#	Line(s)	Comment	Suggested Change	Disposition/Comments
1	General	"Public sector profile" is a new descriptor.	Please define "public sector profile" and how it aligns to the PCTF.

According to DIACC, participants can create profiles based on the baseline conformance criteria. Is the "public sector profile" referring to an expansion of the DIACC conformance criteria? | No change. We were directed to use this descriptor when referring to the public sector version of the PCTF. |
2	General	There is mention of "relationships" throughout the document even though they were not in scope for this version.	It might be useful to scope out relationships for this version in a sentence or footnote early in the document.	No change. Relationships are in scope for this version of the document (see Section 2.1.3 (Scope of the PCTF) and Section 2.3.2 (Digital Representations)); however, they have yet to be dealt with in much detail.
3	General	Version 1.1 mentions devices sporadically throughout the document. Unlike persons and organizations, devices are not defined	Please define "devices" or remove from this version.	Definition of "devices" added. Devices will be dealt with in future versions of the PCTF (see Section 2.3.2 (Digital Representations))
4	General	The use of "persons" throughout the document is a bit confusing; from a business registry perspective, we always use "individual" because legal entities are considered legal "persons"; although this is explained in the annex, the explanation is still a bit confusing because it uses the word "person" for both human beings and legal entities.	Use "individuals" and "organizations" throughout and avoid the use of the word "persons"; include a definition of "individual" that defines it as a "natural person"	No change. The use of the term "person" to represent a human being was discussed and decided on several years ago. The term "individual" has its own problems. The PCTF is heavily dependent on precise and consistent terminology; hence, Appendix A.

#	Line(s)	Comment	Suggested Change	Disposition/Comments
5	General	The PCTF focuses mainly on Canadians and Canadian businesses, whereas CIPO has a majority of foreign clients. The document does not describe how foreign businesses will interact in the context of the PCTF. This may be an issue at CIPO.		Noted. This will be addressed in future versions of the PCTF.
6	General	The document describes a good Business Process Classification for identity management. The next level would require some level of description for information/data to assist in evaluating the impact and enabling the implementation of the PCTF.		Noted.
7	146-165, 235-239	Pages ix, 4 - The terms "Canadians," "citizens" and "residents" appear to be used interchangeably. As they are distinct, we suggest always using "Canadian citizens and residents" unless the term used is deliberate (e.g. it would be fine to use "residents" if the sentence is referring only to non-Canadian citizens residing in Canada).		Text changed.

#	Line(s)	Comment	Suggested Change	Disposition/Comments
8	174-184, 229-232, 602-608	Pages 1, 4, 30 - Section 1 (Purpose of this Document) mentions this is the "public sector profile" but does not elaborate. It would be beneficial to explain what this means. Furthermore, it says the audience of the PCTF are members of the private sector, but private sector entities are not directly addressed throughout the document.		No change. We were directed to use this descriptor when referring to the public sector version of the PCTF. Members of the private sector may be interested in learning about the public sector profile. Moreover, this public sector-oriented version of the PCTF may be extended to the private sector in
9	195-201	Centralized model is mentioned but not defined, and then federated model is chosen for the Canadian digital ID ecosystem.	Either define centralized model and then choose federated with a rationale for federated, or remove mention of centralized model.	Paragraph deleted.
10	212	Section 3.2 (Stakeholder Community) does not include municipal governments, non-profits, and regulatory and standards bodies.	Add municipal governments, non-profits, and national, international and other regulatory and standards bodies to stakeholder list.	Section 3.2 (Stakeholder Community) merged into new Section 2.4 (Digital Ecosystem Roles).
11	212, 667	Stakeholders are identified in two places—212 and 667—and in very different ways. This is confusing.	Change Section 4.7 title to Roles only.	Section 3.2 (Stakeholder Community) merged into new Section 2.4 (Digital Ecosystem Roles).

#	Line(s)	Comment	Suggested Change	Disposition/Comments
12	220-221, 225	Federal government is noted as both an authoritative and a relying party, but provincial and territorial governments are only noted as authoritative parties when provincial and territorial governments also rely on the federal government's information (e.g. citizenship documents used as foundational ID).	Mention provincial and territorial governments are also relying parties.	Section 3.2 (Stakeholder Community) merged into new Section 2.4 (Digital Ecosystem Roles).
13	224-228	Page 3 - Provinces and territories are also relying parties (e.g., on identities provided by IRCC).		Section 3.2 (Stakeholder Community) merged into new Section 2.4 (Digital Ecosystem Roles).
14	228	In other parts of the document, the term "public and private sectors" is used; yet, in this section, there is "government" and "private". Non-government public sector, for example, as relying parties, is not shown. For example, line 359 uses "public and private sectors".	Public Sector (non government) are users and providers of services to individuals or organisations. The public sector often relies on government authoritative parties to determine who is eligible for the public organisation's services.	Section 3.2 (Stakeholder Community) merged into new Section 2.4 (Digital Ecosystem Roles).
15	229	Private sector companies limits the private sector.	Change sentence: "Private sector is an end user … "	Section 3.2 (Stakeholder Community) merged into new Section 2.4 (Digital Ecosystem Roles).
16	229-232	It might be helpful to acknowledge that in some cases the private sector also assists government in identity proofing.	Add sentence to reflect the role the private sector plays for government in some cases.	Section 3.2 (Stakeholder Community) merged into new Section 2.4 (Digital Ecosystem Roles)

#	Line(s)	Comment	Suggested Change	Disposition/Comments
17	232	If proof of address is used in knowing if a person is currently a resident of one province or another, a utility bill is generally seen as a proper proof. As such, "some" special private actors may be providers of authoritative proof to the government (right to vote in Quebec, for example, is not a right from birth, but by being a citizen of Canada AND a resident of the		Section 3.2 (Stakeholder Community) merged into new Section 2.4 (Digital Ecosystem Roles).
18	233	Is there IMSC agreement on pursuing World Bank goals? How are these aligned with DIACC goals?		Section 3.3 (Goals) deleted.
19	233-258	Was wondering how the World Bank's goals were chosen to guide the PCTF. What about adding a reference to our own federal government? The Digital Charter might be a useful reference here.	Could add some text about the introduced Digital Charter lays the foundation for modernizing the rules that govern the digital sphere in Canada and rebuilding Canadians' trust in these institutions. The Digital Charter contains 10 principles that include Control and Consent; Transparency, Portability and Interoperability; and Open and Modern Digital Government	Section 3.3 (Goals) deleted.
20	237		Explain this a bit further: "continuous identity from birth to death". Currently, it reads as if we might be tracking citizens.	Section 3.3 (Goals) deleted.

#	Line(s)	Comment	Suggested Change	Disposition/Comments
21	251	We name the "government and private sector", but we could mention something to talk about cities, regional county, etc.	"and other public and private sector"	Section 3.3 (Goals) deleted.
22	263-265	Page 5 – Where can we find the "Pan-Canadian approach for identity management (PCIM)." We have not seen references to this previously.		Reference changed.
23	279	Page 5, last paragraph explicitly notes that it isn't a governance framework however I understood the PCTF as balancing out some of the governance issues		No change. The PCTF is intended to be applied within a governance framework.

#	Line(s)	Comment	Suggested Change	Disposition/Comments
24	286-288, 1002-1004	Pages 6, 61 – Similar to the comment on lines 146-165, 235-239 above. These pages indicate that the scope of the PCTF is: 'the universe of persons in Canada which is defined as all living persons resident in or visiting Canada, as well as all deceased persons, for whom an identity has been established in Canada". We suggest changing "all living persons resident in or visiting Canada" to "all living Canadian citizens and residents." We are unclear if the word "visitor" implies that IRCC would need to provide a Canadian digital ID to a client who is, for example, in Canada for a one week vacation. This is something we need to discuss internally and therefore would like the language to be broader.		Text changed.
25	290	"operating" and "inactive" are not the appropriate dichotomy; an organization can be legally active but not operating or legally inactive and still operating.	… all organizations registered in Canada, including both active and inactive organizations, for which…	Text changed.
26	292, 326-328	The "universe of relationships" is too broad.	Use the digital relationships definition here.	Text changed.

#	Line(s)	Comment	Suggested Change	Disposition/Comments
27	292, 326-328	Relationships are not really tackled in this version. For instance, there are no relationship-related atomic or compound processes.	Perhaps a sentence or footnote here to scope relationships out of this version and into a future version would be useful.	No change. Relationships are in scope for this version of the document (see Section 2.1.3 (Scope of the PCTF) and Section 2.3.2 (Digital Representations)); however, they have yet to be dealt with in much detail.
28	300	The PCTF Model figure implies that the only way to get a digital representation is through PCTF processes. Is this the intended meaning?		Diagram changed.
29	315	The paragraph seems to miss a part linking it to "Supporting Infrastructure".	" with other trust frameworks, with the help of the Supporting infrastructure".	No change. The Supporting Infrastructure is assessed independently.
30	324	The word "exclusively" seems problematic. Maybe we should qualify it? What about a parent acting on behalf of another parent; or a parent acting with parental authority over a child's digital identity? Are these all digital relationships?		No change. This is dealt with through the digital relationship.

#	Line(s)	Comment	Suggested Change	Disposition/Comments
31	329	I was wondering how we would address non-human entities and unique devices. For instance, what about other non-humans such as pets or assets such as a car or a personal smartphone? Could "individual" (or something similar) be used instead of "person", where the definition could allow for non-human entities and unique devices? "Individuals" is already used on line 215. Also the W3C Verifiable Credentials Data Model 1.0 defines a subject to be "A thing about which claims are made", which could include any entity or asset, so why are we limiting ourselves just to persons and organizations? All assets have unique IDs already (e.g., vehicle registration numbers, serial numbers on parts, IP/MAC addresses for connected devices, pet registration numbers, etc.) and can have existing relationships (e.g., individual x owns vehicle y, individual a is the owner of	It mentions they "may" extend PCTF to cover assets, but that should be replaced with "should" extend PCTF to cover other entity types (including non-human entities and assets).	Text changed.
32	338	Question: Is there mention that the Supporting Infrastructure be assessed? (or that there are sufficient assessment / conformance criteria in itself)		No.

#	Line(s)	Comment	Suggested Change	Disposition/Comments
33	341	Suggestion: Even if it's a placeholder for now, we could add a line stating that a short definition is found in Terms and Definitions.	A short definition of each placeholder can be found in Section 5 (Appendix A: Terms and Definitions).	Diagram changed. This diagram is for illustrative purposes only.
34	350-353	Page 9 – Please add "naturalized citizenship" to the following: "A foundational identity is an identity that has been established or changed as a result of a foundational event (e.g. birth, person legal name change, immigration, legal residency [...]"		Text changed.
35	353-355	No examples of contextual identity.	Even though examples are provided in Appendix A, some examples might be useful to better understand Contextual Identity in the body of the text as well.	Text changed.
36	357	"Registrar" is typically the person in charge of administering the business registry; I think to be consistent with the reference to VSOs, the reference should be to the business registries.	Business Registries in the Provinces and Territories	Text changed.
37	358	Same comment as line 357 for the feds.	the Federal Business Registry	Text changed.

#	Line(s)	Comment	Suggested Change	Disposition/Comments
38	360	Question: If a proof of address is considered part of a contextual identity, then "the residency of a province" claim is contextual? I'm curious about that, as I can be born in QC, then move to BC. After X time living in BC, I lose health coverage in QC (but I'm still "born in Quebec"). So, should we classify that as a foundational or contextual		This is an eligibility requirement.
39	384	The phrase "and certification process." We only speak of assessment elsewhere. Should it be both words everywhere or we remove certification from that line?		No change. "certified" or "certification" is used elsewhere with "assessed" or "assessment".
40	390	We suggest adding this, to link to Supporting Infrastructure, which may change more than the processes.	"for a certain population, and that the required Supporting Infrastructure is appropriately assessed and stays assessed over time."	No change. The Supporting Infrastructure is assessed independently.
41	433	Page 13, second paragraph identifies three compound processes for digital identity of a person and was curious if something similar will have to be done for organization.		Paragraph removed.

#	Line(s)	Comment	Suggested Change	Disposition/Comments
42	439, 445	Identity Creation vs Digital Identity Creation: here, we are slowly working on having a "shared identity", which "may" have a digital credential to allow access online. The goal, for us, is to offer omni-channel communications (start online, get phone help, finish in person; or start a form in person, finish online; etc.) We see it as "Identity Creation" only.		Paragraph removed.
43	456	Section 4.3.3 (Dependencies) notes the dependencies; however, the descriptions of the atomic processes do not.	Note the dependencies in the atomic process details in Section 4.4 (Atomic Processes in Detail).	In early versions of the PCTF document (circa 2016), we attempted to describe the dependencies but, due to instance variability, the resulting text and diagrams were unwieldy. Instead, dependencies are now noted and described during the assessment process.
44	461	We were hoping to find a little more about the dependencies, or how the PCTF will slowly suggest dependencies in the future. It's a little short for now, with near no mention elsewhere.		In early versions of the PCTF document (circa 2016), we attempted to describe the dependencies but, due to instance variability, the resulting text and diagrams were unwieldy. Instead, dependencies are now noted and described during the assessment process.

#	Line(s)	Comment	Suggested Change	Disposition/Comments
45	463, 471	The phrase "or technical process" of line 463 and "certified" of line 471 implies that the Supporting Infrastructure will be part of the assessment, somewhat. It's not quite clear yet for the reader.		Text changed.
46	475	Table title: we have technical processes as examples of Identity Maintenance.	Existing Business [or Technical] Process Examples	Text changed.
47	475	Add an example of Identity Maintenance.	A form submission to communicate a change of home address.	No change. This is not an example of Identity Maintenance.
48	475	Same comment as line 357 throughout the table - refer to business registries and not registrars.	a business registry process…	Text changed.
49	475	In chart under identity verification, not sure the third example is a good one; business registries don't typically have ownership information or information about the kind of business it is (or services); or maybe you are referring to another type of registry?	A financial tracking process that confirms that the organization exists and is legally active by comparing to the applicable business registry.	Example removed.

#	Line(s)	Comment	Suggested Change	Disposition/Comments
50	485	Question: There is mention in the PCTF of relying parties relying on other PCTF-assessed partners. Have we thought, yet, of how one assessed partner will know of others? We have AB => CAN, but not the other way around, nor two provinces between each other, at least not for now. Are there thoughts for a registry of some sort?		No change. This will be dealt with by governance.
51	487	Should add a mention of the Supporting Infrastructure here, as it really may help with the "conveyance" part.		No change. The Supporting Infrastructure is addressed in the last paragraph.
52	511	If we added hints of Supporting Infrastructure assessment previously, we should add a note about it here as well.		No change. The Supporting Infrastructure is addressed in the last paragraph.

#	Line(s)	Comment	Suggested Change	Disposition/Comments
53	515	Section 4.4.1 (Identity Resolution) seems to not take into account contextual identities, and the risk of duplicates, in that case. For example, if one allows a person A to be herself AND have a second digital identity of A' which is herself-at-work for organization O, is it the task of identity resolution to find that out? We are planning to allow some duplicates, between individuals and individual's profile as a user of an organization; but we will ask that the official agent of the organization be a verified individual (high level of certainty that they are who they are).		Noted. This requires further analysis.
54	517	This atomic process speaks of identity information. At other place, we use "attributes" or "claims". We could maybe standardize with one?		Usage of terms has been standardized.
55	517	Question: Is the authoritative record only a concept of foundational identity? Or is it OK for some contextual information, such as an email address or phone number? (which can be proved to be in the possession of the individual with some technical processes)		No. Yes.

#	Line(s)	Comment	Suggested Change	Disposition/Comments
56	521	Do we want to add a touch of "level of assurance" concept in that atomic process description? Section 4.4.5 (Evidence Validation) only speaks of strong "proof"		No.
57	522	The phrase "dynamically confirming" is confusing.	Please provide some examples.	Noted. This will be explained in a future version of the PCTF document.
58	524	We need stronger language re: ensuring identity information is accurate.	Change to confirming whether information is accurate and updating to maintain accuracy.	Text changed.
59	525	Who is the attributed actor?	Some examples might be useful here.	Text changed.
60	528	Credential will not be issued to an organization; rather, it will be issued to a person representing the organization.		No change.
61	535, 537	The use of the term "signature" might lead readers to think in terms of e-signature vs. digital signature.	We suggest revisiting the wording of these two atomic processes.	No change.
62	535-546	All the previous atomic process names are noun based (Revocation, Authentication, etc.), but these atomic processes are verb based (Check, Revoke, etc.)	Atomic processes should be named consistently.	Text changed.
63	538-541	We realize Notice and Consent is a thematic issue; however, we thought we'd note that these processes are not in alignment with DIACC.	Please review DIACC conformance criteria re: Notice and Consent.	DIACC groups some of these atomic processes together. We prefer them to be separate.

#	Line(s)	Comment	Suggested Change	Disposition/Comments
64	544	What does "suspended consent" mean? Is the Stored Consent Decision changed to a No until a Yes can be received?		Don't know.
65	549	We have a lot about consent to protect the information of individuals. What about a way for the PCTF to know for which conditions of service an identity is accepted? I guess it's out of scope for now, but acceptance of condition of service is not far from consent to		This is addressed in the assessment process.
66	550		We would like to see some examples of Relying Party compound processes as well in Section 4.5 (Compound Processes in Detail).	Section removed.
67	599	Are signatures a required or optional part of Credential Assurance? Is this just an example of a Credential Assurance process?		Diagram removed.
68	611	We understand that "one person acting on behalf of another" will not be there yet (to be seen in relationships), example, consent for a child		Section removed.
69	612-613	Is "meaningful consent" received for identity provision only or is it also received by Relying Parties for that information as well?		Section removed.

#	Line(s)	Comment	Suggested Change	Disposition/Comments
70	629-633	If there are separate parties requesting and recording consent and disclosing information based on the recorded consent, will the protocols for communicating consent information and changes be defined?		Section removed.
71	642	Should we state that the "Informed consent" is "at least once"? Because I understand that it is a (more) repeatable atomic process, once per service or relying parties.		Diagram removed.
72	647	Page 33, Section 4.5.5 lacks a model image for organization like the one for person in Section 4.5.4		Section removed.
73	649	We guess that Credential Assurance will be enriched for organizations, to know which individuals have the right to act on behalf of the identified organization, once relationships are in.		Section removed.
74	657	Page 34, 4.6 has the set of proofs images for person and was curious if something similar needs to be done for organization		Section removed.
75	662	Multiple express consent boxes?		Diagram removed.

#	Line(s)	Comment	Suggested Change	Disposition/Comments
76	681	The word "claim" seems first used in the graph there, while we use "attributes" and "information" elsewhere. Should we standardize? (although a claim is a more strong word for a verified information or attribute). See line 705-708 for what seems to be an excellent definition of a claim.		Section 4.7 (Stakeholders and Roles) merged into new Section 2.4 (Digital Ecosystem Roles).
77	684	The Canadian Digital Identity Ecosystem Stakeholders figure feels inconsistent with the rest of the document which uses the terms listed under PCTF participant roles (Identity Assurance Provider, Relying Party, etc.).		Section 4.7 (Stakeholders and Roles) merged into new Section 2.4 (Digital Ecosystem Roles).
78	688-731	There are multiple terms and definitions for the same tasks, and this might create consistency challenges.		Section 4.7 (Stakeholders and Roles) merged into new Section 2.4 (Digital Ecosystem Roles).
79	699-700	Please further qualify.	Suggest "between parties the digital ID ecosystem"	Section 4.7 (Stakeholders and Roles) merged into new Section 2.4 (Digital Ecosystem Roles).
80	706	Who can extend the scope of the PCTF? TBS, participants, government participants only? How can we ensure that the extension of scope remains within the parameters of the trust framework?		Section 4.7 (Stakeholders and Roles) merged into new Section 2.4 (Digital Ecosystem Roles).

#	Line(s)	Comment	Suggested Change	Disposition/Comments
81	730		The term used in the rest of the document is Subject, so for consistency perhaps we can change "Digital Identity Owner" to "Subject".	Section 4.7 (Stakeholders and Roles) merged into new Section 2.4 (Digital Ecosystem Roles).
82	749		Assessment should be a separate document.	The intent of this section is to provide an overview of the topic.
83	762	CC can only provide digital identity info for federally-incorporated corporations	the Government of Canada may be a digital identity provider (for federally-incorporated corporations)	Text changed.
84	764	the P/Ts would provide digital identity info for corporations incorporated in their jurisdictions	(for provincially/territorially-incorporated corporations, sole proprietorships and partnerships, etc.)	Text changed.
85	766	Business Registries do not typically know if an organization is "legitimate" or not; rather just whether it exists (was created) and whether it is legally active or not	is responsible for ensuring that the organization exists and has been registered...	Text changed.
86	771	Maybe we should mention that how the acting individual will be related to the organization will be seen later.		Text changed.
87	772		Change to "assessment goal" to prevent confusion with the goal of the PCTF.	Text changed.
88	779	PCTF is identified as a tool, when it is a framework.	Change to "PCTF is a framework based on which assessment tools may be devised to assist all parties ... "	Text changed.

#	Line(s)	Comment	Suggested Change	Disposition/Comments
89	780	If PCTF is not normative, then how will it frame "who is accountable"?		Text changed.
90	786	Section 4.8.2 is unclear.	Remove section.	Section removed.
91	787-802, 975	Pages 40, 51, 54 - What is the relationship between the PCTF and TBS policies and directives? For example, how does the Project Management, Engagement, and Governance (Approvals) section of the PCTF interact with the TBS Directive on the Planning and Management of Investments? (see page 40). In addition, definitions in the annex do not appear to line up with the TBS Policy Direction to Modernize the Government of Canada's Sex and Gender Information Practices (see "documented sex" on page 51 and		Section 4.8.2 removed. The term "documented sex" and its definition removed.
92	808	Page 40, 4.8.3 the second paragraph discusses the detailed worksheet for the PCTF assessment process and we believe the organization conformance criteria would need to be integrated into this.		Agreed.

#	Line(s)	Comment	Suggested Change	Disposition/Comments
93	836	The Business Process to Atomic Process Mapping figure appears without context.	Remove figure, or move the formal determinations after the figure, so that the figure follows from the sentence, "Once the existing business processes have been mapped, they can be assessed and a determination made against each of the related atomic process conformance criteria"	Diagram removed.
94	841-842	Would the relying party "issue" the letter or request it from the authoritative party?		This is dependent on the arrangement.
95	842, 846, 848	"for a digital identity." Missing a word, did you mean "digital identity provider", "digital identity system", or "digital identity" (one individual)?		No change.
96	905	Same comment as line 357.	the Business Registries in the Provinces and Territories	Text changed.
97	907	Same comment as line 358.	the Federal Business Registry	Text changed.
98	933	Define TDIP.		Section removed.
99	937	Define TDI.		Section removed.
100	975	Term: Assurance Delete "or fact" because a fact is always true, so there is no determining its truth.		Text changed.
101	975	Term: Authenticator The word authenticate is used to define authenticator, which is a bit circular.		Text changed.

#	Line(s)	Comment	Suggested Change	Disposition/Comments
102	975	Term: Credential Risk New term that did not appear anywhere else in the text.		Term and definition removed.
103	975	Term: Digital Identity Owner The term subject was used in the document with the exception of one place where digital identity owner is used, so this should be definition of subject.		Depending on the context, the terms "Subject", "Holder", "person", or "person or organization" are used throughout the document. The definition of Digital Identity Owner also now conforms
104	975	Term: Document Authentication New term that did not appear anywhere else in the text. Is this a business process being mapped?		Term and definition removed.
105	975	Term: Evidence of Contextual Identity Examples Business Number 9 and Business Number 15 are unclear.		Text changed.
106	975	Term: Federated Credentials The term is a noun whereas the definition describes an activity (verb): sharing of credential assurances		Term and definition removed.
107	975	Term: Federated Identity The term is a noun whereas the definition describes an activity (verb): sharing of identity assurances		Term and definition removed.
108	975	Term: Federating Credentials There is a lot of room for confusion with the term Federated Credentials. Is there another term we could use?		Term and definition removed.

#	Line(s)	Comment	Suggested Change	Disposition/Comments
109	975	Term: Federating Identity There is a lot of room for confusion with the term Federated Identity. Is there another term we could use?		Term and definition removed.
110	975	Term: Formulate Notice We might now know in advance "with which parties" information might be shared.		Noted.
111	975	Term: Identity Attribute Mentions the term device, even though devices are not defined in this Appendix or elsewhere.		Device is mentioned elsewhere in the document.
112	975	Term: Identity Risk Should a relationship be established between assurance levels and risk: higher assurance = lower risk? Also, term is not used anywhere else in the document.		Term and definition removed.
113	975	Term: Identity Validation Why are there two terms that mean the same thing: Identity Validation and Identity Information Validation?		Identity Validation has been replaced by Identity Information Validation throughout the document.

#	Line(s)	Comment	Suggested Change	Disposition/Comments
114	975	Term: Record Consent "Once the consent information has been stored, a notification on the consent decision made is issued to the relevant parties to the consent decision." Consent decisions might be made more than once, so any recording of consent should be shared with relevant parties.		Agreed.
115	975	Term: Review Consent Define authorized reviewer or give some examples.		Agreed.
116	975	Term: Revoke Consent A notification should be shared with relevant parties if consent is revoked.		Agreed.
117	975	Term: Sex The term intersex should be mentioned: "female, male, or intersex".		Agreed.
118	975	Term: Trust The term device is used.		Term and definition removed.
119	975	Term: Trusted Referee Confirmation New term that is not used elsewhere in the document.		No change.

#	Line(s)	Comment	Suggested Change	Disposition/Comments
120	975	Page 60 – "vital event" should include immigration, legal residency, and naturalized citizenship given the reference on page 9 to immigration and legal residency being foundational events.		Text changed.
121	975	"business event" - should this be "organization event" to be consistent with the language throughout?		No change.
122	975	foundational name - add the federal business registry in there.	federal/provincial/territorial business registry record	Text changed.
123	975	foundation registry - just consistency of language throughout.	There are 14 such registries in Canada (the 13 provincial and territorial business registries and Corporations Canada (federal)).	Text changed.
124	975	organization - just a suggestion :)	A legal entity that is not an individual or a natural person.	No change.
125	975	add definition of individual - also just a suggestion :=)	A natural person, including minors…	No change.
126	1000	We think a word could be added for "contextual vs. foundational" identity here.		No change.
127	1045	Word claim vs. attribute?		No change.
128	1047		Remove "sex" from list of identity attributes because sex- and genderless credentials are the likely future.	Text changed.
129	1152	Where should the Authoritative Party publish its identity resolution requirements?		Text removed.