**IEEE P7012 Working Group**

Unofficial Meeting - Notes
11 June 2019, 11:30 AM – 1:30 PM (ET)

Since the quorum requirements were not met at the time of the roll call and attendance, this was designated an unofficial WG meeting.

1. New attendees to be sent welcome mail by Secretary / Program Manager outlining Policies & Procedures (P&P) for requesting voting status from Chair when it becomes applicable.
2. Our sponsor is IEEE Society on Social Implications of Technology/Social Implications of Technology Standards Committee (SSIT/SC). Volunteers invited to **liaison (technical)** with other WGs.
3. We need a **technical editor** to bring together all the parts of the draft standard. A young professional / student who has skills and interest (ad finds value in doing this for her resume) would be ideal. This person must be a member of the WG to qualify as a candidate. According to IEEE P&P, there has to be an **election via email ballot**.
4. This meeting reached a quorum after the roll call and affiliations had been completed. In such cases, it can be declared as an official meeting and approvals for draft minutes may be taken subsequently. (This was not known at the time of the meeting).
**Action:** Christy to **coordinate approval of draft minutes** of the May 14, 2019 meeting, **via email ballot**.
5. Bernd’s presentation in the offline meeting is a conceptual model that is aspirational. We should **use the ISO 22600 as the basis** for our standard. The WG needs to fully understand and process ISO 22600.
**Action:** Christy to share the document.
6. The use case call was attended by Lisa and Jim. Lisa proposed a “template” approach which was debated at length. David noted that the word ‘template’ viz a collection of terms to negotiate with the other party, is not right because our standard likely has unanticipated use cases. The standard should focus on what kind of language we need to use for **machine-readableness and machine-actionableness**. Instead of templates, we should use “registries”, which hold vetted and unvetted terms along with information on who has vetted them for what purpose. Doc explained that keeping it simple and limited to contract law should be the remit of our standard.
7. Mary- Use cases can come from product development (start with user goals) or engineering focused (the server needs to connect with a device).

Lisa illustrated the output of her use case spreadsheet rolled up into an prototype with “levers” / “switches” to help users avoid tyranny of choice. No stalking must be the default from the user’s perspective.

1. There are 2 levels of use cases. At the lower level what the engineers are supposed to build and the higher level what the users are trying to achieve (as stated in their own terms). In this, because it’s machine readable and it’s focused on terms, it’s focused on the lower level of specification. **Machine readable means how the machines can communicate on behalf of users**: one of the reason for being machine readable rather than directly user/human understandable is because we need to translate what the user wants into machine readable form. Users may or may not understand that translation. This is a machine language of terms, similar to machine language of a contract. **The actual words of a contract are a legal assembly language for terms**. Each party’s lawyer is the “agent” which, in our case, could be software.
2. Most people really want a trusted source that can protect their interests (privacy). Research shows that 96% of people would like to depend on experts they can trust to just tell them the right choice(s).
3. Putting our group’s work in context, Customer Commons is like the the trusted lawyer on the individual’s side, and our WG is working at a lower level: we’re a machine readable framework into which Customer Commons’ various legal structures and contracting procedures can be translated for machines to operate with.
4. **Adrian** suggests a gap analysis between an existing solution that allows users to specify privacy terms, and what we hope to put into our standard. E.g. Conde Nast has implemented user-settable privacy terms via the cookie warning box. <https://www.condenast.com/privacy-policy/#introduction>
5. **David**- Despite the fact that people want a technical solution to privacy, it cannot arise from the technology itself. The technology can only do the book-keeping of agreements that are largely scoped outside the system.
6. **Lisa**- There are 3 lists of use cases we can work with
	1. **Iain / John h**ave worked on an example that has 6 reasons for why an organization should be storing personal data, 20 data types and several purposes for use of the data;
	2. **Customer Commons** use cases
	3. **Lisa’s** list

**Action:** Mary agreed to drive the use case work.

1. **Adrian- Self Sovereign Identity** should be looked at when there’s a need for signatures and when we start talking about machine readability in context of the contract. Push it back by 3-4 months.

**Note:** Chat transcript is not included in these notes.