

2021-01-14 Meeting Minutes ISI WG Meeting

Kantara ISI WG Teleconference

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

Date and Time

- **Date:** 14 Jan 2021
- **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

[Jim Pasquale](#)

[Kenneth Klingenstein](#)

[John Wunderlich](#)

[Iain Henderson](#)

[Mary Hodder](#)

Non-Voting

[Colin Wallis](#)

[Kate Downing](#)

Apologies

1. [Andrew Hughes](#)
2. [Oscar Santolalla](#) (sabbatical)
3. [Lisa LeVasseur](#)

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. [ISI Work Group IPR Policy](#)
3. Today's Agenda
 - a. We'll be doing a quick recap of this past year
 - i. This is the main header title for the beginning of the contributions around this subject [Characteristics for Respectful Tech](#), of which Ken's document we ask Ken to submit. If I got posting it correctly, the link is here.
 - ii. You are all encouraged to give it a look, produce your own and contribute, suggest reviews and
 - b. Discuss the group moving forward to produce more outcomes
 - c. Reviewing the Data Model
4. Approval of Agenda
5. **Approval of Minutes if a quorum**

Agenda

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

Minutes

Item	Who	Notes
Call to Order	Jim Pasquale	Check for a quorum. (Not Quorumed) 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)		
• AdvCIS	Mark Lizar	1. Deliverables a. ? 2. Status: INACTIVE 3. Issues: a. ? 4. Next Steps:
• Intencasting	Iain Henderson	1. Deliverables a. Report on Intencasting 2. Status: INACTIVE 3. Issues: a. Resourcing 4. Next Steps: a. Resume in 2021
• Personal Data Use Receipt Framework	Andrew Hughes	1. Deliverables a. PDUR Framework 2. Status: ACTIVE 3. Issues: a. Draft report comments and review located here - Personal Data Use Receipt Framework Contribution 4. Next Steps: a. ?
• Privacy-Preserving Information Sharing	John Wunderlich	1. Deliverables a. Survey Report b. Recommendation Report 2. Status: INACTIVE 3. Issues: a. Insufficient availability to proceed at this point 4. Next Steps: 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	Discussion of how we might gain external input from the marketplace to obtain feedback on the data model. Group discussion on a number of issues (if you are reading this, please email Kate Downing)
Announcements	All	Please enter your availability on the following link so that we might find a better time for the group: https://www.when2meet.com/?10710726-4WtpV

Meeting Discussions	All	<p>Discussion of Kenneth Klingenstein's document submitted on 12/17/20: group was generally positive, however suggested that some of the characteristics listed might better describe a specific profile; not necessarily a framework.</p> <p>We should develop a list of the understood Purposes of Use.</p> <p>Next steps: accept/reject the comments on the existing DRAFT v2.0</p> <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 an authority so that legal agreements and other appropriate bases for authorization are captured. Do 'you' have the 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>
New Business Proposals	All	
Next meeting	All	<p>*** Next call 2021-01-21 10:30 am Eastern DAYLIGHT Time</p> <p>https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/323930725</p>
Adjournment	Moved: Seconded:	Motion carried

Action Items

- Type your task here, using "@" to assign to a user and "/" to select a due date
- Please enter your availability here: <https://www.when2meet.com/?10710726-4WtpV> so that we might better accommodate the group's schedule
- Consider <https://slite.com/features> for spec / data model generation
- [Kate Downing](#) to merge changes & send to team for review
- [Kenneth Klingenstein](#) to share a checklist of touch-points for the next meeting 16 Dec 2020