![ISO logo]

ISO/TMB PSC 01 N0015

Date: 2010-04-07

ISO/TMB PSC 01

Privacy Steering Committee

Secretariat: DIN, Germany

Tilte: **Canada National Body Comments on draft Terms of Reference, Termium and Live Inventory**

*Source***:** SCC, National Body of Canada

*Project(s)***:**

Additional information This document is circulated for consideration at the 2nd ISO/TMB PSC 01 meeting and teleconference on 23rd April 2010.

Due Date:

Distribution: ISO/TMB PSC 01 Members
ISO/TMB Secretariat
ISO/IEC JTC 1 Secretariat
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 27 Management
ISO/TMB PSC 01 Chairman

Von: Steven Johnston [mailto:Steven.Johnston@priv.gc.ca]
Gesendet: Montag, 29. März 2010 22:26
An: Passia, Krystyna
Betreff: RE: ISO/TMB_PSC01_010: Notice/Agenda for Second PSC 01 Meeting/Conference Call

Krystyna:

As previously discussed, I will not be able to join the next meeting (Melaka) in person. However, I will be able to dial into the meeting and have reserved time in my calendar for this.

If it is not too late to do so, I would like to offer a number of comments on topics raised during the initial meeting or in your subsequent e-mails:

1) Draft Terms of Reference: as pointed out during the Berlin meeting, I believe that the Committee should be a true steering committee, not just a "working group" that completes the limited tasks set to it by the TMB in TMB Resolution 146/2009. In other words, the committee should provide long-term strategic guidance to TMB and ISO committees and working groups on matters related to the development of privacy-related standards. I realize that not everyone agrees with this approach, but given the level of involvement we have in the Committee, it would be a shame to waste that talent on simply organizing a one-day conference and implementing a website.

One of the "additional tasks" set by TMB is examining the feasibility of improving cooperation with policy makers. To my mind, this should include the data protection and privacy regulators (i.e., the International Conference of Data Protection and Privacy Commissioners). As the liaison officer from the Conference to WG 5 - I do not believe the Conference has liaisons with any other committee or working group - I will be providing members of the Conference with an update on the Committee's activities. I know that the Conference were one of the potential invitees to the October event (along with OECD, etc.) discussed in Berlin - the question will be one of actually getting members of the Conference involved. I will be there in my capacity as liaison officer (and as a Committee member). If the event is held in Berlin, I could see members of the different German Commissions (federal and state) attending, along with members from other European Commissions (e.g., France, UK, Spain, etc.). I guess it will depend on what constitutes appropriate representation and how we go about inviting guests to the event

2) Termium: I am aware of Termium through some of my national level work - in fact, members of the Translation Bureau (the agency responsible for Termium) are members of a Canadian national committee on identity management. It was my understanding that SC 27 SD6 (Vocabulary) was already part of Termium, or was going to be added to Termium. Given that ISO is proposing to have the terminology standard ISO 2382 transposed to Termium, I think it makes perfect sense to use that document as a repository for privacy-related terminology as well. We have the added benefit of having a managed service, which takes that particular burden away from an ISO committee or WG. All we need to do is ensure that as new documents are developed, committees and WGs a) check the database to see if the terms and definitions they are proposing are already included (and if so, they should adopt those definitions unless there is a compelling reason not to), and b) add new terminology to the database on a consistent basis. If we can do that, then Termium will become a very useful tool;

3) ICT Security Standards Roadmap (ITU-T): As with Termium, I was aware of the ITU-T Roadmap work, including the database of approved security standards - I just haven't looked at it in a while. This is certainly one way to approach the concept of a "live inventory". It will be interesting to get more details on what level of effort is required to maintain this site, and in particular, how consistently the ITU-T study groups contribute to the database. I note that there are already links to SC 27 and SC 37 work on the site (see, for example, Part 3: Security standards under development (http://www.itu.int/ITU-T/studygroups/com17/ict/part03.html)) - would it be possible/feasible to simply expand that part of the site and contribute to it (rather than a separate ISO site)? I haven't thought it all the way through but I can see some advantages to that approach (e.g., lower overhead, single point of reference, etc.) as well as some disadvantages (e.g., ensuring the site is up-to-date, how to publicize it so that members of ISO are aware of its existence, etc.). Something to consider.

4) October 2010 Conference: as I mentioned during the Berlin meeting, I think it would be useful to have a keynote speaker (a futurist, perhaps) who can paint a picture of where society is heading in terms of privacy and data protection over the course of the next ten years (i.e., what will data protection and privacy look like in 2020?). I think this would be very useful in terms of setting the context for the

remainder of the discussion around what ISO (and by extension, other SDOs) should do in terms of developing standards in this area. It might also have the benefit of helping attract people to the event - otherwise it may be viewed as too narrow, too specialized, too boring...

Have you received any feedback/comments from any of the other Committtee members?

Hopefully, the above comments amke sense. If you have any questions, please let me know.

Regards

Steve