

## Exercise 8

### 8.1 Location privacy (10pt)

In this exercise we investigate a probabilistic model for privacy-preserving location reporting. We use a Bayesian network as explained in the guest talk [HAHT17, Sec. 2.2].

Our model consists of  $n$  independent users moving for  $m$  discrete periods of time in a space that simply consists of  $R$  regions. We assume the location of a user at time  $t$  depends only on its location at time  $t - 1$ . Let the random variable  $X_{it} \in \{1, \dots, R\}$  denote the location of user  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  at time  $t \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ . The initial locations of the users are assumed known.

- a) Represent this model as a Bayesian network (and clarify what each node represents). Give a factorized formula for the joint distribution  $P_{\mathbf{X}}$  for  $\mathbf{X} = [X_{it}]$  that describes the overall behaviour of all users throughout the  $m$  time periods.
- b) Now assume additionally that users have a mechanism to report an obfuscated location  $O_{it}$  at every time. The mechanism is probabilistic, and the reported location lies in the range  $\{1, \dots, R\}$  and depends on the actual location of the user at time  $t$ . Upgrade your model and formula to account for this mechanism.
- c) Finally, in addition to the previous assumptions, users now report pairwise co-locations as follows. *If* two users are at the same location at time  $t$ , they report this with probability  $q$  (the report includes the fact that they are in the same location but not the location); *otherwise*, i.e., when they are not at the same location, they do not report such a co-location (i.e., the report has probability 0). Define the appropriate random variables and express the conditional probability functions for reporting co-locations. Give a new model and factorized formula for the joint distribution over all defined events.

## References

- [HAHT17] M. Humbert, E. Ayday, J. Hubaux, and A. Telenti, *Quantifying interdependent risks in genomic privacy*, ACM Trans. Priv. Secur. **20** (2017), no. 1, 3:1–3:31, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3035538>.