KantaraColin (to All): Colin is on a train so cannot talk most of the time due to tunnels, even if requested to. ;-).

KantaraColin (to All): The new charter, applied to the to be named ISI-WG.

KantaraColin (to All): ISI-WG.. wiki, GPA, email.. yes..

To All: Mary made a motion to change the name from IS-WG to ISI-WG

To All: Second; Lisa L

KantaraColin (to All): To Mary's query about contributors. Each Contributor listed on the CR v1.1 doc need to agree to re-contribute it to ISI to enable the new group to use it as a baseline to launch new projects.

KantaraColin (to All): The naming clash was to do with the original InfoSharing WG (IS-WG) from the days before Consent was added to it to become CISWG. We still have that material archived so you see how a clash would occur..

To All: Oscar: Why the new name?

To All: motion carries the new name for the informationsharing wg is now Information Sharing Interoperability-WG

Iain Henderson (to All): Iain's here, apologies for being late

To All: Proposal for contributors to Consent Receipt to contribute/have contributed their contributions to the new WG as baseline text for further work.

KantaraColin (to All): Those contributing folks are listed in the published CR V1.1.

Mark Lizar (to All): https://kantarainitiative.org/confluence/display/GI/Option+Non-Assertion+Covenant

KantaraColin (to All): Patent and Copyright opt out to RAND license?

To All: Mark asked for a link to the new IPR: https://kantarainitiative.org/confluence/display/GI/Option+Non-Assertion+Covenant

KantaraColin (to All): Ah, no seems Mark is asking about the new IPR as per the link above..

To All: Iain Motion on the above: Proposal for contributors to Consent Receipt to contribute/have contributed their contributions to the new WG as baseline text for further work.
To All:

Second By Jim P.

To All:

Motion carried.

To All:

Mark has question the vallity of the current non assertion IPR

Mark Lizar (to All):


KantaraColin (to All):

Sure, I think you are looking at an earlier version? We are looking at Non assertion covenant and that has no mention of IEEE on it.

Mark Lizar (to All):

thanks Colin - where do i find it ?

KantaraColin (to All):

under about menu off website, IPR.. Version 2

Mark Lizar (to All):

i need to send to COEL - as they used the same IPR as the CR has now.. -

mary hodder (to All):

What happens if something is not re-contributed?

KantaraColin (to All):

The contributor needs to specifically point to the text as their contribution. Research on that to validate the claim, then if true, that text is redacted from the text in the new WG.

To All:

Draft proposaed email to the current CIS WG: As you are probably aware, the Consent Information Sharing workgroup (CIS-WG) is proposed to be archived and replaced by a new workgroup [proposed name Information Sharing Interoperability - ISI-WG] to be both more agile and project-driven, as well as operating under a more flexible IPR regime.

Furthermore, it is the desire of both the voting participants in the CISWG the participants in the new ISIWG to use the Consent Receipt Specification v1.1 text as the baseline for further document development.

It is important therefore, that the contributors to the work are aware of this and also agree to their work being contributed into the new work group with its more flexible IPR.

All known contributors are listed in the Consent Receipt Specification v1.1 incorporating previous versions and published at: (link) as at the close of the 45 day IPR review and public comment period for this specification. They are listed below for the sake of clarity.

...John doe ...Sally doyle
...

The new ISI-WG requests Contributors to Consent Receipt v1.1 to agree to the re-contribution of those contributions from the Consent and Information Sharing work group to the new group.

Please complete the form on Survey Monkey (link) regarding your agreement or otherwise to this recontrtribution to the new workgroup as soon as possible but in any event by Monday January 20th, 2020.

Finally, we welcome everyone continuing to contribute your knowledge, expertise, and perspectives in this new WG [ name] effort. (links to GPA, wiki etc)

KantaraColin (to All):

The UST work is not being contributed to the new ISI-WG, at least no-one has asked for it, whereas CR V1.1 asked for it.

KantaraColin (to All):

..CR V1.1 was asked for..
mary hodder (to All): 11:20 AM
Colin: ok so the old work would just sit at the archive?

mary hodder (to All): 11:21 AM
If so that's fine too, and then if we wanted to do more work later, we could come back and agree under the new IRP?

Iain Henderson (to All): 11:22 AM
yes that would work

KantaraColin (to All): 11:25 AM
Agree.. the UST work not not being contributed, just sits in the archive, and if and when needed to move somewhere, we tackle that at the time. So +1 to Ian's

Lisa LeVasseur (to All): 11:29 AM
Thanks Jim!

Iain Henderson (to All): 11:29 AM
Thanks all, I need to drop off.

mary hodder (to All): 11:32 AM
thanks all

mary hodder (to All): 11:32 AM
thanks jim

Yusuf Khan (to All): 11:32 AM
Thanks Jim

Lisa LeVasseur (to All): 11:33 AM
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