

Zorg voor Privacy!

Grand Round, RadboudUMC

Bart Jacobs — Radboud University
bart@cs.ru.nl
18 sept. 2017



Where we are, so far

Introduction

Current status

New developments

Conclusions



Outline

Introduction

Current status

New developments

Conclusions



Own involvement in e-health

- ▶ Invited at expert meetings in Parliament (Senate) in 2009-2011 on Electronic Health Records “EPD”
 - rejected unanimously in April 2011, mainly for privacy concerns
- ▶ Since 2015 involved in **Parkinson op Maat** study, with Bas Bloem
 - joint project of RadboudUMC with Verily — life science branch of Alphabet/Google
 - our role: supplier of privacy-friendly “PEP” technology for managing research data — funded by Province of Gelderland
- ▶ Member of RadboudUMC’s privacy advice board
- ▶ Active with non-profit foundation
 - <https://privacybydesign.foundation>
 - in **identity management**, also in the medical sector
 - the foundation issues BIG attributes — soon also AGB codes



EPD-security & privacy was/is hotly debated topic



(from: Kidsweek, feb. 2009)



Where we are, so far

Introduction

Current status

New developments

Conclusions



Privacy is keeping information in context (Helen Nissenbaum)

- ▶ We naturally live in different **contexts**
 - home, work, sports club, in church, with friends ...
- ▶ We naturally want to keep information in context
 - what we tell to our doctor should not end up in a supermarket
- ▶ People get upset when **contextual integrity** is broken
 - recall anger: about selling customer financial data (ING), about speeding data ending up at the police (TomTom), about school children's performances in online tests ending up at publishers
- ▶ When explained like this, almost **everybody** cares about privacy
- ▶ The Google's and Facebook's of this world make us use the **same identifier** everywhere or track us via **Like** 👍 and **cookies**
 - they break-up contexts, and destroy our basic privacy intuitions
 - Mark Zuckerberg: "Having two identities for yourself is a lack of integrity" 😞😞😞



Specific law: WGBO

- ▶ WGBO = *wet op de geneeskundige behandelingsovereenkomst*
- ▶ It regulates interactions and obligations between patients and medical professionals, eg.
 - professionals must inform their patients (eg. about risks), and ask for **informed consent** before treatments
 - patients must provide correct and complete information
- ▶ Medical professionals must maintain a **dossier** about each patient
 - confidentiality and integrity of the dossier are required: medical information must remain in medical context!
 - patients have access rights to their dossier
- ▶ Nowadays, dossiers are no longer maintained personally
 - organised collectively in a hospital
 - outsourced to specific companies (Epic, HIS-providers, ...)
- ▶ What about medical apps? Who gets the data? In context? Legal?



Who owns medical data?

- ▶ Fundamental but difficult question!
- ▶ Situation in NL:
 - No-one !?!
 - medical professional is **responsible**
 - patient has **rights**

About medical professionals (based on own experience)

- ▶ **What they know well**
 - patient privacy **one-on-one**
 - that they should not talk about individual patients at parties etc.
- ▶ **Where they are ignorant and/or naive**
 - **structural, analytical** aspects of privacy and information security
 - strategic importance of data and data flows
 - sensitivity to this problem: “we are the good guys, so what?”
 - the wider picture — because of strong operational focus, a bit like with police officers

In teaching these matters receive no attention — as far as I know

- ▶ also, medical privacy & information security & the wider (societal) implications, are not **academic** topics within medical faculties (REshape’rs are “believers” and uncritical technology-pushers)



Where we are, so far

Introduction

Current status

New developments

Conclusions

Broad perspective

Follow the data!

- ▶ Traditionally, you should “**follow the money**” in order to understand power relations in society.



From: All
president's
men (1976)

- ▶ Nowadays you need to **follow the data**

There are many laws and rules to **regulate** and monitor financial flows. Regulation of data flows is still in its infancy



Protecting people, possibly even against themselves

- ▶ In most civilised countries it is forbidden to sell your own organs
 - in legal terms, in Dutch: *organen zijn buiten de handel geplaatst*
- ▶ Why? This is so patronising!
 - In order to **protect** (poor) people against such definitive options
- ▶ Maybe it should also be forbidden to sell your own medical data

All big IT-firms are expanding into the medical world

Why?

- ▶ Profit margin are highest for medical devices/services
- ▶ Sick people don't wince about privacy and consent to any data transfer
- ▶ Medical data are extremely **valuable**
 - for commercial purposes, like targeted advertisements
 - for assessing (financial) risks — e.g. for mortgages
 - for own medical research and patents
 - for selling them (back) to hospitals, and to pharmaceuticals

Medical sector is often so naive about contextual integrity

- ▶ London's *Royal Free* hospital transferring medical data of 1.6M patients to Google's DeepMind for testing a kidney app
- ▶ Patients were unaware, no consent was asked
- ▶ "inappropriate legal basis" according to UK's national data guardian



"Googlisation of healthcare"

- ▶ Big-IT is compiling large health datasets, via apps and (free) services
 - they are the new proprietors, gatekeepers, mediators of the data
 - they can **store** and **analyse** health data in huge quantities
- ▶ Confusingly, they use **public repertoire**, framing their activities as only for the "public good"
 - they appeal to research participant's altruism and good will
- ▶ Which hospitals/universities will get **access** to these private datasets?
 - only the rich ones? Or the famous ones?
 - or the ones that promise to contribute with more data?
 - who is running the show, setting agenda's, with which goals?
- ▶ Fundamentally different relation than with **pharmaceutical** companies
 - pharmaceuticals are active only in one domain
 - big-IT is active in many: advertising, shopping, communication ...
 - they deliberately connect all these domains — breaking contexts

(See also: Tamar Sharon, 10.2217/pme-2016-0057)

People and their tools

Big question

To what extent should technology **help** and/or **force** medical professionals to keep data in context?

- ▶ Big-IT's tools aim at **frictionless sharing** — with big-IT!
 - E.g. **Whatsapp** is frequently used for medical communication
 - Where do pictures end up? In the iCloud / Google cloud / ...
 - Apps are for data collection, at odds with doctor's *dossierplicht*
- ▶ Alternatives are needed, but missing / cumbersome / expensive
 - Who uses secure mail systematically?
- ▶ Security technology slows you down, e.g. in authentication
 - lack of compartmentalisation of dossiers looks insane to me
- ▶ It's a shared responsibility between management and professionals to **introduce** and **use** proper security technology; GDPR will require it



Medical IT-security & privacy must professionalise!

- ▶ **For external reasons**
 - Tough European data protection (GDPR) will be in force soon
 - e.g. more transparency & explicit consent will be required (e.g. for PALGA and other such databanks, certainly commercially)
 - privacy impact assessments (PIA) needed for new technology
- ▶ **For internal reasons**
 - (1) To keep patients' trust, for using their data in medical research
 - ▶ professionally pseudonymise and encrypt data
 - ▶ like with PEP technology, used for *Parkinson op Maat*
 - (2) To keep healthcare under public control and counter big-IT
 - ▶ your professional independence is at stake!

Where we are, so far

Introduction

Current status

New developments

Conclusions



Main points

- ▶ The essence of privacy protection is **keeping data in context**
- ▶ Learn to **think in terms of data** and data flows
 - medical data is extremely valuable; don't give it away
 - stay in control of your data, e.g. via tough contracts
- ▶ Make medical security & privacy part of the curriculum and research agenda
 - it's a strategic matter; don't try to avoid/delegate it
 - you need to professionalise, to stay on top of developments
- ▶ Closer **interdisciplinary** cooperation with security/privacy specialists is needed — a non-trivial effort
 - but also a broader societal/political debate
- ▶ Consider making "data care" part of the hospital's public profile

Thanks for your attention!

