

information systems and network information security through centralized training and practical operations. The third is to explore the establishment of an expert consultation system [10, p. 78–84]. Through the appointment of informatization experts in universities, research institutes, and government departments, the establishment of court informatization expert advisory groups, and the introduction of a project investment review mechanism during the phases of project initiation, investigation and acceptance, and gradually established Informatization construction efficiency evaluation system, promote the simultaneous implementation of informatization project construction and efficiency evaluation, and guide and improve court informatization construction [10, p. 87]. The fourth is to continue to improve the informatization operation and maintenance performance management evaluation mechanism, incorporate the degree of informatization application and the implementation of information security into the department and individual performance evaluation content, further clarify the goals and tasks of informatization operation and maintenance, and take multiple measures to implement it to ensure Informatization work is actively developing.

References

1. Yao, Li. Judicial Efficiency: theoretical analysis and institutional construction // Legal and Business Studies. – 2014. – № 5. – P. 23–25.
2. Zhou, Qiang. Applying information age to promote judicial openness and justice. – 2017. – № 4. – P. 45–50.
3. Gao, Yifei. On the new development of trial openness in the digital age in the United States and its enlightenment to China. – 2019. – № 6. – P. 56–61.
4. Long, Fei. Florida Judicial Development Strategy // Legal Information. – 2018. – № 1. – P. 67–69.
5. Liao, Yuanxun. The Supreme Court's Delegation to South Korea's Courts to Investigate the Informatization Construction. – 2014. – № 9. – P. 81–87.
6. Zhou, Qiang. Applying the information age to promote judicial openness and justice by information technology // Newsletter on Judicial Administration of the People's Courts. – 2016. – № 2. – P. 77–80.
7. Zhang, Weiping. Basic mode of civil procedure: basis of transformation and choice // Modern Law. – 2018. – № 3. – P. 45–51.
8. Guo, Jisheng. Reflections on Judicial Costs [J]. – 2017. – № 7. – p.52-56.
9. He, Rong. Reform and development of judicial administration in People's Courts. – 2014. – № 7. – P. 33–34.
10. Shen, Deyong. Scientific planning, practical work and steady promotion of the construction of "Balance Project". – 2017. – № 7. – P. 78–84.

<http://edoc.bseu.by>

Chen Mengdi
BSEU (Minsk)

THE GOVERNANCE CONCEPT OF CHINA'S PERSONAL INFORMATION
PROTECTION UNDER BLOCKCHAIN

The era of big data means that personal information has increased in recent years exponentially. Web applications and centralized organizations collect and use a large number of personal data. Although data analysis can provide personalized services for information subjects, it also raises the issue of personal information leakage and protection. A global survey report of ForgeRock's latest tool shows that the number of personal information leaks such as usernames and passwords in 2020 has increased by 450% over the previous year [1]. Criminals also combine other personal information on social networking sites to locate their identity and visit personal banks, accounts, medical records, etc.

The governance of personal information protection under the blockchain is essentially the governance of personal information by technology and law. Summarizing the current concepts of personal information protection governance under the blockchain, there are mainly regulatory governance and responsive governance.

Regulatory governance is the specific manifestation of repressive law in the technical field. It is the state's regulation of technological development through legal norms, emphasizing that technology is a tool to achieve the goal of governance on the basis of rules of law. In other words, if technology conflicts with legal norms, the technology needs to be adjusted and domesticated to meet the requirements of legal norms. In fact, the concept of regulatory governance is not conducive to technological innovation and ignores the inherent self-management value of technology. On the contrary, responsive governance embodies the requirements of responsive law, which is a concept of multiple co-governance centered on problems and self-adjusted through laws. Both of these have disadvantages.

China currently adopts the concept of integrated governance. The concept of integrated governance includes the following two aspects. Personal information involves both personal interests and property interests. This makes the personal attributes of personal information gradually specialized in the social attributes of the big data era. The law clarifies the rights of information subjects and their rights protection at the same time. Through technology we are able to ensure the reasonable flow of personal data and the best use of the material. Second, as far as blockchain technology is concerned, the technology has its governance logic, but the utility produced by the technology depends on the goal value pursued by the technology users.

As far as the law itself is concerned, on the one hand, the interactive update speed of new technologies far exceeds that of the law. The old norms are broken and the new norms have not yet been established, so social anomie will occur. In terms of interests, law and technology pursue common good, which embodies a wider range of trust interests. The protection of personal information in the context of big data does not only rely on codes run by digital technology (self-discipline) or on the rules and regulations of the national legal system (heteronomy). It is not a simple parallel governance of the two, but rather legal regulations, Technical codex, a fusion governance that combines technical code with legal norms.

References

1. FORGEROCK. – 2021. ForgeRock Consumer Identity Breach Report. – Mode of access: <https://www.forgerock.com/resources/view/122965273/analyst-report/forgerock-consumer-identity-breach-2021-report>. – Date of access: 25.11.2021.