith, Thomas Steinke, and Jonathan Ullman. 2017. Exposed! A Survey of Attacks on Private Data. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application* 4, 1 (2017), 61–84. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-statistics-060116-054123> [arXiv:https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-statistics-060116-054123](https://arxiv.org/abs/https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-statistics-060116-054123)
- [21] Lindsay Ellis. 2023. ChatGPT Can Save You Hours at Work. Why Are Some Companies Banning It? *Wall Street Journal* (2023).
- [22] ENISA. 2019. ENISA’s PETs Maturity Assessment Repository. <https://www.enisa.europa.eu/publications/enisa2019s-pets-maturity-assessment-repository>
- [23] Haimei Gong, Liangjun Jiang, Xiaoyang Liu, Yuanqi Wang, Omary Gastro, Lei Wang, Ke Zhang, and Zhen Guo. 2023. Gradient leakage attacks in federated learning. *Artificial Intelligence Review* (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-023-10550-z>
- [24] Mark Gurman. 2023. Samsung Bans Staff’s AI Use After Spotting ChatGPT Data Leak. *Bloomberg* (2023). <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2023-05-02/samsung-bans-chatgpt-and-other-generative-ai-use-by-staff-after-leak>
- [25] Karen Hao. 2019. Hackers trick a Tesla into veering into the wrong lane. *MIT Technology Review* (2019). <https://www.technologyreview.com/2019/04/01/65915/hackers-trick-tesla-autopilot-into-veering-towards-oncoming-traffic/>
- [26] Sandy Huang, Nicolas Papernot, Ian Goodfellow, Yan Duan, and Pieter Abbeel. 2017. Adversarial Attacks on Neural Network Policies. [arXiv:1702.02284 \[cs.LG\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1702.02284)
- [27] Alex Hughes. 2023. ChatGPT: Everything you need to know about OpenAI’s GPT-4 tool. *BBC Science Focus* (2023). <https://www.sciencefocus.com/future-technology/gpt-3>
- [28] Intel. [n.d.]. Intel® Software Guard Extensions (Intel® SGX). <https://www.intel.com/content/www/us/en/architecture-and-technology/software-guard-extensions.html>
- [29] Intel. [n.d.]. Strengthen Enclave Trust with Attestation. <https://www.intel.com/content/www/us/en/developer/tools/software-guard-extensions/attestation-services.html>
- [30] ISO. 2023. ISO/IEC TR 27563:2023. (2023). <https://www.iso.org/standard/80396.html>
- [31] ISO. 2023. ISO/IEC WD 18033-8. (2023). <https://www.iso.org/standard/83139.html>
- [32] Daniel Jakobovitz and Raja Giryes. 2019. Improving DNN Robustness to Adversarial Attacks using Jacobian Regularization. [arXiv:1803.08680 \[cs.LG\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1803.08680)
- [33] Sangpyo Kim, Jongmin Kim, Michael Jaemin Kim, Wonkyung Jung, John Kim, Minsoo Rhu, and Jung Ho Ahn. 2022. BTS: An Accelerator for Bootstrapped Fully Homomorphic Encryption. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture* (New York, New York) (ISCA ’22). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 711–725. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3470496.3527415>
- [34] Eunsang Lee, Joon-Woo Lee, Young-Sik Kim, and Jong-Seon No. 2022. Optimization of Homomorphic Comparison Algorithm on RNS-CKKS Scheme. *IEEE Access* 10 (2022), 26163–26176. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2022.3155882>

- [35] James Me netrey, Christian Gottel, Anum Khurshid, Marcelo Pasin, Pascal Felber, Valerio Schiavoni, and Shahid Raza. 2022. Attestation Mechanisms for Trusted Execution Environments Demystified. In *Distributed Applications and Interoperable Systems*. Springer International Publishing, 95–113. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-16092-9_7
- [36] Microsoft. [n.d.]. What is data loss prevention (DLP)? <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/security/business/security-101/what-is-data-loss-prevention-dlp>
- [37] MITRE. [n.d.]. ATLAS Matrix. <https://atlas.mitre.org/matrices/ATLAS/>
- [38] Arvind Narayanan and Vitaly Shmatikov. 2008. Robust De-anonymization of Large Sparse Datasets. In *2008 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (sp 2008)*. 111–125. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SP.2008.33>
- [39] Krishna Giri Narra, Zhifeng Lin, Yongqin Wang, Keshav Balasubramaniam, and Murali Annavaram. 2019. Privacy-Preserving Inference in Machine Learning Services Using Trusted Execution Environments. arXiv:1912.03485 [cs.LG]
- [40] NIST National Cybersecurity Center of Excellence. [n.d.]. Data Confidentiality: Identifying and Protecting Assets. <https://www.nccoe.nist.gov/data-confidentiality-identifying-and-protecting-assets-and-data-against-data-breaches>
- [41] Joseph Near, David Darais, and Kaitlin Boeckl. 2020. Differential Privacy for Privacy-Preserving Data Analysis. *Cybersecurity Insights (A NIST Blog)* (2020). <https://www.nist.gov/blogs/cybersecurity-insights/differential-privacy-privacy-preserving-data-analysis-introduction-our>
- [42] U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. [n.d.]. Summary of the HIPAA Privacy Rule. <https://www.hhs.gov/hipaa/for-professionals/privacy/laws-regulations/index.html>
- [43] U.S. Department of Labor. [n.d.]. Guidance on the Protection of Personal Identifiable Information. <https://www.dol.gov/general/ppii>
- [44] UCI Office of Research. [n.d.]. Privacy and Confidentiality. <https://research.uci.edu/human-research-protections/research-subjects/privacy-and-confidentiality/>
- [45] OpenAI. 2022. Introducing ChatGPT. <https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt>
- [46] Nikolaos Pitropakis, Emmanouil Panaousis, Thanassis Giannetos, Eleftherios Anastasiadis, and George Loukas. 2019. A taxonomy and survey of attacks against machine learning. *Computer Science Review* 34 (2019), 100199. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosrev.2019.100199>
- [47] Thilina Ranbaduge, Dinusha Vatsalan, and Ming Ding. 2022. Privacy-preserving Deep Learning based Record Linkage. arXiv:2211.02161 [cs.CR]
- [48] Kurt Rohloff. 2017. Homomorphic Encryption – Making it Real. *Duality* (2017). <https://dualitytech.com/blog/homomorphic-encryption-making-it-real/>
- [49] Kurt Rohloff. 2022. Duality Advances Homomorphic Encryption Landscape with OpenFHE. *Duality* (2022). <https://dualitytech.com/blog/duality-advances-homomorphic-encryption-landscape-with-openfhe/>
- [50] Jihyeon Ryu, Dongho Won, and Youngsook Lee. 2022. A Study of Split Learning Model. In *2022 16th International Conference on Ubiquitous Information Management and Communication (IMCOM)*. 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IMCOM53663.2022.9721798>
- [51] Amazon Web Services. [n.d.]. AWS Nitro Enclaves. <https://aws.amazon.com/ec2/nitro/nitro-enclaves/>
- [52] Vasily Sidorov, Ethan Yi Fan Wei, and Wee Keong Ng. 2022. Comprehensive Performance Analysis of Homomorphic Cryptosystems for Practical Data Processing. arXiv:2202.02960 [cs.CR]
- [53] WSJ Staff. 2021. Inside TikTok’s Algorithm: A WSJ Video Investigation. *Wall Street Journal* (2021). <https://www.wsj.com/articles/tiktok-algorithm-video-investigation-11626877477>
- [54] Ben Wolford. [n.d.]. What is GDPR, the EU’s new data protection law? <https://gdpr.eu/what-is-gdpr/>
- [55] Cihang Xie, Jianyu Wang, Zhishuai Zhang, Zhou Ren, and Alan Yuille. 2018. Mitigating Adversarial Effects Through Randomization. arXiv:1711.01991 [cs.CV]
- [56] Haomiao Yang, Mengyu Ge, Dongyun Xue, Kunlan Xiang, Hongwei Li, and Rongxing Lu. 2023. Gradient Leakage Attacks in Federated Learning: Research Frontiers, Taxonomy and Future Directions. *IEEE Network* (2023), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MNET.001.2300140>
- [57] Guangsheng Zhang, Bo Liu, Huan Tian, Tianqing Zhu, Ming Ding, and Wanlei Zhou. 2023. How Does a Deep Learning Model Architecture Impact Its Privacy? A Comprehensive Study of Privacy Attacks on CNNs and Transformers. arXiv:2210.11049 [cs.CR]