

**IEEE P7012 Working Group
Draft Meeting Minutes
14 May 2019, 11:30 AM – 1:30 PM (EDT)**
Recording – Secretary, Sunil Malhotra

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 11:33 AM (EDT) by David Reed, Working Group Chair. A quorum was established and noted.

2. Roll call and Affiliation Declarations

List of attendees is attached.

3. Approval of Draft Agenda

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

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

Update by David Reed on the Veripath patent and PatCom status. We have to get a letter of approval from the patent holder. The line "*early identification of holders of potential patent claims is encouraged*" is nuanced. Concern is naturally focused on whether issued patents contain claims that are "essential", that is, must be infringed in order to practice the standard.

There are two goals:

- 1) Reducing barriers to the adoption of the standard,
- 2) Not fueling any potential patent litigation that may damage users of the standard or IEEE.

There are rules about the kind of discussions we are allowed to have. Our concern as a WG is whether there are issued patents that are "essential". We are not allowed to discuss the status of any ongoing or threatened litigation.

Participants have no duty to conduct patent landscape analysis and therefore no duty to identify patents that may conflict with our standard.

Action / Takeaway:

David will act in accordance with PatCom policy and contact Veripath.

5. Approval of 9 April Meeting Minutes

Motion to approve the meeting minutes. (Mover: Sunil Malhotra, Second: Doc Searls) The draft minutes were approved as submitted without objection.

6. Drafting Section 1 of 7012

Lisa LeVasseur – uploaded revised version to iMeet on 13 May.
(<https://iee-sa.imeetcentral.com/p/aQAAAAAD2oaX>)

We need to create a structure and outline for the standard. There are IEEE templates which can be referenced. We can use Bernd Blobel's experience with the process for creating the standard. Bernd has suggested that we could use, as a starting point, the ISO 22600 document for reference. Bernd suggested that we create smaller sub-groups to work on different chapters which he will be happy to coordinate bilaterally.

Action / Takeaway:

- Need for organizational support to set up calls and for program management.
- Need for task structure.
- Lisa to circulate Draft of Section 1 as attachment, to the list.
- Provisional approval of Section 1 in next meeting.

7. Follow-up on offline meetings

- a. List of use cases** – Lisa presented a spreadsheet to understand the use cases and to open the discussion. The WG was walked through one use case in the context of time and in setting up the Me2B relationship.

Bernd explained the intent of the GDPR and explained the typical cookie notices we are seeing are not respectful of the GDPR because of the dynamic nature of the agreement.

Another element of consent even in the GDPR is identification of the parties since there is no such thing in law as an anonymous contract.

The other issue around identity is that privacy is about persons, and not data. Eg. My computer has a particular signature that can be detected by a web server and can be used to define me as a person without my presenting any credentials.

If we start with "vendor collects", there is no negotiation and no agency. Start with the user agent as the default so it does not allow me to be identified. Either we have to assume that nothing is going to be stored about the individual, or we assume that we're using a browser for our agent not to be associated with any domain.

There are 2 arguments with regard to browser fingerprinting

1. To provide better service and so we don't have to have everybody log in on every click;
2. The other party can be devious and surveil you whether you like it or not.

Action / Takeaway:

- Smaller group discussion on identification and identity.
- Lisa's list of use cases should be hashed out. Lisa will work on a separate sub group.
- Process vs. Data – something we should capture.

b. Crafting the **outline specifications of the standard**

- Sunil to work on outline of the standard.

c. Self **Sovereign Identity (SSI) how identity will be represented in future systems –**

Adrian- Starting with SSI as the root of agency on the part of the individual would be the best way to organize what we're planning to do. We want to assume human technical agency as the goal.

Proposal to start with the following as given:

1. You have a SSI which may or may not be the same domain but you get to choose.
2. The identity is usable as a way to sign a contract or executing the proof that you are in control of that identity.
3. The identity points to a user agent which might be your browser but could also be something much more sophisticated.

a) Q: Is there an existing process that defines how SSI can be created in a technical context?

A: Yes

b) Q: Are the terms of SSI specifically limited to something like the world wide web or is there a more general notion? Eg. Facial recognition.

A: The framework of SSI is concerned with achiness and communication related to identity and agency around those. If there's a machine involved, eg. like your wallet, which you control then it is under SSI. In facial recognition, your face is not something you control unless you wear a Guy Fawkes mask and reveal as much as you wish.

Doc- It starts with the model of agency in the real world. The main difference from how we have been handling identity in the industrial world is that it doesn't look at issuance of a driving license or credit card as identity but as a verifiable claim.

Starting with the position that the individual is in charge of the presentation of credentials and the credentials can be verified.

The privacy terms should state what types of identities the parties can use in carrying out privacy. It does imply tight connection with SSI. Can we, in the language of our standard, refer to SSI and its

properties, and how it gets connected to terms. That needs to be written and described either with reference to an existing standard or with reference to an existing conceptual model which can be implemented by other standards.

Action / Takeaway:

- Adrian will draft a few paragraphs on SSI to incorporate into our standard.

8. Open Consent Frameworks

Kantara is an open consent framework among others that need to define terms and one of the potential roles of our standard is to provide interoperability between frameworks.

Jim- V2 seeks to move beyond the scope of simple consent to more of agreement and authorization to share specific kinds of information. It's an agreement that binds requester and responder in a relationship or a kind of communication.

Lisa- Kantara is not a fully fleshed out consent framework and one of the most real artifacts is the "consent receipt" which is a transaction log. We should focus our energy on mutually agreed upon information sharing agreements.

David- The idea of terms is to specify meaning rather than process. What we need is a way to define the meaning of the receipts or record or logs that can be interpreted across a larger scope of application.

Lisa- One possible point of convergence in the roadmap for consent is a baby step of what eventually will fall into a richer "mutually agreed upon information sharing agreement". That seems to be the relationship between our work and the terms frameworks.

9. Project Planning for this working group

Covered in general but not discussed.

10. Other Miscellaneous topics

None

11. Future Meetings

- 11 June 2019, 11:30 AM – 1:30 PM (EDT)
- 9 July 2019, 11:30 AM – 1:30 PM (EDT)

12. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 1:40 PM (EDT)

Attendance

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation	Role	Officer
Bernd	Blobel	University of Regensburg, Medical Faculty	V	
Lisa	LeVasseur	Wrethinking, the Foundation	V	Co-Chair
Mary	Hodder	Customer Commons & JLINC Labs	V	
Iain	Henderson	Customer Commons & JLINC Labs	V	
Dean	Landsman	PDEC	V	
David	Reed	Deep Plum Research	V	Chair
Jim	Pasquale	Digi.me Ltd.	V	
Sunil	Malhotra	Ideafarms	V	Secretary
Doc	Searls	Customer Commons	V	
Joyce	Searls	Customer Commons & Sovrin Foundation	V	
Adrian	Gropper	Patient Privacy Rights	NV	
Henrik	Biering	Peercraft	NV	
Alexander	Mense	University of Applied Sciences Technikum	NV	
Sukanya	Mandal	Self	NV	

V = Voting Member
NV = Non Voting Member
P = Participant