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Overview

❖ Motivations
❖ The Belmont Report
  ❖ Respect for Persons
  ❖ Beneficence
  ❖ Justice
❖ Professional Ethical Codes
❖ Ethical Impact Assessment (EIA) Framework: Applying Traditional Principles to ICT Research
❖ Up Next
Motivations

- Rapid changes in effects of enabling technologies on human welfare
- Novel ethical challenges arise in gap between expectations and capabilities
- ICT research catalyst: computer & network research for cyber security R&D
  - lack of practical, reproducible scientific results via gap between ops and research
- DHS PREDICT effort
- But, sharing challenges
  - Network traffic privacy and confidentiality
  - Legal gray areas in collecting, disclosing data for research
- Botnets, Vulnerability disclosure, Antiphishing studies, oh my!
- Ops abuses: barrier to entry & BOP
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Launch Pad: Belmont Report & ‘202’ Report

= Ethical Principles and Guidelines for Research Involving Human Subjects

**Authority:** National Research Act 1974 → Nat’l Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical & Behavioral Research
-- ID basic ethical principles for human subjects research
-- Develop guidelines to assure compliance with principles

✦ **Belmont Drivers:**

✦ Nuremburg Code- post WWII Nuremburg War Crime Trials standard

✦ **Role of principles:** prescriptive basis for formulating, interpreting, critiquing the rules; purpose to provide framework to guide resolution of ethical problems.

• DHS Ethics Working Group to apply Belmont to ICTR = 202 Report
Launch Pad: Professional Ethical Codes

✧ ACM Code of Ethics and Professional conduct (1992)

✧ The Good: “do good” imperative for membership
✧ The Bad: limited domain- workplace and employment
✧ The Ugly: still a gap; how does “do good” apply to ICT human research & experimentation?
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Lift-Off: Ethical Impact Assessment (EIA) Framework

- **What**: PIA analog; v.1 prototype

- **Why**:
  - ‘unfunded mandates’ are a disservice to all stakeholders
  - make ethics ‘embraceable’ lower costs and increase motivation for researchers (especially technical mindsets) to engage

- **How**: intellectual tool to apply abstract principles to practice
Applying Respect for Persons Principle

**Applied:**

1. individuals should be treated as autonomous agents
2. persons with diminished autonomy entitled to protection

**Applied in cyber security context:**

(A) should include both individuals and society, should consider organizations; realize tight coupling of humans w/ data and systems

Yeah, But → identity :: network artifacts disjointed; hard to ID potentially at-risk populations in network traces
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EIA and Respect for Persons

Framing Questions:

- Can the network artifacts (IPA, URL) be reasonably linked to an identifiable human? (or, automated device or human-operated device level)
- Does the data collected concern the ‘substance, purport or meaning of a communication’ from an identifiable person?
- Does data reveal behavioral data that could link to identifiable person?
Applying Respect for Persons (mas)

- **Applied in cyber security context:**
  - (B) obtain consent to use data and info systems for specific research purposes
  - Yeah, But → in vivo research in cyber environment – size, scope, provenance, rights – introduce legal, strategic, economic factors
EIA and Respect for Persons (mas)

Framing Questions:

- If individuals are identifiable in network and security data, have they consented?
- Can they decline participation in the research, or uses of collected data?
- If the purpose of data use has changed, has renewed consent been obtained?
- Is consent possible, or does it directly and substantially impede research goals? (ref Beneficence)
Applying Beneficence Principle

- **Applied:**
  - 1. Do not harm
  - 2. Minimize possible harms (& max benefits)

- **Applied in cyber security context:**
  - (A) researchers should systematically assess both risks and benefits of research on privacy, civil rights, well-being of persons
  - **Yeah, But →** RBA challenging with gaps, grayness of laws, professional codes, IRBs
  - (B) researchers should consider the full spectrum of risks of harms to persons and information systems (reputational, emotional, financial, physical)
  - **Yeah, But →** normative social immaturity re: harms (qualitative & quantitative)
EIA and Beneficence

Framing Questions:

- What are effects of research on all stakeholders: researchers, human subj, society?
- What are possible unintended consequences? E.g., privacy harms
- What is nature and source of collected data?
- What is purpose of collecting data?
- What is intended use of data?
- Will research be disseminated to 3rd parties and used consistent with purpose?
- What are the administrative and technical controls to enforce obligations?
- What is risk of re-identification (law trigger, data quantity, threat perspective, time/effort required)
- What categories of activity have strong reasons for involving HSR?
Applying Beneficence and EIA (yet mas)

- **Applied in cyber security context** (including Professional Codes)
  - (C) Research should not violate laws, operator agreements, K obligations, or other private arrangements
  - Yeah, But → legal due diligence hard, uncertain applications and interpretations of laws
- **Framing Questions:**
  - If the research conflicts with law/policy, is there an exception or valid agreement otherwise permitting?
  - If gov’t involved, will there be int’l or bilateral diplomatic ramifications?
  - Should research methodology be modified or abandoned?
  - Have you engaged legal guidance?
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Applying Beneficence Principle (mas)

Applied in cyber security context:

(D) Design & conduct research to maximize probable benefits and minimize harms to persons and organizations

Yeah But → estimating scale at which risks and benefits can occur; ability to attribute research data and results to individuals; increasing availability of data
EIA and Beneficence (mas)

- Framing Questions:
  - Does research impact CIA of info systems (including originating and transiting)?
  - Does research design include controls to minimize harms (ie, using in vitro, anonymization or other disclosure controls)?
  - Are there exigent circumstances that should be factored into the evaluation of harm from research?
  - Will research result in no > harm than what would occur in its absence?
  - What checks and balances to prevent/repeat harms?
    - chill 1st A. rights to speak, associate, surf anonymously
    - target groups based on sex, religion, politics
    - Impair data quality & integrity
    - Surveillance harms – id theft, gov’t persecution, alter behavior re: counter-surveillance
  - Could the research make the targeted problem (eg, infosec) worse, or undermine research goals?
Applying Beneficence and EIA (yet mas)

- **Applied in cyber security context:**
  - (E) If research causes risk or harm to a person, the person should be notified
  - If research reveals but does not cause unanticipated harm, strongly consider responsible disclosure (sponsor organization, IRB, LE)

- **Yeah, But ➔ what about risk held in abeyance?**

- **Framing Questions:**
  - When notification of persons is not possible or appropriate, can harm be mitigated by notifying other appropriate parties?
  - Is notification and response tailored to the causes and extent of risk exposure?
Applied in cyber security context:

- (A) Benefits and burdens of research should be shared fairly between research target subjects and beneficiaries of research results
- Yeah, But → selection of subjects is challenging in cyber context (e.g., attribution/provenance, projection)

Framing Questions:

- Does the research raise fairness and discrimination concerns?
- Will the research undermine cooperation from the community whose participation is needed/targeted?
- Is the research methodology and results transparent?
EIA – Applying Justice (mas)

- **Applied in cyber security context**
  - **(B)** selection of research subject should be equitable (with exceptions to balance benefits), and should adhered to internationally accepted best practices
  - **Yeah, But** → variance in nation-states’ cyberlaws & rights

- **Framing Questions:**
  - To what extent does research violate legal and ethical principles of equality?
  - How should research design be altered to decrease inequality or mitigate its effects?
  - Is the standard against which research measured that of reasonable researcher, not strict liability?
Are We There Yet?

- Must explicitly justify reasoning to all stakeholders if we claim low risk :: benefit of research

- V. 1 of EIA… will evolve in parallel and in concert with The 202 Report
  - Subsequent meetings 9/09, 11/09, 3/10, 6/10
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICT Research Activity:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Assessment Considerations</td>
<td>Comments &amp; Examples</td>
<td>Research Component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ETHICAL PRINCIPLE: (A) Respect for Persons</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Relevant Parties- consider individuals and organizations, including computer systems and data</td>
<td>[insert bullet questions]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Consent- obtain informed consent to collection, use or disclose data and systems; consent does not transfer for research purposes unless specifically obtained</td>
<td>[insert bullet questions]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Compliance – engage due diligence for respecting laws, contracts, etc. to protect individuals and orgs</td>
<td>[insert bullet questions]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ETHICAL PRINCIPLE: (B) Beneficence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Harms- consider full spectrum of harms to persons and information systems</td>
<td>Legal, systems assurance, privacy, reputation, physical psychological, economic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Maximize Benefits- design and conduct to maximize benefits and minimize harms</td>
<td>[insert bullet questions]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Migration- notify appropriate parties if research causes harm, consider if harm is revealed</td>
<td>[insert bullet questions]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ETHICAL PRINCIPLE: (C) Justice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Fairness &amp; Equity- benefits and burdens should be apportioned fairly</td>
<td>[insert bullet questions]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Transparency</td>
<td>[insert bullet questions]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Props

- Much grey matter feedback by the DHS Working Group on Ethics in ICTR
  - inaugural workshop May 26th-27th, 2009 in Washington, DC

- Estimated completion of working group and publication of authoritative guidance in Summer 2010.

….and Thank-You
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