Gap Analysis for Kantara consent receipts.

This document aims to compare the struct and vision of the Kantara consent receipts to Gataca's Verifiable Consent in order to adjust and make both compatible; or analyze the impact of a migration.

Terminology comparison

Kantara Consent Receipt	Verifiable Consent
PII	Claims
PII Controller	Authorized Entity
PII Principal Id	Approver Subject
consentReceiptID	Consent Id

Structure comparison

Kantara Consent Receipt	Verifiable Consent
PII Principal Id	approverSubject
consentReceiptID	id
Jurisdiction	-
PolicyURL	-
Collection Method	- (is it needed? is it not always the same?)
Sensitive - SPICat	- (not explicit)
Public Key	- (Not explicit, deducible from DID)
-	**Proof (signature of the consent document by both parties)**
Multiple receivers	1 Receiver of the data
Multiple services	1 Service per consent
Data of the receiver (contact, address, url...)	- (not explicit, might be obtainable from a public registry)

Kantara Consent Receipt	Verifiable Consent
Allow on behalf processing	-
Purposes	Claims
PrimaryPurpose	- (not explicitly: purpose application)
Third party disclosure	purpose = third party sharing
Purpose Category + purpose	purpose (no human readable translation inside doc)
Pii Category	type
Termination	-
Consent Type	- (not explicitly: always EXPLICIT by design?)
- (no segregated data id per purpose, a global data identifier at doc level)	credential Id

```
Mayor changes are bold; missing info in italic
```

Mayor gaps

There are 2 mayor gaps, considering compatibilities on the two models:

- Signature of the consent autocontained in the document itself
- Uniquely identifying each PII knowing the credential Ids

There are minor gaps:

- new data fields that were not directly present but inferable on the Verifiable Consent
- new data fields that were not being registered or used
- different structurization of equivalent fields
- bigger flexibility on multiple services and receivers (not sure about the use case)