

Module 8 Data Governance

© 2021, Anwitaman DATTA. School of Computer Science and Engineering, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

Teaching material

Accompanying teaching material

These slides are accompanied with a jupyter notebook and an html deck of slides.

The big picture

- **Data governance** adds to stakeholders' trust in the data —specifically, in how that data is collected, analyzed, published, or used.
- **Discoverability:** Make technical metadata, lineage information, and a business glossary readily available. Business critical data needs to be correct and complete. Master data management to guarantee that data is finely classified ensuring appropriate protection against inadvertent or malicious changes or leakage.
- - **Security:** Depending on the nature of business and data regulatory compliance, management of sensitive data (e.g., personally identifiable information, business intelligence and assets), data security and exfiltration prevention.
 - Accountability: Provide an operating model for ownership and accountability around boundaries of data domains.

Source: Data Governance - The Definitive Guide by Eryurek et al







Image source: Data Governance - The Definitive Guide by Eryurek et al

A few data governance considerations

Access control

Need to know: Mandatory + discretionary access control. Per-use-case policies. Defense in depth: Apply multiple layers of defense.

Compliance

Regulatory obligations

Store data in narrow slices

Don't store all data together, and instead segregate by purpose. Data lifecycle (retention/deletion).

Backup

Periodically check restoration capability

Audit

Log access and changes, carry out periodic checks (also of the infra)

Version & quality control

Lineage/provenance, Meta-data management, Cataloguing



Lineage workflow



Use cases:

Quality control: How do I know if the data used is trusted, and not coming from less trusted systems without manual oversight?

Audit: Show me all the sensitive data within our data warehouse, and what systems use sensitive data?

Compliance: I need to report and audit all systems that process PII.

Source: Data Governance - The Definitive Guide by Eryurek et al

Data governance as a data scientist

Several issues of immediate concern:

- Lineage & provenance
- Version and data quality control
- Enabling/enhancing privacy for analytics







k-anonymity (and friends)



Differential privacy

Original Purchase Table								
	Ongin							
Shop	User ID	Time	Price	Price Bin				
	7abc1a23	09/23	\$97.30	\$49 - \$146				
hit i	7abc1a23	09/23	\$15.13	\$5 - \$16				
	3092fc10	09/23	\$43.78	\$16-\$49				
Ø	7abc1a23	09/23	\$4.33	\$2 - \$5				
€₽	4c7af72a	09/23	\$12.29	\$5 - \$16				
Ţ	89c0829c	09/24	\$3.66	\$2 - \$5				
r U	7abc1a23	09/24	\$35.81	\$16-\$49				

Mosaic effect: different factors can be used in conjunction with one another to determine if an individual is identifiable.

Original Purchase Table						
	Ongin					
Shop	User ID	Time	Price	Price Bin		
	7abc1a23	09/23	\$97.30	\$49 - \$146		
FTH	7abc1a23	09/23	\$15.13	\$5 - \$16		
	3092fc10	09/23	\$43.78	\$16 - \$49		
Ŷ	7abc1a23	09/23	\$4.33	\$2 - \$5		
⊕₽	4c7af72a	09/23	\$12.29	\$5 - \$16		
Ś	89c0829c	09/24	\$3.66	\$2 - \$5		
비 민 민	7abc1a23	09/24	\$35.81	\$16-\$49		



Source: https://mosaiceffect.com/

GDPR compliant Pseudonymisation requires that personal data must be transformed so that the identity of individuals cannot be discovered by linkage attacks. To achieve GDPR compliant Pseudonymisation, the practice of tokenization can be expanded to use dynamically-generated tokens applied to both direct and indirect identifiers. data about the Pseudonym used to obscure the activities of User ID "7abc1a23" is retained, but it is made available only to authorised parties under controlled conditions - it is not revealed to the outside world.



[User ID Time Price Price Bin Pseudonymis 67c0Gt11 09/23 \$97.30 \$49 - \$146 Image: Comparison of the second se				le	Additional Information		
	Shop	User ID	Time	Price	Price Bin	Pseudonymised	Time	Pseudonym	User ID
	Ś	67c0Gt11	09/23	\$97.30	\$49-\$146	\bigcirc	09/23	67c0Gt11	7abc1a23
	hth	54ಐ	09/23	\$15.13	\$5 - \$16	O	09/23	54ಐ	7abc1a23
		3092fc10	09/23	\$43.78	\$16-\$49				
	Ŷ	DeTym321	09/23	\$4.33	\$2 - \$5	O	09/23	DeTym321	7abc1a23
	€₽₽	4c7af72a	09/23	\$12.29	\$5 - \$16				
	Ś	89c0829c	09/24	\$3.66	\$2 - \$5				
Source: https://mosa	iceffect	HHyargLM .COM/	09/24	\$35.81	\$16-\$49	S	09/24	HHyargLM	7abc1a23

From a purely technical point of view, Pseudonymization, even with GDPR's stringency, is nevertheless wishful thinking in terms of privacy.

e.g., in case the "additional information" table is revealed through a breach!

with the definition of differential privacy, we shall see more on the implication of even a single record



Identifier(s): Attribute(s) in data record that uniquely identifies an individual in a population.



Quasi-identifier(s): set of non-sensitive attributes, which, if linked with external data may uniquely identify at least one individual in the population

Sensitive attributes

Voter Registration Data

Name	Age	Sex	Zipcode
Ahmed	25	Male	53711
Brooke	28	Female	55410
Casey	31	Female	90210
Dave	19	Male	02174
Evelyn	40	Female	02237

Age	Sex	Zipcode	Disease
25	Male	53711	Flu
25	Female	53712	Hepatitis
26	Male	53711	Brochitis
27	Male	53710	Broken Arm
27	Female	53712	AIDS
28	Male	53711	Hang Nail

Example from Mondrian Multidimensional K-Anonymity by LeFevre et al

Table T is k-anonymous with respect to attributes X1, ..., Xd if every unique tuple (x1, ..., xd) in the (multiset) projection of T on X1, ..., Xd occurs at least k times (forming equivalence classes).



Identifier(s): Attribute(s) in data record that uniquely identifies an individual in a population.



Quasi-identifier(s): set of non-sensitive attributes, which, if linked with external data may uniquely identify at least one individual in the population

Sensitive attributes

Age	Sex	Zipcode	Disease
[25-26]	Male	53711	Flu
[25-27]	Female	53712	Hepatitis
[25-26]	Male	53711	Brochitis
[27-28]	Male	[53710-53711]	Broken Arm
[25-27]	Female	53712	AIDS
[27-28]	Male	[53710-53711]	Hang Nail

k-anonymity: The Mondrian greedy partitioning algorithm





Example from Mondrian Multidimensional k-Anonymity by LeFevre et al

I-diversity

- Homogeneity Attack
- Background knowledge attack

	N	on-Se	Sensitive	
	Zip Code	Age	Nationality	Condition
1	13053	28	Russian	Heart Disease
2	13068	29	American	Heart Disease
3	13068	21	Japanese	Viral Infection
4	13053	23	American	Viral Infection
5	14853	50	Indian	Cancer
6	14853	55	Russian	Heart Disease
7	14850	47	American	Viral Infection
8	14850	49	American	Viral Infection
9	13053	31	American	Cancer
10	13053	37	Indian	Cancer
11	13068	36	Japanese	Cancer
12	13068	35	American	Cancer

	1	Non-Sen	Sensitive					
	Zip Code	Age	Nationality	Condition				
1	130**	< 30	*	Heart Disease				
2	130**	< 30	*	Heart Disease				
3	130**	< 30	*	Viral Infection				
4	130**	< 30	*	Viral Infection				
5	1485*	≥ 40	*	Cancer				
6	1485*	≥ 40	*	Heart Disease				
7	1485*	≥ 40	*	Viral Infection				
8	1485*	≥ 40	*	Viral Infection				
9	130**	3*	*	Cancer				
10	130**	3*	*	Cancer				
11	130**	3*	*	Cancer				
12	130**	3*	*	Cancer				

Example from *l*-Diversity: Privacy Beyond k-Anonymity by Machanavajjhala et al

Progenies of privacy models ...

1-diversity is neither necessary nor sufficient to prevent attribute disclosure.

There are many other variations, e.g., t-closeness, m-invariance, δ -disclosure, etc.

Still no perfect or quantifiable privacy guarantee!

A different perspective on privacy

Publishing statistics, or supporting an interactive statistical database

AGE **STATISTIC** GROUP COUNT MEDIAN MEAN 1A total population 7 30 38 2A 33.5 4 30 female 2B 30 3 44 male 2C black or African American 51 48.5 4 2D 3 24 white 24 3A (D) (D) (D) single adults 3B married adults 51 54 4 4A 3 36 36.7 black or African American female 4B (D) (D) (D) black or African American male (D) (D) (D) 4C white male . (D) (D) 4D white female (D) (D) (D) (D) 5A persons under 5 years (D) 5B (D) (D) persons under 18 years (D) (D) 5C persons 64 years or over (D)

TABLE 1: FICTIONAL STATISTICAL DATA FOR A FICTIONAL BLOCK



Sources: Table - <u>Understanding Database Reconstruction Attacks on Public Data</u> by Garfinkel et al Figure - <u>The Science Behind WhiteNoise: Differential Privacy</u> talk by S. Vadhan

Models and memories

Example: The neural network used for training may inadvertently spill out actual data instances it was trained with!



Open in Google Translate

Feedback

Cue: dyslexic, agnostic, insomniac joke?

Differential privacy

Publishing statistics, or supporting an interactive model



Can't learn anything new about a specific individual in the DB? What about learning something generic which is still true about the individual? E.g., Salary range for SCSE grads.

This is not to be considered as a privacy compromise (definitional convention/choice): If we can learn the same thing about the individual, even if the specific individual were to be replaced by another random member of the population.

Disentangle learning about the population as a whole versus learning about an individual.

Cynthia Dwork's introductory talk on <u>The definition of differential privacy</u> Image source: <u>TensorFlow Blog</u>

Differential privacy

Publishing statistics, or supporting an interactive model

The outcome of an analysis is (almost) the same, irrespective of whether an individual is included or not included in the dataset.



Can't learn anything new about a specific individual in the DB?

What about learning something generic which is still true about the individual? E.g., Salary range for SCSE grads.





Disentangle learning about the population as a whole versus learning about an individual.

Cynthia Dwork's introductory talk on The definition of differential privacy



A randomized mechanism M: $D \rightarrow R$ satisfies (ε , δ)-differential privacy if for any two adjacent datasets X, X' \in D and for any measurable subset of outputs Y \subseteq R it holds that^{*}:

 $\Pr[M(X) \in Y] \le e^{\epsilon} \Pr[M(X') \in Y] + \delta$

 * With the term δ , a weaker form of differential privacy is achieved (than without it). The original definition did not have this term.

Adjacent dataset: Datasets which are different only by presence/absence of one sample of data. Variation: An individual data sample is replaced by another individual sample (2ϵ), the entire set of samples from one user is present/absent.

* Definition as used in <u>TensorFlow privacy technical paper</u>.

Randomized response

Mechanism predates the advent of the notion of differential privacy and associated formal treatment, and provides **refutability**

Local differential privacy is a model with the added restriction that even if an adversary has access to the personal responses of an individual in the database, that adversary will still be unable to learn too much about the user's personal data, in contrast to global differential privacy that incorporates a central aggregator with access to the raw data.

Text adapted from Wikipedia

Do you have attribute A? answer is **boolean 0/1**

Consider that A actually happens, i.e., 1 with a **probability** μ



 $Pr(1) = (1-p) \mu + p(1-k)$

If there are N_1 yes responses out of N responses, then we can estimate $\boldsymbol{\mu'}$

Consider X and X' as our db before/after adding data for a specific individual. Do you have attribute X?

Consider query K() returns the count of **yes** in the DB. Assume that we know the response of this query from before adding the new record.

- If the **actual answer is 0**, the probability that the value of K() is unchanged after adding the data is: 1-p + pk
- If the **actual answer is 1**, the probability that the value of **K()** is unchanged after adding the data is: pk

We can establish two inequalities:

$$1 \le e^{\epsilon} \cdot p \cdot k$$
$$1 \le e^{\epsilon} \cdot (1 - p + p \cdot k)$$

We can then determine, based on an **upper bound** for ϵ :

$$\epsilon = -ln(p \cdot k)$$

Note: One may want to support other data – nonbinary, non-tabular – and carry out other kinds of operations than just counting. The nature of noise introduced, and the data/computational primitives that can be constructed over such "noisy data" varies. While some versatile approaches exist, it is still an active area of research, with several open challenges.

1-p

Some other approaches and tools for privacy-enhancing analytics



Federated learning

See more on Federated learning with Tensor Flow







Server (Aggregation node)

Image source: Federated learning and Differential Privacy article

Further practical considerations



Semantic relations among features, e.g., ZIP codes are geographically clustered

- Their roles in terms of **utility**
- Information dependency/redundancy and impact on privacy



Use-case driven

- Utility of specific features, e.g., adapt the heuristics to determine k-anonymous groups

Record suppression

- It may sometimes be beneficial (in terms of utility) to remove some records altogether, rather than try to include every record and still form k-anonymous equivalence groups

This deck of slides is accompanied with Jupyter notebook for hands-on activities.

The notebook code/examples are based on/adapted from Kiprotect's <u>tutorial on Data Privacy for</u> <u>Data Scientists</u> by Andreas Dewes and Katherine Jarmul.

A few general purpose tools and libraries

for differential privacy and federated learning

https://github.com/opendp/

https://blog.tensorflow.org/2019/03/introducing-tensorflow-privacy-learning.html

https://www.tensorflow.org/federated/federated_learning

Disclaimer: There are capability limitations in terms of the kind of computations (and dependent analysis/algorithms) that can currently be supported.

