

Model-Checking the Implementation of Consent

Raúl Pardo¹ and Daniel Le Métayer²

¹ IT University of Copenhagen, Denmark (raup@itu.dk)

² Univ Lyon, Inria, INSA Lyon, CITI, F-69621 Villeurbanne, France

Abstract. Privacy policies define the terms under which personal data may be collected and processed by data controllers. The General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) imposes requirements on these policies that are often difficult to implement. Difficulties arise in particular due to the heterogeneity of existing systems (e.g., the Internet of Things (IoT), web technology, etc.). In this paper, we propose a method to refine high level GDPR privacy requirements for informed consent into low-level computational models. The method is aimed at software developers implementing systems that require consent management. We mechanize our models in TLA⁺ and use model-checking to prove that the low-level computational models implement the high-level privacy requirements; TLA⁺ has been used by software engineers in companies such as Microsoft or Amazon. We demonstrate our method in two real world scenarios: an implementation of cookie banners and a IoT system communicating via Bluetooth low energy.

1 Introduction

The EU General Data Protection Regulation [9] (GDPR) adopted in May 2016 has been welcomed by many experts as a step forward for privacy protection. The GDPR grants new rights to individuals and imposes new obligations on controllers (hereafter, respectively, data subjects, or DSs, and data controllers, or DCs, following the GDPR terminology)—with significant penalties that could act as a deterrent even for large companies. However, its actual impact will depend to a large extent on its interpretation and monitoring, but also on the existence of technical tools to implement its provisions. In this respect, the implementation of consent, which is one of the most widely used legal bases for data processing, raises specific challenges. For example, Recital 32 of the GDPR states that “consent should be given by a clear affirmative act establishing a freely given, specific, informed and unambiguous indication of the data subject’s agreement to the processing of personal data relating to him or her, such as by a written statement, including by electronic means, or an oral statement.”

In practice, internet users generally have to consent on the fly, when they want to use a service, which leads them to accept mechanically the conditions of the provider (e.g., [14]). Evidently, this does not meet the above GDPR requirements to provide informed consent. This situation will become even worse with the advent of the internet of things (“IoT”), which has the potential to extend to the “real world” the tracking already in place on the internet.

A common way to tackle this problem is to design privacy languages where users can define their privacy preferences [22]. First, privacy policy languages appeared as a way for users to express and enforce privacy preferences (e.g. [3, 5, 8, 19, 27]). For example, users may define who can collect their data or whether data can be transferred to 3rd parties. After the GDPR appeared, some of these languages became partly outdated, as the GDPR introduced new requirements that were not previously foreseen. This has produced a wave of new languages focused on enforcement and verification of GDPR requirements, e.g., [15, 28]. To enforce GDPR requirements, these languages impose certain architectural constraints in the system implementation; for instance, on the way different parties communicate. However, in practice, not all systems use the same architecture. There are systems where devices do not support “direct” communication with each other, and “indirect” means of communication (e.g., via policy repository) are required.

This raises the following question: *How can we design and verify that implementations of consent management mechanisms ensure GDPR requirements?* In this paper, we propose a method to verify that different implementations of consent management systems satisfy GDPR requirements. We build on the PILOT privacy policy language [27]—whose syntax was designed to capture the information that users and service providers must provide to satisfy GDPR requirements. Our method uses program graphs (extended state machines) as design language. Then, we use a mechanization of PILOT semantics and program graphs in TLA^+ [17] to formally verify whether a given implementation refines PILOT semantics. We show how to prove (via model-checking) that PILOT semantics satisfy requirements for informed consent, and that an implementation refines PILOT semantics (which implies that it satisfies the same informed consent requirements). The proposed method is aimed at software engineers, which is the reason why we selected TLA^+ as verification tool and extended state machines as design language. TLA^+ has been used in industrial applications (e.g. [10, 23]), and state machines is a basic model familiar to most software engineers.

In summary, our contributions are: i) a formal semantics for PILOT; ii) a framework for software engineers to design implementations of consent management systems using extended state machines known as *program graphs*; iii) two case studies modeling real world consent management scenarios: web cookie banners and an IoT system communicating via Bluetooth low energy; and iv) a mechanization in TLA^+ of PILOT semantics and the program graphs in the case studies. We use the formalization to verify (via the TLA^+ model-checker) that the PILOT semantics satisfies privacy requirements for informed consent, and that our case study implementations refine PILOT semantics (and, consequently, satisfy the same requirements for informed consent). The TLA^+ mechanization is available in the accompanying artifact [26] and repository [20].

2 Privacy Policy Language

Basic Definitions. We start with a set \mathcal{D} of *devices* that can store, process and communicate data—e.g., smartphones, laptops or servers. Let \mathcal{E} denote the

set of *entities* such as Google or Alphabet and $\leq_{\mathcal{E}}$ the associated partial order—e.g., since Google belongs to Alphabet we have $Google \leq_{\mathcal{E}} Alphabet$. Entities include DCs and DSs. Every device is associated with an entity. However, entities may have many devices associated with them. The function $\mathbf{entity} : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ defines the entity associated with a given device. Let \mathcal{I} be a set of *data items* corresponding to the pieces of information that devices communicate. Let \mathcal{T} be a set of datatypes and $\leq_{\mathcal{T}}$ the associated partial order. The function $\mathbf{type} : \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ associates a datatype to each data item. Examples of datatypes are: age, address, city and clinical records. Since *city* is one of the elements that the datatype *address* may be composed of, we have $city \leq_{\mathcal{T}} address$. We use datatype to refer to the semantic meaning of data items. We use \mathcal{V} to denote the set of all values of data items, $\mathcal{V} = (\bigcup_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \mathcal{V}_t)$ where \mathcal{V}_t is the set of values for data items of type t . A special element $\perp \in \mathcal{V}$ denotes the undefined value. The device where a data item is created (its source) is called the *owner* device of the data item. The function $\mathbf{owner} : \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ associates an owner device to each data item. We denote by \mathcal{P} the set of *purposes* and $\leq_{\mathcal{P}}$ the associated partial order. For instance, if *newsletter* is considered as a specific type of advertisement, then we have $newsletter \leq_{\mathcal{P}} advertisement$. PILOT privacy policies are contextual: they may depend on *conditions* regarding information stored in the devices where they are evaluated. An example of condition is: “*Only data from adults may be collected.*” We use a simple logical language to express conditions. Let \mathcal{F} denote a set of functions, and *terms* t be defined as: $t ::= i \mid c \mid f(\vec{t})$ where $i \in \mathcal{I}$ is data item, $c \in \mathcal{V}$ is a constant value, $f \in \mathcal{F}$ is a function, and \vec{t} is a list of terms matching the arity of f . The syntax of the logical language is $\varphi ::= t_1 * t_2 \mid \neg \varphi \mid \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2 \mid tt \mid ff$ where $*$ is an arbitrary binary predicate, t_1, t_2 are terms; tt and ff represent respectively true and false. For instance, the condition above is modeled as $age \geq 18$. We denote the set of well-formed conditions as \mathcal{C} .

Abstract Syntax of PILOT Privacy Policies. PILOT policies express the conditions under which data can be communicated. We consider two types of data communication: *data collection* and *data transfer*. Data collection corresponds to DCs collecting DS information. A transfer is the event of sending previously collected data to third-party DCs.

Definition 1 (PILOT Privacy Policies Syntax). *Given entity $\in \mathcal{E}$, Purposes $\in 2^{\mathcal{P}}$, condition $\in \mathcal{C}$, retention_time $\in \mathbb{N}$, and datatype $\in \mathcal{T}$, the syntax of PILOT policies is defined as follows:*

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Pilot Privacy Policy} &::= (\text{datatype}, \text{dcr}, \text{TR}) \\
 \text{Data Communication Rule (dcr)} &::= \langle \text{condition}, \text{entity}, \text{dur} \rangle \\
 \text{Data Usage Rule (dur)} &::= \langle \text{Purposes}, \text{retention_time} \rangle \\
 \text{Transfer Rules (TR)} &::= \{ \text{dcr}_1, \text{dcr}_2, \dots \}
 \end{aligned}$$

We use DUR , DCR , \mathcal{PP} to denote the sets of data usage rules, data communication rules and PILOT privacy policies, respectively. The set of transfer rules is defined as the set of sets of data communication rules, $TR \in 2^{DCR}$.

The purpose of *data usage rules* is to define the operations that may be performed on the data. *Purposes* is the set of allowed purposes and *retention_time* is the deadline for erasing the data. For example, consider the data usage rule $dur_1 = \langle \{research\}, 19/04/2024 \rangle$; tacitly mapping dates to N. This rule states that data may be used only for the purpose of research until 19/04/2024.

Data communication rules define the conditions under which data must be collected by or communicated to an entity. The outer layer of data communication rules—i.e., the condition and entity—should be checked by the sender whereas the data usage rule is to be enforced by the receiver. The first element, *condition*, imposes constraints on the data item and the context (state of the DS device); *entity* indicates the entity allowed to receive the data; *dur* is a data usage rule stating how *entity* may use the data. For example, $\langle age > 18, AdsCom, dur_1 \rangle$ states that data may be communicated to the entity AdsCom which may use it according to dur_1 (defined above). It also requires that *age* is greater than 18; *age* may be the data item to be sent or contextual information stored in the device.

Transfer rules form a set of data communication rules specifying the entities to which the data may be transferred.

DSs and DCs use PILOT *privacy policies* to describe how data may be used, collected and transferred. The element *datatype* indicates the type of data the policy applies to, *dcr* defines the collection conditions, and *TR* the transfer rules. Several PILOT policies may be necessary to capture the privacy choices for a datatype. For instance, a DS may allow only her employer to collect her data when she is at work, and, when being in a museum, only the museum. To this end, the DS must define two policies, one for each location. A *subsumption* relation $p_1 \sqsubseteq p_2$ indicates that p_1 is more restrictive than (or subsumes) p_2 . Intuitively, a policy is less restrictive than another if it allows for data items to be used for a larger set of purposes, for a longer period of time or sent/transferred to a larger set of entities. We refer readers to Appendix A for the formal definition of the subsumption relation, as introduced in [27].

Running Example: Cookie Banners. Cookie banners are HTML forms that websites use to let users express their choices regarding the use of cookies. Typically, they include: the entities allowed to collect the data, the purposes for which they may use it, the retention period and the allowed transfers to third parties.

Fig. 1 shows an example where DSs can select the check boxes in the top bar to agree on having the DC using their data for the specified purposes. The cookie banner provides detailed information about the types of cookies that the DC may choose.

Fig. 1 shows information related to advertisement cookies—DSs may click on left tabs to visualize the information related to other cookies. The main panel indicates the cookie name, provider (DC), a description of the purpose for data




Fig. 1: Example Cookie Banner

PILOT Policy	Textual form for end user GUI
1. \perp	Collected data may be used only for necessary purposes.
2. $(\text{cookie}, \langle tt, \text{flights.com}, \{\{\text{special_offers}\}, 21/12/2024\}\rangle, \emptyset)$	Data of type <i>cookie</i> can be collected by <i>flights.com</i> and used for <i>special_offers</i> purposes until <i>21/12/2024</i> .
3. $(\text{cookie}, \langle tt, \text{flights.com}, \{\{\text{special_offers}\}, 21/12/2024\}\rangle, \{\langle tt, \text{hotels.com}, \{\{\text{hotel_ads}\}, 19/04/2024\}\rangle\})$	Data of type <i>cookie</i> can be collected by <i>flights.com</i> and used for <i>special_offers</i> purposes until <i>21/12/2024</i> . This data may be transferred by <i>flights.com</i> to <i>hotels.com</i> which may use it for <i>hotel_ads</i> purpose until <i>19/04/2024</i> .
4. $(\text{cookie}, \langle tt, \text{flights.com}, \langle \emptyset, 0 \rangle\rangle, \{\langle tt, \text{hotels.com}, \{\{\text{hotel_ads}\}, 19/04/2024\}\rangle\})$	Data of type <i>cookie</i> can be collected by <i>flights.com</i> and transferred to <i>hotels.com</i> which may use it for <i>hotel_ads</i> purposes until <i>19/04/2024</i> .

Table 1: PILOT policies for cookie banner.

collection, expiration time, and required communication protocol. Note that sometimes a DC may set cookies (called third-party cookies) for a different DC.

When the GDPR came into force, many DCs had to adapt their cookie banners to be compliant with the new regulation. This is all the more important in the view that, according to Recital 42 of the GDPR, “*where processing is based on the data subject’s consent, the controller should be able to demonstrate that the DS has given consent to the processing.*” Many websites include unique identifiers in cookies. These identifiers may be used for different purposes such as integrity of online sessions, security, statistics or personalized advertisement. Since users can be uniquely identified using these cookies, according to GDPR, they are *personal data*. Therefore, DCs can use them only as necessary for the delivery of their services unless they have obtained a valid consent of the DSs for additional purposes. For instance, in the list above, using cookies for integrity of online sessions or communication security does not require explicit consent of the DS because it is necessary for the correct functioning of the website. However, statistics or advertising are additional purposes for which the consent of the DSs is required. In what follows, we show how to use PILOT to encode the information in cookie banners and its advantages as opposed to current cookie banner technology.

Consider the DC, *flights.com*, operating a flight search engine website. The website *flights.com* uses cookies to track users and show special offers. Furthermore, *flights.com* transfers data to a partner company *hotels.com*. The website *hotels.com* is a hotel search engine that may use data received from *flights.com* to show advertisements, e.g., hotels in users’ flight destinations. Legally speaking, *flights.com* must obtain the explicit consent of the users to transfer their data to *hotels.com* for this purpose. To this end, *flights.com* allows users to choose among four options. They are shown on left column in Table 1.

The options correspond to the different configurations shown in Fig. 1, i.e., selecting: 1) only “Necessary”; 2) “Necessary” and “Special offers”; 3) “Necessary”, “Special offers” and “Advertisement”; 4) “Necessary” and “Advertisement”. The policy \perp (option 1) corresponds to an *empty policy*, which does not allow *flights.com* to use cookies for purposes other than the necessary ones. The condition (tt) means absence of specific conditions for the cookies to be collected (options 2, 3, 4) or transferred to *hotels.com* (options 3 and 4). The data usage

rule $\langle \emptyset, 0 \rangle$ in Option 4 means that *flights.com* is not allowed to use cookies for any other purpose than required to deliver its service. In Option 4, it is only allowed to share information with *hotels.com* which can use it to provide hotel advertisements. This scenario corresponds to the common third-party advertisement business model. PILOT policies can be mapped to natural language for their use in GUIs [27]. We show the natural language version on the right column of Table 1.

To obtain DS consent, *flights.com* must provide the above PILOT policy options the first time that the DS interacts with the website. A possibility is to attach an XML version of the PILOT policies for each option in the HTML form—see [21] for an encoding of PILOT policies in an IoT system, and not allow DSs to use the website until they make a choice. Then, the selected policy is sent together with the cookie to inform the DC of the DS choice. Alternatively, DSs may define their own PILOT policy before visiting the website. Consider a *flights.com* user, Alice, who likes to benefit from special offers. Alice is a security aware person, and she only agrees to have cookies collected if they are communicated via HTTPS. Cookies contain the attribute *Secure*, which can be enabled to indicate that they must be transmitted via HTTPS. To this end, Alice sets the following PILOT policy: $(\text{cookie}, \langle \text{cookie.Secure} = \text{tt}, \text{flights.com}, \langle \{\text{special_offers}\}, 21/12/2024 \rangle \rangle, \emptyset)$ In practice, Alice would express her policy in its natural language version [27]: *flights.com may collect data of type cookie if the attribute cookie.Secure is active and use it for special_offers purposes until 21/12/2024*. The condition *cookie.Secure = tt* means that the PILOT policy can be used only if the secure cookie attribute of the cookie used by *flights.com* is enabled. When Alice visits *flights.com*, only two options can be selected from the four proposed by *flights.com*. If *flights.com* does not use secure cookies, then Alice’s policy is not enabled and the first option (\perp) must be chosen. If *flights.com* enables secure cookies, then option 2 can also be selected. By using a language like PILOT, this process can be carried out automatically.

Though implementing cookie banners seems an easy task, it has been shown that many implementations failed to comply with GDPR requirements [18]. Thus, a remaining question is: How can we assist software engineers in designing and implementing cookie banners that enforce GDPR requirements? The following sections use this example to describe a method to tackle this problem.

3 Abstract Operational semantics

The *abstract* operational semantics of PILOT defines the conditions under which devices may exchange policies and data. This semantics does not describe *how* communication or checks are implemented. Implementation details are specified using lower level models (cf. §4). We build on the system state introduced in [27].

Systems are composed of devices that communicate data and use PILOT policies to express DSs and DCs privacy requirements. Every device has a set of associated policies. A policy is associated with a device if it was defined in the device or the device received it. DS devices have a set of data associated with them. This models the data stored in the device, e.g., the device MAC address or the user’s

email. We keep track of the data collected by DC devices together with their corresponding PILOT policies. The system state is formally defined as follows.

Definition 2 (System state). *The system state is a triple $\langle \nu, \pi, \rho \rangle$ where: i) $\nu : \mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ is a mapping from the data items of a device to their corresponding value in that device. ii) $\pi : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{P}\mathcal{P}}$ is a function denoting the policy base of a device. The policy base contains the policies created by the owner of the device and the policies sent by other devices in order to state their collection requirements. A pair (d, p) means that PILOT policy p belongs to device d . We write π_d to denote $\pi(d)$. iii) $\rho : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{P}\mathcal{P}}$ returns a set of triples (s, i, p) indicating the data items and PILOT policies that a controller has received. If $(d', i, p) \in \rho(d)$, we say that device d has received or collected data item i from device d' and policy p describes how the data item must be used. We write ρ_d to denote $\rho(d)$. We denote the universe of all possible states as \mathcal{S} . \square*

In Def. 2, ν returns the local value of a data item in the specified device. When the value of a data item in a device is undefined, ν returns \perp . The policy base of a device d , π_d , contains received PILOT policies or policies that have been defined locally. If $(d, p) \in \pi_d$, the policy p corresponds to a policy that d has defined in the device itself. If $(e, p) \in \pi_d$ where $d \neq e$, p is a policy sent from device e . Policies stored in the policy base are used to compare the privacy policies of two devices before the data is communicated. The information that a device has received is recorded in ρ . Also, ρ contains the PILOT policy describing how data must be used. The difference between policies in π and ρ is that policies in π are used to determine whether data can be communicated, and policies in ρ are used to describe how a data item must be used by the receiver.

Example 1. Fig. 2 shows a state composed of two devices: Alice’s web browser, and *flights.com*’s server. The figure depicts the situation after Alice’s browser has loaded *flights.com* and she has chosen an option in the cookie banner.

The database in Alice’s state (ν_{Alice}) contains a data item of type cookie, $cookie_{Alice}$, with value c . The policy base in Alice’s browser (π_{Alice}) contains two policies: $(Alice, p_{Alice})$ representing a policy that Alice defined, and $(flights.com, p_{flights.com})$ which represents a policy $p_{flights.com}$ sent by *flights.com*. We assume that p_{Alice} and $p_{flights.com}$ are the policies applying to data items of type cookie.

The state of *flights.com* contains one more element than Alice’s state, namely, the set of received data ($\rho_{flights.com}$). This set contains the item $cookie_{Alice}$ collected from Alice, and the policy $p_{flights.com}$ that describing how to handle the data. Note that $p_{flights.com}$ was the PILOT policy originally defined by *flights.com*. To satisfy Alice’s privacy preferences, $p_{flights.com}$ must be more restrictive than Alice’s policy p_{Alice} , which is denoted by $p_{flights.com} \sqsubseteq p_{Alice}$. This condition can easily be enforced by comparing the policies before data is collected. The first element in $(Alice, cookie_{Alice}, p_{flights.com})$ indicates that the data comes from Alice’s device. Finally, *flights.com*’s policy base has one policy: its own policy $p_{flights.com}$, which was communicated to Alice for data collection.




Fig. 2: Cookie Banner System State Example

System Events. We define the abstract semantics of the events in [27] focused on exchange of data items and PILOT policies. The set of events, denoted as E , includes: *request*, *send*, and *transfer*. *Traces* are sequences of state-event pairs $(s_1, e_1), (s_2, e_2), (s_3, e_3), \dots$ where $s_i \in \mathcal{S}$ is a system state and $e_i \in E$ is an event. A state s_{i+1} is the result of executing e_i on state s_i . We write $s \xrightarrow{e} s'$ to denote that s' is reached by executing e on state s . Every event is tagged with a timestamp indicating when the event occurs. We use a function $\mathbf{time} : E \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ to assign the timestamp—represented as a natural number.

Table 2 shows the definition of the events using small step operational semantics rules. The conditions of the rules are written as premises and the state updates are written on the right hand side. The functions `activePolicy` and `activeTransfer` determine whether a policy is active upon sending/transferring a data item. Intuitively, a policy is active if it applies to the data item to be sent, to the receiving entity, the retention time has not yet been reached, and its condition holds. The same must hold for active transfers (but for the transfer rule), and also the retention time for the sender (i.e., the retention time in the policy) must not have been reached. We refer readers to Appendix B for the formal definition of these functions, as introduced in [27]. We use $p.t$, $p.TR$ and $p.dcr.e$ to refer to the datatype associated to p , its set of transfer rules and the entity specified in the communication rule, respectively.

The event $request(sndr, rcv, t, p)$ models a data request from a DC to a DS or another DC. Thus, $sndr$ is always a DC device, and rcv may be a DC or DS device. A request includes the type t of the requested data and a PILOT policy p . The policy is required to refer to the datatype that is requested, i.e., $p = (t, _, _)$. After executing *request*, the pair $(sndr, p)$ is added to π_{rcv} (R1). If rcv already received a comparable policy from $sndr$ ($p \sqsubseteq q \triangleq p \sqsubseteq q \vee q \sqsubseteq p$), then q is replaced with p (R2); as new DCs policies may be more or less restrictive. Thus, rcv is informed about the updated terms for data handling.

The event $send(sndr, rcv, i)$ models collection of data item i from DS $sndr$ by DC rcv . Devices can only send i if defined in the state, $\nu(sndr, i) \neq \perp$. To execute *send*, it must hold that π_{sndr} contains: i) an active policy defined by $sndr, p_{sndr}$, indicating how $sndr$ allows DCs to use her data, and ii) an active policy sent by rcv, p_{rcv} , indicating how it commits to use the data. Data is sent if p_{rcv} is more restrictive than p_{sndr} (i.e., $p_{rcv} \sqsubseteq p_{sndr}$). We record the exchange in ρ_{rcv} indicating: the sender, the data item and rcv 's PILOT policy, $(sndr, i, p_{rcv})$. We update rcv 's database with the value of i in $sndr$'s state, $\nu(rcv, i) = \nu(sndr, i)$.

REQUEST	
R1	$\frac{(sndr, p) \in \pi_{sndr} \quad \forall (sndr, q) \in \pi_{rcv} \cdot p \not\sqsubseteq q}{\langle \nu, \pi, \rho \rangle \xrightarrow{\text{request}(sndr, rcv, t, p=(t, -, -))} \langle \nu, \pi', \rho \rangle} \text{ with } \pi'_{rcv} = \pi_{rcv} \cup \{(sndr, p)\}$
R2	$\frac{(sndr, p) \in \pi_{sndr} \quad (sndr, q) \in \pi_{rcv} \quad p \sqsubseteq q}{\langle \nu, \pi, \rho \rangle \xrightarrow{\text{request}(sndr, rcv, t, p=(t, -, -))} \langle \nu, \pi', \rho \rangle} \text{ with } \pi'_{rcv} = (\pi_{rcv} \setminus q) \cup \{(sndr, p)\}$
SEND	
	$\frac{\begin{array}{l} (rcv, p_{rcv}) \in \pi_{sndr} \quad \text{activePolicy}(p_{rcv}, \text{send}(sndr, rcv, i), st) \\ (sndr, p_{sndr}) \in \pi_{sndr} \quad \text{activePolicy}(p_{sndr}, \text{send}(sndr, rcv, i), st) \\ p_{rcv} \sqsubseteq p_{sndr} \quad \nu(sndr, i) \neq \perp \end{array}}{st = \langle \nu, \pi, \rho \rangle \xrightarrow{\text{send}(sndr, rcv, i)} \langle \nu', \pi, \rho' \rangle} \text{ with } \begin{cases} \rho'_{rcv} = \rho_{rcv} \cup \{(sndr, i, p_{rcv})\} \\ \nu'(rcv, i) = \nu(sndr, i) \end{cases}$
TRANSFER	
	$\frac{\begin{array}{l} (-, i, p) \in \rho_{sndr} \quad tr \in p.TR \\ \text{activeTransfer}(tr, p, \text{transfer}(sndr, rcv, i), st) \\ (rcv, p_{rcv}) \in \pi_{sndr} \quad \text{activePolicy}(p_{rcv}, \text{transfer}(sndr, rcv, i), st) \\ p_{rcv} \sqsubseteq (p.t, tr, p.TR) \quad \nu(sndr, i) \neq \perp \end{array}}{st = \langle \nu, \pi, \rho \rangle \xrightarrow{\text{transfer}(sndr, rcv, i)} \langle \nu', \pi, \rho' \rangle} \text{ with } \begin{cases} \rho'_{rcv} = \rho_{rcv} \cup \{(sndr, i, p_{rcv})\} \\ \nu'(rcv, i) = \nu(sndr, i) \end{cases}$

Table 2: Small Step Operational Semantics of Events.

The event $\text{transfer}(sndr, rcv, i)$ models a DC ($sndr$) transferring a data item i to another DC (rcv)—if defined in the state, $\nu(sndr, i) \neq \perp$. First, it must hold that π_{sndr} contains an active policy from rcv , p_{rcv} . Let p denote the policy sent by the data owner along with i . There must exist an active transfer rule (tr) in the set of transfers rules of p . As before, the policy sent by rcv must be more restrictive than those sent by data owners, i.e., $p_{rcv} \sqsubseteq p_{tr}$ where p_{tr} is a policy with the active transfer tr in the place of the data communication rule and with the same set of transfers as p . Data items can be transferred more than once to the entities in the set of transfers as long as the retention time has not been reached. This is not an issue in terms of privacy as data items are constant values. We update ρ_{rcv} with the sender, the data item and rcv 's PILOT policy, $(sndr, i, p_{rcv})$. Note that the owner of the data item is not $sndr$ since transfers always correspond to exchanges of previously collected data, $\text{owner}(i) \neq sndr$. The database of rcv is updated with the current value of i in ν_{sndr} .

4 Refinement into Operational Models

A *refinement* is an operational model that can be directly implemented—i.e., it can easily be translated to source code. Refinements provide information about the *communications* between devices and the *locality of the computations*; these details are omitted in the abstract semantics. A refinement must include operational models for each device in the system. We model refinements using a symbolic representation of labeled transition systems called *program graphs* (PGs) [2]. These models can be seen as extended state machines—and should

be familiar to most software engineers, as they are part of their basic education. For each PG, we consider a (finite) set of variables Var . Each variable $x \in Var$ belongs to a domain D_x , we use $D = \bigcup_{x \in Var} D_x$ to denote the set of all domains. Functions $\eta: Var \rightarrow D$ map variables to a value in their corresponding domain, and we use $Eval(Var)$ to denote the set of all η functions. We use $Cond(Var)$ to denote a set of conditions on variables. Program graphs are defined as follows:

Definition 3 (Program Graph [2]). *A program graph PG over a set of variables Var is a tuple $(Loc, Act, Effect, \rightarrow, Loc_0, g_0)$ where Loc is a set of locations and Act is a set of actions; $Effect: Act \times Eval(Var) \rightarrow Eval(Var)$ is an effect function; $\rightarrow_{PG} \subseteq Loc \times Act \times Cond(Var) \times Loc$ is a conditional transition relation; $Loc_0 \subseteq Loc$ is a set of initial locations; and $g_0 \in Cond(Var)$ is the initial condition.*

When no confusion may arise, we omit the subscript in \rightarrow_{PG} . By convention the shape of the actions in Act is $a(\vec{x})$ where $\vec{x} = x_1, x_2, \dots$ is a finite vector of variables, called the *parameters* of the action. We write $q \xrightarrow{a(\vec{x})/\varphi} q'$ to denote that there exists a transition from q to q' in the PG labeled by $a(\vec{x})/\varphi$, i.e., $(q, a(\vec{x}), \varphi, q') \in \rightarrow_{PG}$. For simplicity, when $\varphi = \top$ we write $q \xrightarrow{a(\vec{x})} q'$.

In the following we define the synchronous composition of PGs. To this end, we use *synchronization actions*. For any synchronization action $a(\vec{x})$, there are corresponding sending ($a^\uparrow(\vec{x})$), and receiving ($a^\downarrow(\vec{x})$) actions. Two devices communicate via $a(\vec{x})$ by each of them executing one of the corresponding sending and receiving action. We use $\eta[\vec{x}_{a^\downarrow} \mapsto \eta(\vec{x}_{a^\uparrow})]$ to denote that the variables in the receiving action are bind with the values of the sending action in η . We use synchronization actions to formally define the synchronous composition of PGs.

Definition 4 (Synchronous Composition). *Given two PGs PG_1 and PG_2 , such that $PG_i = (Loc_i, Act_i, Effect_i, \rightarrow_i, Loc_{0_i}, g_{0_i})$, the synchronous composition over the actions $H = \{a(\vec{x}) \mid a^\uparrow(\vec{x}) \in Act_j \wedge a^\downarrow(\vec{x}) \in Act_k \text{ for } j, k \in \{1, 2\} \text{ and } j \neq k\}$ is defined as, $PG_1 ||_H PG_2 \triangleq (Loc_1 \times Loc_2, Act_1 \cup Act_2 \cup H, Effect, \rightarrow, Loc_{0_1} \times Loc_{0_2}, g_{0_1} \wedge g_{0_2})$ and the transition relation \rightarrow is defined as*

$$\frac{q_i \xrightarrow{a(\vec{x})/\varphi_i} q'_i \quad a(\vec{x}) \notin H}{(q_1, q_2) \xrightarrow{a(\vec{x})/\varphi_1} (q'_1, q_2)} \text{ with } i \in \{1, 2\} \quad \frac{q_1 \xrightarrow{a^\uparrow(\vec{x})/\varphi_1} q'_1 \quad q_2 \xrightarrow{a^\downarrow(\vec{x})/\varphi_2} q'_2 \quad a(\vec{x}) \in H}{(q_1, q_2) \xrightarrow{a(\vec{x})/\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2} (q'_1, q'_2)}$$

$$\text{and, } Effect(a(\vec{x}), \eta) = \begin{cases} Effect_i(a(\vec{x}), \eta) & \text{if } a(\vec{x}) \notin H \text{ and } a(\vec{x}) \in Act_i \text{ with } i \in \{1, 2\} \\ \eta[\vec{x}_{a^\downarrow} \mapsto \eta(\vec{x}_{a^\uparrow})] & \text{if } a(\vec{x}) \in H \end{cases}$$

In what follows, we use PGs to model implementations of different system architectures. We model devices that can communicate directly and indirectly. We consider, w.l.o.g., policies and transfers that are always active; note that this check can always be added as a prerequisite before sending data. We prove that the implementations refine the abstract semantics of PILOT in §5.

Direct Communication: Cookie Banners. We return to our cookie banner example. We define two PGs for the two devices in the example: Alice's laptop




Fig. 3: Direct Communication Program Graphs.

(DS device) and the server hosting *flights.com* (DC device). These PGs precisely describe the program that Alice and the server must execute in their devices, and the communication between them. We model a system where the DS defines a policy *a priori* and data collection is allowed if the DC policy complies with the DS policy. Note that this differs from the usual interaction where the DS is presented with several DC policies, and she must select one (cf. Fig. 1).

Data Subject Gateway (DS program). This program allows data collection only if the DC policy respects (subsumes) Alice’s policy. Fig. 3a shows the data subject gateway PG. This PG runs on Alice’s browser (DS device). It contains the following variables: p_{DS} corresponding to $\pi(DS, DS)$ in the abstract semantics, p_{DC} corresponding to $\pi(DS, dc)$, and the current state σ of the PG (not in abstract semantics). We define *Effect* as: $Effect(Init(i, p_{DS}), \eta) = \eta[p_{DS} \mapsto \text{policy_init}(), i \mapsto \text{data_init}()]$ and $Effect(\tau, \eta) = \eta$. The functions `policy_init()` and `data_init()` model machine-level functions that retrieve: the policy from the user (e.g., via a browser extension or settings form), and the data item (e.g., when entered by the user or automatically retrieved by the browser), respectively. For each data item, an instance of the data subject gateway is executed. Internal actions τ model transitions with no effect on PG variables. The synchronization events *request* and *send* are defined as in Def. 4; they synchronize with the corresponding events in the DC program described below.

Intuitively, the PG in Fig. 3a starts with an initialization action, $init(p_{DS}, i)$, where Alice’s inputs her policy (p_{DS}) and the data item (i). Then, the data subject gateway waits for data collection requests, $request^{\downarrow}(DC, DS, p_{DC})$. A request includes the sender DC, the receiver DS, and the policy of the DC. Upon receiving a request, the data subject gateway checks whether the DC policy complies with that of the DS, $p_{DC} \sqsubseteq p_{DS}$. If so, it sends the item (i) along with the policy (p_{DC}) that must be enforced when processing i , $send^{\uparrow}(DS, DC, p_{DC}, i)$. Otherwise, data collection does not take place, and the PG goes back to wait for further requests.

Data Controller Gateway (DC program). This program can request data from DSs, process it according to its privacy policy, and transfer it (if requested by another DC and allowed by the policy). Fig. 3b shows the controller gateway PG. This PG runs on the server hosting *flights.com*. It consists of the following variables: p_i and i correspond to the policy and data item sent by the DS: $(i, DS, p_i) \in$

$\rho(\text{DC})$ in the abstract semantics, $p_{\text{DC}} = \pi(\text{DC}, \text{DC})$, $p_{\text{DC}'} = \pi(\text{DC}, \text{DC}')$, and current state σ of the PG (not in abstract semantics). The *Effect* function is defined as: $\text{Effect}(\text{init}(p_{\text{DC}}), \eta) = \eta[p_{\text{DC}} \mapsto \text{policy_init}()]$ and $\text{Effect}(\tau, \eta) = \eta$. In this case, `policy_init()` retrieves the DC policy.

The PG in Fig. 3b starts by initializing the DC policy, p_{DC} . Then, it sends a request to collect data of the type specified in p_{DC} . This occurs, for instance, when a client visits *flights.com*. At this point, the data controller gateway waits to receive the data from the DS. Upon receiving the data, it can transfer the data to another data controller DC' . This corresponds to the edges between s_3 and s_4 . This interaction is identical to that of the data subject gateway (cf. Fig. 3a). The only difference is that the policy used to determine the compliance with the DS preferences is p_i , i.e., the policy sent by the DS during data collection. Note that this ensures that DS preferences are enforced even if data items are transferred—this property is formally proved in §5.

This implementation is applicable to systems with support for direct communication. For example, a system where users upload data from a smartwatch to fitness social networks such as Strava or Fitbit. However, this implementation cannot be applied to systems that automatically broadcast data—e.g., Bluetooth protocols—where receivers can record DS data as soon as DS devices enter the collection range. Below we describe an alternative refinement for these systems.

Indirect Communication: Bluetooth Low Energy. Many wireless communication protocols, such as *Bluetooth low energy* (BLE), require broadcasting identifying information such as MAC addresses to operate. Unfortunately, this information is becoming a common way to track DSs in public places [4, 7, 21, 24]. This type of data collection is especially dangerous as it occurs without DSs being aware or notified; data is collected as soon as DSs enter the range of the collecting device. This is known as *passive* data collection. The GDPR imposes restrictions on (passive) data collection; namely it can only be carried out if DSs provide explicit consent. We describe a refinement for passive data collection, which makes it possible for DSs to provide (or not) explicit consent.

Consider a Bluetooth tracking system installed in a shopping mall. The system is composed by data collection devices (DC devices) that automatically record the Bluetooth MAC address of DS devices within their range—e.g., smartphones, smartwatches, wireless headsets, etc. Direct communication cannot be applied here. DC devices can *only* collect data broadcast by DS devices, and DC devices cannot communicate the DC policy prior to collecting the data. Nevertheless, DS devices can communicate data items and policies via Bluetooth. We exploit this feature to make it possible for the DSs to provide consent.

Policy Repository. DCs can upload their policies to a *public repository*. These repositories store and send policies, but do not modify them. The repository could be hosted by the DC or governmental entities such as Data Protection Agencies. DS devices download DC policies from repositories *before* entering the operation range of the DC device. Otherwise, DCs cannot store the DS data (see details below). Fig. 4b shows the policy repository PG. The variable p_{DC} corre-




Fig. 4: Indirect Communication Program Graphs.

sponds to $\pi(\text{DC}, \text{DC})$. The database of all received policies is denoted as Π_{DCs} . This is a temporary variable to support indirect exchange of policies between DCs and DSs; not part of the abstract semantics. The PG includes the current state σ (not in abstract semantics). The *Effect* function is defined by synchronization actions; except for the action $\text{uploadPolicy}^\downarrow(\text{DC}, p_{\text{DC}})$ that additionally updates the repository database with p_{DC} , $\Pi_{\text{DCs}} \cup \{(\text{DC}, p_{\text{DC}})\}$. The repository can either receive DC policies, $\text{uploadPolicy}^\downarrow(\text{DC}, p_{\text{DC}})$, or send policies to DSs, $\text{downloadPolicies}^\uparrow(\text{DS}, \Pi_{\text{DCs}})$, upon receiving a request $\text{requestPolicies}^\downarrow(\text{DS})$.

Data Subject Gateway (DS program). This program broadcasts a data item and DS policy together. Fig. 4a shows the PG. The DS policy p_{DS} corresponds to $\pi(\text{DS}, \text{DS})$. Π_{DCs} represents the repository database, and σ the PG current state (none in the abstract semantics). *Effect* is defined as $\text{Effect}(\text{init}(p_{\text{DS}}, i), \eta) = \eta[p_{\text{DS}} \mapsto \text{policy_init}(), i \mapsto \text{data_init}()]$, and $\text{Effect}(\tau, \eta) = \eta$.

The PG starts with an initialization action, $\text{init}(p_{\text{DS}})$, where the DS defines her policy and data item i is recorded. The function $\text{policy_init}()$ retrieves the policy from the DS, and, $\text{data_init}()$ initializes i to the Bluetooth MAC address of the device. Then, it requests from the policy repository the database of DC policies, $\text{requestPolicies}^\uparrow(\text{DS})$. Upon receiving them, $\text{downloadPolicies}^\downarrow(\text{DS}, \Pi_{\text{DCs}})$, the data subject gateway starts to broadcast the data item i , receiver DC, and policy p —this might be implemented as in [21]. This step iterates over all policies in Π_{DCs} that comply with the p_{DS} . Non-deterministically (or, alternatively, triggered by the DS), the data subject gateway can update its policy database—action τ in the PG.

Data Controller Gateway (DC program). This program can upload the DC policy to the policy repository, and collect and process DS data according to their policy. We omit transfers as they are identical to that in Fig. 3b; it simply requires adding s_4 and the connecting edges. Fig. 4c shows the PG. Variables p and i correspond to the policy and data item sent by the DS: $(i, \text{DS}, p) \in \rho(\text{DC})$ in the abstract semantics. As in previous PGs, there is a current state variable σ (not in the abstract semantics). The *Effect* function is defined by synchronization actions and a policy initialization machine-level function.

The PG starts by initializing the DC policy, p_{DC} . In order for DSs to access p_{DC} , the PG uploads it to the policy repository, $uploadPolicy^\uparrow(DC, p_{DC})$. Then, the data controller gateway starts collecting MAC addresses and corresponding policies from DS devices within its range of operation. When the received policy does not conform p_{DC} (loop in s_2), the data item and policy are discarded, and the PG continues collecting data. Note that the DC device may receive policies for other DCs, in such a case the policy will fail to subsume that of the DC. We remark that, in our setting, policies are not secret, e.g., there is no problem in Amazon learning the policy that Alice defined for Google.

5 Verification of Legal Privacy Requirements

We use model-checking to verify that: i) the abstract semantics complies with privacy requirements inspired by the GDPR; and ii) the PGs in §4 refine the abstract semantics—thus, satisfying the same privacy requirements. We mechanize the abstract semantics and PGs in TLA^+ [17], and use the TLA^+ Toolbox [16] to automatically verify privacy requirements and refinements. The TLA^+ code is available in [20, 26].

TLA⁺ Mechanization. The abstract semantics is directly encoded as defined in Table 2— TLA^+ includes set theoretic operations as well as the next state operator *prime* (\prime). As for PGs, the only challenge is encoding synchronization actions (see Def. 4). To this end, we use a variable, $msgs$, modeling the set of messages in transit. Actions $a^\uparrow(\vec{x})$ and $a^\downarrow(\vec{x})$ add and remove an element $\langle a, \vec{x} \rangle$ in $msgs$, respectively. Note that this type of asynchronous communication differs from the synchronous composition in Def. 4. Consequently, the PGs in §4 are designed so that, if the PG is in a state waiting receive data (i.e., a state with an outgoing transition labeled with a receiving action), then the PG cannot make progress unless the corresponding message is sent. Hence, they exhibit the same synchronization behavior as specified in Def. 4.

This formalization serves as a guideline for software engineers to verify privacy requirements and refinements. TLA^+ has been used in real case studies by engineers in large companies such as Amazon [23]. We demonstrate the use of the model-checker in the TLA^+ Toolbox to verify privacy requirements and refinements on a model comprising: a DS, a data item (owned by the DS), two DCs, three PILOT policies p_1, p_2, p_3 (randomly selected by devices in their initialization steps) with $p_1 \sqsubseteq p_2$. As before, these policies are always active. This corresponds to worst-case analysis (as required in security and privacy applications) as it permits data communication for all data collection and transfer rules. We chose this model as it is the smallest model triggering all events (which are explored non-deterministically by the model-checker). To improve the performance of model-checking, we abstracted the syntax of PILOT policies. The relation \sqsubseteq is explicitly encoded as a partial order in the model. Model-checking privacy requirements and refinements on these models takes less than 10 seconds on a 1x1.7GHz virtual machine with 4G of RAM. Unfortunately, verifying models including more entities, data items or policies introduces a scalability problem due

to state explosion. However, we conjecture that these additions will not change the results. Note that: i) consent properties concern each data item separately (i.e., the handling of consent for one item does not affect another); ii) we consider (non-deterministically) independent and dependent (in terms of \sqsubseteq) policies for each item; and iii) all communication events are (non-deterministically) triggered. Our future work includes mechanizing a formal proof of this conjecture.

Legal Privacy Requirements. We verify that: i) the abstract semantics do not allow DCs to violate DS policies; and ii) one of the necessary conditions for informed consent according to the GDPR.

Privacy Requirement 1 (DS Policy Compliance) *DCs always follow a policy p_i for processing a data item i that complies with the policy defined by the DS, $p_{DS} \sqsubseteq p_i$.*

This requirement ensures that DCs cannot bypass the constraints imposed by DSs in processing their data. Formally, given device d , data controller dc , and data subject ds ,

$$\text{if } (d, i, p_i) \in \rho_{dc} \text{ and } p_{DS} = \pi(ds, ds) \text{ then } p_i \sqsubseteq p_{DS}$$

with $\text{type}(i) \leq_{\mathcal{T}} p_{DS}.t$. The requirement is formalized and successfully verified [26]. This requirement is of utmost importance as it ensures that DSs choices are never violated, and confirms the correctness of the design of our semantics.

The GDPR states that consent must be *informed*. Intuitively, this requirement means that *before* data is collected the DS must be informed about how data will be processed and whether it will be transferred. This requirement is of special interest, as there exist implementations of cookie banners that failed to comply with informed consent [18]. Below we state two necessary privacy requirements to enforce informed consent.

Privacy Requirement 2 (Informed Consent for Data Collection) *Before a DC receives data item i , the owner of i must have received a PILOT policy from the DC.*

Formally, given a DS $sndr$, DC rcv , and data item i ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{if } (sndr, i, -) \in \rho_{rcv} \text{ and } \text{owner}(i) = sndr \\ &\text{then } (rcv, p) \in \pi_{\text{owner}(i)} \text{ and } \text{type}(i) \leq_{\mathcal{T}} p.t. \end{aligned}$$

This property states that a DS has provided informed consent for data collection iff every time that a DC collects data from a DS, the DS has received a policy for the collected item from the DC. This privacy requirement concerning informed consent is successfully verified (see [26]).

We have verified that PILOT abstract semantics enforces two privacy properties which are required by the GDPR. This result shows that software engineers (such as cookie banner developers) could use PILOT abstract semantics as a high-level design for their implementations. Furthermore, as we describe below, they can use our formalization to verify that their implementations satisfy our abstract semantics; thus satisfying the privacy requirements discussed here.

Refinements In TLA^+ , refinement (or implementation) amounts to logical implication; the so called *refinement mappings* [1]. Formally, a specification I implements an abstract specification S iff $I \Longrightarrow S$. This proof technique requires mapping state variables in the specification to state variables in the implementation. We described this mapping for all the PGs in §4—see our TLA^+ mechanization for details [26].

Let AbstSem denote the abstract semantics specification (Table 2), DirectRef the specification of direct communication (PGs in Fig. 3), and IndirectRef the specification of indirect communication (PGs in Fig. 4). We successfully verify that i) $\text{DirectRef} \Longrightarrow \text{AbstSem}$; and ii) $\text{IndirectRef} \Longrightarrow \text{AbstSem}$ (see [26]).

The most important consequence of this result is that both refinements are guaranteed (proven) to enforce the privacy requirements above. Furthermore, new privacy requirements proven on the abstract semantics will also hold in the refinements. This is useful in practice as formal reasoning on the abstract semantics is much easier; the abstract semantics omit implementation details unnecessary for reasoning about privacy.

6 Related work and concluding remarks

Related work Several languages have been proposed to formally define privacy policies e.g., S4P, CI, PrivacyAPI, PrivacyLFP and PILOT [3, 5, 8, 19, 27]. Generally, these works focus on reasoning about system behavior with respect to privacy policies and regulations. However, none of them address the gap between formal definition and implementation. Our refinement method (§4) contributes to bridging this gap, and demonstrates it for the PILOT language—although our method can be applied to any privacy policy language whose policies and system behavior can be formally defined. In [27], the authors used the SPIN model-checker [12] to answer privacy risk queries. However, the model used for verification was based on an informal description of system events. Here we formalize the abstract semantics in TLA^+ , we formalize two GDPR requirements for the implementation of consent, and introduce a method to specify and verify refinements.

Different enforcement implementations for the P3P privacy policy language [6] have been studied via refinements [25]. Papanikolaou et al. translate P3P policies into CSP [11] and refinement is interpreted as a comparison between policies [25]. Instead, we use a system level notion of refinement. We verify that the behavior of the implementation is equivalent to that of an abstract semantics satisfying GDPR requirements for informed consent.

Some programming languages are designed to embed the enforcement of privacy requirements [15, 28]. In [28], the authors propose a programming language that includes consent management. However, it does not include notions of data transfer and DC policy. Therefore, it cannot be used to address the GDPR requirements in this paper. DPL [15] covers more GDPR requirements than our work, but its operational semantics is higher level than PGs. The system configuration operates on objects but it does not specify how different devices execute

each program—as we did for our PGs. Our refinement method could be used to refine DPL semantics to lower level implementations.

Hublet et al. introduced an enforcement of GDPR requirements for web applications [13]. The authors present an enforceable GDPR specification for web applications written in Metric First-Order Temporal logic. Their work covers more GDPR requirements than the work presented here, but it is limited to web applications. Our method does not impose constraints on architecture. For instance, we showed a refinement of a Bluetooth-based communication system in §4.

Conclusion We proposed a method to implement and verify legal requirements for consent management. The method aims to assist software engineers in designing and verifying systems that require consent management. The design/implementation language is program graphs—extended state machines that are common in the education of software engineers. We use a verification toolbox [16] that has been used by software engineers in industry [10, 23]. We provided a formal abstract semantics for the PILOT language, and verified that it satisfies GDPR requirements for informed consent. We introduced a notion of refinement as operational models to design the implementation of the devices in the system. We demonstrated the use of refinements to implement direct and indirect communication systems. We verified that the implementations refine PILOT abstract semantics, i.e., they ensure the same GDPR requirements for informed consent. We mechanized the abstract semantics, refinements and privacy requirements in TLA^+ , and used model-checking for verification.

References

1. Abadi, M., Lamport, L.: The existence of refinement mappings. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **82**(2), 253–284 (1991)
2. Baier, C., Katoen, J.: Principles of model checking. MIT Press (2008)
3. Barth, A., Datta, A., Mitchell, J.C., Nissenbaum, H.: Privacy and contextual integrity: Framework and applications. In: Proceedings of the 27th IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, S&P’06. pp. 184–198 (2006)
4. Becker, J.K., Li, D., Starobinski, D.: Tracking anonymized Bluetooth devices. *Proc. Priv. Enhancing Technol.* **2019**(3), 50–65 (2019)
5. Becker, M., Malkis, A., Bussard, L.: S4P: A generic language for specifying privacy preferences and policies. Tech. rep. (2010)
6. Cranor, L.F., Egelman, S., Sheng, S., McDonald, A.M., Chowdhury, A.: P3P deployment on websites. *Journal of Electronic Commerce Research and Applications* **7**(3), 274–293 (2008)
7. Danis, F.S., Cemgil, A.T.: Model-based localization and tracking using Bluetooth low-energy beacons. *Sensors* **17**(11), 2484 (2017)
8. DeYoung, H., Garg, D., Jia, L., Kaynar, D.K., Datta, A.: Experiences in the Logical Specification of the HIPAA and GLBA Privacy Laws. In: Proceedings of the 9th ACM Workshop on Privacy in the Electronic Society, WPES’10. pp. 73–82. ACM (2010)

9. European Union: Regulation 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the council of 27 april 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing directive 95/46/ec (General Data Protection Regulation) (May 2016), available: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.L_.2016.119.01.0001.01.ENG&toc=OJ:L:2016:119:TOC
10. Hackett, A.F., Rowe, J., Kuppe, M.A.: Understanding inconsistency in Azure Cosmos DB with TLA+. In: 45th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering: Software Engineering in Practice, SEIP@ICSE 2023. pp. 1–12. IEEE (2023)
11. Hoare, C.A.R.: Communicating sequential processes. *Commun. ACM* **21**(8), 666–677 (1978)
12. Holzmann, G.J.: *The SPIN Model Checker - Primer and Reference Manual*. Addison-Wesley (2004)
13. Hublet, F., Basin, D.A., Krstic, S.: Enforcing the GDPR. In: *Computer Security - ESORICS 2023 - 28th European Symposium on Research in Computer Security*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 14345, pp. 400–422. Springer (2023)
14. Jensen, C., Potts, C.: Privacy policies as decision-making tools: an evaluation of online privacy notices. In: *Proceedings of the 2004 Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI 2004*. pp. 471–478. ACM (2004)
15. Karami, F., Basin, D.A., Johnsen, E.B.: DPL: A language for GDPR enforcement. In: 35th IEEE Computer Security Foundations Symposium, CSF 2022. pp. 112–129. IEEE (2022)
16. Kuppe, M.A., Lamport, L., Ricketts, D.: The TLA+ toolbox. In: *Proceedings of Fifth Workshop on Formal Integrated Development Environment, F-IDE@FM'19*. EPTCS, vol. 310, pp. 50–62 (2019)
17. Lamport, L.: *Specifying Systems, The TLA+ Language and Tools for Hardware and Software Engineers*. Addison-Wesley (2002)
18. Matte, C., Bielova, N., Santos, C.: Do cookie banners respect my choice? : Measuring legal compliance of banners from IAB europe’s transparency and consent framework. In: *Proceedings of 41st IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, S&P'20*. pp. 791–809. IEEE (2020)
19. May, M.J., Gunter, C.A., Lee, I.: Privacy APIs: Access control techniques to analyze and verify legal privacy policies. In: *Proceedings of the 19th IEEE Computer Security Foundations Workshop, CSFW'06*. pp. 85–97. IEEE Computer Society (2006)
20. TLA⁺ mechanization of abstract semantics, program graphs, and privacy requirements: <https://github.com/raulpardo/pilot-tla/>
21. Morel, V., Cunche, M., Le Métayer, D.: A generic information and consent framework for the iot. In: *Proceedings of 18th IEEE International Conference On Trust, Security And Privacy In Computing And Communications, TrustCom'19*. pp. 366–373. IEEE (2019)
22. Morel, V., Pardo, R.: Sok: Three facets of privacy policies. In: *Proceedings of the 19th Workshop on Privacy in the Electronic Society, WPES 2020*. pp. 41–56. ACM (2020)
23. Newcombe, C., Rath, T., Zhang, F., Munteanu, B., Brooker, M., Deardeuff, M.: How amazon web services uses formal methods. *Commun. ACM* **58**(4), 66–73 (2015)
24. Oosterlinck, D., Benoit, D.F., Baecke, P., Van de Weghe, N.: Bluetooth tracking of humans in an indoor environment: An application to shopping mall visits. *Applied Geography* **78**, 55 – 65 (2017)

25. Papanikolaou, N., Creese, S., Goldsmith, M.: Refinement checking for privacy policies. *Sci. Comput. Program.* **77**(10-11), 1198–1209 (2012)
26. Pardo, R., Le Métayer, D.: Model-Checking the Implementation of Consent (Accompanying Artifact). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12550375>, <https://zenodo.org/records/12550375>
27. Pardo, R., Le Métayer, D.: Analysis of privacy policies to enhance informed consent. In: Proceedings of the 33rd Annual IFIP WG 11.3 Conference on Data and Applications Security and Privacy, DBSec’19. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 11559, pp. 177–198 (2019)
28. Tokas, S., Owe, O.: A formal framework for consent management. In: Proceedings of the 40th IFIP WG 6.1 International Conference Formal Techniques for Distributed Objects, Components, and Systems, FORTE 2020. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 12136, pp. 169–186. Springer (2020)

A Policy subsumption

We recall the definition of PILOT *policy subsumption* [27].

Definition 5 (Data Usage Rule Subsumption). *Given two data usage rules $dur_1 = \langle P_1, rt_1 \rangle$ and $dur_2 = \langle P_2, rt_2 \rangle$, we say that dur_1 subsumes dur_2 , denoted as $dur_1 \preceq_{DUR} dur_2$, iff i) $\forall p_1 \in P_1 \cdot \exists p_2 \in P_2$ such that $p_1 \leq_P p_2$; and ii) $rt_1 \leq rt_2$.*

Definition 6 (Data Communication Rule Subsumption). *Given two data communication rules $dcr_1 = \langle c_1, e_1, dur_1 \rangle$ and $dcr_2 = \langle c_2, e_2, dur_2 \rangle$, we say that dcr_1 subsumes dcr_2 , denoted as $dcr_1 \preceq_{DCR} dcr_2$, iff i) $e_1 \leq_E e_2$; and ii) $dur_1 \preceq_{DUR} dur_2$.*

Definition 7 (PILOT Privacy Policy Subsumption). *Given two PILOT privacy policies $\pi_1 = \langle t_1, dcr_1, TR_1 \rangle$ and $\pi_2 = \langle t_2, dcr_2, TR_2 \rangle$, we say that π_1 subsumes π_2 , denoted as $\pi_1 \sqsubseteq \pi_2$ iff i) $t_1 \leq_T t_2$; ii) $dcr_1 \preceq_{DCR} dcr_2$; and iii) $\forall tr_1 \in TR_1 \cdot \exists tr_2 \in TR_2$ such that $tr_1 \preceq_{DCR} tr_2$.*

B Condition evaluation, Active Policies and Transfer rules

We recall the definitions for *condition evaluation*, *active policy*, and *active transfer* [27].

Definition 8 (Condition Evaluation). *Given the valuation function ν , device $d \in \mathcal{D}$, and condition $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}$, $eval()$ is defined as shown in Table 3.*

Definition 9 (Active PILOT policy). *Given, devices $sndr, rcv \in \mathcal{D}$, policy $p \in \mathcal{PP}$, data item $i \in \mathcal{I}$ and state $st \in \mathcal{S}$,*

$$\begin{aligned}
 activePolicy(p, send(sndr, rcv, i), st) = \\
 type(i) \leq_T t \wedge eval(\nu, sndr, \varphi) \wedge time(st, send(sndr, rcv, i)) < rt \wedge \\
 entity(rcv) \leq_E e
 \end{aligned}$$

where $p = (t, \langle \varphi, e, \langle -, rt \rangle \rangle, -)$ and $st = \langle \nu, -, - \rangle$. □

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{eval}(\nu, d, tt) = \mathbf{true} \\
& \mathbf{eval}(\nu, d, ff) = \mathbf{false} \\
& \mathbf{eval}(\nu, d, i) = \nu(d, i) \\
& \mathbf{eval}(\nu, d, c) = \hat{c} \\
& \mathbf{eval}(\nu, d, f(t_1, t_2, \dots)) = \hat{f}(\mathbf{eval}(\nu, d, t_1), \mathbf{eval}(\nu, d, t_2), \dots) \\
& \mathbf{eval}(\nu, d, t_1 * t_2) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{eval}(\nu, d, t_1) \hat{*} \mathbf{eval}(\nu, d, t_2) & \text{if } \mathbf{eval}(\nu, d, t_i) \neq \perp \\ \perp & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
& \mathbf{eval}(\nu, d, \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{eval}(\nu, d, \varphi_1) \text{ and } \mathbf{eval}(\nu, d, \varphi_2) & \text{if } \mathbf{eval}(\nu, d, \varphi_i) \neq \perp \\ \perp & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
& \mathbf{eval}(\nu, d, \neg\varphi) = \begin{cases} \text{not } \mathbf{eval}(\nu, d, \varphi) & \text{if } \mathbf{eval}(\nu, d, \varphi) \neq \perp \\ \perp & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

Table 3: Definition of $\mathbf{eval}(\nu, d, \varphi)$ We use \hat{c} , \hat{f} and $\hat{*}$ to denote the interpretation of constants, functions and binary predicates, respectively. We assume that these interpretations are the same across all devices.

Definition 10 (Active transfer rule). Given, devices $sndr, rcv \in \mathcal{D}$, policy $p \in \mathcal{PP}$, transfer rule $tr \in p.TR$, data item $i \in \mathcal{I}$ and state $st \in \mathcal{S}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{activeTransfer}(tr, p, \mathbf{transfer}(sndr, rcv, i), st) = \\
& \quad \mathbf{time}(st, \mathbf{transfer}(sndr, rcv, i)) < rt_p \wedge \\
& \quad \mathbf{eval}(\nu, sndr, \varphi_{tr}) \wedge \mathbf{time}(st, \mathbf{transfer}(sndr, rcv, i)) < rt_{tr} \wedge \\
& \quad \mathbf{entity}(rcv) \leq_{\mathcal{E}} e_{tr}
\end{aligned}$$

where $tr = \langle \varphi_{tr}, e_{tr}, \langle -, rt_{tr} \rangle \rangle$, $p = \langle -, \langle -, -, \langle -, rt_p \rangle \rangle, - \rangle$ and $st = \langle \nu, -, - \rangle$. □