ARPA Hellenic Logical Systems - Public Consultation on [“Guidelines 1/2026 on processing of personal data for scientific research purposes”]

This analysis provides a bird's-eye view of the **EDPB Guidelines 1/2026**. It examines the structural shift in how European data policy intends to balance the freedom of science with the right to privacy in an era of rapid technological acceleration.

I. The Proposal: A Logic for Scientific Data

The EDPB aims to provide a harmonized framework for processing personal data for research, essentially creating a regulatory bypass for activities deemed genuinely scientific.

- To prevent commercial entities from using research as a loophole, the guideline proposes six indicative factors: methodical approach, ethical adherence, verifiability, autonomy, societal contribution, and scientific merit.
- Research benefits from a presumption of compatibility. Data collected for one purpose can be reused for research without a new compatibility test.
- The guideline introduces broad consent (consenting to a general field like medical genetics) and dynamic consent (ongoing interaction where subjects approve new research stages).
- Controllers can reject a right to erasure or right to object if granting it would "render impossible or seriously impair" the research goals.

II. The Fault Lines: What Could Go Wrong?

Looking at this from a systemic perspective, several logical holes emerge that could create significant friction between policy and progress.

- **Institutional Gatekeeping:** The guidelines rely heavily on traditional academic markers, such as PhD titles or independent review boards. This may inadvertently stifle independent innovation or decentralized R&D firms that don't fit the classic university mold.
- **The Anonymization Myth:** The guidelines prioritize anonymization. However, in fields like genomics or high-dimensional AI, "true" anonymization is increasingly impossible without destroying the data's utility. This creates a "utility vs. compliance" deadlock.
- **Broad Consent Ambiguity:** While broad consent is permitted, it is strictly limited to a specific area of research. If a breakthrough occurs outside that narrow box, the entire dataset could become legally radioactive and unusable.
- **The Erasure Conflict:** The high threshold for rejecting erasure requests ("strictly necessary") puts the burden of proof on the researcher. A single deletion request in a linked longitudinal study could compromise the integrity of the entire historical record.

III. The Horizon: A Timeline of Impact

Timeline	Impact on Life and Industry
Immediate	Private startups and commercial R&D will face immediate hurdles proving they meet the six factors to avoid being labeled as simple marketing analysis.
5 Years	We will likely see the rise of "Vetted Research Repositories" (Biobanks/Data Lakes). Research will shift from individual collection to "renting" access from these certified silos.
10 Years	As genetic sequencing becomes ubiquitous, the bird's eye risk is that family members' data is exposed through one relative's participation, despite individual safeguards.
20 Years	If the "Right to Erasure" is applied aggressively, our collective scientific history becomes "swiss cheese", full of holes, making the reproducibility of long-term climate or health studies impossible.

IV. Strategic Suggestions: What to Pay Attention To

To ensure this framework actually supports the freedom of science, the following shifts are suggested:

1. Shift from Identity to Agency

Move away from requiring "academic titles" as the primary proof of scientific autonomy.

- **Why:** Merit should be defined by the rigor of the methodology and the transparency of the results, not the institutional pedigree of the researcher.
- **How:** Implement DLT-based audit trails or immutable "Reality Recorders" that log the scientific process in a verifiable, tamper-proof manner.

2. Recognize Technical Immutability

Create a clearer exception for "Indisputable Records."

- **Why:** For certain types of research (eg. public health trends or historical software development), the integrity of the ledger is more important than the individual's right to vanish.
- **How:** Clarify that if data is part of a fixed historical state (like a Merkle tree), the right to erasure is functionally impossible and thus exempt.

3. Replace Broad Consent with Sovereign Control

Instead of one-time broad consent, promote privacy dashboards, such as ARPA Live ID.

- **Why:** It grants the subject the highest degree of autonomy while allowing the data to remain active for multiple projects.
- **How:** Utilize "Consent Receipts" and digital interfaces where users can toggle access for specific research nodes in real-time.

4. Redefine Anonymization

Accept functional pseudonymization as a sufficient long-term safeguard.

- **Why:** Identifying humans is often necessary for long-term health outcomes.
- **How:** Use trusted “Data Trustees" to manage the "key" to the data, ensuring the researcher sees only the patterns while the subject's identity remains legally and technically partitioned.

ARPA Hellenic Logical Systems | ΑΡΠΑ Ελληνικά Λογικά Συστήματα
Thessaloniki, Greece, May 2026

arpacorp.net | research@arpacorp.net | Book A Free Consultation