

**IEEE P7012 Working Group  
Meeting Minutes  
16 October 2018, 11:30 AM – 1:30 PM (EDT)**  
*Recording – Secretary, Sunil Malhotra*

**1. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 11:36 am by Lisa LeVasseur, Working Group Vice-Chair.

Christy Bahn, IEEE-SA, Program Manager noted that the working group meeting would be recorded for purposes of generating the meeting minutes and the recording would be deleted once the minutes were produced. She asked if there were any concerns or issues with recording the meeting. No one spoke up.

**2. Roll call of Individuals and Affiliation Declarations**

List of attendees is attached.

**3. Approval of Agenda**

***Motion to approve the meeting agenda.*** (Mover: Doc Searls, Second: Sunil Malhotra) The agenda was approved as submitted without objection.

**4. IEEE Patent Policy: [Call for Patents](#)**

The call for patents was raised; no one raised any concerns or any comments for consideration.

**5. Approval of 21 August Meeting Minutes**

***Motion to approve the meeting minutes.*** (Mover: Jim Pasquale, Second: Gurshabad Grover) The minutes were approved as submitted without objection.

**6. Approval of 25 September Meeting Minutes**

***Motion to approve the meeting minutes.*** (Mover: Jim Pasquale, Second: Doc Searls) The minutes were approved as submitted without objection.

**7. Reports on work assigned at Previous Meeting** 

**a. Mark Lizar update on W3C Taxonomy group update**

- i. Taxonomy:** Mary Hodder explained the structure of the taxonomy document (<https://bit.ly/2EFz46c>) and further explained that the document was assembled / compiled from other identity projects for the last 5-7 years. Our group could use it as a template and add / remove items to create our own taxonomy.

Lisa LeVasseur felt that the word “terms” is unclear as a standalone and asked if it meant terms of privacy, engagement or service, in the context of building the infrastructure. Doc Searls explained that 1) We’re not just users and 2) We’re not just submitting, because both seem to suggest that we are the **Second Party rather than the First Party**, which makes us subordinate. The idea behind this working group is that **“Contract”** is the overarching concept of the way this will work.

The main idea is that we as First Parties can proffer, not submit, terms to sites and services, which are Second Parties, in a way that an agreement can be reached and recorded. Doc also emphasized that the scope of this WG is fairly narrowly confined as to how a machine responds to terms, not a policy. Eg. The first one at Customer Commons (<http://customercommons.org/home/tools/terms/>) is “just show me it’s not based on tracking”, where the Second Party can agree and record.

To Lisa’s question on whether these words relate to our WG specifically, Mary clarified that the words had been contextualized and suitably modified from their strict dictionary meanings.

Joyce suggested that it might help if Mark and/or Mary, who are familiar with the terms, could pick what might apply in this WG and also that instead of **User Submitted** terms, we could switch to **First Party Submitted** terms, to extend First Party status to entities as well. Mary suggested that we not cut down the taxonomy list yet but do it down the road when the machine readable layer was also available.

- ii. **The Framework levels:** Lisa suggested a use case with different levels of trust, and proposed we should think of a framework that allows such. Doc however, stressed the importance of keeping a narrow scope and emphasized that we cannot drive this with the existing or planned design for anybody who’s operating as a Second Party.

In most cases we are looking at machine readability being open to negotiation, being open to subsequent modification of contract but primarily **“we agree or we don’t agree.”** We don’t want to foreclose the possibility of negotiation, but starting out with negotiation will not work. Accordingly, we can begin with a simple request, as in Customer Commons, “Please show me ads, simply make sure you’re not tracking me,” is what should drive the mandate of the WG.

Lisa proposed creating language for the taxonomy (even something as fundamental as 'contract term' does not figure in it) especially definitions coming from the First Party. Mary added that since First Party terms had not been used before, we could look at other digital standards and also create our own definitions where no words can be found.

Adrian Gropper wanted to understand if TLS (Transport Security Layer) could be used for the handshake and Mary shared the example of Medium's response to "Do Not Track", even though it was not a completed standard. There are other browser features we could also use. The W3C standards for "Do Not Track" have a header we can use. Basically we will have to create our own taxonomy.

**Takeaway+ /Actions:**

- Everybody is invited to send any missing term(s) that we feel could be relevant, even if they are just placeholders.

**b. Sunil Data Points on India**

- i. India Vectors:** Sunil explained specific differences in the India context, the largest impact coming in the exercising of agency by First Parties, many of whom are illiterate and are not aware of their rights. The role of **Fourth Parties, therefore becomes crucial.**



A third of the world population is India + China - Fourth Party role a balancing feature

Doc explained that a Fourth Party, unlike a Third Party, represents the individual and is an extension of their personal agency. The key reason to bring attention to these data points is to ensure that the standards are more widely applicable and can include realities of developing countries (A high-level view of the vectors, above). The paradox of India's technology landscape is that while it has one of the largest populations of smartphones in the world, people hardly even know what they agree to when they click "I accept" on any site / service. Secondly, the culture of middlemen persists, making individual agency one step removed, effectively introducing another layer of potential tracking. Sunil suggested using the above picture as a baseline to help pick India-relevant factors for this WG to include / exclude from the standards.

Doc summarized that there's a substantial population of the world that's going to need the Fourth Party role in the regime of Machine Readable Terms. **Individuals are going to be represented by agents and our standards must be useful to them as well.** Additionally, a significant aspect of what we're doing has to be open / amenable to Online Dispute Resolution, even by machines. Lisa said this was a great example to flesh out the practical role of Fourth Parties.

Bernd Blobel pointed to the need for specifications of the solution that would allow negotiation between parties within the online dispute resolution mechanism. (Not sure if this is what Bernd meant)

Sunil suggested creating user stories and use cases from a customer experience standpoint to uncover unmet needs of First Parties. Lisa noted that David Alexander had already started work doing this.

Doc explained that in a client-server world there are as many different ways of interacting with a site or service as there are logins and passwords. What we are trying to create are user journeys on our side, and this makes the contract approach helpful. However, the journey we need to describe is one where the individual (**First Party**) has **"one standard way of doing one kind of interaction with everybody else in the world that is operating as the Second Party."**

**Takeaway +/- Actions:** We want to produce a very user-centric (view it as an idealized flow) of what the user as a First Party is and is trying to do.

- ii. Machine-Readable-Privacy JSON-LD context document:** Victor Grey (JLINC Labs) had sent an email on 10 October 2108 specific deliverable for the WG, proposing a JSON Linked Data contract definition. Accordingly we need a table with a list of “terms” (names of properties) that point to a JSON-LD context document to have a machine readable context. In order for 2 machines to agree to a contract, they **both need to be able to reference existing, standard pieces of contracts which can be assembled and that can be identified by “hashing” them.**

Mark Lizar emphasized that creating a handshake using the hashing method would be a simple and powerful way to start. Mary further allayed Bernd Blobel’s concerns around feasibility of the approach by presenting the example of “Stalking Terms” that Customer Commons has proposed for advertising. The term is proffered as a 4-part piece to be accepted by the other entity as a Yes / No.

- iii. Reference Architecture:** Lisa observed that in developing the handshake, we need a reference architecture, meaning entities that will talk to each other. At some point we will need a functional representation, especially something that maps to the functional entities that are being defined in the taxonomy.

- c. David Alexander Update on Architecture Scaffold and Use Cases – Could not attend the meeting due to a personal emergency.**

**Takeaway +/Actions:**

- WG to check-in with David Alexander offline and see if he has begun any work.
- Mary to share the document / wiki of the terms.

## **8. Short presentations on relevant external standards efforts**

**a. Bernd Blobel**

Bernd Blobel presented the **Architecture-Centric, Ontology-Based Approach** to system / solution design. Using the example of healthcare, he showed how Provider Policy falls short in the case of personalized care situations where you have to consider the actors, their contexts and needs as well as the individual patient’s environment and expectations. He also showed a representation of a system that is currently being piloted on the **ISO Interoperability Reference Architecture**.

**Takeaway +/Actions:**

- Bernd has already circulated the presentation via email on 25 Sep 2018. [IEEE WG 7012 - Architecture-Centric, Ontology-Based

Approach to Policies.pdf]  
- Bernd will share some references to instances.

**b. Others**

No other items were proposed.

**9. Future Meetings**

- 13 November, 11:30 AM – 1:30 PM (EDT)
- 11 December, 11:30 AM – 1:30 PM (EDT)

**10. Adjourn**

***Motion to adjourn the meeting.*** (Mover: Lisa, Second: Sunil)

The meeting was adjourned at 1:35 pm

***Attendees***

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation	Role	Officer
Victor	Grey	JLINC Labs	P	
Bernd	Blobel	University of Regensburg, Medical Faculty	V	
Adrian	Gropper	Patient Privacy Rights	V	
Gurshabad	Grover	Centre for Internet and Society, India	V	
Iain	Henderson	Customer Commons & JLINC Labs	V	
Mary	Hodder	Customer Commons & JLINC Labs	V	
Dean	Landsman	PDEC	V	
Lisa	LeVasseur	Wrethink	V	Chair
Mark	Lizar	Open Consent Group Ltd	V	
Sunil	Malhotra	Ideafarms	V	Secretary
Mike	O'Neill	Baycloud Systems Ltd.	V	
Jim	Pasquale	digi.me Ltd	V	
Doc	Searls	Customer Commons	V	

Joyce	Searls	Customer Commons & Sovrin Foundation	V	
-------	--------	---	---	--

Christy      Bahn      IEEE-SA (staff)

V = Voting Member
P = Participant

**Resources / Chat transcripts:** Via Christy Bahn

**16 October 2018 - WG Meeting WebEx Chat**

Comment/Question 1: Here is the Taxonomy:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1KwsKwLbuThBDtGx2TZwhuSYmdMrQDI9vBHhGY5YpW50/edit#>

Comment/Question 2: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Transport\\_Layer\\_Security](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Transport_Layer_Security)

Comment/Question 3: Relevant: <https://gizmodo.com/do-not-track-the-privacy-tool-used-by-millions-of-peop-1828868324>

Comment/Question 4:

<https://www.google.com/search?q=vrm+%22fourth+party%22>

Comment/Question 5: Something to discuss before this session ends: focusing discussion at IIW, which some of us will be attending next week:

<http://iiworkshop.org> Ahead of then, on Monday, we'll be planning at VRM Day:

<http://vrmday2018b.eventbrite.com>. <http://vrmday2018b.eventbrite.com>

Comment/ Question 6:

<https://kantarinitiative.org/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=80053232>

Comment/Question 7: Human and Legal Readable layers example for the

<https://kantarinitiative.org/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=80053232>

