

2020-12-03 Meeting Minutes ISI WG

Kantara ISI WG Teleconference

Date and Time | Attendees | Apologies | Agenda | Minutes | Next Meeting

Date and Time

- **Date:** 03 Dec 2020
- **Time:** 10:30 Eastern Time

Approval: [2021-02-04 Meeting Minutes ISI WG Meeting \(DRAFT\)](#)

Attendees

[Participant Roster](#) - As of 2020-02-20, the quorum is 6 of 11

(Voting participants are: [Andrew Hughes](#), [Iain Henderson](#), [Jim Pasquale](#), [John Wunderlich](#), [Kenneth Klingenstein](#), [Lisa LeVasseur](#), [Mark Lizar](#), [Mary Hodder](#), [Oscar Santolalla](#), [Salvatore D'Agostino](#), [Yusuf Khan](#))

Voting

1. Jim Pasquale
2. John Wunderlich
3. Iain Henderson
4. Mary Hodder
5. Kenneth Klingenstein

Non-Voting

1. Kate Downing
2. Colin Wallis

Apologies

1. Andrew Hughes
2. Oscar Santolalla (sabbatical)

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. [ISI Work Group IPR Policy](#)
3. Approval of Agenda
4. **Approval of Minutes if a quorum**

Agenda

1. [Director's Corner](#)
2. PDUR Framework

Minutes

Item	Who	Notes
Call to Order	Jim Pasquale	Check for a quorum. Quorum achieved. Reminder about attendance policy for voting status.
ISI Work Group IPR Policy	Jim Pasquale	A reminder of IPR policy for the WG
Approval of Agenda	Moved: Seconded:	
Approval of Minutes	Moved: Seconded:	Discussion: None Changes: None Actions arising: None

Project Updates (Month-end Updates) (not required this meeting)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AdvCIS 	Mark Lizar	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Deliverables <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. ? 2. Status: INACTIVE 3. Issues: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. ? 4. Next Steps:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intentcasting 	Iain Henderson	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Deliverables <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Report on Intentcasting 2. Status: INACTIVE 3. Issues: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Resourcing 4. Next Steps: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Resume in 2021
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personal Data Use Receipt Framework 	Andrew Hughes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Deliverables <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. PDUR Framework 2. Status: ACTIVE 3. Issues: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Draft report comments and review located here - Personal Data Use Receipt Framework Contribution 4. Next Steps: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. ?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Privacy-Preserving Information Sharing 	John Wunderlich	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Deliverables <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Survey Report b. Recommendation Report 2. Status: INACTIVE 3. Issues: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Insufficient availability to proceed at this point 4. Next Steps: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Find a new lead to move the project forward OR b. Resume when available

WG Discussion

Personal Data Use Receipt Framework	Jim Pasquale Provided an overview Continued the walk-through of the PDURF	Group discussion on a number of issues (if you are reading this, please email Kate Downing or make changes to reflect your actual comments located in the v0.2 Word document <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion around the review of comments in v0.2 of the PDURF • Notes from conversation held within the document comments
Announcements	All	Director's corner updates regarding the AGM are available on the website. Congratulations to 2020 award-winning contributors. Thank you Oscar. Voting for 2021 positions will take place next week, when ISI-WG has a quorum. Anyone who wishes to run for a chair or co-chair position may self-nominate by reaching out to Staff @Kantara.

New Business	All	<p>Kenneth Klingenstein No new trust frameworks until a comparison of existing trust frameworks have been conducted. Privacy frameworks are likely embedded within these trust frameworks, and consent frameworks within these privacy frameworks. Consent mechanisms such as duration, collection, usage, disclosure etc. should be rationalized. Suggestion to create a comparison prior to moving forwards. High-level analysis prior to a deeper dive? Places where consent is defined TODAY (in legislation, regs, etc.)</p> <p>Motion to consider this when we next achieve a quorum.</p> <p>John Wunderlich Suggestion to rephrase consent as authority so that legal agreements and other appropriate basis for authorization are captured. Do 'you' have an authority to collect? Is this legitimate interest? If this is consent how is this determined? We are not looking to understand the legal basis, we are instead looking to scope this as an understanding of the MECHANISM for consent (purpose of use).</p> <p>IAB framework is upstream of the PDURF - we instead might want to understand if this is an allowable use based upon the mechanism itself?</p> <p>(perhaps this is a deeper-dive?) is the usage consistent w/ purpose of use?</p> <p>(e.g. publish individual's data on company newsletter – I have the data; is this purpose allowed under the basis that I hold this data?)</p> <p>Mary Hodder View https://www.thetradedesk.com to see concerns with 'absolutely verifiable' identity all the time... (privacy minimization); pseudonyms are part of our reality & the need for companies / individuals to categorically & definitively identify an individual at every juncture is disturbing</p>
Next meeting	All	<p>*** Next call 2020-12-10 10:30 am Eastern DAYLIGHT Time</p> <p>https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/323930725</p>
Adjournment	<p>Moved: Kenneth Klingenstein</p> <p>Seconded: John Wunderlich</p>	Motion carried

Action Items

- Type your task here, using "@" to assign to a user and "/" to select a due date
- [Kenneth Klingenstein](#) to share a checklist of touch-points for the next meeting **10 Dec 2020**