IEEE P7012 Working Group
Draft Meeting Minutes
13 November 2018, 11:30 AM – 1:30 PM (ET)
Recording – Secretary, Sunil Malhotra

1. **Call to Order**
   The meeting was called to order at 11:30 am by David P Reed, Working Group Chair.

2. **Roll call and Affiliation Declarations**
   List of attendees is attached.

3. **Approval of Agenda**
   Motion to approve the meeting agenda. (Mover: Doc Searls, Second: Dean Landsman) 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 16 October Meeting Minutes**
   Motion to approve the meeting minutes. (Mover: Joyce Searls, Second: Dean Landsman) The minutes were approved as submitted without objection.

6. **Collaboration platform iMeet Central**
   David R noted that the mailing list didn't seem to be the most efficient way for us to collaborate and, since IEEE has made available the iMeet platform for its WGs, we could think of using it. Christy Bahn volunteered to introduce iMeet Central and took attendees through its features and aspects. She explained that it is a document repository and has discussion areas, calendar and a wiki feature. Spreadsheets and pdf documents can be collaborated on but **not** Word documents.

   Christy suggested that access be revoked for voting members who had not attended meetings for an extended period, but also that such members could request access after they attend at least one meeting.

   Takeaway +/Actions:
   - It was agreed to use the iMeet Central as the platform for collaboration of the WG.
   - Christy will send an invite to all members after the meeting.

7. **Reports on work from previous meeting**

   a. **David Alexander Update on Architecture Scaffold and Use Cases**

David A expressed displeasure that there had been no engagement or participation in the early effort he had put into creating the outline, roles and activities. He explained the principles he had used-

Principle 1: Don't reinvent the wheel
Put together a basic list of links from Eve Maler, Doc Searls, Iain Henderson, JLINC, …

Principle 2: Think in terms of scaffolding
To get the architecture right for delivering a minimum viable proposition that can work.

i. **Scope of the WG:**
David A said that everybody had worked on their own reference architecture and might think that theirs would be the "right mousetrap" but that would not be the best way to go. Setting up of this group was to create something **small, thin and highly utilitarian** and a **mechanism of extension** so it isn't frozen in time.

David R clarified that our job was **"not to create a reference architecture as a standard, but to create a mechanism by which reference architectures could have a small common set of elements, so that they could interoperate."**

ii. **Focus on interoperability:**
David R explained that we are a very small group focused on interoperability cautioning that we would waste too much time if we looked at too many alternatives, even if they are complementary. As Doc had explained, we are looking to create a minimal standard that would allow negotiation to happen, and, as an architect, it simply **entails reaching an agreement on the meaning of basic messages, which meaning comes not from the message itself but the context.**
Interoperability means some basic terms (terminology) and a descriptive programming language through which to express what is wanted or what is being agreed to.

We cannot use the privacy implementations of other standards because the context is different and therefore cannot interoperate. **The most important contribution of this WG is to provide a way for other solutions to work together.**
David R illustrated using the Standards of the Internet with the goal to create interoperability between diverse groups. They had to start bottom-up to unify efforts, with something small viz. **How do you format a message and how do you describe source and destination.** Just that piece is **the bottom of the Internet**! There are mechanisms to build on top of that (TCP,

Packet Voice, DNS,…).

iii. Use Cases:
An idea that we have talked about is to take a Customer Commons agreement and code it on a very low level mechanism such that it can be negotiated by machines.

iv. Concept Oriented Architecture (COA) vs. Information Oriented Architecture (IOA):
Bernd brought out that privacy is not limited to terms. Introducing Concept Oriented Architecture, a reference architecture based on concepts that are interoperable, he shared that at a recent ISO meeting in Italy, a decision was made to move reference architectures to a formal, normative standard: <u>a basic reference considering interoperability as a knowledge sharing issue and therefore based on the concepts behind them, not just the ICT (Information & Communication Technology) led information items and objects but going beyond to what is meant by them</u>.

Implementing this isn't about programming. The basic issue is about expressing the intentions, expectations and constraints properly which is done by first focusing on understanding what the different parties (actors) are dealing with in the negotiation and then having to do something to come to an agreement. Thereafter it becomes an implementable artifact.

Examples of COA: The main difference between object orientation and concept orientation is that the ICT representation of information objects is not common across domains. Eg. If a lawyer refers to a person via a person object, a medical doctor would not have the same concept of the person, nor would a nurse or a technician. As a result, perspectives of different decision makers looking at the same information object would be different. Instead of an ICT representation, **concept harmonization** is needed for <u>interoperability viz. collaboration between different stakeholders from different domains, education and disciplines based on their own intentions, understanding, etc</u>. In other words, **Interoperability Reference Architecture operates in the Knowledge Space**.

According to Bernd, in order for the solution to be interoperable, we should not start with defining terms (taxonomy) as information objects or data objects since user intentions (especially if they are from different domains and contexts) cannot be properly understood or harmonized. To which Mary noted that the reason the taxonomy document has been kept

open to changes, as a living document, is precisely to cover the point Bernd makes. Bernd emphasized that mere terms and terminology would be inadequate. The challenge would be for people to come to a common understanding / agreement on concept representations which in turn would need to refer to official ontologies. Concepts are different domain-wise and such an ontology framework would help laypersons express terms that can be understood across domains.

Creative Commons to the rescue: Doc proposed this as a **signal–response** with an opening for negotiation. Opening specifically means that it is not just something to accept or reject, but logically a way to say "No, but" or "Yes, and". **The solution must have a way for somebody to signal from their side as a First Party, to be accepted by the Second Party, and recorded**. Our model is similar to Creative Commons: what we don't want to have is—"Here are thousands of possible responses a company can have to an inquiry from an individual (First Party). <u>We need something that's understandable in simple, logical and straightforward language.</u>**

v. **Should we prototype?**
Adrian and Bernd got into a debate on the better approach between dynamic context harmonization and a list of binary questions leading Mary to suggest we take a prototyping approach using the work done already done in the taxonomy document. Accordingly, it would make sense to take one of the terms already created at the human and legal readable levels and build a schema, so as to have something tangible to review and critique.

David R agreed with Mary's suggestion that this could be done offline, adding that we should keep in mind that whatever we're trying to do should be seen from the point of view of a business and if they would willingly adopt the standard. **<u>"It's not that you can't express what a privacy seeking individual wants, but that you might not be able to express what the privacy seeing individual might allow in exchange for getting value."</u>**

b. **Taxonomy update**
This item was covered under **7 a.** above, and not discussed as a separate agenda topic.

Takeaway +/Actions:

1. Scope of WG is becoming clearer –interoperability is key, standard to be small, thin and highly utilitarian with a mechanism of extension.
2. Resolve debate over Concept Oriented Architecture (COA) vs. Information Oriented Architecture (IOA)
3. Take decision on prototyping the "No Stalking" terms of Customer Commons by creating a schema for the group to review and evaluate. To be hashed out on the iMeet platform to start drawing connections between work done, work partly done and work in progress, etc.
4. In order to have convergence on the above discussions we should start with David A's architecture scaffolding idea and the taxonomy presented by Mary Hodder / Mark Lizar during the October 16, 2018 meeting and create **ONE** use case before the next meeting scheduled for December 11, 2018. Doing it in the context of iMeet would be ideal.

8. Learning from IIW – Discussion led by Doc Searls

Doc had shared a slide (available at https://ieee-sa.imeetcentral.com/p/aQAAAAADuZJa) of the IIW Report

There is an appetite for something simple. A lot of different efforts are gaining energy.

Report

- Must the standard apply to terms alone i.e. starting with the term and ending in a contract on both sides, or can it be loose enough to map to the physical world where we send constant privacy signals to others?
  - We're open to conversation or we're not, open to being followed or not, more private or less private, … in ways that are more casual or vernacular rather than formal or formalized.
  Doc — "It's hard to take something that's highly vernacular and put it in a programmatic environment."
- GDPR – the prevailing interpretation by lawyers working for companies is that individuals cannot be data controllers but instead, are data subjects. Lawyers working for our side confirm that GDPR provides that individuals can control their own data.
  Eve — There's a lot wrong about the ways GDPR is being interpreted." Eve.
- Lamentation of lost respect for the deep stuff (the Net's base protocols, FOSS code & methods).
- General impression is that only way to deal with a site or service is through AI and/or ML on both sides.
  Doc — "My AI" came up.
- Although it isn't directly applicable to this WG, whether or not you can sell your data is a hot topic.
- General need for use cases.

Discussions

The US Privacy Act of 1974 prohibited government from collecting personal data of citizens. In 1998 WSJ reported a workaround by 35 government agencies that bought the entire database of US Citizens from 3rd party data aggregators.

Takeaway +/Actions:
1. **Mary** — How can we provide safeguards while designing this standard having agencies treat us as equal parties and don't try to circumvent the requirements of data privacy?
2. Can we also take into account what US citizens fear vs the privacy requirements of other parts of the world?

9. **Project Planning for this working group**

David R has sent out a rough timeline for this WG. He explained that the typical time frame for standards is 3 to 4 years: the work gets done in the first year and the remaining time is spent responding to concerns and getting approvals etc.

Takeaway +/Actions:
1. David R will upload the project timelines to iMeet Central.
2. Members to review and get back to group and/or David R with dates, concerns, suggestions, scope and other elements.

10. **Short presentations on relevant external standards efforts**
    a. **Others**

No other items were proposed.

11. **Future Meetings**
- 11 December, 11:30 AM – 1:30 PM (ET)
- 8 January, 11:30 AM – 1:30 PM (ET)

Daylight savings impacts India negatively, Sunil requested moving the call to an hour earlier in the winter.

Sunil needs somebody to fill in as Secretary for the December call.

Takeaway +/Actions:
1. David R will create another Doodle poll to check if this is possible. If too many members drop off, there will be no change in the current scheduled time.
2. Send out a volunteer request on the group for filling in as Secretary in the 11 December call. If nobody puts their hand up, Christy has kindly agreed to take notes and will share the call recording with Sunil.

12. **Adjourn**

Motion to adjourn the meeting. (Mover: David R, Second: Doc)
The meeting was adjourned at 1:30 pm

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation	Role	Officer
Victor	Grey	JLINC Labs	P	
David	Alexander	Mydex CIC	V	
Bernd	Blobel	University of Regensburg, Medical Faculty	V	
Adrian	Gropper	Patient Privacy Rights	V	
Eve	Maler	ForgeRock	V	
Iain	Henderson	Customer Commons & JLINC Labs	V	
Mary	Hodder	Customer Commons & JLINC Labs	V	
Dean	Landsman	PDEC	V	
David	Reed	Deep Plum Research	V	Chair
Mark	Lizar	Open Consent Group Ltd	V	
Sunil	Malhotra	Ideafarms	V	Secretary
Colin	Wallis	Kantara Initiative	V	
Zbynek	Loebl	independent ODR expert + internet and ICT lawyer, PRK Partners, Czechia	V	
Doc	Searls	Customer Commons	V	
Joyce	Searls	Customer Commons & Sovrin Foundation	V	
Christy	Bahn	IEEE-SA (staff)		

V = Voting Member
P = Participant