



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

TASK GROUP ON
AUTHENTICATION AND IDENTITY MANAGEMENT

PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Following a meeting Sept. 23, 2015 at Harvard Law School, Cambridge, Mass.

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

Link: [PRE MEETING AGENDA](#)

Link: [BLACKBOARD SCRIBBLINGS](#)

A. Confirming a prototype process terminology

- FIRST step is a proof-of-concept demonstration, which could be a good wire frame, or something that has some pieces working and others spoofed. This will be used to confirm interest of constituencies (see below) and raise money.
- SECOND step is at least one pilot. In Cambridge we left it undecided whether the [attribution project](#) Atul Tulshibagwale is proposing, the [service being built](#) by Drummond Reed [around XDI](#), or the capabilities that Clickshare-LifeStream can integrate -- or other approaches -- end up as one pilot or three pilots or some combination.
- THIRD STEP is minimum viable product.

B. Prototyping design requirements

Here are the identity-authentication design requirements. There is nothing about content or personalization here because that wasn't the remit of this task group:

1. No permanent, central names/identity database
2. User has control over all personal attributes except those necessary for authentication to be trustworthy. (Such as unique user ID, home base service provider and account credit status).
3. Supports a plurality of content providers of various types

4. Supports various models of identity provision
5. Establishes a consistent level of trust in identity among participants
6. Supports different models of access rights
7. Facilitates sharing / aggregation of user attributes where permissioned by the user
8. Facilitates aggregation and settlement of access records.
9. Exchange plays no role in settling pricing or commercial service offerings
10. Adheres to different, established privacy regimes
11. Minimal technical hurdles for implementation by content providers

C. Three burning questions

- How can content companies make money when users are not visiting their sites?
- Is there a way of collaborating among these companies that we can increase their revenues for unregistered users which are visiting their own sites?
- When you have registered users or paying subscribers visiting any of the member sites how can the member companies offer them premium content from other sites within the network?

D. Value propositions for three stakeholders

FOR CONTENT PROVIDERS

- Allows them to make better use of the data they have about users.
- It doesn't make them beholden to a few very large firms who have other interests. It equalizes the power. Because as it is now everyone is negotiating one to one in a very asymmetric way.
- This way we can deliver so many at once with a common negotiation that others will want to negotiate over.

FOR PLATFORMS (Apple, Google, FB, HuffPost, BuzzFeed etc.)

- They don't like the privacy negatives people have about them.
- It will still give them what they need to sell their advertising on.
- It doesn't stop them from getting the money they need to make money on advertising.
- And it has the ability to deliver them more and better information about users.

FOR THE PUBLIC (User)

- Somebody they are happy doing business with and sharing more information.
- They will have some control over what is shared and it is not just somebody else telling them.
- It reduces the frustration of unwanted ads/content
- Better, easier access to more content