

# 2021-04-28 Paper Based Credentials Drafting Group Meeting Notes

## Attendees

- Tony Rose
- Rebecca Distler
- David Janes
- Vitor Pamplona
- Marie Wallace
- Justin Dossey
- Drummond Reed
- Mustafa Ozcakil
- Kaliya Young
- Bart Suchies

## Agenda Items

Time	Item	Who
2 min	Welcome & Antitrust Policy Notice	Chair
XY min	Topic A	TBC
XY min	Topic B	TBC
XY min	Topic C	TBC
3 min	Wrap up	Chair

## Presentations

## Recording

Topic: Good Health Pass - Paper Credentials

Start Time : Apr 28, 2021 11:01 AM

Meeting Recording:

[https://zoom.us/rec/share/R7omT7PEi1HzUDZkU6d1TC9rbTxxwF7L7o4d4WAH9J\\_P7mGjqwEuiteuKEH3Zqb.J-\\_dTpc7J3s75Csp](https://zoom.us/rec/share/R7omT7PEi1HzUDZkU6d1TC9rbTxxwF7L7o4d4WAH9J_P7mGjqwEuiteuKEH3Zqb.J-_dTpc7J3s75Csp)

## Notes

1. Welcome and Linux Foundation antitrust policy

2. Review of Timeline

- Week of April 28 - Drafting Week
  - Focus on getting draft "clean" by Friday EOD. Clean = comments resolved, sections drafted (e.g., full sentences), properly formatted, placeholders or gaps highlighted in text. Articulate major points or questions that still need to be discussed and include them in a preamble at the beginning of each draft.
- Week of May 3 - GHPC Community Review
  - Prepare to release drafts as individual documents (PDF) on Confluence. Create corresponding Google Forms to solicit input on each individual draft (down to sections, not lines). All comments will be shared directly with drafting group leads; commenters will not have an ability to see other's comments at this stage.
- Week of May 10 - Revision and Iteration
  - Drafting leads to discuss feedback in drafting groups
- Week of May 17 - Aim for Public Comment

3. Review of Draft + Assignments

- Justin to revise statements to be "should / must" in section 4
  - We need to have certification - need something certifiable; if all we are is wishy-washy, worried about it being "certifiable"
  - Should = best guidance, must = compliance
- Does a GHP have to have a paper option in order to be considered a "good" pass - yes
  - Their initial decisions will remain
  - Encode as GZIP?
  - No surprises from data group - data group not dealing with the coding issue (e.g., some medical data might be SNOWMED, ICD, Canada has its own system, CMX - can't just put medical data - have to have some reference on string)
  - Both WHO and EU are deferring decisions to member states
  - Coding can be done with peer names - OCA can't help you map from disparate datasets; one ICD code might map to multiple SNOWMED codes
  - EU hasn't added support for multilingual credentials

- Coding language and language translation problems
  - Translational of a credential so someone can read it
  - Design phased recommendations around this
  - Biggest open question = how do we take an electronic credential and move it into a paper credential (we don't know how big everything else looks from other groups); if we only choose one, they don't be in compliant
  - EU and WHO - anything we say won't change the needle for them
- Use of "positive" test results?
  - <https://virolens.keyoptions.com/>
  - Can a positive test result be turned into a pass? Credential may get used for "back to work" use cases
  - Need to be over threshold to be determined positive (one test negative, one test positive) - will depend on the test
  - Listed the rapid antigen - PCR test agreed to be adequate?
- Assumption by issuers that verifiers know what to ask - issuer has made decision on whether you're good to go; different consideration
  - Force verifiers to get original credential because pass made assumption that you didn't need anything else
  - Pass = for a specific use case; credential
  - Already making assumptions
- 30 / 60 / 90 - target guidance for original system

#### Assignments

- Section 1 - Marie
- Section 2 - David
- Section 3 - David
- Section 4 - Justin
- Section 5 - Bart
- Section 6 - Ask for someone from UX group (e.g., designer)
- Section 7 - Vitor
- Section 8 - Justin
- Section 9 - Tony & David
- Glossarist = Vitor

#### Action Items

1. Section leads to finish drafting of sections; work to cross-reference with drafts of corresponding drafting groups