

IEEE P7012 Working Group
Unofficial Meeting - Notes
11 December 2018, 11:30 AM – 1:30 PM (ET)

Since the quorum requirements were not met, this was designated an unofficial WG meeting.

1. Generally agreed by attendees that iMeet would be adequate for collaboration. Are there other modes of collaboration besides asynchronous?
2. Discussion around the use case combining taxonomy and architecture scaffolding. Mary explained that the document is only meant to give a light description to set out a framework that can be discussed in detail. The idea is to work on it in wiki fashion to get the framework right before doing the deep dives into any of the fields. We can do a fleshed out use case. David A had suggested that we add mobile and other devices into it.
3. Models and procedures / approaches we can borrow from Creative Commons or emulate.
4. Stick with #**NoStalking** use case as outlined by Mary Hodder (<https://bit.ly/2LJ51dW>)
5. We want to break out of the client-server way of looking at things because it has become standard practice to treat individuals as second parties.
6. **Victor** - First Party, Second Party etc. wasn't getting across what we wanted so we started calling one the **Data Rights Holder** – entity that has moral or legal rights to the data being shared, which is often an individual but could also be a company. The receiving / agreeing party is the **Data Custodian**.
7. **Adrian** – Can we think of using IRC the way W3C uses it, as an option to WebEx. Added benefit to be able to auto-generate minutes and for queuing up speakers.
8. Can we think of not going through a standards process and instead multiple Registries that hold terms that can be referred to by each party's agent. While the agent might be using a web browser, it must be assumed to be an automaton which has its own intelligence and Machine Learning capabilities. **Action:** David Reed to have follow on conversation offline with Adrian to eval.
9. **David R-** We tend to think "web" because it is the most developed interoperable system, but we also have privacy issues and relationships being built outside since the web's mechanisms are awkward and non-standard for maintaining identity. Here we're developing a more general idea that fits into a handshake, which if we can make simple and small without dependency on other standards of the web, but able to but expressed in the web identification handshake saying "*I'm the same guy*" at every request.
10. Thinking through a use case on the web is fine but we also need others like IPFS which has a distributed file system rather than a server.

11. The data custodian role must be thought through because it might play a pivotal role down the road. Maybe a step beyond **#NoStalking** —“Don’t allow others to stalk me either.”
12. **Doc-** there’s a dysfunctional response on the server side on GDPR which does not hold up to its spirit. To have something on the side of the individual where we’re not being tracked and cookies of third parties are not being injected AND info is not being shared with other parties, and we agree to some term (common vocabulary) which says, “Yes, that is what the user wants,” we then record it. The answer to most of these problems is **cranking up the agency on the individual’s side.**
13. **Mike** explained the differences between US and Europe with regard to the 2009 **do not track** initiative and also explained the ‘political’ ramifications of W3C. Mary pointed out that the world was different back then and in case of **do not track** Yahoo forced opt-in as default. Today there is more will to create laws for individuals. Her proposal is to make this a individual centric framework and figure out how to communicate back and forth where potentially express a desire for something and we can effectively make it an opt out.
14. **David R-** A significant change since 2009 is that “Anonymity has failed”. Going beyond the web handshake and adding agency, an idea would be to go with strong identity, i.e. in any interaction, provide a token of who you are and add the ability to find your agent. The agent can read a proposal at will (can we have machine-readable interactions). This means you can adapt to situations—even direct some requests to you as a human—instead of trying to construct a contract that can survive all changes. Basically, presume you have an identity, you can be reached and hand over the power over your information to the agent. No anonymity needed. (Adrian added pseudonymity.)
15. Google’s progressive webapps where a local server is added on the user side. **David R** shared that it is easier to introduce a standard into something that’s in the middle of its evolution. An easier path might be to get privacy into progressive web apps. On the issue of reliability brought up by **Adrian**, **Mary** explained that app makers are paying more attention to resources.
16. Many of the things we would like to achieve by sharing personal data—medical care, online shopping, etc.—cannot be done by seeking more anonymity. To the extent we need to share could spawn new ideas of how. Eg. Identity data that is for a session.
17. **Mary** walked everybody through the **#NoStalking** use case and workflow. Basic elements
 - pieces of code on both sides that can talk to each other
 - Data schema
 - record keeping if agreement is reached
18. **IMPORTANT!** Discussion around simple and complex terms - **Mike** pointed out that in the case of complex terms or those where adjustments are made, it would create a “fingerprint”, thereby resulting in the opposite of what we’re trying to do.
Doc shared the background of the first version of **#NoStalking** and

suggested pre-establishing the pieces and combining them into making ONE term.

- 19. David R** – Concept of registry that comprises a list of all terms but could also be an intermediary like a “**secure enclave**” (from Security) where matching and validations are done without exposing. The result is a message back to both parties — “Terms are agreed”. **Doc** isn’t sure if we should finalize the trusted intermediary approach just yet.
- 20. Mary**- Decentralized means that the whole marketplace agrees to a standard set of terms which don’t change but can be augmented as new technologies and scenarios emerge.
- 21.** It was decided to do an offline sub-group meeting to brainstorm the use case further which **Mary** volunteered to lead. Results of this will be shared in the January 2019 WG meeting.

Note: Chat transcript will be created by **Christy** and is not included in these notes.