



Accountable Privacy

M. Burmister, Y.Desmedt, R.N. Wright, A. Yasinsac

in *Security Protocols 2004*

LNCS 3957, pp83-95, 2006

DOI [10.1007/11861386_10](https://doi.org/10.1007/11861386_10)

Aaron Pettit



Summary

- Provides an overview of the issues surrounding privacy and accountability on the internet, and the conflicts that exist between the two



Appreciative Comment

- Does well what it sets out to do
- “... we discuss the apparent conflict that exists between privacy and accountability. We survey some of the issues in privacy and accountability, and highlight research directions....”
- Provides clear definitions for privacy and accountability
- Highlights why conflicts exist between them
- Makes a good argument for why they are both important



Critical Comment

- “There is extensive existing research in security, cryptography and trust infrastructures that, when coupled with **new models**, methods, and techniques can provide adequate accountability while concurrently balancing security with needs for privacy.”
- Strong statement that the paper doesn't support

Critical Comment

Models for Accountable Privacy

1. e-Bay Model
 - Weakly authenticated accounts
 - Trust based on ongoing trust ratings
2. Business Model
 - Weakly authenticated accounts
 - Security is based on profit, i.e. it is more profitable to adhere to the rules
3. Insurance Model
 - Weakly authenticated accounts
 - Liability covered by third party insurance
4. Credit Card [Accountability Partner] Model
 - Weakly authenticated accounts
 - Institution or a groups of trusted users vouch for the protected entities
5. Deposit-Based Model
 - Weakly authenticated accounts
 - Entity provides deposit to guarantee liability in lieu of insurance

- No discussion or explanation



Question

- Who should be responsible for holding people or entities accountable for their actions on the internet?