DONALD W. REYNOLDS JOURNALISM INSTITUTE

Missouri School of Journalism ❦ University of Missouri

THE INFORMATION TRUST EXCHANGE
Trust, identity, personalization,
content and user sharing for the news industry

DRAFT WORKING AGENDA

TASK GROUP ON
AUTHENTICATION AND IDENTITY MANAGEMENT

Dinner: 7 p.m. Tues., Sept. 22, 2015
Henrietta's Table Restaurant in the Charles Hotel, Cambridge, Mass.
Meeting, Wed., Sept. 23, 2015 / 8:30 a.m.-3:30 p.m.
Harvard Law School, Wasserstein Hall, Room 3008
1585 Massachusetts Ave., Cambridge

Participants: Scott Bradner, Rick Lerner, Robert Picard, Atul Tulshibagwale, Randy Picht,
Drummond Reed, Bill Densmore -- and Mary Ruddy (through lunch)
(for minibios, see http://newshare.com/cambridge/bios.pdf)

A. **8:30 a.m. – 9:00 a.m. / Orienting the Day – Randy Picht and Bill Densmore**
   ● Why we are here – Randy Picht – "mission" from RJI Sept. 16
   ● What is our best-possible outcome for the day?
   ● Dividing up the design – the three meetings – Bill Densmore / our focus
   ● Review/revise this agenda

B. **9:00 a.m. – 9:30 a.m. / Assessing the landscape – a *speedy* flyover -- Scott Bradner**

   ● The challenges of standards and collaboration – Federated auth / SSO
   ● User auth/identity in academia – Shibboleth, Oauth, etc. (Scott)
   ● User auth /identity in commerce – FB Connect, Apple ID, credit cards (Atul, Rick)
   ● User auth/identity in government – NSTIC, Identity Commons (Mary, Drummond)
   ● User auth/identity in the news – (Rick / Bob / Randy)

C. **9:30 a.m.-10:15 a.m. / Confirm service requirements for ITE auth/identity (all)**

   EXERCISE: List minimum requirements for authentication and identity services

   SUCH AS:
   1. No permanent, central names/identity database
   2. User has priority control over adding, removing, changing personal attributes

3. Supports plurality of both service and content providers
4. Variable trust/security levels consistent with financial value at stake
5. Capable of welcoming/cross-authenticating users from existing academic, commerce, government networks
6. Must facilitate sharing/aggregation of user attributes, *where permissioned by user*, for real-time ad serving (in principle no different than accessing other content; the ad server is a "content provider" who must be a member of the ITE).
7. Must enable periodic aggregation and settlement of access and payment records
8. Exchange does not play any role in setting pricing or commercial service offerings, just transferring data about them. *(i.e., "managing the marketplace")*

(Bio and informal discussion break – 10:15 a.m.-10:30 a.m.)

D. **10:30 a.m.-11:30 a.m. – Minimum viable specific service features confirmation**

- Identify/confirm aspirational service features related to authentication/identity

  CULL FROM THIS DOCUMENT SOURCE:
  ITE Service Features & Design Specifications (comment/editable draft)
  https://docs.google.com/document/d/1KPfRCXNoF1igLfoWrdDilYO2ox9VFNYaN5UechXpZZk/edit
  or printable version: http://newshare.com/cambridge/ite-service-design-specifications-v3-09-11-15.pdf

- EXERCISE: Decide on minimum service features for prototype/piloting (all)

  POSSIBLE   EXAMPLES?

  1) Federated authentication (multi-site) including:

     ii. Certification of unique identifiers for service and content providers
     iii. Compatible with existing user auth services

  2) EITHER / Dynamic (temporary) caching at auth service of user attributes, such as:
     -- First name saluation (if permissioned)
     -- Zip code (if permissioned)
     -- "Home base" unique identifier
     -- Subscription identifier(s)
     -- Credit auth. for single-item purchase (decrementable by auth   service)
     -- What else?

  3) OR / Access key to user attributes stored at service provider
     -- Similar attributes as above

  4) Provision(s) for real-time sharing –- for customization/personalization of services –- of user profiles, preferences, permissions among system and content providers (including advertisers) who are certified ITE system members.

  5) Logging by "central shared service" of user events/activities within network including specific attributes necessary for off-line aggregation and distribution of payments/charges. *(Design goal: This happens without PII, just a alphaneumeric user ID that is opaque to all parts of the system except the user's identity service provider ("home base.")*

E. **11:30 a.m.-1 p.m. (including lunch) / Design charrette**

Compare auth/identity service requirements and features with existing off-the-shelf solutions. Identify 2-3 options for design to support prototyping/piloting with a combination of available and new applications.   After sketching out design options screen each against these questions:

1. List MV prototype design specifications for auth/identity
2. How much has to be added to existing solutions to support MV requirements?
3. List jobs to be done to deploy auth/identity prototype service
4. Assess risks/challenges and resources required
5. Confirm on most-feasible technical approach(es) for prototyping / piloting

PROPOSED PROTOTYPE PILOT DESIGN:
ITE Prototype Pilot Description and Protocol (draft)
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1y4QgmoQbJdEXDY3kPHMImyNpbcanBHyHvJr6xaxQfd4/edit?usp=sharing   or printable version:
http://newshare.com/cambridge/ite-prototype-pilot-08-03-15.pdf

F. **1:00 p.m.-1:30 p.m. / Process-Outcome check in**

Are we heading toward best-possible outcome for the day or do we need a fast pivot to a different approach? If yes, pivot, if not, keep working (below)

G. **1:30 p.m.-2:30 p.m. / Business charrette**

1. Who can do the work? Cost? Timeframe?
2. What do we need from the content description, tagging, sharing selling task group?
3. What do we need from the user data and privacy task group?

H. **2:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. / Ecosystem advancement**

1. What is the public benefit in any aspect of the service?
2. What are the business opportunities in any aspect of the service?
3. Who can "own" this work scope?
4. How can RJI help? Who else should be asked (example: Mozilla)?
5. When/if should a ITE governing body be formed?

I. **3:00 p.m.-3:30 p.m. / Wrap up and next steps**

1. Summarize our work and conclusions for transmission
   to content and user privacy task groups

2. Who takes the next steps and what are they?

3. Did this gathering and process meet our needs?

--- ADJOURN --

"I would propose that both the containers for embeddable content and the means of **consensual transfer of data about users and interests should be open standards** so users can get these benefits of relevance and sharing wherever they want . . . . "

-- Jeff Jarvis, CUNY Journalism School, writing in his blog:

http://buzzmachine.com/2015/03/24/relationship-stupid/