

**IEEE P7012 Working Group  
Draft Meeting Minutes  
12 February 2019, 11:30 AM – 1:30 PM (ET)**

*Recording – Secretary, Sunil Malhotra*

**1. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 11:38 am by David P Reed, Working Group Chair.

**2. Roll call and Affiliation Declarations**

List of attendees is attached.

**3. Quorum and Membership**

Christy Bahn explained the Policies and Procedures and confirmed that she had accordingly resized the WG. Per the WG P&Ps:

“Voting membership is granted to those participants attending the first meeting of a Working Group upon their request to the Chair.

A non-voting member becomes a voting member by attending 2 of the last 4 meetings and upon sending a request for voting status to the Working Group Chair prior to the next meeting.

A voting member who has not attended at least 2 of the last 4 meetings becomes a non-voting member.”

**4. Approval of Draft Agenda**

***Motion to approve the meeting agenda.*** (Mover: Lisa LeVasseur, Second: Mark Lizar) The agenda was approved as submitted without objection.

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

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

**6. Approval of 13 November Meeting Minutes**

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

**7. Revisiting Scope and Project Organization**

**David P Reed** - The essence of a standard really is a common “*way of talking among systems*”, presumably systems that are **independent of each other and run by different entities**;

AND is a common “almost language”, that is precise enough to be understood by machines;

AND a means of using that language to conduct business among systems.

Most standards of this genre are essentially

- a dictionary / lexicon
- grammar for statements

- rules for constructing sentences, paragraphs and so on.  
At a meta level we need a specific proposed / adopted standard in various contexts. The goal of this WG is to produce a standard  
**Iain Henderson** - Information sharing under defined, standardised terms. That ranges from 'I will not share this under any terms' through to 'you can have it all and do what you like with it'.  
The key variables are 1) what data, 2) shared with whom, 3) for what purposes.

**Action / Takeaway:**

To create a **written document containing** definition of terms, representation of terms (waveforms, strings, messages, ...) and their semantics, description of how those definitions are combined into something that different systems can use and interoperate. **The standard is complete when arbitrary systems can adopt and successfully communicate in a common way.**

**8. Taxonomy revisit**

**Mary Hodder** - Recap of taxonomy discussion. Purpose of taxonomy is to lay out definitions of terms that are compiled from adopted standards. Structure of the document is

1. List of standards referenced
2. Definitions

This is a living document.

(Bernd Blobel shared the wip draft of the ISO interoperability standard via email)

**9. Machine-readable "Server information" structure**

**Mike O'Neill** - Showed and walked through the **Baycloud Bouncer** interface / dashboard showing detailed headers sent by the browser to the server and responses thereof.

- (1) Do websites comply with the DNT in the browser header?
- (2) What about analytics [outside of cookies]?

DNT - default is 1 (no consent)

Q- is there a way for a user to record an accumulating record of DNT obedience?

**Action / Takeaway:**

- Mike O'Neill will arrange **subgroup meeting** to follow up on this topic as well as data analytics questions.  
(<https://baycloud.com/bouncer>)
- Christy Bahn to revert on **version control** feature in iMeet.

**10. Reports on offline meetings**

**a. Modeling Brand Relationships**

**Lisa LeVasseur** – Presented the Brand Relationship model (earlier presented offline). Distinguished between In Physical Life (IPL) vs. In Cyber Life (ICL)

- Fundamental Rules of Engagement (RoE) IPL which ought to apply ICL because brand relationships ICL are broken.
- Egregious asymmetry of Cyber life. First Parties (Individuals) have no relationship with site or service or third parties, yet there's data / info about First Parties being shared around which there's a business.
- Subsidized data monetization- nothing wrong if there's informed consent starting from the vendor side.

Comment from **Doc Searls** via chat - *The subsidy market is a vampire one. "We need your blood to live." But they also got along without your blood before vampirism became normative.*

- There's a distinction between Relationship (remembered) terms and - Transactional (per transaction) terms along the lifecycle of the brand relationship(s).
- There's no anonymous window shopping ICL

**b. No Stalking use case current status**

**Mary Hodder** – Based on offline meetings and progress, some key changes made to the taxonomy document. The main modification to the **NoStalking** Use Case (Updated iMeet link <https://ieeesa.imeetcentral.com/p/aQAAAAADuJGc>) was that earlier there was only one scenario viz. OLD WORLD SCENARIO

**Added**- NEW WORLD SCENARIO triggered by Doc that we shouldn't assume that we always have to be in SLAVE position. To consider using the **NoStalking** Use Case to develop a **NoStalking** machine layer and engineering code that puts individuals in equal standing.

**Added**- DRAFT SCENARIO to address individuals who interact with apps and working of the app model.

**Added**- ALTERNATIVE PATHS for apps.

There may be a need to update contracts / terms  
Marketplace for operating via APIs

Comments from chat:

- Not necessary to know all the other parties, if they're not stalking. If a person says, "show me ads if you like, but don't track me," that should be easy to obey, and record, machine to machine.
- Should hidden ACTORS also be taken as part of the use case?

**Action / Takeaways:**

- Add Internationalization as a placeholder in the document.
- From Lisa's presentation, consider adding subscription instead of only preventing use of data / info.
- Follow up WG meetings to be scheduled between monthly meetings. Need to pick / standardize between Zoom and Webex.

### 11. Call for contributions

This was not discussed owing to shortage of time.

### 12. Project Planning for this working group

This was not discussed owing to shortage of time.

### 13. Other Miscellaneous topics

None

### 14. Future Meetings

- 09 April 2019, 11:30 AM – 1:30 PM (EDT)

- 14 May 2019, 11:30 AM – 1:30 PM (EDT)

### 15. Adjourn

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation	Role	Officer
Victor	Grey	JLINC Labs	V	
Bernd	Blobel	University of Regensburg, Medical Faculty	V	
Gurshabad	Grover	Centre for Internet and Society, India	V	
Lisa	LeVasseur	Wrethink	V	Co-Chair
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	Ideaforms	V	Secretary
Jim	Pasquale	Digi.me	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	
Iain	Henderson	Customer Commons & JLINC Labs	NV	
Mike	O'Neill	Baycloud Systems Ltd.	NV	
Patrick Gage	Kelley	Google	P	
Andrew	Maffei	Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution	P	

Lubna	Dajani	MD Allternet Ltd.	P	
Christy	Bahn	IEEE-SA (staff)		