

Answers to questions captured in the Zoom chat

Following Jay Glasgow's Consent DNA Bitmaps presentation in yesterday's DSWG meeting, he has since taken the time to answer any questions captured in the Zoom chat. Here goes ...

From Jay:

Thanks for having us on the call today—great time with super folks. Here's my attempt to answer the questions in chat...

From @Jim StClair to Everyone: 11:23 AM

So...how do we pilot this stuff?

Jay's response:

The Privacy Co-op already uses this framework with our Affiliates. We are in AWS and we are in the process of opening up access via AWS MarketPlace. You could become an affiliate? :wink: (shameless plug).

As we evolve a standard, we are open to working with other teams to deploy something in a commons.

From @Paul Knowles to Everyone: 11:27 AM

Put an "DNA_bitmap" attribute in the linked Consent VC which houses a hashlink to the exact bitmap.

Jay's response:

Hashlinks are a good way to approach, and that's our thoughts on early use.

From Jan Lindquist to Everyone: 11:28 AM

Is the bitmap (consent DNA) on an individual basis or across a single data capture?

Jay's response:

Anytime a request is made for any identifier (subject), an answer is given, even if lazy provisioned. Assuming a single data capture was multiple records for a single subject, only one bitmap would be referenced for all records, even if you called for each record individually.

From Jan Lindquist to Everyone: 11:30 AM

my other question is how we add the consent DNA to a verifiable credential. Maybe Jay has some thoughts

From Paul Knowles to Everyone: 11:31 AM

I would suggest a hashlink to the bitmap object

From Jan Lindquist to Everyone: 11:31 AM

on an individual basis?

From Paul Knowles to Everyone: 11:32 AM

Yes. Every time the data is in standby for porting. Totally governed by the holder of course.

Jay's response:

This sounds like a good approach.

From Jim StClair to Everyone: 11:33 AM

OK, dumb question...is this "string" in XML?

*I'm trying to mentally map this to a FHIR message..
and failing :)*

Jay's response:

If by FHIR you mean "Fast Healthcare Interoperability Resources", and if I understand that world correctly, then a request for consent can be transactional and part of a process. For example, if you had a decoupled PEP and PDP, a PDP could call the bitmap as a PIP resource. In this case, the request might be XML or other (XACML?). More on protocols below, but suffice it to say that the CNS (Consent Name Service, like the DNS) will likely need to support myriad interface types.

From @John Wunderlich to Everyone: 11:36 AM

This makes even more sense where the data lake is a data commons or a data trust with a fiduciary duty to the individuals. Companies who want to display ads can bring their algorithms to the data trust and only ever get access to the minimum necessary data about the user.

Jay's response:

Amen.

From John Wunderlich to Everyone: 11:40 AM

What does this look like if you replace "Platform" with "Protocol"?

Jay's response:

We actually have a section in 7. Consistent Addressability where we open the door for "Transports and Signaling" specifically to start the conversation around protocol. Great point!

From Jim StClair to Everyone: 11:40 AM

+1 John

This is the gravy for the biscuits, people...

Jay's response:

As an Alabama boy, I had to at least echo this...

From @Scott Whitmire to Everyone: 11:45 AM

Think of the VCs granting permission as an audit trail for individual changes to the bitmap. Every individual override to a default setting should be backed by a VC issued by the person. Layer 1 or 2, the changes would be documented in layer 3, but it needs to be baked into the fabric.

Jay's response:

While we're in the development stages, we want to keep the horizon wide for adoption. For example, Big Data companies will likely walk away from a solution that requires external AuthN+AuthZ on a record by record basis, or the like. So, in your last statement, while I totally agree with your point, we may want to replace the word "should" with "can". "Every individual override to a default setting can be backed by a VC issued by the person."