

CS-523 Advanced topics on Privacy Enhancing Technologies

Privacy-preserving Data Publishing I **Live exercises**

Carmela Troncoso
SPRING Lab
carmela.troncoso@epfl.ch

| Key | Gender | Zipcode | Age | Disease |
|---------|--------|---------|-----|---------------|
| Eric | M | 1007 | 25 | Cancer |
| Justine | F | 1012 | 25 | Heart Disease |
| Emma | F | 1012 | 25 | Flu |
| Helen | F | 1012 | * | Flu |
| Paul | M | 1007 | 25 | Cancer |
| Philip | M | 1012 | 35 | Herpes |
| Michel | M | 1012 | 35 | Cancer |
| Mory | M | 1007 | 25 | Cancer |
| Adrien | M | 1007 | 25 | Heart Disease |
| Mallory | M | 1012 | 35 | Flu |
| Camille | F | 1012 | 25 | Herpes |
| Samuel | M | 1012 | 35 | Cancer |
| Marco | M | 1007 | * | Cancer |
| Damien | M | 1012 | 35 | Flu |

Consider only the *Gender, Zipcode, Age* attributes.

Which statement is **TRUE**?

- (A) The database achieves k-anonymity with $k = 4$.
- (B) The database does not achieve k-anonymity for any k .
- (C) The database achieves k-anonymity with $k = 1$.
- (D) The database achieves k-anonymity with $k = 2$.

| Key | Gender | Zipcode | Age | Disease |
|---------|--------|---------|-----|---------------|
| Eric | M | 1007 | 25 | Cancer |
| Justine | F | 1012 | 25 | Heart Disease |
| Emma | F | 1012 | 25 | Flu |
| Helen | F | 1012 | * | Flu |
| Paul | M | 1007 | 25 | Cancer |
| Philip | M | 1012 | 35 | Herpes |
| Michel | M | 1012 | 35 | Cancer |
| Mory | M | 1007 | 25 | Cancer |
| Adrien | M | 1007 | 25 | Heart Disease |
| Mallory | M | 1012 | 35 | Flu |
| Camille | F | 1012 | 25 | Herpes |
| Samuel | M | 1012 | 35 | Cancer |
| Marco | M | 1007 | * | Cancer |
| Damien | M | 1012 | 35 | Flu |

Consider *Gender, Zipcode, Age* as *quasi-identifying* attributes.

Which statement is **TRUE**?

- (A) The database achieves k-anonymity with $k = 4$.
- (B) The database does not achieve k-anonymity for any k .
- (C) The database achieves k-anonymity with $k = 1$.
- (D) The database achieves k-anonymity with $k = 2$.

| Key | Gender | Zipcode | Age | Disease |
|---------|--------|---------|-----|---------------|
| Eric | M | 1007 | 25 | Cancer |
| Justine | F | 1012 | 25 | Heart Disease |
| Emma | F | 1012 | 25 | Flu |
| Helen | F | 1012 | * | Flu |
| Paul | M | 1007 | 25 | Cancer |
| Philip | M | 1012 | 35 | Herpes |
| Michel | M | 1012 | 35 | Cancer |
| Mory | M | 1007 | 25 | Cancer |
| Adrien | M | 1007' | 25 | Heart Disease |
| Mallory | M | 1012 | 35 | Flu |
| Camille | F | 1012 | 25 | Herpes |
| Samuel | M | 1012 | 35 | Cancer |
| Marco | M | 1007 | * | Cancer |
| Damien | M | 1012 | 35 | Flu |

Consider the *Disease* attribute to be sensitive.

Which statement is **TRUE**?

- (A) The database achieves 3-diversity.
- (B) The database is differentially private.
- (C) The database achieves 5-diversity.
- (D) None of the above

| Key | Gender | Zipcode | Age | Disease |
|---------|--------|---------|-----|---------------|
| Eric | M | 1007 | 25 | Cancer |
| Justine | F | 1012 | 25 | Heart Disease |
| Emma | F | 1012 | 25 | Flu |
| Helen | F | 1012 | * | Flu |
| Paul | M | 1007 | 25 | Cancer |
| Philip | M | 1012 | 35 | Herpes |
| Michel | M | 1012 | 35 | Cancer |
| Mory | M | 1007 | 25 | Cancer |
| Adrien | M | 1007' | 25 | Heart Disease |
| Mallory | M | 1012 | 35 | Flu |
| Camille | F | 1012 | 25 | Herpes |
| Samuel | M | 1012 | 35 | Cancer |
| Marco | M | 1007 | * | Cancer |
| Damien | M | 1012 | 35 | Flu |

Consider the *disease* attribute to be sensitive.

Which statement is **TRUE**?

- (A) The database achieves 3-diversity.
- (B) The database is differentially private.
- (C) The database achieves 5-diversity.
- (D) None of the above

| Key | Gender | Zipcode | Age | Disease |
|---------|--------|---------|-----|---------------|
| Eric | M | 1007 | 25 | Cancer |
| Justine | F | 1012 | 25 | Heart Disease |
| Emma | F | 1012 | 25 | Flu |
| Helen | F | 1012 | * | Flu |
| Paul | M | 1007 | 25 | Cancer |
| Philip | M | 1012 | 35 | Herpes |
| Michel | M | 1012 | 35 | Cancer |
| Mory | M | 1007 | 25 | Cancer |
| Adrien | M | 1007 | 25 | Heart Disease |
| Mallory | M | 1012 | 35 | Flu |
| Camille | F | 1012 | 25 | Herpes |
| Samuel | M | 1012 | 35 | Cancer |
| Marco | M | 1007 | * | Cancer |
| Damien | M | 1012 | 35 | Flu |

Consider *Age* as quasi-identifying and *Disease* as the sensitive attribute.

Which statement is **TRUE**?

- (A) The database achieves 3-diversity.
- (B) The database is differentially private.
- (C) The database achieves 5-diversity.
- (D) None of the above

HarvardX and MITx: The First Year of Open Online Courses

Fall 2012-Summer 2013

Inside

Executive Summary

Introduction

Interpreting Findings

Differences Among
the First HarvardX
and MITx Courses

Descriptive Statistics

Registration and
Certification

Demographics

Enrollment

Geography

Activity

Conclusion



HarvardX and MITx Working Paper #1*
January 21, 2014

This report is the result of a collaboration
between the HarvardX Research Committee
at Harvard University and the Office of
Digital Learning at MIT.

- 597,692 individuals registered for 17 online courses offered by Harvard and MIT through the EdX platform
- Data collected: students' demographics, engagement with course content, and final course grade
- “To meet these privacy specifications, the HarvardX and MITx research team (guided by the general counsel, for the two institutions) opted for a k-anonymization framework” [3]. A value of $k = 5$ “was chosen to allow legal sharing of the data” in accordance with FERPA. Ultimately, EdX published the 5-anonymized dataset with 476,532 students' records”

HarvardX

MIT | ODL
MIT OFFICE OF
DIGITAL LEARNING

* Ho, A. D., Reich, J., Nesterko, S., Seaton, D. T., Mullaney, T., Waldo, J., & Chuang, I. (2014). *HarvardX and MITx: The first year of open online courses* (HarvardX and MITx Working Paper No. 1).

HarvardX and MITx: The First Year of Open Online Courses

Fall 2012-Summer 2013

Inside

Executive Summary

Introduction

Interpreting Findings

Differences Among the First HarvardX and MITx Courses

Descriptive Statistics

Registration and Certification

Demographics

Enrollment

Geography

Activity

Conclusion



HarvardX and MITx Working Paper #1*
January 21, 2014

This report is the result of a collaboration between the HarvardX Research Committee at Harvard University and the Office of Digital Learning at MIT.



* Ho, A. D., Reich, J., Nesterko, S., Seaton, D. T., Mullaney, T., Waldo, J., & Chuang, I. (2014). *HarvardX and MITx: The first year of open online courses* (HarvardX and MITx Working Paper No. 1).

- Published data **Xed**:
 - Basic demographics: self-reported level of education, gender, and year of birth, country (inferred from the student's IP address)
 - Activities and Results in 16 out of 17 courses
 - Results: enrolled, grade, certification status
 - Activities: e.g., number of posts in course
- K-anonymized (Generalization and suppression) with respect to:
 - $Q^* = \{\text{enrolled in course 1}, \dots, \text{enrolled in course 16}\}$
 - $Q_i = \{\text{gender, year of birth, country, enrolled in course } i, \text{ number of forum posts in course } i\}$

- If you were a student of one of these courses: what would be the privacy concerns? What adversaries would you worry about?

- If you were a student of one of these courses: what would be the privacy concerns? What adversaries would you worry about?
- If you were a student of one of these courses would you say it is safe?

- If you were a student of one of these courses: what would be the privacy concerns? What adversaries would you worry about?
- If you were a student of one of these courses would you say it is safe?
- Does the order of k-anonymization matter?

- If you were a student of one of these courses: what would be the privacy concerns? What adversaries would you worry about?
- If you were a student of one of these courses would you say it is safe?
- Does the order of k-anonymization matter?
- If you found a unique record... how would you re-identify?

More on the Xed fiasco and other attacks

Attacks on Deidentification's Defenses

Aloni Cohen*
University of Chicago

Abstract

Quasi-identifier-based deidentification techniques (QI-deidentification) are widely used in practice, including k -anonymity, ℓ -diversity, and t -closeness. We present three new attacks on QI-deidentification: two theoretical attacks and one practical attack on a real dataset. In contrast to prior work, our theoretical attacks work even if every attribute is a quasi-identifier. Hence, they apply to k -anonymity, ℓ -diversity, t -closeness, and most other QI-deidentification techniques.

First, we introduce a new class of privacy attacks called *downcoding attacks*, and prove that every QI-deidentification scheme is vulnerable to downcoding attacks if it is minimal and hierarchical. Second, we convert the downcoding attacks into powerful *predicate singling-out (PSO)* attacks, which were recently proposed as a way to demonstrate that a privacy mechanism fails to legally anonymize under Europe's General Data Protection Regulation. Third, we use LinkedIn.com to reidentify 3 students in a k -anonymized dataset published by

1 Introduction

Quasi-identifier-based deidentification (QI-deidentification) is widely used in practice. The most well known QI-deidentification techniques are k -anonymity [26]. Throughout this work we usually speak about k -anonymity specifically, but everything applies without modification to ℓ -diversity [18], t -closeness [17], and many other QI-deidentification refinements.

A relatively small number of data points suffice to distinguish individuals from the general population. For example, in the 2010 census 44% of the population was unique based only on census block, age, and sex [1]. Turning this insight into a privacy notion, k -anonymity aims to capture a sort of anonymity of a crowd.

A data release is k -anonymous if any individual row in the release cannot be distinguished from $k - 1$ other individuals in the release using certain attributes called *quasi-identifiers*.