

2021-06-21 Rules Engines Drafting Group Meeting Notes - Session 1

Attendees

- [Chris Buchanan](#), chair
- [Kaliya Young](#), WG co-chair
- [Noam Arzt](#)
- Rob Broere
- [Trev Harmon](#), PM
- [viola wang](#)

Agenda Items

Time	Item	Who
2 min	Welcome & Antitrust Policy Notice	Trev
5 min	Overview of the public feedback document	Chris
	Reviewed public feedback	Everyone

Recording - [Link](#)

Notes

- Antitrust and IPR announcement
- Noam put in a comment that the document is long and complex, and therefore difficult to understand if you haven't been involved from the beginning.
 - When do the 30/90/180 days start?
 - Kaliya noted that we are going to address this in the opening of the document.
 - Kaliya, part of the 30/90/180 framework is to help with momentum.
 - Noam is concerned that this specific timeframe might be providing naysayers with opportunities to take shots at the overall approach as the time passes.
- Discussed the note from Harmen van derk Kooij.
- Noam provided a link to their ICE open source project in the References.
- Regarding the notes from the DIF H&T SIG, there was a decision by the larger group that we would work with them for a separate document.
- We'll add ICTS's links into the references, as well.
- Regarding Daniel Hardman's comment, Chris talked a few days ago with Kaliya about it. He noted that when we started, several people asked why we even had a rules engine section because there is a difference between process and product, and rules engines are products. Consequently, we scoped things down.
 - Some people reading our section are seeing rules engines as verifiers. This is true sometimes, but not always.
 - If we scope back up, then we end up with a whole document on this single subject.
 - We may need to add more clarification regarding scope.
 - Noam thinks that where we should have focused was on the rules, not necessarily the mechanism for enforcing those rules.
- Rules engines don't need to be a network service; it can be a local service. We may need a short comment in the document to clarify this.
- We had a discussion regarding Trevor Butterworth's second comment.
- We moved on to the specifically tagged comments in our document.
- Attestations are signed claims. Just because a health event took place, it doesn't necessarily mean that the health event was clinically validated. This lead to a discussion regarding how this fits into the overall structure.
- Medical / clinical efficaciousness evaluation is not happening currently in these systems. Noam pushed for this to happen.
- Validity is going to be determined by the destination (generally at the country level). Chris views this approach as being similar to how travel visas are handled today.
- From a privacy point of view, the medical information should be kept as early in the process as possible.
- We discussed the comment from Hervé Prezet in 7.1.5.1.1.
 - In this case, the airline is the customer.
 - We probably need to rewrite part of this section to make it more clear.
- It would be helpful to have the "zone markers" in Figure 13.

Chat Log

```
00:02:06      Trev Harmon:      Drafting Group Folder: https://drive.google.com/drive/u/2/folders
/11FDOzxxbZgrc75ujODoBY7it22Fk0Lje
00:13:04      Noam Arzt (HLN):      https://cdsframework.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/ICE/overview
```

Action Items

1. Everyone to provide feedback on the public feedback.