

Lifting the Cage of Consent

A Techno-Legal Perspective on Evolvable Trust Relationships

Beatriz Esteves & Ruben Verborgh

IDLab, Department of Electronics and Information Systems, Ghent University, Belgium

Those concerned about privacy worry that personal data changes hands too easily. We argue that the actual challenge is the exact opposite: our data does not flow well enough, cultivating a reliance on questionable and often unlawful shortcuts in a desperate bid to survive within today’s data-driven economy. Exclusively punitive interpretations of protective legislation such as the GDPR throw out the baby with the bathwater through barriers that equally hinder “doing the right thing” and “doing the wrong thing”, in an abject mistranslation of how ethical choices correspond to financial cost. As long as privacy-friendly data treatment proves more expensive or complicated than readily available alternatives, economic imperatives will continue to outrank their legal counterparts. We examined existing legislation with the aim of facilitating mutually beneficial interactions, rather than more narrowly focusing on the prevention of undesired behaviors. In this article, we propose the implementation of evolvable trust systems as a scalable alternative to the omnipresent yet deeply broken delusion of ill-informed consent. We describe personalized, technology-assisted legal processes for initiating and maintaining long-term trust relationships, which enable parties to reliably and sustainably exchange data, goods, and services. Our proposal encourages a redirection of additional efforts towards the techno-legal alignment of economical incentives with societal ones, reminding us that—while trust remains an inherently human concept—technology can support people in evolving and scaling their relationships to meet the increasingly complex demands of current and future data landscapes.

1 The Cage of Consent

1.1 Privacy is a red herring

News media are eager to report on the next scandal leaking from the industrial data kitchens of Google, Adobe, ByteDance, and the like. The fourth power’s crusade to raise awareness of the societal devastation inflicted by Cambridge Analytica [44] and subsequent disasters [16, 39, 41, 61] echoes across the economical and political wasteland that sprouted such widespread abuse in the first place. In an embarrassing bout of irony, journalism’s oversimplification of *privacy* as a dial that must be cranked all the way up, inadvertently plays into the cards of those same data funneling companies they believe to be lecturing. After Zuckerberg unilaterally proclaimed the end of privacy in 2010 [47], Big Tech’s more recent public communications now smother our collective indignation with an ostentatious appropriation of privacy [43, 77, 84, 85] as if suddenly owed gratitude for their artful reinvention. Such blatant red herrings reinvigorate society’s futile attempts at reclaiming privacy, thereby spawning a fatal terminological stretch from which any leftover meaning bleeds in vain. Meanwhile, companies project their own deeply rooted fear of data starvation onto people’s genuine worry of exploitation—circularly fueled by a compulsion to manifest as merciless data scavengers at the faintest smell of digital oil.

We confidently discredit these companies’ abundant mentions of privacy as nothing but premeditated distractions, because achieving complete privacy is a straightforward goal that carries surprisingly little utility for the majority of humanity. Print all of your documents, photos, data, medical files, and place them together with your electronic devices inside a large mold. Pour in an ample volume of concrete before sinking the receptacle in the ocean, and you will be a few dozen GDPR erasure requests away from no one accessing your data ever again. Regrettably, that includes yourself. This contrived example highlights the danger that arises when privacy-focused debates ignore individuals’ vastly more complex protection needs beyond a theoretical notion of isolation. The *CIA triad* [79] in Figure 1 more accurately expresses real-world data decisions as a continuous tension between *Confidentiality*, *Integrity*, and *Availability*.




Figure 1: The CIA triad [79] of *Confidentiality*, *Integrity*, and *Availability* illustrates that personal data requirements involve nuance and complexity beyond what any one-dimensional *privacy* lever can model. One can never maximize all three; the appropriate degree of compromise is a case-specific choice.

What we often loosely refer to as “privacy” lets itself be more precisely defined as “confidentiality”, a preference for restricting the number of parties who are privy to certain data. Confidentiality unfortunately clashes with availability because, while redundancy and backups improve the reliability of data access, they simultaneously leave more pathways for eavesdroppers. Essentially, whatever makes it hard or easy for others to retrieve our data, affects ourselves in similar ways. The same door lock that delays seasoned burglars from entering, also blocks rightful inhabitants who lost or forgot their house key.

We must therefore carefully reflect on *when* and *how* personal data contributes to the realization of individuals’ own objectives, when aiming to construct a legislative framework for supporting people in their daily lives and with their long-term ambitions. We cannot mistakenly assume that 100% confidentiality represents the universal optimum within all data exchange relationships, and must understand the other parts of the scale in order to provide meaningful legal and technological empowerment. Absence of such consideration recasts progress as sophisticated damage control, rather than advancing the more fundamental and sustainable objective of engaging in mutually beneficial transactions.

1.2 Personal data unlocks mutual value exchanges

A more nuanced discussion requires shifting our perspective from personal data as solely a risk or liability, to personal data as an intentional means for extracting desired and mutual value from business-to-customer and other relationships. We will temporarily reduce subtleties and complexities to a neutral interaction model between an individual and a service provider, in order to focus on the basic motives and incentives behind such exchanges.

Whenever an individual requests a certain service from a third-party provider, the nature of this service may inherently depend on the availability of *i*) relevant data points *ii*) for the purpose of executing the service at the requested quality level *iii*) during the period of its execution. From an efficiency and confidentiality perspective, we can reasonably expect the individual to prefer *data minimization* [7]—in absence of accidental or deliberate barriers that distort the exposure of additional data into the more simple or attractive option [14, 88]. Minimization involves limiting the necessary exchange to *i*) those data points strictly required for any proper execution of *ii*) only the specifically requested service within *iii*) solely the time and space required to execute the service. In terms of the CIA triad, successful minimization thus trades the *smallest possible decrease in confidentiality* for the *smallest possible increase in availability* to complete the requested service, with *possible compromises on integrity* for convenience.

To illustrate a strict application of this model, we follow the example of a printed magazine subscription. This service consists of a transaction in which the customer pays a monetary amount to obtain one year of monthly postal deliveries of a specifically chosen magazine series. We leave the initial payment process out of scope, and focus on the completion of the delivery process. Disruption to confidentiality is minimized when the magazine publisher only stores the postal address of the customer, their choice of magazine, and the end date of their subscription—all of which are securely deleted after the delivery of the final magazine. Theoretically speaking, these few data points suffice for service providers to offer the subscription service without additional data collection or processing. Each party acts rationally and selfishly in this exchange: the customer prefers receiving the magazine over keeping their money plus address to themselves, and vice versa for the provider.

However efficient it may seem, observe that minimization neither prevents nor mitigates *all* privacy-adjacent risks. Given that personal information was exchanged, one can easily contend the customer's privacy has been compromised, regardless of our inclination to argue "necessarily so". Although neither having nor breaching privacy is the key underlying motive for either participant, the combination of voluntariness with minimization cannot prevent misuse in even the simplest of cases. The minimal data set in this example still enables the aforementioned burglars to target subscribers of high-tech luxury magazines who live in remote areas. Unlike a more limited singular privacy axis, the broader realm of the CIA triad encompasses each customer's individual right to decide whether their continued passion for technology justifies a slightly elevated danger of burglary. Nevertheless, correctly applied minimization reduces the risk level by shrinking the attack surface to the bare minimum for those who choose to purchase the service.

In practice, we realistically know from experience that the scope of data to which service providers seek access tends to be larger—sometimes considerably—than the strictly minimal scope required to deliver a requested service, implying that other motives are at play. Financial incentives might drive them to bypass data minimization with extensions of *i*) collected data points, *ii*) purpose, and/or *iii*) time and space. Perhaps the provider operates a different business model, in which their primary source of revenue is not subscriptions but third-party services based on extended subscriber data. An extension of purpose occurs when the provider retargets subscription data for different objectives, such as marketing for its other periodicals. Providers commonly retain customer data past the end date of their subscriptions, even if only as a service to themselves for advertising or speeding up future subscriptions. Such nonessential extensions expand the attack surface or prolong its exposure, leading to a heightened risk of various kinds of misuse—and the provider's own violation of minimality already constitutes a first instance thereof.

From the simple exchange model, two broad *modi operandi* thus emerge:

1. Service providers for whom the execution of directly requested services is the exclusive source of long-term income. If we naively presuppose an impeccable inflow of customer data, their mission lacks financial incentives to process any data beyond the scope of each service's execution. This first category counts a limited number of members today, as few companies restrict the storage of customer data to the scope of explicitly requested services.
2. Service providers who supplement their long-term gains by repurposing data gathered in the context of one service for the realization of other services, offered to either themselves or different classes of customers. Most companies reside in this second category, as their business model is predicated on their ability to leverage data for additional services. Given the high cost of data acquisition at any point in time, they opt for an extended scope in advance, even though excessive in the moment.

This chasm could be closed with complementary strategies. A punitive approach considers what barriers and obstacles could be imposed onto the second group to nudge or force a substantial portion of them into behaving like the first, which ideally remains unaffected by the intervention. A supporting approach instead wonders which barriers and obstacles could be removed for the first group in order to encourage voluntary movement by the second, increasing the former's attractiveness for all parties involved.

1.3 Stuttering data incurs a socioeconomic cost

Our theoretical examination of intentional data exchange clearly needs to be augmented to take ethics and legality into account. Rather than subjectively imposing a moralistic value judgment on different profit models, we neutrally observe that *a)* an individual may want to request a service from a provider, *b)* exchange of certain personal data might be a precondition to the requested service’s satisfactory fulfillment, and *c)* the provider may independently possess an incentive to process data beyond the service’s scope of requirements. For the sake of argument, we will hereafter assume an ethical point of view that considers non-minimal data usage to cause negative long-term societal effects, given supporting proof of recent years. Such conclusion would regard it a lawmaker’s duty to ensure that the long-term benefits of data minimization to service providers significantly outweigh any short- or long-term competitive advantage they would stand to gain from intentional disregard. Legislation can achieve this by decreasing the benefits of undesired behaviors and/or increasing the benefits of desired behaviors.

The *General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)* [67] partially was a reaction to an exponential spread of unsustainable data practices, which it sought to discourage through procedures that may end in considerable fines [83, 92]. Parties involved in personal data processing must maintain a capacity for executing certain legal processes, which may subsequently produce evidence of either *compliance* or *non-compliance*. Unfortunately, such capacity comes at a non-negligible cost in either case, leading to a perverse backfiring in which companies that can afford the fine of non-compliance preemptively write it off as a business expense. Through this penalizing interpretation, the GDPR delivered on its promise of a level playing field chiefly in the sense that it leaves individuals and most companies now equally powerless vis-à-vis multinationals, for whom 4% of annual global revenue makes a judicious investment.

Frankly—after suppressing the urge to raise a moralizing finger—we must confirm this choice as an astute conclusion from the GDPR’s chosen codification of the ethical connection between long-term societal cost and legal consequence as a short-term economic expense. Companies act rationally and have a duty towards their shareholders to behave in financially predictable and responsible ways. When parents incentivize dishwashing by threatening an 80-cent allowance reduction for untidiness, an obedient teenager will gladly spend their remaining €19.20 on anything more fun than a sink filled with dirty plates. Coincidentally headquartering the European subsidiaries of many global data processors, Ireland grew bizarrely concerned about being perceived as an overly strict parent by its dearly beloved adoptees. It therefore trials a more reassuring form of compassion that rewards their offspring’s admirable dedication to business studies [48]. Suffice to say that European lawmakers’ presumed ethical ambition of leveraging gentle punishment to encourage lasting alignment between societal and economic incentives, turned out to be no match for cunning lobbyists whose stakeholders favored a covert divergence all along [2]. No need to publicly declare the end of privacy when you can openly have your cake and eat someone else’s, too.

As a possibly even more unfortunate side-effect, the same legislation ultimately hinders benevolent data exchanges in which all participants sincerely pursue mutual benefit without hidden data exploitation. Whatever motivation remains for being a data-minimizing company is usually nipped in the bud by the inflated cost and risk of handling *any* amount of data in the first place. Companies may find avoiding data minimization more prudent altogether, because the delta in effort between minimal and more-than-minimal data processing tends to be dwarfed by both options’ common cost threshold for data acquisition. Notwithstanding the GDPR’s citizen-empowering aspects such as *consent withdrawal* and the *right to erasure*, the unbridled continuation of societally detrimental data practices casts a long shadow over the EU’s worldwide data stage [54]. Similar ramifications can be observed in the more recent *AI Act* [73], whose attempt at balancing a commitment to protection with a desire for innovation risks hurting both, and in several non-European legislative initiatives such as the proposed *Brazil AI Bill* [65], India’s *Digital Personal Data Protection Act* [29], and Tanzania’s *Personal Data Protection Act* [62].

In light of these failing protection mechanisms, one could be tempted to conclude that personal data nowadays flows all too easily. However, we claim the exact opposite. *Personal data does not flow well enough*, which explains why we are plagued by an abundance of shortcuts, wherein counting potential fines as an integral part of the data acquisition cost proves to be the cheaper and hence most rational option. Rather than an unforeseeable cause, such calculated behavior is a symptom of legislative failure, unfolding within an economic reality that cannot afford to capture society’s thriving data and AI momentum.

The extreme dysfunctionality of our personal data streams damages society and humanity immeasurably far beyond diminished business efficacy. Many obstructions to data propagation that initially appear praiseworthy through a superficial privacy lens, become shallow excuses for denying people a legitimate choice of trading a minimal loss in confidentiality for an impactful presence of availability. The consequences of data immobilization can be life-defining. Ensuring that data from a wearable fitness bracelet reaches a medical professional on time, can mean the difference between life or death [51]. Cars unwittingly store evidence about their owner’s quietly progressing Alzheimer’s disease, years before a general practitioner suspects it [4]. Those impacted would violently disagree that their data ever flows too well.

In light of such monumental potential, we cannot help but wonder how reimagined data flows could bring crucial improvements to our lives that outlast the inevitable hurt they cause—which starts by dismantling this incessant paradox as a false dichotomy long past its expiration date. Cases such as the ones above substantiate our perspective that addressing the profound scarcity of robust data flows contributes to obsoleting a lesser but persistent abundance of harmful data flows. Balanced access to data serves both the individual and those who handle their data for the delivery of requested services. Studying mutual benefit can help us identify sweet spots within the CIA triad. Nonetheless, we require an actionable legal approach to turn such theoretical explorations into an operational data exchange framework.

1.4 Trust plays the long game

In this article, we introduce a techno-legal proposal for *evolvable trust* as a sustainable mechanism for data exchange with well-aligned socioeconomic incentives. We argue the need for a more long-term view on the evolving relationship between a data subject and a data controller. A relational approach can only succeed if it recognizes the needs and desires of all sides as valid and important: individuals have clear requirements in society beyond confidentiality, and companies have the reasonable goal of guarding their profit/investment ratio to maintain a competitive economic position. The wide ethical spectrum in between allows us to demarcate areas where those different demands are not necessarily at odds, so we can identify the roads that lead us there and mitigate the obstacles along the path.

On *both* sides of the relationship, trust is at an all-time low [91]. The frequently repeated sentiment that people do not trust companies with their data, is another component to the ongoing psychological projection within the privacy realm. After all, individuals merely reciprocate the remarkable lack of trust companies bestow upon them. The intrusive and upfront cookie dialogs forge a thinly veiled disguise for a company’s severe distrust of whether a customer would agree—at a *later* point in time—to an anticipated need of data. The depth of this distrust conspires with the nonexistent incentives for minimality to produce an overly complicated user experience that ridicules any residual scraps of the customer’s rightful proclivity for data minimization. Thus completes the vicious cycle of the never-ending self-fulfilling prophecy, in which companies do not trust that customers will trust them, which prompts them to inform their customers that they, in fact, do not trust them to trust them.

From a legal perspective, businesses exploit the unequal power dynamic to foist their own substantial compliance burden upon reluctant consumers, under the misguided pretense that what we lack in trust can unilaterally be substituted by text. We must frame this stubborn reflex against a background of varying scalability properties of different kinds of one-to-one relationships. Business-to-business interactions are, in the grander scheme of things, magnitudes less numerous than business-to-customer interactions.




Figure 2: Cookie dialogs are up-front agreements of mutual distrust. The above specimen (courtesy of Sky News) presents one of the more recent fads where, in a most creative interpretation of the GDPR, visitors can seemingly “consent” to the use of legitimate interest as a legal basis for data processing.

As such, businesses more often find themselves in situations with the time and capability to tailor legal contracts that can govern their relations. Advances in machine-assisted contract drafting further enhance this scalability [6]. In contrast, the prevailing reliance on *consent* [10, 27] as an unautomatable [38] legal basis for data exchange encounters scalability hurdles that increasingly prove insurmountable. Every website with an unprocessable volume of privacy policies symbolizes our consolidating despair via its unique contribution to the rapidly accumulating costs for unnamed lawyers and unwilling readers [52]. They trigger our daily ritualistic retelling of “the biggest lie on the Internet” [57], wherein we manually pop every last balloon that celebrates our society’s noble fight for citizens’ rights, while tacitly wishing we no longer had to. Figure 2 brings an egregious example thereof.

Regardless of people’s strongly held moral convictions, at the end of the day, the core dynamic of our data-driven society becomes reduceable to a straightforward question of economics. All long-term ethical considerations converge to constructing an interpretation of a sustainable balance between the multiple kinds of monetary and non-monetary costs paid by participating actors. The current status quo holds individuals and companies hostage in a self-inflicted Stockholm syndrome, which has long transgressed all conditions for sustainability, never mind growth. Let us for once harness this paralyzing chokehold as a tremendous opportunity: any growth impediments can abruptly escalate into serious business hindrances. Preparedness to equally consider all parties in the data exchange relationship fosters the rare circumstances under which some might be willing to escape the local optimum that holds us all back. Could a focus on mutual value enable *both* sides of the relationship to win?

In this article, we invite readers into a pragmatic embrace between the law’s noble intent to embody ethical data principles and its simultaneous impotence to prescribe them. Existing punitive responses to transgressive behaviors are complemented by our proposal for an unburdening empowerment that fosters mutually beneficial exchanges in a technology-assisted, scalable way. Two-sided cost reduction could spearhead the realignment of societally advantageous data minimization with economically motivated necessity. We ultimately target the long-term goal of making responsible data behaviors cheaper than their currently less expensive unethical shortcuts.

1.5 Objectives

Different people across different decades have thought about this ‘trust’ conundrum and reached similar conclusions as we did, with the difference that maybe now we are in a legal and technical landscape that might actually let us do something about it. Never mind that, in the era of data spaces, we also need to piece together the legal jigsaw that data protection and AI compliance is becoming, especially in Europe. This conflictive nature is even present at the most basic level – safeguarding the fundamental right to health can come at the cost of the fundamental right to privacy. All in all, policy making and technology development have walked astray for far too long. It is long overdue that they shake hands from time to time in the hopes that in the near future, they always go hand in hand.

As such, in this article, we *i)* address challenges related to valid GDPR consent, *ii)* for scalable relationships between humans, businesses, and machines, and *iii)* explore other legal bases, towards establishing *long term* evolvable trust in the exchange of data, services and goods. Considerations on fundamental facets of trust are explored in the hopes of establishing a methodology for the realization of such demands through an *permanently evolving* relationship. This approach leverages aspects of *i)* data governance, *ii)* automation, *iii)* interoperability, and *iv)* stakeholder collaboration, features previously identified as core for successful RegTech systems [78]. We identify core areas of work where these features will be prominent, namely on *i)* compliance and provenance checking, *ii)* negotiation on access and usage, *iii)* personalized dialogs, *iv)* delegation of control, *v)* reusable policies, *vi)* auditing, and *vii)* secondary data reuse.

2 Consent cannot scale

2.1 The universality of consent

Consent serves as the cornerstone for processing personal data on the Web [25], a principle upheld in both Europe and the United States, albeit through contrasting lenses. In Europe, the approach is an active one, requiring individuals to *opt-in*, with the intended goal of giving clear permission for their data’s use. Across the Atlantic in the US, the standard shifts, embracing *opting-out* as the norm, where consent is presumed unless it is objected to. Despite these divergent practices, both regions anchor their legality in the fundamental requirement that data subjects fully grasp the implications of their data’s journey and usage. Furthermore, a similar endeavor can be observed globally, as new data protection laws spring forth like hotcakes in recent years, inspired by GDPR’s influence. This wave of legislative activity is often described as the Brussels effect [11], where the influence of European Union standards ripples across the world, shaping data privacy frameworks far beyond its borders.

When we consider GDPR’s flavour of consent, its intent to empower the data subject shines brightly. However, it becomes equally apparent that it falls short for both individuals and businesses. What it brings in empowerment, it also brings in responsibility, placing the onus on data subjects to stay informed about every aspect of their data’s usage. This approach brings with it two significant challenges: *i)* a scalability burden, and *ii)* an understandability concern, as legalese can be overwhelming and obscure for individuals. Looking at its concrete conditions, consent should be provided through a “*clear affirmative action*”, be “*freely given, specific, informed and unambiguous*”, *demonstrable by the data controller*, and “*be as easy to withdraw as to give*” (Articles 4.11 and 7 [67]). These demands also manifest as scalability annoyances for businesses, particularly for small and medium enterprises, which might not have enough resources to scale effectively when faced with the challenges of meeting auditing duties and fulfilling obligations related to consent withdrawal. Furthermore, when businesses are faced with the decision of selecting a legal ground for processing the data necessary for their operations, they inevitably rely on obtaining consent to collect as much data as possible during the initial interaction, driven by the concern that users may not return in the future. This underscores, once again, that establishing a trust framework to facilitate

the responsible flow of data will yield mutual benefits for both individuals and businesses. Not only that, the over-reliance on consent mechanisms also leaves companies at a disadvantage by not fully realizing the potential of data due to consent-imposed constraints.

As such, numerous voices have been raised against the efficacy of the consent mechanism to genuinely enhance the digital lives of people and businesses [25]—the culture of consent on the Web has morphed into a ritual of blind, uninformed adhesion to terms of service, where decisions are swayed not by understanding but by the tides of social pressure and collective behavior [5, 82]. Moreover, beyond placing an impossible-to-deal-with burden on individuals, consent still is not valid since consent management platforms and other similar services are not even legally compliant for them to give informed and specific consent [40, 45]. Furthermore, as Sun et al. highlight, an examination of GDPR enforcement, from its enforcement date to June 26th, 2023, reveals a substantial body of over 3000 official enforcement documents, among which 134 documents reference Article 7 on “Conditions for Consent”. Of those, 65 cases resulted in fines, with only 7 imposing penalties exceeding 1 million euros. This analysis highlights a troubling reality: even if not lawful, the misuse of consent often goes insufficiently challenged and it is difficult to challenge effectively.

Venturing beyond the borders of the EU, and examining the data protection landscape in the world’s most populous nations, the universal reliance on consent becomes strikingly clear. This reveals an equally pressing need to transcend the limitations of consent, recognizing that it is but a starting point in safeguarding personal data. Table 1 encapsulates these findings, drawing attention to key insights derived from the analysis of data protection regulations from India (IN), China (CN), US state laws, Indonesia (ID), Pakistan (PK), Nigeria (NG), Brazil (BR), Bangladesh (BD), Russia (RU) and Mexico (MX), the ten most populated countries in 2023^{1,2}. Of these, only Bangladesh stands without a data protection law, though its Cybersecurity Act 2023 [28] launched a first step towards legislating the lawful use of identity information. Hardly surprising, given that data, and especially personal data, is being treated as a hot commodity these days. Meanwhile, Pakistan’s Personal Data Protection Bill (PDPB) [32] remains in draft form, yet to solidify into enforceable law. Following we present a list of the examined laws per country.

1. India (IN) – Digital Personal Data Protection Act 2023 (DPDP Act) [29]
2. China (CN) – Personal Information Protection Law 2021 (PIPL) [64]
3. United States (US) – There is no comprehensive national data protection law in the United States, although there are laws focused on specific data types, e.g., consumer health data and minor’s online data, that are excluded from this analysis. Existing state laws, that are already being enforced, are described below.
 - (a) California (CA) – California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA) [12]
 - (b) California (CA) – California Privacy Rights Act (CPRA) [13]
 - (c) Colorado (CO) – Colorado Privacy Act (CPA) [18]
 - (d) Connecticut (CT) – Connecticut Data Privacy Act (CTDPA) [24]
 - (e) Nevada (NV) – Nevada Privacy of Information Collected on the Internet from Consumers Act (NPICICA) [55]
 - (f) Oregon (OR) – Oregon Consumer Privacy Act (OCPA) [58]
 - (g) Texas (TX) – Texas Data Privacy and Security Act (TDPSA) [86]
 - (h) Utah (UT) – Utah Consumer Privacy Act (UCPA) [87]
 - (i) Virginia (VA) – Virginia Consumer Data Protection Act (VCDPA) [90]
4. Indonesia (ID) – Personal Data Protection Law 2022 (PDP) [63]
5. Pakistan (PK) – Personal Data Protection Bill 2023 draft (PDPB) [32]
6. Nigeria (NG) – Nigeria Data Protection Act (NDPA) [56]
7. Brazil (BR) – General Data Protection Law (LGPD) [49]

¹Information derived from <https://population.un.org/wpp/> (accessed on August 12th, 2024).

²Country codes and their subdivisions are represented using the Alpha-2 code in the ISO 3166 standard, openly available at <https://www.iso.org/iso-3166-country-codes.html>

8. Russia (RU) – Federal law No. 152 FZ of 27 July 2006, “On Personal Data” (the Data Protection Act or DPA) [36]
9. Mexico (MX) – Federal Law for the Protection of Personal Data Held by Private Parties (FLP-PDHP) [50]

As evidenced in Table 1, it is apparent that the “Brussels effect” is more than just a buzzword. The majority of the analyzed laws reflect a definition of consent closely aligned with that of the GDPR, emphasizing its *freely given, specific, informed* and *unambiguous* nature, as well as it being an *affirmative act* taken by the data subject. Additionally, if we introduce the notion of consent being both *unconditional* and *conscious*, it becomes clear that further reflection is required on how such expectations would strain already overburdened consent-based systems.

In this context, of interest is also the choice of US state laws and their Mexican counterpart, as they have chosen to adopt “opt-out” consent as the default approach, while reserving “opt-in” consent as the required legal basis for processing sensitive personal data, such as health or children’s data. However, it must be stated that both regulatory approaches grant individuals the right to withdraw consent, with the exception of Texas, Utah and Virginia. The same cannot be said about record-keeping. While “opt-in” based jurisdictions require consent to be demonstrable, their “opt-out” counterparts mostly do not, explicitly, identify such a requirement.

Table 1: Analysis of consent definitions and key requirements in the ten most populated countries in 2023 (the ISO 3166 standard was used to refer to countries and their subdivisions) versus EU’s GDPR. Due to the absence of a comprehensive national law, the currently enforceable US state laws were analyzed in its place. Most laws opt for a GDPR-like definition, as showcased by the first nine rows which focus on the definition of consent. The ensuing rows (Opt-out, Notice, Withdrawal, Delegation and Records) highlight key requirements derived from the usage of consent as a legal basis.

Since California has two state laws on data protection, fields identified with a X* represent requirements present in both. (X) marks laws where withdrawal of consent is only considered for situations where opt-in consent is required for the processing of sensitive data, as opt-out consent is the norm. Pakistan’s law is represented in X as it is still a draft and, as such, subject to change. Russia’s notice requirements, as identified by X^{DS}, depend on the source of the personal data, if the data subject is the data source, then the notice should be available upon request, while other sources require the notice to be shown before processing. Furthermore, Mexico’s data protection authority promotes the availability of different types of notices, X³, depending on the type of data being processed and on how it is notified.

Criteria	EU	IN	CN	US								ID	PK	NG	BR	BD	RU	MX
				CA	CO	CT	NV	OR	TX	UT	VA							
Affirmative act	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X				
Freely given	X	X		X	X	X		X	X		X		X	X	X		X	
Specific	X	X		X	X	X		X	X		X		X	X			X	
Informed	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	
Unambiguous	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X			
Unconditional		X																
Voluntary			X				X			X							X	
Explicit			X															
Conscious																X		
Opt-out				X*	X	X	X	X	X	X	X						X	
Notice	X	X	X	X*	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X ^{DS}	X ³	
Withdrawal	X	X	X	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)				X	X	X	X	X	(X)	
Delegation		X				X		X	X									
Records	X	X	X	X*				X				X	X	X	X		X	

The duty to showcase an appropriate consent notice, enabling individuals to make informed decisions and allowing businesses to obtain high-quality data, is prevalent across countries, while only Mexico’s data protection authority offers guidelines for three distinct types of notices, tailored to the nature of the data being processed and the method of notice delivery [80], e.g., a comprehensive notice is required when data is collected in person, a simplified version is needed for direct online or phone interactions, while a short form notice can be delivered when space is limited, such as in a SMS. On that note, Russia’s Data Protection Act [36] notice requirements are also distinct from all others: depending on whether the data is collected from the data subject or from other sources, the duty to provide notice differs — in the first case, an active approach must be taken by the data subject, as the notice must only be available upon request, while in the second case, the law imposes a stricter requirement as the data subject must be provided with the notice prior to the beginning of the personal data processing. This analysis does not delve into the specific contents of the notices, which vary across jurisdictions. While these notices serve as key tools for informing individuals when consent is required, their function extends beyond consent alone. Businesses utilize them to meet broader transparency obligations, covering various legal grounds for processing data, outlining how individuals can exercise their rights, and more. Therefore, the intricacies of notice content fall outside the primary focus of this section. It could however be debated whether European policy-makers could take a page from the other jurisdictions’ books and allow the usage of distinct types of notices with more or less information according to the usage of data being made, its sensitivity, the preferences of the data subject, and so on and so forth. Such an approach could benefit both sides of the equation, sparing users from engaging with details they deliberately choose to avoid, while also encouraging businesses to steer clear of the shortcuts they currently employ to gain rapid access to data.

Another interesting idea is being put forward in India’s DPDP Act [29], as well as a few of the US state laws [24, 58, 86] — the idea of having a “consent manager”, or an “authorized agent”, acting on the data subject’s interest. While the role of US-based “authorized agents” is quite limited in terms of scope, i.e., they only act on the person’s behalf to opt-out of processing activities that do not align with the data subject’s preferences, India’s “consent manager” has a much bigger role to play. The DPDP Act actually defines that such a manager can act as “a single point of contact [...] to give, manage, review and withdraw [...] consent through an accessible, transparent and interoperable platform” [29]. Furthermore, US-based laws put forward techniques to designate such agents including browser settings or extensions, or a global setting embedded within an electronic device. The significance of such techniques cannot be overstated—*every* business-to-customer interaction inherently faces greater scalability challenges compared to business-to-business interactions since their are far more numerous and most customers do not have a proficient capacity to engage in meaningful negotiations. Therefore, equipping individuals with robust tools that can negotiate on their behalf will allow them to manage their personal data far more effectively and efficiently. In Section 4.4, we revisit this concept, highlighting the significant role Web agents will play in delegating control over data management and enhancing user autonomy.

Regardless of opt-in or opt-out conditions, or even what information needs to be passed in notices or kept in records, one fact remains clear — consent-as-is has reached its local optimum, in particular when it comes to empowering users or making new streams of data available to businesses. In response to these challenges, a growing number of legal scholars have proposed innovative ways to get over such a peak. One prominent suggestion is the concept of broad consent for secondary purposes, not specified at the time of consenting, such as storage or research use [9, 42]. While these ideas have been optimistically put in perspective, they also come with trade-offs, especially when dealing with stringent requirements surrounding sensitive personal data, like health-related data. The possibility to use “Pre-Formulated Declarations of Data Subject Consent” put forward either by data controllers [17] or by data subjects [38], that have agents negotiating or enforcing preferences on their behalf [81, 93], is also being discussed as a potential solution, though both still require advanced protection tools to avoid unfair terms for both parties.

2.2 Everything, everywhere, all at once

Over the past decade, technological progress has been met with a flurry of policy-making and legislative activity, particularly across Europe. While the notion of data protection is far from novel — its roots tracing back to the 1981’s Council of Europe Convention 108+ [26] and the EU’s 1995 Data Protection Directive [30] — the advent of the GDPR has reshaped the global landscape. This landmark regulation addresses the pervasive use of digital personal data, with consent being put at centre stage, as underscored in the analysis provided in the previous section.

In the wake of GDPR’s global effect, inspiring data protection regulations worldwide [11], the European Commission unveiled its visionary *strategy for Data* in 2020 [34]. This initiative seeks to weave a seamless flow of data across sectors within the EU, while steadfastly upholding European ideals of personal data protection, consumer protection legislation, and competition law. At its core lies a commitment to crafting fair, transparent, and practical rules for accessing and using data, all underpinned by mechanisms of trustworthy governance to ensure integrity and balance in the digital age. A cascade of regulatory proposals has since emerged—many now enacted—each crafted to refine and expand the landscape of personal (and non-personal) data governance. From the Data Governance Act (DGA) [70] to the Digital Services Act (DSA) [69], Digital Markets Act (DMA) [68], Data Act [71], European Digital Identity (EUDI) [72], and the European Health Data Space (EHDS) Regulation [74], these measures collectively form a robust framework for the digital age. Furthermore, the AI Act [73] framework also cannot be ignored, as it regulates the usage of personal and non-personal data to train AI models. The timeline of these regulations, from the proposal date to its entry into force and applicability, is showcased in Figure 3. With many obligations already in motion—spanning the DMA’s rules for large online platforms, or “gatekeepers”, the DGA’s mandates for data intermediation service providers and data altruism organizations, and the DSA’s framework for digital service providers—the European strategy for data is advancing with unwavering momentum, with many already calling for reforms to the DGA [8, 89]. Moreover, the recently adopted EHDS Regulation cannot be forgotten, as it imposes restrictions on the use of personal and non-personal electronic health data whether being for primary care usage or for promoting the secondary use of health data for research, innovation, and policymaking. Member States will be required to offer at least one digital identity wallet to all citizens and residents by 2026, as mandated by EUDI [72], and its Implementing Acts for the core functionalities and the certification of EUDI wallets, which were recently adopted by the Commission [46]. To further underscore the point, GDPR enforcement rules [66]—additional requirements to ensure the consistent interpretation and application of the GDPR across the EU—and GDPR simplification rules [33]—an amendment to reduce record-keeping for small and medium-sized enterprises—were also proposed by the Commission. Amid the still-unraveled intricacies of these regulations, and their relationship with the GDPR, one truth emerges—consent has been elevated to a central role within this evolving regulatory framework [15]. As such, in the following paragraphs, we will explore these regulations and the role that consent plays in them.

European Digital Identity The EUDI Framework builds on the electronic Identification, Authentication and Trust Services Regulation (eIDAS) [75]. The latter establishes a single, interoperable framework for electronic identification and trust services to enable safer electronic interactions between businesses, while making them faster and more efficient across the EU. Furthermore, trust service providers that comply with eIDAS requirements can also use their services as evidence in legal proceedings. Examples of trust services are electronic signatures, electronic seals and timestamps, website authentication certificates, or electronic registered delivery services. EUDI introduces a series of new requirements in this law, in particular including the creation of an European Digital Identity Wallet, which should be certified by certification bodies accredited by data protection supervisory authorities. Recently, the EC also adopted five implementing regulations related to *i*) rules for the integrity and core functionalities of EUDI Wallets [20],




Figure 3: Timeline of European data and digital services regulations in the wake of the *European strategy for data*.

ii) rules on the protocols and interfaces of EUDI Wallets solutions [23], iii) rules on person identification data and electronic attestations of attributes of EUDI Wallets [19], iv) reference standards, specifications and procedures for a certification framework for EUDI Wallets [22], and v) obligations for notifications to the Commission concerning the EUDI Wallet ecosystem [21]. By default, Wallet providers must remain blind to the details of a user's Wallet-related transactions, however, an exception arises – where personal data is essential for delivering a Wallet-related service, the user's explicit consent is required and should be granted for each specific instance. Additionally, EU countries are tasked with creating mechanisms at national level to enable qualified trust service providers in verifying “qualified electronic attestation of attributes”, i.e., official documents such as, e.g., social security documents or driving licenses. As such, these providers must be equipped to validate the authenticity of these attributes through authentic sources, but solely with the informed consent of the individual to whom the attestation pertains.

Data Governance Act The DGA [70] is one of the key pillars of the *strategy for data* to create a single European data space. Its primary aim is to foster the exchange of data across sectors within the EU, while embedding “transparency” requirements for data users. It sets forth conditions for the reuse of specific categories of public sector data and introduces a new entity – the single information point provider – to facilitate access between data users and this particular data domain. Beyond this, it legislates the market for data intermediation service³ providers and data altruism⁴ organizations, paving the way for data subjects and data holders to share their information with these entities, in the latter's case for the “public good”. Regarding consent, none of these new services can be overlooked. When contemplating the re-use of data pertaining to data subjects, public sector bodies must enable the reuse of data on the basis of consent, ensuring that data flows only with the deliberate agreement of its subjects. To this end, they are entrusted with guiding potential re-users in seeking such consent, providing pathways through technical mechanisms to channel these requests for reuse, as well as with informing data subjects about the possibility to refuse consent (Recital 15 [70]). Furthermore, data intermediation service providers, when offering their services to data subjects, must provide avenues for individuals to wield their rights, including “giving and withdrawing their consent to data processing” (Recital 30 [70]). Additionally, data intermediation service providers that

³data intermediation service' means a service which aims to establish commercial relationships for the purposes of data sharing between an undetermined number of data subjects and data holders on the one hand and data users on the other, through technical, legal or other means [...] (Article 2.11 [70])

⁴data altruism' means the voluntary sharing of data on the basis of the consent of data subjects to process personal data pertaining to them [...] without seeking or receiving a reward that goes beyond compensation related to the costs that they incur where they make their data available for objectives of general interest [...], such as healthcare, combating climate change, improving mobility, facilitating the development, production and dissemination of official statistics, improving the provision of public services, public policy making or scientific research purposes in the general interest (Article 2.16 [70])

operate as data cooperatives⁵ aim to “strengthen the position of individuals in making informed choices before consenting to data use, influencing the terms and conditions of data user organisations attached to data use in a manner that gives better choices to the individual members of the group or potentially finding solutions to conflicting positions of individual members of a group on how data can be used where such data relates to several data subjects within that group” (Recital 31 [70]). As for data altruism activities, to cultivate trust in the process of granting and withdrawing consent with clarity and ease, a European data altruism consent form will be developed by the European Commission, with the support of the European Data Innovation Board and the European Data Protection Board. Especially in the realms of scientific research and statistical use of data, this form should serve as a bridge between legal terms and a user-friendly experience for altruistic data sharing (Recital 52 [70]). Nonetheless, the latest practical guide related to the DGA, dropped by the Commission on September 24th, 2024, does not provide any updates on when the form will be available [35], and flags are already being raised regarding the economic viability of these newly fledged services [89]. There is, however, a push for the use of standardized semantic specifications to design these forms, while maintaining the potential for personalization and contextualization [59, 76]. Currently, there are at most twenty four data intermediation services providers⁶ and two data altruism organizations⁷ registered by the Commission, while the DGA has been applicable since September 24th, 2023, and data intermediation services providers need to comply with their obligations by September 24th, 2025. When it comes to data altruism, there are ambiguities in its definition and application [3]—it focuses on consent, although consent is only one of many applicable legal grounds for the processing of personal data, and the altruistic reuse of non-personal data seems to be implicitly overlooked. Not only that, the interpretation of broad consent or how to assess compatible re-uses of data still lacks clarity, while the notion of data altruism activity does not provide enough detailed information, in particular in relation to the allocation of responsibilities and the protection of individuals when it comes to their data rights. Furthermore, the Commission has abandoned the idea of having a rulebook for data altruism⁸, which was set out on DGA’s Article 22 [70] and was supposed to provide additional information related to the obligations set out for these organisations. As for data intermediation services, several issues have also been pointed out. Besides the description of potentially demanding conditions for providing such services, described in DGA’s Chapter III [70], the scope of activities and business models of intermediaries beseeches clarification [3, 89]. The interplay of DGA’s rules with other branches of law, e.g., cybersecurity, or price regulations, must be internally unbundled by organizations seeking to supply intermediation activities, with clear guidance from the Commission and its supra-national authorities still lacking [8].

Data Act The Data Act [71] constitutes a cross-sectoral legislative framework and a central pillar of the European data strategy, designed to establish harmonised principles governing equitable access to and responsible use of data. It covers both personal and non-personal data, while laying down requirements on *i*) making data generated through connected products and related services accessible to the user, *ii*) making data from data holders available to data recipients and *iii*) to public sector bodies and authorities when needed for public interest tasks, *iv*) ensuring fair terms for data sharing contracts between data holders and small and medium-sized companies or not-for-profit research organisations, *v*) enabling the switch between data processing services, *vi*) establishing safeguards to protect data holders against unlawful data transfer outside the EU, and *vii*) developing interoperability standards for data to be accessed, transferred and used. Moreover, it reviews certain aspects of the 1996’s directive “on the legal protection of databases” [31], to make data generated or acquired from Internet of Things (IoT) devices accessible for access and reuse. While

⁵“services of data cooperatives” means data intermediation services offered by an organisational structure constituted by data subjects, one-person undertakings or SMEs [...] (Article 2.15 [70])

⁶<https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/policies/data-intermediary-services>, accessed on August 4th, 2025.

⁷<https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/policies/data-altruism-organisations>, accessed on August 4th, 2025.

⁸https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/better-regulation/have-your-say/initiatives/14094-Data-altruism-Rulebook-for-organisations-collecting-personal-data-in-the-general-interest_en, accessed on August 4th, 2025.

the Data Act is primarily concerned with non-personal data, in circumstances where users of connected products and related services qualify as data subjects, the rights conferred by the Act operate in addition to those established under the GDPR [67]. In fact, a central challenge for the Act lies in its interaction with the EU’s personal data protection framework, particularly in contexts where organizations process datasets comprising both personal and non-personal data, as this distinction is paramount to assess the scope of application of the GDPR [37]. Additionally, the rights of access and data portability set forth in GDPR’s Articles 15 and 20 [67] are further complemented by this Act by allowing users to “access all data generated by the use of a connected product, whether personal or non-personal” [71]. Accordingly, when wishing to process personal data, a GDPR legal ground such as consent needs to be in place. The influence of consent within the framework of Data Act requirements extends far beyond this point—even when data sharing agreements are automatically executed, there must be tooling in place to interrupt and terminate them with the mutual consent of the involved parties (Recital 104 [71]). Furthermore, ensuring coherence with the requirements of the DGA [70], DMA [68], and the AI Act [73], as well as with adjacent branches of law—including contractual obligations, competition law, and the protection of trade secrets—presents further potential sources of friction.

Artificial Intelligence Act The AI Act [73] establishes a risk-based approach to guide the governance of artificial intelligence across the EU, assigning responsibilities to providers and users according to the weight of the risks their AI systems may carry. At its sternest, the Act draws a clear boundary against high-risk applications that endanger human safety: systems designed to manipulate, to score individuals socially, to remotely identify them, or to sway the will of voters are categorically forbidden. Yet, the Act is not meant to stifle innovation—it allows general-purpose AI to flourish, provided that it safeguards the fundamental rights of EU citizens and upholds transparency through practices such as AI impact assessments. Exemptions for research endeavors and for components shared under open-source licenses are also granted. Regarding the role of consent, the Act extends its scope beyond its usage to justify personal data processing: “*informed consent*” from subjects is also required for the testing of an AI system, and its intended purpose, in real-world conditions, and following the GDPR counterpart, it may be revoked at any time without providing any justification.

European Health Data Space Regulation The EHDS Regulation [74] is the first legislative initiative in the EU aimed at establishing a common European data space. Its objective is to empower individuals by granting them improved access to their electronic personal health data, both at the national and European levels. In parallel, the Regulation seeks to establish governance mechanisms for primary and secondary use of electronic health data, and foster the development of a unified market for electronic health record (EHR) systems, wellness applications, and medical devices. In addition to extending the rights of access, rectification, and data portability established in Articles 15, 16, and 20 of the GDPR [67], this Regulation grants data subjects, specifically with regard to personal electronic health data, the following rights: *i*) to insert information in their own EHR, *ii*) to restrict access, *iii*) to obtain information on accessing data, *iv*) to opt out in primary use, and *v*) to lodge a complaint with a digital health authority. Furthermore, by 26 March 2027, the EC will launch, through implementing acts, technical specifications for the priority categories of personal electronic health data, namely *i*) patient summaries, *ii*) electronic prescriptions, *iii*) electronic dispensations, *iv*) medical imaging studies and related imaging reports, *v*) medical test results, and *vi*) discharge reports. These specifications will define the European electronic health record exchange format, which must be commonly adopted in the EU, machine-readable, and enable the transmission of personal electronic health data across different software applications, devices, and healthcare providers. By that same deadline, the Commission will also give shape to a central interoperability platform for digital health. This infrastructure will provide services to enable the exchange of personal electronic health data among the Member States’ national contact points for digital health. Moreover, the EHDS

Regulation provides a set of measures to ensure a consistent, and trustworthy secondary use of health data. It establishes the minimum categories of electronic health data that data holders must make available for secondary use, such as electronic health data from EHRs or data from wellness applications, as well as the purposes for which it can be processed, e.g. improvement of the delivery of care, scientific research related to health, and policymaking and regulatory activities. Nonetheless, data subjects have the right to opt out of secondary use at any time without providing any justification. Be it for primary care or for the secondary use of data, every activity including the processing electronic health data must rest upon a GDPR lawful ground (Recitals 15 and 52 [74]). As such, within this framework, consent emerges once more as a pivotal subject matter, particularly in light of the sensitivity that health data embodies.

The misuse and overuse of consent, as a generic mechanism to exchange personal data on the Web, is a well-known fact by now. Not only that, the transactional speed at which it is happening also serves as a telling that it cannot be considered valid consent. With the key role that consent was given within the EU's data and technology regulatory landscape, one might wonder whether the issues that consent has been facing as a legal basis for personal data processing are not being seriously debated. It seems that we are already past what consent can make possible for both individuals and companies, and now we are asking even more to fulfil the well-desired common European data spaces. In this context, we will explore the advantages and disadvantages of going beyond consent, exploring the myriad of other lawful grounds that allow the processing of personal data.

3 Beyond consent

3.1 The lawful six

Consent is only but one of the lawful grounds prescribed by the GDPR for data controllers to process personal data of EU citizens. Beyond the oft-cited ground of consent, Article 6 [67] provides a framework of alternative legal bases, each carrying its own rationale and applicability. *Contractual necessity* enables data processing when it is necessary for fulfilling contractual agreements in which the data subject is a party. *Legal obligation*, by contrast, reflects the authority of law itself, compelling controllers to comply with its provisions. *Legitimate interest* occupies a more nuanced position, inviting a balancing of organizational aims against the rights and freedoms of individuals. The ground of *public interest* allows processing where the welfare of society outweighs private considerations, including the activities of official authorities. Finally, *vital interest*, more rarely invoked, stands as a safeguard in moments of urgency for the protection of life or safety of data subjects.

The determination of an appropriate legal basis for processing under the GDPR is inherently dependent on the specific purpose of the processing activity, as well as the nature of the data involved and other contextual factors such as the relationship between the controller and the data subject. The choice of legal ground must therefore be carefully aligned with the underlying rationale for processing and the risks associated with the data at issue. Importantly, when these conditions evolve—for example, if the purposes of processing change—it becomes necessary to re-evaluate the chosen legal basis and determine whether a new one must be established to ensure continued compliance. Table 2 presents a comparative analysis of the previously identified lawful bases, evaluating them across several dimensions of practical relevance. Specifically, it considers their potential for automation, that is, the extent to which a given legal basis may enable organizations to automate or semi-automate access to personal data. It further examines the degree of involvement required from the data subject, highlighting variations in the level of individual intervention. Finally, the table assesses scalability, understood as the ease with which a legal basis can be consistently applied at scale across multiple services and jurisdictions. These dimensions are particularly relevant for organizations seeking to streamline compliance processes while ensuring that individual rights

remain adequately protected. Furthermore, this analysis applies exclusively to categories of personal data that do not fall within the GDPR’s definition of special category data, for which additional safeguards and legal conditions are required.

Table 2: Comparison of GDPR legal grounds in terms of automation, data subject interaction, and scalability.

Legal basis	Automation potential	Data subject interaction	Scalability
Consent	Low	High	Low
Contract	High	Medium-Low	High
Legal obligation	High	Low	High
Legitimate interest	Semi	Medium	Medium
Public interest	Low	Low	Low
Vital interest	Semi	None	Low

From the perspective of *automation potential*, contract and legal obligation emerge as the most amenable to deterministic, rule-based implementations. Contractual processing can often be operationalized in a straightforward manner, as access decisions follow directly from the predefined terms of the agreement between the parties. Similarly, legal obligation lends itself to automation where obligations are clearly codified, though complexity may arise when overlapping or conflicting legal regimes demand context-specific interpretation. Legitimate interest and vital interest, by contrast, allow only partial automation: both require human oversight, either through a contextual balancing test in the case of legitimate interest, or through predefined emergency scenarios in the case of vital interest. Consent and public interest remain the least conducive to automation. Consent would require highly granular data subject preferences to account for the diverse range of purposes, data types, and data controllers involved, while public interest processing is typically confined to specific authorities and thus not easily generalized across contexts.

The dimension of *data subject interaction* further illustrates the varying operational implications of each legal basis. Consent requires the highest level of engagement, encompassing opt-in mechanisms, ongoing policy management to manage one’s preferences, and the possibility of withdrawal. Legitimate interest involves a more limited form of interaction, namely the right of the data subject to object to processing. Contractual processing entails interaction at the point of sign-up or acceptance, after which further data subject involvement is minimal. Legal obligation and public interest grounds typically preclude any opt-out, as compliance with statutory or societal requirements takes precedence over individual choice. Vital interest, by definition, applies in circumstances where the data subject is unable to act, thereby eliminating direct interaction altogether.

In terms of *scalability*, contract and legal obligation again stand out. Standardized contractual terms make it possible to extend the same legal ground across large numbers of users, while legal obligations enable the construction of compliance pipelines around well-defined statutory requirements. Legitimate interest is somewhat more limited, but still more scalable than consent, since it avoids the administrative overhead of user-by-user consent collection. While the balancing test introduces interpretive complexity, standardized assessment tools could partially mitigate this burden. By contrast, consent suffers from inherent scalability challenges, mostly related to its informed and specific character. Public interest and vital interest grounds are even more narrowly circumscribed: the former applies predominantly to specific public bodies, while the latter is invoked only in exceptional, often life-threatening situations.

In conclusion, the analysis suggests that the contractual legal ground offers significant potential for both automation and scalability, as its reliance on predefined agreements allows organizations to implement standardized agreements as the basis for rule-based personal data processing activities, while contract law does not forbid such arrangements, given that the legal limits when processing special data are strictly respected. Contract is also a recognized and operative legal basis in several EU laws beyond just the GDPR,

namely under the Data Act [71] to use data generated by connected products. Similarly, the legal obligation ground demonstrates strong suitability for automated and scalable processing, though its applicability remains confined to contexts where regulatory compliance explicitly requires the handling of personal data. Hence, both lawful grounds should be used where consent should not due to inherent power imbalance between controller and subject, for instance when employers are processing the personal data of their employees [60]. Legitimate interest, by contrast, with its broad and not purpose-specific scope [1], should be considered to enable exchanges that can create value for both controllers and data subjects, even if they override the latter’s interests at times. Accordingly, the performance of balancing exercises in every distinct context is important to avoid misuse [53]. Overall, broadening the range of lawful bases beyond consent enables data controllers to maintain compliance with the GDPR, while simultaneously alleviating individuals from the considerable scalability and comprehensibility challenges that consent would pose if it were required for all personal data processing activities encountered in daily life.

3.2 Jurisdictional flavors

While the EU’s GDPR establishes a comprehensive framework with six primary legal bases, other regions either adopt similar structures or deviate by introducing unique grounds or limiting their scope of applicability. The comparative overview in Table 3 illustrates both the convergence and divergence of legal bases for personal data processing across major jurisdictions—previously described in Section 2.1.

Table 3: Legal basis from the several data protection regulations described in Section 2.1, including the EU’s GDPR for comparison. X is used to identify the legal bases present in each regulatory text. O is used to differentiate opt-out consent from its opt-in counterpart—all US state laws only include opt-out consent. In the case of India, (X) marks legal bases that are covered by the “Legitimate uses” legal basis present in the DPDP Act [29]. Pakistan’s law is represented in **X** as it is still a draft and, as such, subject to change.

Legal bases	EU	IN	CN	US	ID	PK	NG	BR	BD	RU	MX
Consent	X	X	X	O	X	X	X	X		X	O
Contract	X		X		X	X	X	X		X	
Legal obligation	X	(X)	X		X	X	X	X		X	
Vital interest	X	(X)	X		X	X	X	X		X	
Public interest	X	(X)	X		X		X				
Legitimate interest	X				X	X	X	X		X	
Legitimate uses		X									
Legally disclosed			X							X	
Disclosed by DS			X							X	
Required by law			X			X				X	
Public administration								X			
Research								X		X	
Rights exercise								X			
Credit protection								X			
Media and journalism										X	

As previously established, in most jurisdictions, *consent* serves as a foundational basis, whereas in the US state laws and Mexico, it operates primarily as an opt-out mechanism with certain opt-in requirements for sensitive data. Contract and legal obligation also exhibit substantial alignment across several jurisdictions. In the EU, Brazil, Russia, Indonesia, Pakistan, Nigeria, and China, *contracts* provide a legitimate basis where the processing is necessary for contractual performance. *Legal obligation*, similarly, is a consistent ground across these frameworks, except for China, though its interpretation may differ. Beyond legal obligation

with court orders or statutory duties, in China, Pakistan and Russia, personal data can be processed if *required by other laws or administrative regulations*.

Certain jurisdictions expand the list of recognized grounds with context-specific provisions absent from the GDPR. India’s DPDP Act [29] introduces *legitimate uses*, encompassing situations such as voluntary data provision, medical emergencies, public health, employment, or legal obligations, leaving out contractual necessity or legitimate interests. China explicitly recognizes personal data *disclosed by the individual* or made *legally public*, with the Russia’s DPA law [36] providing akin bases. Brazil introduces additional categories including *research*, *exercise of rights* in judicial, administrative or arbitration proceedings, *credit protection*, and *processing by public administration* for policy execution. Russia similarly codifies provisions for *media and journalism*, as well as research. These specific, context-driven legal bases reflect a pragmatic accommodation of socio-economic and institutional needs within national data protection regimes.

At the same time, *public interest* and *vital interest* remain unevenly adopted. The EU, China, Indonesia, and Nigeria acknowledge these categories, particularly for tasks carried out by public authorities or in emergency situations, but their absence in other jurisdictions is either folded into more specific categories, e.g., legitimate uses in India or research in Brazil and Russia, or addressed through sector-specific rules rather than general data protection law.

A striking divergence emerges in the United States and Mexico, where opting-out is the norm. Opt-in is reserved for the handling of sensitive data, including child data, in the California, Colorado, Connecticut, Oregon, Texas, and Virginia state laws, while Nevada’s opt-in consent mechanism concerns only health data, and the Mexican law goes one step further by mandating written consent for all sensitive personal data. This structure underscores a consumer protection orientation rather than a legal basis framework in the European sense.

Taken together, these findings reveal a fragmented but partially convergent global landscape. While consent, contract, and legal obligation form common denominators across many systems, several jurisdictions supplement these with additional, context-specific grounds. Such variations reflect differing legal traditions, regulatory priorities, and socio-political contexts, ultimately shaping how data controllers and subjects experience the balance between flexibility, compliance, and protection. Nonetheless, the contractual legal basis warrants particular emphasis, as it not only enables greater automation and scalability compared to consent, but also provides a lawful foundation for processing personal data across a wide range of jurisdictions, thereby offering long-term benefits for both controllers and data subjects. In the following section, we delve into the concept of *evolvable trust*—a scalable techno-legal alternative that explores GDPR’s legal bases without overreliance on consent as the sole lawful ground, while simultaneously establishing economic incentives for the exchange of data, goods, and services among the parties involved.

4 Trust as a temporal relationship

4.1 Defining trust

Despite abundant mentions of the word “trust”, we have so far not defined it, as such definitions tend to stray into philosophy. To mitigate this risk, we present an operational definition for the purposes of this article:

Trust is a relationship between individual people or groups of individuals, the quality of which evolves over time, serving as a channel that supports the exchange of data, services, and/or goods.

By defining trust as an interpersonal relationship, we explicitly exclude relationships between people and devices or software; the idea being that people fundamentally cannot bestow trust upon technology, for technology can impossibly experience or reciprocate trust. As such, in our model, people trust companies, even if such companies are represented by software. The role of technology is not that of a party in the trust relationship, but rather to support such relationships at scale.




Figure 4: The dominant timeline for digital trust relationships starts with the *Brief Explosion Of Trust* (BEOT), at which point a data subject is asked to agree to an exhausting list of demands, in stark contrast to the absence of a factual trust relationship that would normally serve as collateral. Informed decision or negotiation is impossible as the relationship itself has not yet commenced, leaving no opportunities to assess trustworthiness. All needed and unneeded conditions are established beforehand, as the consent dialog model disregards the evolutive character of real-world relationships.

Current technologies are not well equipped to support the inevitable evolution that characterizes the dynamics of human trust relationships. As such, the potential for improvements on each side of the relationship is substantial. We compare the current, limited model with a model that better reflects the complexity of the real world.

4.2 Brief Explosion Of Trust

Within theoretical physics, the Big Bang model postulates a single dense moment at the beginning of time, which produced all matter that can ever exist within this universe. A careful analysis of current practical GDPR interpretations reveals that most practitioners collectively decided the exchange of data must necessarily adhere to a similar one-shot model of time.

The majority of data controllers therefore adopt the BEOT model featuring a *Brief Explosion Of Trust* in which they consider a data subject’s first moment of interaction as the immediate and final opportunity to obtain any possible guarantees and permissions across all of spacetime. Figure 4 depicts a timeline within this model, through an example in which a person builds a relationship with a provider of streaming music. Note how the initial visit of the website corresponds to the point where the data subject has to make all decisions about trust for the entire relationship, despite not having started said relationship. The clear advantage is that every imaginable future act of sharing data *will* be covered by the single prior agreement; the obvious disadvantage that it *has* to be, resulting in an agreement that is overly and unnecessarily wide at every single point on the timeline where data is shared.

Despite its roots in physics, the BEOT model demonstrates an existential allergy to Schrödinger’s cat through its intolerance for uncertainty as to whether a given data point is available or unavailable. The underlying angst stems from the presumption that anything left uncreated at the start of the joint timeline with a data subject might never come into existence. Assuming this model of the data universe, a controller’s only rational behavior consists of seizing the initial moment of the BEOT to demand a data subject’s unconditional and non-negotiable consent for all possible data usages, thereby already anticipating any possible timeline developments for themselves or their current and future partners. As a result, the data subject is asked to settle all of the trust that could be possibly be required for the entire duration of the relationship before the relationship takes place—by essentially agreeing that trust is indeed absent.

To simplify their detection, each BEOT is announced by an increasingly longer consent dialog describing the extent of the explosion at a level of detail beyond the understanding of most. Data subjects consequently




Figure 5: In an evolvable trust model, no decision or exchange happens at the first moment of interaction; rather, the relationship is allowed and encouraged to grow. Every act of exchanging data is encapsulated in a trust context pertaining to this specific data point and exchange, reflecting the status of the relationship at that moment in time. This model aligns with the dynamics of real-world relationships, notably due to its elimination of widely scoped prior agreements regarding abstract future interactions that cannot be meaningfully decided yet.

live through BEOT experiences in the Old English sense of *bēot*: a ritualized promise to proclaim one's acceptance of a seemingly impossible challenge in order to gain tremendous glory for its accomplishment.

Sadly, the accomplishment itself limits both parties, as the ability to evolve is crucial to B2C relationships. Let us therefore not forget that a lack of trust incurs a significant cost for people and companies. From a legal angle, it is highly doubtful whether the threshold of informed consent is achieved. Nonetheless, the agreement texts themselves likely provide some degree of protection due to their sheer length, which could make litigation prohibitively expensive. At the same time, they paint a grim picture of the times to come, especially for businesses who aim to establish a genuine relationship for mutual benefit—which not coincidentally forms the cornerstone of economics. Companies cannot leverage trust as a key differentiator with a static interaction model that imposes fixed boundaries at the start.

4.3 Evolvable trust

In a model of evolvable trust, the qualities of trust in the model need to reflect those of the real-world at any given point in time. Specifically, the following conditions need to hold:

- There is no presumption of trust at the start of the relationship.
- The quality of trust can evolve in a positive or negative direction at any point in time.
- Every act of exchange is contextualized with specific policies that explicitize the understanding of trust at the moment.

As an illustration of those principles, the timeline in Figure 5 reimagines the interaction of Figure 4 in which a person establishes a new relationship with a streaming music provider. The relationship starts when the person visits the website, at which point there exists no notion of trust between both parties. Through interaction with the website, the person gains confidence that the company can provide value to them, yet no exchange has taken place yet.

By browsing specific parts of the music catalog, the person discloses the first piece of personal data, namely their interest in certain artists and genres. This specific act of exchange in isolation could be argued from the perspective of legitimate interest, since disclosing a preference for a certain genre is a necessary precondition to display it. As such, the data point “this person prefers 80s rock music” is exchanged with the context that the person considers usage of this data for the selection of songs during the active browsing session to be legitimate interest. At this point, the person can back out of the relationship with the understanding that their exchange of data will not impact them any further, given the specific scoping

in time and purpose. The company has achieved its goal of demonstrating they provide a service relevant to the person’s musical tastes.

The company subsequently offers a free subscription, which can be activated by creating an account through a combination of email address and password. These individual data points constitute personal information, which can similarly be exchanged with a specifically scoped legal basis.

This mechanism is invoked repeatedly so support the evolution of the relationship at every step. When a stronger engagement is required, such as when the person decides to purchase a paid subscription, explicit consent will be asked for the credit card information to be used for this specific transaction. At every point in the relationship, each exchanged data point is accompanied by the minimal trust context required to achieve every step. The advantage of this approach is that the company never requires a level of trust or agreement beyond what is strictly necessary, and that all the information to make an informed decision is available to the person at the point where they have to decide. The disadvantage is, compared to the single action pattern of the BEOT, the large number of individual decision points during the course of the relationship timeline. However, their vastly increased volume is compensated by a significant narrowing in scope for each point, opening up the possibility of assistance or even automation.

4.4 Assisted or automated trust decisions

The development of assisted and automated trust systems requires a rethinking of how individuals, organizations, and machines interact in the exchange of data, services, and goods. Evolvable trust cannot be sustainably operationalized under the current paradigm of data usage management if, instead of a BEOT, millions of decisions have to be taken by companies and people alike. To move beyond this impasse, a higher level of abstraction is necessary for the representation of data usage conditions. Rather than requiring individuals to engage with the minutiae of every data transaction, meta-policy languages and policy catalogs can provide scalable mechanisms for defining, deriving, and instantiating policies that align with individual preferences, legal requirements, and organizational needs. These higher-order policy frameworks would allow for contextual instantiation at the moment of decision-making, enabling the selection of appropriate legal bases—including but not limited to consent—under the GDPR and other regulatory systems. Based on these policies, both assistance and automation mechanisms could support individuals and companies in the evolution of their relationship.

Such mechanisms require dynamic negotiation protocols if they are to support the exchange of a data point with a trust context that includes *specific* data usage conditions. Negotiation protocols, expressed in standardized and machine-readable formats, enable individual preferences and controller requirements to be reconciled efficiently, independently of the legal ground that justifies such a transaction. To ensure that both individuals and companies can meaningfully engage with these negotiations, personalized dialogs are indispensable. Under consent, this means tailoring information to support informed choices, whereas in the context of legitimate interest, dialogs may highlight the right to object. Personalized interfaces, when adaptive and responsive to individuals’ distinct wishes for control, enhance autonomy and ensure that reliance on any given legal basis is both valid and transparent. The delegation of control further extends this approach by enabling individuals to entrust decision-making to other individuals or automated agents. For example, consent managers or intelligent policy agents can enforce predefined user preferences while adapting to evolving contexts. India’s *consent manager* [29] and US-based *authorized agents* [24, 58, 86] represent regulatory efforts that incentivize the use of such technologies. Complementing these measures, auditing mechanisms ensure that assisted and automated processes remain accountable over time. Integrated auditing functions, strengthen both ex-ante and ex-post accountability, reassuring individuals that their data is handled as promised while equipping organizations with demonstrable evidence of compliance.

Taken together, these areas illustrate that assisted and automated trust decisions must operate across multiple layers of governance, communication, and oversight. Their integration provides not only a scalable and interoperable infrastructure for data exchange but also a pathway to establishing evolvable trust relationships that endure over time.

5 Conclusions

Above all, consent dialogs represent an astonishing lack of imagination between technologists, lawyers, and economists. On the one hand, we deem technology so powerful that profit maximization equates unlimited data extraction by all legal and adjacent means available. On the other hand, we perceive the same technologies as fundamentally limited in their capability to capture the complex relationship dynamics that supposedly necessitate the processing of such vast amounts of data in the first place. The presumed inevitability of explosive moments of distrust reaffirms the lack of competitive advantage rather than addressing it responsibly.

Trust is not a zero-sum game. Hence, it should not be understood as a struggle over who exercises control, but as a right for self-determination within relationships to the benefit of all involved. Genuine autonomy emerges when individuals can continuously influence how their data contributes to an evolving relationship, without being forced to choose between abstract notions of absolute privacy and complete exposure. In contrast to a one-time binary consent model, trust functions as a personalized balance between competing values such as confidentiality and availability, conciseness and transparency, accountability and privacy, all of which can be adjusted according to each relationship over time. Responsible personalization dissolves the impasse of lopsided benefits by tailoring control to how a specific person can advance their own interests as well, rather than imposing uniform rules that work for neither individuals nor companies.

Implementing evolvable trust relationships requires systems that reduce the cost and effort of acting in the ethically preferred way. People must be able to delegate nuanced choices to tools that act in their interest, where both human and machine actors share a clear understanding of contextual appropriateness. These systems model trust not merely as a layer atop consent, but as the broader container within which permission and consent evolve. It all starts with the notion that *both* parties in a relationship stand to gain *more* from a proportional exchange, in a striking parallel to the core economic principles of trade.

Yet as we sacrifice the red herring of absolute privacy on the altar of untapped socioeconomic potential, let us remember—akin to the biblical miracle of the multiplying bread and fish, or Disney’s *Mickey Mouse* after the 2023 copyright expiration of *Steamboat Willie*—that data above all remains a copyable good, and exhibits vastly different properties compared to other basic elements needed to comfortably live our lives. Unlikely Rumpelstiltskin, whose life depends on the secrecy of a single data point, we are continuously empowered to leverage our own data thanks to this inherent regenerative capacity. Increasing the scalability of the legal mechanisms must be predicated upon the notion that encouraging better data flows—as opposed to solely punishing questionably shortcuts—can realize proportional benefit the individual named therein. As much as widespread mistreatment of data has caused unfathomable damage to people and society, individuals’ life-changing capability currently locked within their own data is still infinitely bigger and more valuable than what any company can squeeze out of there. With a significant amount of potential gain present in every data point; progress does not equal halting the extraction of all gains, but rather the reappropriation of these gains to those the data personally affects. Our economic incentives therefore require urgent realignment with our socio-ethical considerations of long-term sustainability, which ultimately involves appropriate codification into law. May an increased understanding of trade-offs between confidentiality and availability, together with the vast automation opportunities for beyond-consent data exchanges, lead us to more responsible data flows for mutual benefit, so help us GDPR.

References

- [1] Article 29 Data Protection Working Party. *Opinion 06/2014 on the notion of legitimate interests of the data controller under Article 7 of Directive 95/46/EC*. 2014. URL: https://ec.europa.eu/justice/article-29/documentation/opinion-recommendation/files/2014/wp217_en.pdf.
- [2] Ece Özlem Atikcan and Adam William Chalmers. “Choosing lobbying sides: The general data protection regulation of the European Union”. In: *Journal of Public Policy* 39.4 (2019), pp. 543–564.
- [3] Julie Baloup et al. *White Paper on the Data Governance Act*. SSRN Scholarly Paper. Leuven, Belgium: KU Leuven - Centre for IT & IP Law, 2021. DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.3872703.
- [4] Sayeh Bayat et al. “GPS driving: a digital biomarker for preclinical Alzheimer disease”. In: *Alzheimer’s Research & Therapy* 13.1 (June 2021). ISSN: 1758-9193. DOI: 10.1186/s13195-021-00852-1.
- [5] Anja Bechmann. “Non-Informed Consent Cultures: Privacy Policies and App Contracts on Facebook”. In: *Journal of Media Business Studies* 11.1 (2014), pp. 21–38. ISSN: 1652-2354. DOI: 10.1080/16522354.2014.11073574.
- [6] Kathryn D Betts and Kyle R Jaep. “The dawn of fully automated contract drafting: Machine learning breathes new life into a decades-old promise”. In: *Duke Law & Technology Review* 15 (2016), p. 216.
- [7] Asia J. Biega et al. “Operationalizing the Legal Principle of Data Minimization for Personalization”. In: *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. SIGIR ’20. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2020, pp. 399–408. ISBN: 9781450380164. DOI: 10.1145/3397271.3401034. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3397271.3401034>.
- [8] Tervel Bobev et al. *White Paper on the Definition of Data Intermediation Services*. SSRN Scholarly Paper. Rochester, NY, 2023. DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.4589987.
- [9] Sarah N. Boers, Johannes J. M. van Delden, and Annelien L. Bredenoord. “Broad Consent Is Consent for Governance”. In: *The American Journal of Bioethics* 15.9 (2015). Taylor & Francis, pp. 53–55. ISSN: 1526-5161. DOI: 10.1080/15265161.2015.1062165.
- [10] August Bourgeois and Laurens Vandercruysse. “Reinvigorating Consent: Exploring New Paradigms for Privacy and Data Sharing”. In: *Proceedings of 22nd European Conference on Computer-Supported Cooperative Work*. ECSCW 2024: Proceedings of the 22nd European Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work. European Society for Socially Embedded Technologies (EUSSET), 2024. DOI: 10.48340/ECSCW2024_EP08.
- [11] Anu Bradford. *The Brussels Effect: How the European Union Rules the World*. Oxford University Press, 2019. ISBN: 978-0-19-008858-3. DOI: 10.1093/oso/9780190088583.003.0002.
- [12] *California Consumer Privacy Act*. 2018. URL: https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB375.
- [13] *California Privacy Rights Act*. 2020.
- [14] Hanbyul Choi, Jonghwa Park, and Yoonhyuk Jung. “The role of privacy fatigue in online privacy behavior”. In: *Computers in Human Behavior* 81 (2018), pp. 42–51. ISSN: 0747-5632. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.12.001>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0747563217306817>.
- [15] Andrés Chomczyk Penedo. “Towards a technologically assisted consent in the upcoming new EU data laws?” In: *PinG Privacy in Germany* 5 (2022), pp. 180–187. ISSN: 2196-9817. DOI: 10.37307/j.2196-9817.2022.05.05.
- [16] Catalin Cimpanu. “Database leaks data on most of Ecuador’s citizens, including 6.7 million children”. In: *ZDNET* (Sept. 16, 2019). URL: <https://www.zdnet.com/article/database-leaks-data-on-most-of-ecuadors-citizens-including-6-7-million-children/>.

- [17] Damian Clifford, Inge Graef, and Peggy Valcke. “Pre-formulated Declarations of Data Subject Consent—Citizen-Consumer Empowerment and the Alignment of Data, Consumer and Competition Law Protections”. In: *German Law Journal* 20.5 (2019), pp. 679–721. ISSN: 2071-8322. DOI: 10.1017/glj.2019.56.
- [18] *Colorado Privacy Act*. 2021. URL: <https://leg.colorado.gov/bills/sb21-190>.
- [19] “Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2024/2977 of 28 November 2024 laying down rules for the application of Regulation (EU) No 910/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards person identification data and electronic attestations of attributes issued to European Digital Identity Wallets”. In: *Official Journal of the European Union* (2024). URL: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg_impl/2024/2977/oj/eng.
- [20] “Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2024/2979 of 28 November 2024 laying down rules for the application of Regulation (EU) No 910/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards the integrity and core functionalities of European Digital Identity Wallets”. In: *Official Journal of the European Union* (2024). URL: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg_impl/2024/2979/oj/eng.
- [21] “Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2024/2980 of 28 November 2024 laying down rules for the application of Regulation (EU) No 910/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards notifications to the Commission concerning the European Digital Identity Wallet ecosystem”. In: *Official Journal of the European Union* (2024). URL: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg_impl/2024/2980/oj/eng.
- [22] “Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2024/2981 of 28 November 2024 laying down rules for the application of Regulation (EU) No 910/2014 of the European Parliament and the Council as regards the certification of European Digital Identity Wallets”. In: *Official Journal of the European Union* (2024). URL: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg_impl/2024/2981/oj/eng.
- [23] “Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2024/2982 of 28 November 2024 laying down rules for the application of Regulation (EU) No 910/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards protocols and interfaces to be supported by the European Digital Identity Framework”. In: *Official Journal of the European Union* (2024). URL: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg_impl/2024/2982/oj/eng.
- [24] *Connecticut Data Privacy Act*. 2022. URL: <https://www.cga.ct.gov/2022/ACT/PA/PDF/2022PA-00015-R00SB-00006-PA.PDF>.
- [25] Ella Corren. “The Consent Burden in Consumer and Digital Markets”. In: *Harvard Journal of Law & Technology* 36.2 (2022), pp. 551–614.
- [26] Council of Europe. *Convention 108+: Convention for the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data*. 1981. URL: <https://www.coe.int/en/web/data-protection/convention108-and-protocol>.
- [27] Bart Custers et al. “The role of consent in an algorithmic society – Its evolution, scope, failings and re-conceptualization”. In: *Research Handbook on EU Data Protection Law*. Edward Elgar Publishing, 2022, pp. 455–473. ISBN: 978-1-80037-168-2. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781800371682.00027>.
- [28] *Cybersecurity Act*. 2023. URL: <http://bdlaws.minlaw.gov.bd/act-1457.html>.
- [29] *Digital Personal Data Protection Act 2023*. 2023. URL: <https://www.meity.gov.in/content/digital-personal-data-protection-act-2023>.
- [30] “Directive 95/46/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 1995 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data”. In: *Official Journal L 281* (1995), pp. 11–50. URL: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:31995L0046&from=en>.

- [31] Directive 96/9/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 March 1996 on the legal protection of databases. 1996. URL: <http://data.europa.eu/eli/dir/1996/9/2019-06-06>.
- [32] Draft of the Personal Data Protection Bill. 2023.
- [33] EDPB-EDPS Letter on European Commission draft proposal on simplification of record-keeping under the GDPR | European Data Protection Board. 2025. URL: https://www.edpb.europa.eu/our-work-tools/our-documents/letters/edpb-edps-letter-european-commission-draft-proposal_en.
- [34] European Commission. *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions - A European strategy for data*. 2020. URL: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A52020DC0066>.
- [35] European Commission. *Implementing the Data Governance Act – guidance document*. 2024. URL: <https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/library/new-practical-guide-data-governance-act>.
- [36] Federal Law of 27 July 2006 N 152-FZ on Personal Data. 2006. URL: https://pd.rkn.gov.ru/docs/Federal_Law_On_personal_data.doc.
- [37] Michèle Finck and Frank Pallas. “They who must not be identified—distinguishing personal from non-personal data under the GDPR”. In: *International Data Privacy Law* 10.1 (2020), pp. 11–36. DOI: 10.1093/idpl/ipz026.
- [38] Marcu Florea and Beatriz Esteves. “Is Automated Consent in Solid GDPR-Compliant? An Approach for Obtaining Valid Consent with the Solid Protocol”. In: *Information* 14.12 (2023). ISSN: 2078-2489. DOI: 10.3390/info14120631. (Visited on 11/30/2023).
- [39] “FTC to Ban BetterHelp from Revealing Consumers’ Data, Including Sensitive Mental Health Information, to Facebook and Others for Targeted Advertising”. In: *Federal Trade Commission Press Release* (Mar. 2, 2023). URL: <https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/news/press-releases/2023/03/ftc-ban-betterhelp-revealing-consumers-data-including-sensitive-mental-health-information-facebook>.
- [40] GOOGLE LLC v CNIL (Decision n°430810 of the Council of State). 2020. URL: https://www.cnil.fr/sites/cnil/files/atoms/files/council-of-state-decision-google-2020-06-19_en_0.pdf.
- [41] Josh Halliday. “Data breach exposes details of 25,000 current and former BBC employees”. In: *The Guardian* (May 29, 2024). URL: <https://www.theguardian.com/media/article/2024/may/29/data-breach-exposes-details-of-25000-current-and-former-bbc-employees>.
- [42] Dara Hallinan. “Broad consent under the GDPR: an optimistic perspective on a bright future”. In: *Life Sciences, Society and Policy* 16.1 (2020). ISSN: 2195-7819. DOI: 10.1186/s40504-019-0096-3.
- [43] Alex Hern. “Facebook announces privacy tools to ‘put people in more control’ of data”. In: *The Guardian* (Mar. 28, 2018). URL: <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2018/mar/28/facebook-privacy-tools-put-people-control-data>.
- [44] Joanne Hinds, Emma J. Williams, and Adam N. Joinson. “‘It wouldn’t happen to me’: Privacy concerns and perspectives following the Cambridge Analytica scandal”. In: *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies* 143 (2020). ISSN: 1071-5819. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijhcs.2020.102498.
- [45] IAB Europe contre Gegevensbeschermingsautoriteit (Case C–604/22). 2024. URL: <https://curia.europa.eu/juris/document/document.jsf?text=&docid=283529>.
- [46] *Implementing regulation for European Digital Identity Wallets*. 2024. URL: <https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/library/implementing-regulation-european-digital-identity-wallets>.
- [47] Bobbie Johnson. “Privacy no longer a social norm, says Facebook founder”. In: *The Guardian* (Jan. 11, 2010). URL: <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2010/jan/11/facebook-privacy>.
- [48] Filippo Lancieri. “Narrowing data protection’s enforcement gap”. In: *Maine Law Review* 74.1 (2022).

- [49] *Lei nº 13.709, de 14 de agosto de 2018 - Lei Geral de Proteção de Dados Pessoais*. 2018. URL: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2015-2018/2018/lei/l13709.htm.
- [50] *Ley Federal de Protección de Datos Personales en Posesión de los Particulares*. 2010. URL: <https://www.diputados.gob.mx/LeyesBiblio/ref/lfpdppp.htm>.
- [51] Steven A Lubitz et al. "Detection of atrial fibrillation in a large population using wearable devices: the Fitbit Heart Study". In: *Circulation* 146.19 (2022), pp. 1415–1424.
- [52] Aleecia M McDonald and Lorrie Faith Cranor. "The cost of reading privacy policies". In: *I/S: A Journal of Law and Policy for the Information Society* 4 (2008).
- [53] Victor Morel et al. "Legitimate Interest is the New Consent – Large-Scale Measurement and Legal Compliance of IAB Europe TCF Paywalls". In: *Proceedings of the 22nd Workshop on Privacy in the Electronic Society*. Association for Computing Machinery, 2023, pp. 153–158. DOI: 10.1145/3603216.3624966.
- [54] John Naughton. "More choice on privacy just means more chances to do what's best for big tech". In: *The Guardian* (July 8, 2018). URL: <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2018/jul/08/more-choice-privacy-gdpr-facebook-google-microsoft>.
- [55] *Nevada Privacy of Information Collected on the Internet from Consumers Act*. 2019. URL: <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/NRS/NRS-603A.html>.
- [56] *Nigeria Data Protection Act*. 2023. URL: https://ndpc.gov.ng/Files/Nigeria_Data_Protection_Act_2023.pdf.
- [57] Jonathan A. Obar and Anne Oeldorf-Hirsch. "The biggest lie on the Internet: ignoring the privacy policies and terms of service policies of social networking services". In: *Information, Communication & Society* 23.1 (2020), pp. 128–147. ISSN: 1369-118X. DOI: 10.1080/1369118X.2018.1486870.
- [58] *Oregon Consumer Privacy Act*. 2023. URL: https://www.oregonlegislature.gov/bills_laws/ors/ors646A.html.
- [59] Harshvardhan J. Pandit, Jan Lindquist, and Georg P. Krog. "Implementing ISO/IEC TS 27560:2023 Consent Records and Receipts for GDPR and DGA". In: *Privacy Technologies and Policy*. Ed. by Meiko Jensen, Cédric Lauradoux, and Kai Rannenberg. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland, 2024, pp. 228–251. ISBN: 978-3-031-68024-3. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-031-68024-3_12.
- [60] Article 29 Data Protection Working Party. *Guidelines on consent under Regulation 2016/679*. 2018. URL: <https://ec.europa.eu/newsroom/article29/redirection/item/623051/en>.
- [61] Bindu Shajan Perappadan and Aroon Deep. "U.S. cyber security firm indicates data breach sourced from ICMR". In: *The Hindu* (Oct. 31, 2023). URL: <https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/us-cyber-security-firm-indicates-data-breach-sourced-from-icmr/article67477424.ece>.
- [62] *Personal Data Protection Act*. 2022. URL: <https://oagmis.agctz.go.tz/portal/acts/237>.
- [63] *Personal Data Protection Law*. 2022. URL: https://jdih.setkab.go.id/PUUdoc/176837/Salinan_UU_Nomor_27_Tahun_2022.pdf.
- [64] *Personal Information Protection Law of the People's Republic of China*. 2021. URL: http://www.npc.gov.cn/npc/c2/c30834/202108/t20210820_313088.html.
- [65] *Projeto de Lei Nº 2338, de 2023*. 2023. URL: <https://legis.senado.leg.br/sdleg-getter/documento?dm=9347593&ts=1720207594996>.
- [66] *Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down additional procedural rules relating to the enforcement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679*. 2023. URL: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex%3A52023PC0348>.

- [67] “Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Directive 95/46/EC (General Data Protection Regulation)”. In: *Official Journal of the European Union L 119* (2016), pp. 1–88. URL: <http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2016/679/oj>.
- [68] “Regulation (EU) 2022/1925 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 September 2022 on contestable and fair markets in the digital sector and amending Directives (EU) 2019/1937 and (EU) 2020/1828 (Digital Markets Act)”. In: *Official Journal of the European Union L 265* (2022), pp. 1–66. URL: <http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2022/1925/oj/eng>.
- [69] “Regulation (EU) 2022/2065 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 October 2022 on a Single Market For Digital Services and amending Directive 2000/31/EC (Digital Services Act)”. In: *Official Journal of the European Union L 277* (2022), pp. 1–102. URL: <http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2022/2065/oj/eng>.
- [70] “Regulation (EU) 2022/868 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 May 2022 on European data governance and amending Regulation (EU) 2018/1724 (Data Governance Act)”. In: *Official Journal of the European Union L 152* (2022), pp. 1–44. URL: <http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2022/868/oj/eng>.
- [71] “Regulation (EU) 2023/2854 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2023 on harmonised rules on fair access to and use of data and amending Regulation (EU) 2017/2394 and Directive (EU) 2020/1828 (Data Act)”. In: *Official Journal of the European Union* (2023). URL: <http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2023/2854/oj>.
- [72] “Regulation (EU) 2024/1183 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 April 2024 amending Regulation (EU) No 910/2014 as regards establishing the European Digital Identity Framework”. In: *Official Journal of the European Union* (2024). URL: <http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1183/oj/eng>.
- [73] “Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence and amending Regulations (EC) No 300/2008, (EU) No 167/2013, (EU) No 168/2013, (EU) 2018/858, (EU) 2018/1139 and (EU) 2019/2144 and Directives 2014/90/EU, (EU) 2016/797 and (EU) 2020/1828 (Artificial Intelligence Act)”. In: *Official Journal of the European Union* (2024). URL: <http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689/oj/eng>.
- [74] *Regulation (EU) 2025/327 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 February 2025 on the European Health Data Space and amending Directive 2011/24/EU and Regulation (EU) 2024/2847*. 2025. URL: <http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2025/327/oj/eng>.
- [75] “Regulation (EU) No 910/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 July 2014 on electronic identification and trust services for electronic transactions in the internal market and repealing Directive 1999/93/EC”. In: *Official Journal of the European Union L 257* (2014), pp. 73–114. URL: <http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2014/910/oj/eng>.
- [76] Arianna Rossi. “One Form to Rule Them All: Towards a Personalized, But Standardized, European Data Altruism Consent Form”. In: *Enabling and Safeguarding Personalized Medicine*. Ed. by Federica Casarosa, Francesca Gennari, and Arianna Rossi. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland, 2025, pp. 49–76. ISBN: 978-3-031-99709-9. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-031-99709-9_4.
- [77] Dominic Rushe. “Privacy is not dead: Microsoft lawyer prepares to take on US government”. In: *The Guardian* (Dec. 14, 2014). URL: <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2014/dec/14/privacy-is-not-dead-microsoft-lawyer-brad-smith-us-government>.
- [78] Paul Ryan, Martin Crane, and Rob Brennan. “GDPR Compliance Tools: Best Practice from RegTech”. In: *Enterprise Information Systems*. Ed. by Joaquim Filipe et al. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2021, pp. 905–929. ISBN: 978-3-030-75418-1. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-75418-1_41.

- [79] Spyridon Samonas and David Coss. “The CIA strikes back: Redefining confidentiality, integrity and availability in security.” In: *Journal of Information System Security* 10.3 (2014), pp. 21–45.
- [80] Secretaría de Economía. *Lineamientos del Aviso de Privacidad*. 2013. URL: <https://www.gob.mx/se/documentos/lineamientos-del-aviso-de-privacidad>.
- [81] Wout Slabbinck et al. “Enforcing Usage Control Policies in Solid using Rule-Based Web Agents”. en. In: *Accepted for publication at the Solid Symposium 2024*. 2024. URL: https://pod.woutslabbinck.com/WIP/24-06-21_Enforcing_UCP_in_Solid-using_Rule-based_Web_Agents.pdf.
- [82] Daniel J. Solove. *Murky Consent: An Approach to the Fictions of Consent in Privacy Law*. GWU Legal Studies Research Paper No. 2023-23. Rochester, NY, 2023. DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.4333743.
- [83] Chen Sun et al. “GDPRxiv: Establishing the State of the Art in GDPR Enforcement”. In: *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies*. 2023. DOI: 10.56553/popets-2023-0121.
- [84] Josh Taylor. “Meta begins rolling out end-to-end encryption across Messenger and Facebook”. In: *The Guardian* (Dec. 7, 2023). URL: <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2023/dec/07/meta-facebook-messenger-end-to-end-encryption>.
- [85] Josh Taylor. “‘Privacy by design’: Google to give people more power over their personal data”. In: *The Guardian* (Mar. 19, 2021). URL: <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2021/may/19/privacy-by-design-google-to-give-people-more-power-over-their-personal-data>.
- [86] *Texas Data Privacy and Security Act*. 2023. URL: <https://capitol.texas.gov/tlodocs/88R/billtext/html/HB00004F.htm>.
- [87] *Utah Consumer Privacy Act*. 2022. URL: <https://le.utah.gov/~2022/bills/static/SB0227.html>.
- [88] Christine Utz et al. “(Un)informed Consent: Studying GDPR Consent Notices in the Field”. In: *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. London, United Kingdom: Association for Computing Machinery, 2019, pp. 973–990. ISBN: 9781450367479. DOI: 10.1145/3319535.3354212. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3319535.3354212>.
- [89] Melanie Verstraete et al. “Assessing the Economic Viability of Data Intermediation Services as Defined in the DGA”. In: *62nd International FITCE Congress, "Services and Infrastructures Toward Smart Society"*. 2023. DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.4575790.
- [90] *Virginia Consumer Data Protection Act*. 2021. URL: <https://lis.virginia.gov/cgi-bin/legp604.exe?212+sum+HB2307>.
- [91] Ari Ezra Waldman. *Industry Unbound: The Inside Story of Privacy, Data, and Corporate Power*. 1st. Cambridge University Press, 2021. ISBN: 978-1-108-59138-6. URL: <https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/industry-unbound/787989F90DBFC08E47546178A7AB04F7>.
- [92] Josephine Wolff and Nicole Atallah. “Early GDPR Penalties: Analysis of Implementation and Fines Through May 2020”. In: *Journal of Information Policy* 11 (2021), pp. 63–103. ISSN: 2381-5892. DOI: 10.5325/jinfopoli.11.2021.0063. URL: <https://doi.org/10.5325/jinfopoli.11.2021.0063>.
- [93] Jesse Wright. “Here’s Charlie! Realising the Semantic Web vision of Agents in the age of LLMs”. In: *Accepted for publication at ISWC 2024 Doctoral Consortium proceedings*. 2024. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2409.04465>.