KantaraColin (to All):	10:36 AM
Colin is on a train so cannot talk most of the time due to tunnels, even if requested to. ;	-).
KantaraColin (to All):	10:45 AM
The new charter, applied to the to be named ISI-WG.	
KantaraColin (to All):	10:46 AM
ISI-WG wiki, GPA, email yes	
To All:	10:47 AM
Mary made a motion to change the name from IS-WG to ISI-WG	
To All:	10:47 AM
Second; Lisa L	
KantaraColin (to All):	10:49 AM
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 enablethe new group to use it as a baseline to launch new proje	ects.
KantaraColin (to All):	10:50 AM
The naming clash was to do with the original InfoSharing WG (IS-WG) from the days bet	
Consent was added to it to become CISWG. We still have that material archived so you clash would occur.	see now a
To All:	10:50 AM
Oscar: Why the new name?	
To All:	10:52 AM
motion carries the new name for the informationsharing wg is now Information Sharing Interoperability-WG	
Loin Llondorson (to All).	10:58 AM
lain Henderson (to All): lain's here, apologies for being late	INIA 66.01
To All:	11:00 AM
Proposal for contributors to Consent Receipt to contribute/have contributed their contribute the new WG as baseline text for further work.	butions to
KantaraColin (to All):	11:01 AM
Those contributing folks are listed in the published CR V1.1.	
Mark Lizar (to All):	11:03 AM
https://kantarainitiative.org/confluence/display/GI/Option+Non-Assertion+Covenant	
KantaraColin (to All):	11:03 AM
Patent and Copyrightopt out to RAND license?	
To All: Mark asked for a link to the new IDD:	11:03 AM
Mark asked for a link to the new IPR: <u>https://kantarainitiative.org/confluence/display/GI/Option+Non-Assertion+Covenant</u>	
Kentere Celin (to All):	11:00
KantaraColin (to All): Ah, no seems Mark is asking about the new IPR as per the link above	11:03 AM
To All:	11:05 AM
lain Motion on the above: Proposal for contributors to Consent Receipt to contribute/ha	ve

lain 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:	11:05 AM
Second By Jim P.	
To All:	11:06 AM
Motion carried.	
	44.00
To All: Mark has question the valiity of the current non assertion IPR	11:09 AM
Mark Lizar (to All):	11:09 AM
https://kantarainitiative.org/confluence/display/GI/Option+Non-Assertion+Covenant? preview=/2293776/39125094/Kantara%20Initiative%20IPR%20Policies	
KantaraColin (to All):	11:09 AM
Sure, I think you are looking at an earlier version? We are looking at Non assertion covenauthat has no mention of IEEE on it.	nt and
Mark Lizar (to All):	11:10 AM
thanks Colin - where do i find it ?	
	11.10
KantaraColin (to All): under about menu off website, IPR Version 2	11:10 AM
Mark Lizar (to All):	11:10 AM
i need to send to COEL - as they used the same IPR as the CR has now	
mary hodder (to All):	11:10 AM
What happens if something is not re-contributed?	
	11:14 AM
The contributor needs to specifically point to the text as their contribution. Research on the validate the claim, then if true, that text is redacted from the text in the new WG.	
To All:	11:18 AM
Draft proposaed email to the current CIS WG: As you are probably aware, the Consent Info	ormation
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 p 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	project- in the
new ISIWG to use the Consent Receipt Specification v1.1 text as the baseline for further development. It is important therefore, that the contributors to the work are aware of this and also agree	
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 proversions and published at : (link) as at the close of the 45 day IPR review and public common period for this specification. They are listed below for the sake of clarity. John doeSally doyle etc	revious
The new ISI-WG requests Contributors to Consent Receipt v1.1 to agree to the re-contributors to consent and Information Sharing work group to the new group Please complete the form on Survey Monkey (link) regarding your agreement or otherwise	up.

Please complete the form on Survey Monkey (link) regarding your agreement or otherwise to this recontribution 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..

11:20 AM

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 under the new IRP?	back and agree
lain 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 taht at the time. So +1 to lan's	
Lisa LeVasseur (to All):	11:29 AM
Thanks Jim!	
lain 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
ChatLog	