**Date: 7-5-2012**

**PAC Drafting Conference Call**

**Attendees:**

Ann Geyer  
Collin Soutar  
Collin Wallis  
Peter Kapek  
Tom Smedingham

1. **Drafting Discussion --General**
   * None
2. **Drafting Discussion – Minimalism #2.3**

* Clarified that the RP has the right to specify the information it requires from the CSP, provided the specification is made in writing.
* If the RP has not provided written instructions, then the CSP may provide only the information specified in the Federal Profile
* If the RP requests information that is a subset of the Federal Profile, it should but need not be by written request.
* Identified that there is no mechanism in this document to place minimal data collection and usage requirements on a RP, since RP are out of scope. Issue is placed in the parking lot for further discussion.
* Identified that there is minimal data collection and usage requirements on the CSP for CSP purposes not directly related to the RP authentication transactions. Issue is place in the parking lot for further discussion.

1. **Drafting Discussion – Unique Identity #2.4**

* Discussed the context for this requirement. Agreed that some context explanation should be included to guide the assessor. For example, purpose of the persistent abstract identifier is to allow the RP to consolidate transactions from the same individual without requiring information about the individual’s identity.
* Agreed to include a definition of “persistent abstract identifier” from ISO or other industry standards organization. Collin Soutar volunteered to track down candidate definitions for next call.
* Clarified that the requirement calls for the identifier to be unique to a specific RP. The purpose is to minimize the likelihood that individual can be profiled and possibly identified by combining transactions across multiple RPs using the individual’s persistent abstract identifier. Collin Wallis mentioned that in Canada, RPs are not permitted to share and consolidate information in this way.
* Identified a need to include requirements for information protection for the identifier. Absent specific requirements added to the Requirements document, we will provide recommendations to the assessors as to what safeguards to evaluation. We are relying on the inclusion of information protection as a core privacy principle.

1. **Parking Lot Items (Consolidated List)**

From 7/5/2012

* Requirements on RP for collecting only the minimal information necessary from the CSP for its authentication transactions.
* Look ahead to Adquate Notice shows that the notice requirements apply only to the information transmitted to a RP and not to other uses that the CSP may have for collecting PII. There is a general concern that requiring the disclosure of too much PII would invalidate the voluntary participation/consent privacy principle.
* Is there a US restriction on whether Federal RP can share identity information across RP applications?
* Need to determine what information protections/data safeguards should be included in the assessment of Unique Identity requirements.

From 6/7/2012

* + Discussants felt that guidance on how the private information collected and maintained by a CSP is protected should be part of this document

1. **Tasks Assigned**

Open

* Collin Soutar—identify candidate definitions from industry standards for “persistent abstract identifier.”

Closed

* Collect the relevant working and reference documents and post them to the P3WG site for easy reference. Ann Geyer done 6/8/2012
* When feasible, extract from passages for discussion and post then in the meeting reminder email for easy reference. Ann Geyer done 6/8/2012

1. **Items Referred to Full P3WG:**  none
2. **Attachments:** none