Experiences in the Logical Formalization of the HIPAA and GLBA Privacy Laws

Anupam Datta

Carnegie Mellon University

TRUST Conference November 11, 2010

Privacy in Organizational Processes



Achieve organizational <u>purpose</u> while respecting privacy expectations in the <u>transfer</u> and <u>use</u> of personal information within and across organizational boundaries.

Observation: Real privacy laws are complex.

- Examples:
 - Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA)
 - Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (GLBA)
- ► Long, dense HIPAA Privacy Rule has 84 operational clauses for transmissions on ~30 pages
- ► Too complex to be a practical day-to-day guide.

Observation: Real privacy laws are complex.

- Examples:
 - Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA)
 - Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (GLBA)
- Long, dense HIPAA Privacy Rule has 84 operational clauses for transmissions on ~30 pages
- ► Too complex to be a practical day-to-day guide.

Desiderata: Interactive tools for enforcement and analysis

- "Does GLBA permit Bank X to disclose Bob's info to Charlie?"
- "Are Hospital Y's policies consistent with HIPAA?"

Prior work:

- Logics and languages for specification of privacy policies
 - P3P [Cranor et al.], XACML [OASIS], EPAL [Backes et al.], requirements engineering [Breaux and Antón], LPU [Barth et al.], Privacy APIs [Gunter et al.], deontic logic [I. Lee et al.], SecPAL [Becker et al.], ...

Prior work:

- Logics and languages for specification of privacy policies
 - P3P [Cranor et al.], XACML [OASIS], EPAL [Backes et al.], requirements engineering [Breaux and Antón], LPU [Barth et al.], Privacy APIs [Gunter et al.], deontic logic [I. Lee et al.], SecPAL [Becker et al.], ...
- Formal specification of privacy laws
 - ▶ LPU [Barth et al.]: Examples from HIPAA and GLBA
 - ► Datalog HIPAA [Lam et al.]: HIPAA §§164.502, 506, and 510
 - Privacy APIs [Gunter et al.]: HIPAA §164.506
 - Deontic logic [I. Lee et al.]: Examples from FDA CFR §610.40

Prior work:

- Logics and languages for specification of privacy policies
 - P3P [Cranor et al.], XACML [OASIS], EPAL [Backes et al.], requirements engineering [Breaux and Antón], LPU [Barth et al.], Privacy APIs [Gunter et al.], deontic logic [I. Lee et al.], SecPAL [Becker et al.], ...
- Formal specification of privacy laws
 - ▶ LPU [Barth et al.]: Examples from HIPAA and GLBA
 - ► Datalog HIPAA [Lam et al.]: HIPAA §§164.502, 506, and 510
 - Privacy APIs [Gunter et al.]: HIPAA §164.506
 - ► Deontic logic [I. Lee et al.]: Examples from FDA CFR §610.40

Problem:

- Formalization efforts have not covered full privacy laws.
- Do these techniques scale to specification and computer-assisted enforcement of full privacy laws?

Contributions:

1. PrivacyLFP, a logic and signature for expressing privacy laws

- $1. \ {\rm PrivacyLFP},$ a logic and signature for expressing privacy laws
- 2. Complete formalizations of HIPAA and GLBA's operational requirements for transmissions

- 1. PrivacyLFP, a logic and signature for expressing privacy laws
- 2. Complete formalizations of HIPAA and GLBA's operational requirements for transmissions
- 3. Ideas and algorithm for enforcement of HIPAA, GLBA, etc.

- 1. PrivacyLFP, a logic and signature for expressing privacy laws
- 2. Complete formalizations of HIPAA and GLBA's operational requirements for transmissions
- 3. Ideas and algorithm for enforcement of HIPAA, GLBA, etc.

Contributions:

- 1. PrivacyLFP, a logic and signature for expressing privacy laws
- 2. Complete formalizations of HIPAA and GLBA's operational requirements for transmissions
- 3. Ideas and algorithm for enforcement of HIPAA, GLBA, etc.

Reported in: Experiences in the Logical Formalization of the HIPAA and GLBA Privacy Laws [DeYoung,Garg,Jia,Kaynar,Datta]

Contributions:

- 1. PrivacyLFP, a logic and signature for expressing privacy laws
- 2. Complete formalizations of HIPAA and GLBA's operational requirements for transmissions
- 3. Ideas and algorithm for enforcement of HIPAA, GLBA, etc.

Reported in: Experiences in the Logical Formalization of the HIPAA and GLBA Privacy Laws [DeYoung,Garg,Jia,Kaynar,Datta]

Builds on: Logic of Privacy and Utility (LPU) [Barth,Datta,Mit A logical formalization of contextual integrity

[Barth,Datta,Mitchell,Nissenbaum] [Nissenbaum]

Structure of privacy laws

Structure of privacy laws

Features of the logic PrivacyLFP

Features with syntactic support only Features with semantics

Structure of privacy laws

Features of the logic PrivacyLFP

Features with syntactic support only Features with semantics

Enforcement

Structure of privacy laws

Features of the logic PrivacyLFP

Features with syntactic support only Features with semantics

Enforcement

Conclusion

Outline

Structure of privacy laws

Features of the logic PrivacyLFP

Features with syntactic support only Features with semantics

Enforcement

Conclusion











Positive norms, φ_i^+ : Transmission *may occur* if condition is satisfied.

 "A covered entity may disclose protected health information for treatment activities [...]." [HIPAA §164.506(c)(2)]

Positive norms, φ_i^+ : Transmission *may occur* if condition is satisfied.

 "A covered entity may disclose protected health information for treatment activities [...]." [HIPAA §164.506(c)(2)]

Negative norms, φ_j^- : Condition *must be satisified* if transmission occurs.

 "A covered entity must obtain an authorization for any use or disclosure of psychotherapy notes." [HIPAA §164.508(a)(2)]

Positive norms, φ_i^+ : Transmission *may occur* if condition is satisfied.

 "A covered entity may disclose protected health information for treatment activities [...]." [HIPAA §164.506(c)(2)]

Negative norms, φ_j^- : Condition *must be satisified* if transmission occurs.

 "A covered entity must obtain an authorization for any use or disclosure of psychotherapy notes." [HIPAA §164.508(a)(2)]

$$maysend(p_1, p_2, m) \triangleq \left(\bigvee_i \varphi_i^+\right) \land \left(\bigwedge_j \varphi_j^-\right)$$

Positive norms, φ_i^+ : Transmission *may occur* if condition is satisfied.

 "A covered entity may disclose protected health information for treatment activities [...]." [HIPAA §164.506(c)(2)]

Negative norms, φ_j^- : Condition *must be satisified* if transmission occurs.

 "A covered entity must obtain an authorization for any use or disclosure of psychotherapy notes." [HIPAA §164.508(a)(2)]

$$maysend(p_1, p_2, m) \triangleq \left(\bigvee_i \varphi_i^+\right) \land \left(\bigwedge_j \varphi_j^-\right)$$

Positive norms, φ_i^+ : Transmission *may occur* if condition is satisfied.

 "A covered entity may disclose protected health information for treatment activities [...]." [HIPAA §164.506(c)(2)]

Negative norms, φ_j^- : Condition *must be satisified* if transmission occurs.

 "A covered entity must obtain an authorization for any use or disclosure of psychotherapy notes." [HIPAA §164.508(a)(2)]

$$maysend(p_1, p_2, m) \triangleq \left(\bigvee_i \varphi_i^+\right) \land \left(\bigwedge_j \varphi_j^-\right)$$

Positive norms, φ_i^+ : Transmission *may occur* if condition is satisfied.

 "A covered entity may disclose protected health information for treatment activities [...]." [HIPAA §164.506(c)(2)]

Negative norms, φ_j^- : Condition *must be satisified* if transmission occurs.

 "A covered entity must obtain an authorization for any use or disclosure of psychotherapy notes." [HIPAA §164.508(a)(2)]

$$maysend(p_1, p_2, m) \triangleq \left(\bigvee_i \varphi_i^+\right) \land \left(\bigwedge_j \varphi_j^-\right)$$

Positive norms, φ_i^+ : Transmission *may occur* if condition is satisfied.

 "A covered entity may disclose protected health information for treatment activities [...]." [HIPAA §164.506(c)(2)]

Negative norms, φ_j^- : Condition *must be satisified* if transmission occurs.

 "A covered entity must obtain an authorization for any use or disclosure of psychotherapy notes." [HIPAA §164.508(a)(2)]

$$\textit{maysend}(p_1, p_2, m) \triangleq \left(\bigvee_i \varphi_i^+\right) \land \left(\bigwedge_j \varphi_j^-\right)$$

Exceptions to negative norms:

"A covered entity must obtain an authorization for any use or disclosure of psychotherapy notes, except [...]."

$$\varphi_{164.508a2'}^{-} \triangleq \varphi_{164.508a2}^{-} \lor \left(\varphi_{164.508a2iA}^{e} \lor \cdots\right)$$

Exceptions to negative norms:

"A covered entity must obtain an authorization for any use or disclosure of psychotherapy notes, except [...]."

$$\varphi_{164.508a2'}^{-} \triangleq \varphi_{164.508a2}^{-} \lor \left(\varphi_{164.508a2iA}^{e} \lor \cdots\right)$$

Exceptions to negative norms:

"A covered entity must obtain an authorization for any use or disclosure of psychotherapy notes, except [...]."

$$\varphi^-_{164.508a2'} \triangleq \varphi^-_{164.508a2} \lor (\varphi^e_{164.508a2iA} \lor \cdots)$$

Exceptions to negative norms:

"A covered entity must obtain an authorization for any use or disclosure of psychotherapy notes, except [...]."

$$\varphi_{164.508a2'}^{-} \triangleq \varphi_{164.508a2}^{-} \lor \left(\varphi_{164.508a2iA}^{e} \lor \cdots\right)$$

Exceptions to negative norms:

"A covered entity must obtain an authorization for any use or disclosure of psychotherapy notes, except [...]."

Conclusion: Satisfy either the core or one of the exceptions.

$$\varphi_{164.508a2'}^{-} \triangleq \varphi_{164.508a2}^{-} \lor \left(\varphi_{164.508a2iA}^{e} \lor \cdots\right)$$

"Exceptions" to positive norms:

- A covered entity may disclose information to report abuse.
- Disclosures under previous require informing the victim.

Conclusion: Satisfy the core and its refinements.

$$\varphi^+_{\mathbf{164.512c1'}} \triangleq \varphi^+_{\mathbf{164.512c1}} \wedge \varphi^e_{\mathbf{164.512c2}}$$
Exceptions refine norms of transmission

Exceptions to negative norms:

"A covered entity must obtain an authorization for any use or disclosure of psychotherapy notes, except [...]."

Conclusion: Satisfy either the core or one of the exceptions.

$$\varphi_{164.508a2'}^{-} \triangleq \varphi_{164.508a2}^{-} \lor \left(\varphi_{164.508a2iA}^{e} \lor \cdots\right)$$

"Exceptions" to positive norms:

- A covered entity may disclose information to report abuse.
- Disclosures under previous require informing the victim.

Conclusion: Satisfy the core and its refinements.

$$\varphi^{+}_{164.512c1'} \triangleq \varphi^{+}_{164.512c1} \land \varphi^{e}_{164.512c2}$$

Exceptions refine norms of transmission

Exceptions to negative norms:

"A covered entity must obtain an authorization for any use or disclosure of psychotherapy notes, except [...]."

Conclusion: Satisfy either the core or one of the exceptions.

$$\varphi_{164.508a2'}^{-} \triangleq \varphi_{164.508a2}^{-} \lor \left(\varphi_{164.508a2iA}^{e} \lor \cdots\right)$$

"Exceptions" to positive norms:

- A covered entity may disclose information to report abuse.
- Disclosures under previous require informing the victim.

Conclusion: Satisfy the core and its refinements.

$$\varphi^+_{\mathbf{164.512c1'}} \triangleq \varphi^+_{\mathbf{164.512c1}} \land \varphi^e_{\mathbf{164.512c2}}$$

Exceptions refine norms of transmission

Exceptions to negative norms:

"A covered entity must obtain an authorization for any use or disclosure of psychotherapy notes, except [...]."

Conclusion: Satisfy either the core or one of the exceptions.

$$\varphi_{164.508a2'}^{-} \triangleq \varphi_{164.508a2}^{-} \lor \left(\varphi_{164.508a2iA}^{e} \lor \cdots\right)$$

"Exceptions" to positive norms:

- A covered entity may disclose information to report abuse.
- Disclosures under previous require informing the victim.

Conclusion: Satisfy the core and its refinements.

$$\varphi^+_{164.512c1'} \triangleq \varphi^+_{164.512c1} \land \varphi^e_{164.512c2}$$

Structure of HIPAA and GLBA privacy laws

Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act:

- Primarily positive norms
 - ▶ 56 positive norms, 7 negative norms, and 19 exceptions
 - ► Negative norms for patient consent or opt-out opportunity (§§164.508 and 164.510)
- Deny all transmissions not explicitly allowed

Structure of HIPAA and GLBA privacy laws

Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act:

- Primarily positive norms
 - ▶ 56 positive norms, 7 negative norms, and 19 exceptions
 - ► Negative norms for patient consent or opt-out opportunity (§§164.508 and 164.510)
- Deny all transmissions not explicitly allowed

Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act:

- No positive norms
 - ► 5 negative norms and 10 exceptions
 - Negative norms require notices and opt-out opportunities (§§6802 and 6803)
- Allow all transmissions not explicitly denied

Outline

Structure of privacy laws

Features of the logic PrivacyLFP

Features with syntactic support only Features with semantics

Enforcement

Conclusion

Outline

Structure of privacy laws

Features of the logic PrivacyLFP Features with syntactic support only

Features with semantics

Enforcement

Conclusion

Purposes of disclosures

HIPAA §164.506(c)(2)

"A covered entity may disclose protected health information for [the purpose of] treatment activities of a health care provider."

Purposes of disclosures

HIPAA §164.506(c)(2)

"A covered entity may disclose protected health information for [the purpose of] treatment activities of a health care provider."

Conclusion: Purpose constants and $\in_{\mathcal{U}}$ predicate for subpurpose hierarchy

 (blood-tests ∈_U treatment) because blood tests are a type of treatment.

Purposes of disclosures

HIPAA §164.506(c)(2)

"A covered entity may disclose protected health information for [the purpose of] treatment activities of a health care provider."

Conclusion: Purpose constants and $\in_{\mathcal{U}}$ predicate for subpurpose hierarchy

 (blood-tests ∈_U treatment) because blood tests are a type of treatment.

$$\varphi^{+}_{164.506c2} \triangleq activerole(p_{1}, covered-entity) \land \\ (t \in_{\mathcal{T}} phi) \land \\ (u \in_{\mathcal{U}} treatment(p_{2})) \land \\ activerole(p_{2}, provider)$$

Principals' beliefs and professional judgement

HIPAA §164.512(f)(4)

"A covered entity may disclose protected health information about an individual who has died to a law enforcement official for the purpose of alerting law enforcement if the covered entity has a suspicion that the death may have resulted from criminal conduct."

Principals' beliefs and professional judgement

HIPAA §164.512(f)(4)

"A covered entity may disclose protected health information about an individual who has died to a law enforcement official for the purpose of alerting law enforcement if the covered entity has a suspicion that the death may have resulted from criminal conduct."

Conclusion: Include uninterpreted believes-... predicates

Principals' beliefs and professional judgement

HIPAA §164.512(f)(4)

"A covered entity may disclose protected health information about an individual who has died to a law enforcement official for the purpose of alerting law enforcement if the covered entity has a suspicion that the death may have resulted from criminal conduct."

Conclusion: Include uninterpreted believes-... predicates

$$\varphi_{164.512f4}^{+} \triangleq activerole(p_{1}, covered-entity) \land \\ (t \in_{\mathcal{T}} phi) \land \\ belongstorole(q, deceased) \land \\ activerole(p_{2}, law-enforcement-official) \land \\ (u \in_{\mathcal{U}} death-notification(q)) \land \\ believes-death-may-be-result-of-crime(p_{1}, q)$$

Outline

Structure of privacy laws

Features of the logic PrivacyLFP Features with syntactic support only Features with semantics

Enforcement

Conclusion

Principals' dynamic roles

Observation: Principals' roles are dynamic.

- Principals enter and exit customer relationships with banks.
- Principals are active in other roles (e.g., doctor) during customer relationship.

Principals' dynamic roles

Observation: Principals' roles are dynamic.

- Principals enter and exit customer relationships with banks.
- Principals are active in other roles (e.g., doctor) during customer relationship.

Conclusion: Distinguish the roles held from the active role.

- belongstorole(Alice, customer(X)): Alice is a customer of X.
- belongstorole(Alice, doctor(Bob): Alice is Bob's doctor.
- activerole(Alice, doctor(Bob)): Alice is currently active as Bob's doctor.
- ► ¬activerole(Alice, customer(X)): Alice is not currently active as a customer of X.

GLBA §6802(b)(1)

"A financial institution may not disclose nonpublic personal information unless the consumer is given the opportunity to [opt-out], before the time that such information is disclosed."

GLBA §6802(b)(1)

"A financial institution may not disclose nonpublic personal information unless the consumer is given the opportunity to [opt-out], before the time that such information is disclosed."

GLBA §6803(a)

"At the time of establishing a customer relationship and not less than annually during such relationship, a financial institution shall provide a disclosure to such customer, of such institution's policies and practices with respect to [disclosing nonpublic personal info]."

GLBA §6802(b)(1)

"A financial institution may not disclose nonpublic personal information unless the consumer is given the opportunity to [opt-out], before the time that such information is disclosed."

GLBA §6803(a)

"At the time of establishing a customer relationship and not less than annually during such relationship, a financial institution shall provide a disclosure to such customer, of such institution's policies and practices with respect to [disclosing nonpublic personal info]."

Conclusion: Borrow operators from temporal logic and TPTL.

GLBA §6802(b)(1)

"A financial institution may not disclose nonpublic personal information unless the consumer is given the opportunity to [opt-out], before the time that such information is disclosed."

GLBA §6803(a)

"At the time of establishing a customer relationship and not less than annually during such relationship, a financial institution shall provide a disclosure to such customer, of such institution's policies and practices with respect to [disclosing nonpublic personal info]."

Conclusion: Borrow operators from temporal logic and TPTL.

• $\Diamond \phi$: " ϕ is true at some past time."

GLBA §6802(b)(1)

"A financial institution may not disclose nonpublic personal information unless the consumer is given the opportunity to [opt-out], before the time that such information is disclosed."

GLBA §6803(a)

"At the time of establishing a customer relationship and not less than annually during such relationship, a financial institution shall provide a disclosure to such customer, of such institution's policies and practices with respect to [disclosing nonpublic personal info]."

Conclusion: Borrow operators from temporal logic and TPTL.

- $\Diamond \phi$: " ϕ is true at some past time."
- $\Diamond \phi$: " ϕ is true at some future time."

GLBA §6802(b)(1)

"A financial institution may not disclose nonpublic personal information unless the consumer is given the opportunity to [opt-out], before the time that such information is disclosed."

GLBA §6803(a)

"At the time of establishing a customer relationship and not less than annually during such relationship, a financial institution shall provide a disclosure to such customer, of such institution's policies and practices with respect to [disclosing nonpublic personal info]."

Conclusion: Borrow operators from temporal logic and TPTL.

- $\Diamond \phi$: " ϕ is true at some past time."
- $\Diamond \phi$: " ϕ is true at some future time."
- $\downarrow x. \phi$: Use x as a name for the current time in ϕ .

GLBA §6802(b)(1)

"A financial institution may not disclose nonpublic personal information unless the consumer is given the opportunity to [opt-out], before the time that such information is disclosed."

$$\begin{split} \varphi_{6802b1}^{-} &\triangleq activerole(p_1, institution) \land \\ & (t \in_{\mathcal{T}} npi) \land \\ \neg activerole(p_2, affiliate(p_1)) \land \\ & belongstorole(q, consumer(p_1)) \\ \rightarrow \\ & \downarrow x. \ \Diamond(\downarrow y. \ (x - y \geq 14) \land \\ & \exists m'. \ send(p_1, q, m') \land \\ & is-notice-of-potential \\ & -disclosure(m', p_1, p_2, (q, t), u)) \end{split}$$

Outline

Structure of privacy laws

Features of the logic PrivacyLFP

Features with syntactic support only Features with semantics

Enforcement

Conclusion

Properties of enforcement

Observations:

Enforcement by execution-time access control alone is insufficient.

- Purposes, beliefs, future obligations, etc. are not, a priori, mechanically decidable.
- Cannot always demand human involvement at execution time (e.g., medical emergency)

Properties of enforcement

Observations:

Enforcement by execution-time access control alone is insufficient.

- Purposes, beliefs, future obligations, etc. are not, a priori, mechanically decidable.
- Cannot always demand human involvement at execution time (e.g., medical emergency)

Enforcement must be:

- 1. execution-time access control mechanisms that may optimistically resolve undecidable predicates, postponing them to
- 2. post-hoc audit with human involvement.

Properties of enforcement

Observations:

Enforcement by execution-time access control alone is insufficient.

- Purposes, beliefs, future obligations, etc. are not, a priori, mechanically decidable.
- Cannot always demand human involvement at execution time (e.g., medical emergency)

Enforcement must be:

- 1. execution-time access control mechanisms that may optimistically resolve undecidable predicates, postponing them to
- 2. post-hoc audit with human involvement.

Goal: Devise decision procedures for predicates that seem mechanically undecidable.

Audit effort during enforcement

- 1. Standardized data formats
 - Have lawyers draft a single annual notice so that the truth of *is-annual-notice* is determined en masse for all customers.

Audit effort during enforcement

- 1. Standardized data formats
 - Have lawyers draft a single annual notice so that the truth of *is-annual-notice* is determined en masse for all customers.
- 2. Design-time analysis of business processes
 - (u ∈_U directory) can be guaranteed true if information kiosk responds only to directory requests.

Audit effort during enforcement

- 1. Standardized data formats
 - Have lawyers draft a single annual notice so that the truth of *is-annual-notice* is determined en masse for all customers.
- 2. Design-time analysis of business processes
 - ► (u ∈_U directory) can be guaranteed true if information kiosk responds only to directory requests.

		Privacy Law	
Audit Effort	Example	GLBA	HIPAA
None	Decision procedures	8 of 15	17 of 84

Audit effort during enforcement

- 1. Standardized data formats
 - Have lawyers draft a single annual notice so that the truth of *is-annual-notice* is determined en masse for all customers.
- 2. Design-time analysis of business processes
 - ► (u ∈_U directory) can be guaranteed true if information kiosk responds only to directory requests.

		Privacy Law	
Audit Effort	Example	GLBA	HIPAA
None	Decision procedures	8 of 15	17 of 84
Small, non-expert	prevent-fraud purpose	12 of 15	47 of 84

Audit effort during enforcement

- 1. Standardized data formats
 - Have lawyers draft a single annual notice so that the truth of *is-annual-notice* is determined en masse for all customers.
- 2. Design-time analysis of business processes
 - (u ∈_U directory) can be guaranteed true if information kiosk responds only to directory requests.

		Privacy Law	
Audit Effort	Example	GLBA	HIPAA
None Small, non-expert Large, expert	Decision procedures prevent-fraud purpose Beliefs, compliance with other laws	8 of 15 12 of 15 15 of 15	17 of 84 47 of 84 84 of 84

New Policy Monitoring Algorithm (Unpublished)

Checks as much policy as possible over audit log and outputs a residual policy:

 $\texttt{reduce}(L, \varphi) = \varphi'$

New Policy Monitoring Algorithm (Unpublished)

Checks as much policy as possible over audit log and outputs a residual policy:

 $\texttt{reduce}(L, \varphi) = \varphi'$

Applied iteratively as log records more actions:

. . .

 $\texttt{reduce}(L_1, \varphi_0) = \varphi_1$ $\texttt{reduce}(L_2, \varphi_1) = \varphi_2$

New Policy Monitoring Algorithm (Unpublished)

Checks as much policy as possible over audit log and outputs a residual policy:

 $\texttt{reduce}(L, \varphi) = \varphi'$

Applied iteratively as log records more actions:

. . .

$$ext{reduce}(L_1, arphi_0) = arphi_1$$

 $ext{reduce}(L_2, arphi_1) = arphi_2$

- Properties
 - Sound: Any extension of log satisfies residual policy iff it satisfies original policy

New Policy Monitoring Algorithm (Unpublished)

Checks as much policy as possible over audit log and outputs a residual policy:

 $\texttt{reduce}(L, \varphi) = \varphi'$

Applied iteratively as log records more actions:

. . .

 $ext{reduce}(L_1, \varphi_0) = \varphi_1$ $ext{reduce}(L_2, \varphi_1) = \varphi_2$

- Properties
 - Sound: Any extension of log satisfies residual policy iff it satisfies original policy
 - Minimal: Residual policy contains only those predicates whose truth cannot be determined from the current log (e.g., future obligations, subjective predicates)
Audit effort during enforcement

Even if experts are used for auditing, the logic directs their efforts.

- Only asks experts about undecidable predicates.
- Limits experts' attention to applicable positive norms, rather than the full law.

Audit effort during enforcement

Even if experts are used for auditing, the logic directs their efforts.

- Only asks experts about undecidable predicates.
- Limits experts' attention to applicable positive norms, rather than the full law.



Audit effort during enforcement

Even if experts are used for auditing, the logic directs their efforts.

- Only asks experts about undecidable predicates.
- Limits experts' attention to applicable positive norms, rather than the full law.

$$p_1 \longrightarrow p_2$$

activerole(p_1 , covered-entity) \land activerole(p_2 , law-enforcement) \land belongstorole(q, deceased) \land ($t \in_{\mathcal{T}}$ phi) \land ($u \in_{\mathcal{U}}$ death-notification(q)) \land believes-result-of-crime(p_1, q)

Audit effort during enforcement

Even if experts are used for auditing, the logic directs their efforts.

- Only asks experts about undecidable predicates.
- Limits experts' attention to applicable positive norms, rather than the full law.



 $\begin{array}{l} activerole(p_1, covered-entity) \\ activerole(p_2, law-enforcement) \\ belongstorole(q, deceased) \\ (t \in_{\mathcal{T}} phi) \\ (u \in_{\mathcal{U}} death-notification(q)) \\ believes-result-of-crime(p_1, q) \end{array}$

$$\begin{array}{l} activerole(p_1, covered-entity) \\ activerole(p_2, provider(q)) \\ (t \in_{\mathcal{T}} phi) \\ (u \in_{\mathcal{U}} treatment(p_2)) \end{array} \land$$

Audit effort during enforcement

Even if experts are used for auditing, the logic directs their efforts.

- Only asks experts about undecidable predicates.
- Limits experts' attention to applicable positive norms, rather than the full law.



activerole(p_1 , covered-entity) \land activerole(p_2 , law-enforcement) \land belongstorole(q, deceased) \land ($t \in_{\mathcal{T}}$ phi) \land ($u \in_{\mathcal{U}}$ death-notification(q)) \land believes-result-of-crime(p_1, q)



Outline

Structure of privacy laws

Features of the logic PrivacyLFP

Features with syntactic support only Features with semantics

Enforcement

Conclusion

Conclusion

Contributions:

- 1. PrivacyLFP, a logic and signature for expressing privacy laws
 - Purposes, beliefs, dynamic roles, concrete temporal requirements, and self-referential clauses
- 2. Complete formalizations of HIPAA and GLBA's operational requirements for transmissions
- 3. Preliminary ideas for enforcement of HIPAA, GLBA, etc.

Conclusion

Contributions:

1. PrivacyLFP, a logic and signature for expressing privacy laws

- Purposes, beliefs, dynamic roles, concrete temporal requirements, and self-referential clauses
- 2. Complete formalizations of HIPAA and GLBA's operational requirements for transmissions
- 3. Preliminary ideas for enforcement of HIPAA, GLBA, etc.

Future work:

- Enforcement!
- Semantics for de-identified data and purposes to reduce audit effort

Thank you!