

The ClearButton Project Provides a New Deal on Data Method for Personal Notice and Authorized Access More information is available at ClearButton.net

Leading up to the [IDESG Plenary and BigDataDialog Hangout on Big Data and Identity](#), it will be helpful to write up an identity-related description of ClearButton with emphasis on use of OpenID Connect, aspects of BlueButton+ and the centrality of user-centered identity and account management for the use of neutral functional infrastructural registry services modeled on do-not-call registries and mobile number portability registries. Gold stars to any contributors that can concisely describe how ClearButton registry services for individual identity and personal data can provide fair information practices in a Big Data world by ensuring individual-centered identifier and end-point connection control with recourse rights at the same time as respecting industry-centered property rights and competitive interests. These facets of ClearButton reflect material aspects of the IDESG mission to develop a balanced identity ecosystem and provide examples of how infrastructure services provided on a low markup quasi utility basis can form essential elements of a larger working marketplace.

Consider the following:

The Business, Legal and Technical Architecture and Systemic Organization of FTC Regulated Do-Not-Call Registry Services

The Business, Legal and Technical Architecture and Systemic Organization of FCC Regulated Full Mobile Number Portability (FMNP) and the role of [National Portability Administration Center \(NPAC\)](#) especially with respect to [Form 499a Compliance](#)

Compare and contrast the fees required to support number portability and the do-not-call registry, noting how the fee is calculated, who owes the fee, who receives the fee, how the revenue is allocated and in return for what is the money paid (please use the FTC minimum and maximum annual fees in effect as of October 1, 2013 for comparison).

Based on the prior comparison and analysis, imagine there were registries for identity-related services operating on behalf of individuals in a comparable manner? For example, comparable identity-related services could ensure portability of identity end-points and the rights to control aspects of who gets access to identity information and services. What functions and roles with respect to use of, payment for, interoperation with and oversight of such identity-related registry services might be allocated to players in an identity ecosystem (eg IdP, Relying Party, Attribute Provider, Regulator, Self-Regulator, etc)? How could the provision of low-cost, standard operating neutral identity-registry services ensure the promise of permission based user-centered first person identity technology while enabling an even more lucrative, innovative and effective marketplace?

