CITIZEN FOCUS ACTION CLUSTER MEETING NOTES

WORKSHOP: INITIATIVE CITIZEN CONTROL OF PERSONAL DATA

Meeting Details: 25 February 2021 – 10:00 – 11-30 CET. ONLINE

AGENDA
Short Introduction.   *Shaun Topham. DataVaults project. Initiative Lead.*
Presentation of the KRAKEN Project.   *Juan Carlos Perez Baun. ATOS*
Discussion regarding the problems faced and the process of identifying and listing the potential solutions to these problems.
"Use-cases for the citizens" and **"The link between urban date platforms and personal data stores/personal data lake".**   *Dr Haydee Sheombar. ERASMUS Centre for Data Analytics Rotterdam and RUGGEDISED Project*
Discussion.
Next Steps.

INTRODUCTION

Shaun Topham (Initiative Lead) gave a brief overview of the initiative for those not present at the launch.
"Building a community of those projects and initiatives dealing with citizen's control of personal data, working towards a European Model as the core, whilst recognising its wider standing elsewhere in the digital economy. Helping and being helped by others initiatives, without duplicating effort. And having a shared target of reaching 300 million citizens served by Urban Data Platforms by 2025."

The slide presentation shows the proposed initial breakdown for carrying out work along with a rough structure.

KRAKEN PROJECT

Juan Carlos Perez Baun (ATOS*)* presented the KRAKEN project with the slides giving a comprehensive picture of what was presented. Given the key focus of KRAKEN being on protecting personal data, it served both as information and a basis for building on the initial ideas behind the initiative.

Discussion

In the discussion which ensued, Elena Palmisano (PIN) in relation to the monetisation of personal data, asked as to whether the KRAKEN Project had a model or technology in mind for this aspect. The response was that this was still under development within the project. He mentioned one idea which was to collaborate with Trade Unions to encourage aggregation of citizen's data in return for incentives. But they were still modelling, adding that this was not easy.

Andrea Garcia Rodriguez (Barcelona Department of International Affairs) enquired as to whether there was a mechanism for the removal of data in their work, with the citizen being able to subsequently opt out and have data removed.

The response was that this was a main focus in keeping with the rights coming from the GDPR of erasing personal data. The "marketplace" function of KRAKEN doesn't store the actual data, using verified credentials and consents etc. to access it. So the revocation process is being worked on within this context, by trying to avoid any personal data being held in the "marketplace" and that the data remains with the original owners. There is a referral point to the specific data in the ledger, but not the data itself.

Given the initiatives approach of creating smaller cluster to work on inter-related topics, a request was made for contact to be made with KRAKEN's legal team.

Maria Micheli (EU JRC) made a comment, not on the technology, but as to whether the question of how users understand all these technical terms- looking at the other side of the technology and asking "What do the citizens make of all this?"

She referred to the scepticism surrounding some of the Covid contact-tracing apps or of the citizens not understanding the measures taken behind the app and posed the question: "Is anyone considering these kinds of communication aspects in the project?"

The KRAKEN approach was that the interaction with the user would be at the initial stage where they enter into the "marketplace". Here all the necessary information would be prepared and presented, covering aspects such as how the data will be used, managed, etc. The Legal team from KU Leuven is responsible for providing this guidance and advising on the measures to be taken in order to comply with all the regulations.

There may be aspects of the other work within Citizen Focus Cluster which may be of benefit to the initiative in this respect.

Marina di Bormida (DataVaults) made a comment that Maria's comments were very relevant as a key element is how acceptance by the citizens is generated and in the DataVaults Project, effort was being made in trying to get feedback from the citizens. A consultation was being prepared considering their attitudes regarding the best way forward, with the intention also of keeping them in the loop, with further iterations, so we too are faced with the same issues as KRAKEN.

"USE-CASES FOR THE CITIZENS" AND "THE LINK BETWEEN URBAN DATE PLATFORMS AND PERSONAL DATA STORES/ PERSONAL DATA LAKE"

Dr Haydee Sheombar based her talk on studies from the ERASMUS Centre for Data Analytics Rotterdam and deliverables from the RUGGEDISED Project. Again, the slides give a good overview of what was presented.
The presentation was divided into three parts. Firstly setting the context which was within a complex and rapid speed of change, which could be worrying. There is a lack of understanding by government on the need to regulate for these changes.
A smart society needs to have engaged citizens, but there are real gaps in achieving this- there is an "engagement deficit". There is a need to help and nudge along behaviour change.
Are Urban Data Platforms performing the same functions as Airbnb and Uber did for rooms and rides? Should Urban Data Platforms be counted as vital infrastructure? Can they help to scale-up Smart City Projects and get away from the constant piloting environment?

Part two was based around the RUGGEDISED Project and specifically on "Governance, Trust and Smart City Business Models" (There are two documents of value here a deliverable of the same name on the RUGGEDISED site and "The Pathway to Market for Urban Data Platforms" Study on the Smart Cities MarketPlace site). The slides provided a wealth of information covering topics such as governance and ownership of platforms and their levels of maturity.

Part three covered use-cases and the "nudging" process, with examples being shown, particularly in regard to how a citizen may benefit directly, with personal service apps derived from the platform.

Topics tabled for discussion included the contradiction between having a critical public infrastructure and the lack of trust in public administration and the notion that citizens aren't really interested in these topics, which was exactly the same being said of citizens in regard to generating electricity from alternate sources and energy meters ten years ago.

Paolo Boscolo (Prato) raised a question in regard to the Study referred to above. Have investigations been carried out with regard to citizens –what was the source of the data presented?
Haydee responded –explaining that there was a survey undertaken of a hundred project managers of Urban Data Platforms and a further aspect, upon which the citizen engagement slide was based, taking the opinions of thirty global experts.
An important aspect is that we need to know why a citizen would engage and not just how they will engage, as there should be value for them.
Elena Palmisano (PIN) referred to the reported problems Rotterdam had regarding the compliance with GDPR issue as a potential "stopper".

The response was that the real problem faced had been differences between the city administration and the private sector. Pointing out that ideally, the platform should not store data just as Airbnb doesn't own rooms or Uber own cars. But there still remains issues over ownership of the data and the provenance of it.

Other questions regarding governance and around Data Trusts and Trusted Third Parties remain to be answered. Asking how we manage and govern personal data helps us to allocate the responsibility to the right place as there is lots of distributed responsibility. But the whole issue of governance is essential for overcoming trust concerns for the urban data platform as a whole, but particularly for personal data.

NEXT STEPS

The date for the next meeting of Wednesday April 14th. (Put back a week from that suggested because of Easter)

It was expected that progress may have been made in contributing to the filling in of the tables associated with the four pillars for action, shown in the introductory slides.

Similarly, the refinement of the structure of the initiative, to create smaller groups to interact with outside projects and initiatives should be moved forward.

First targets could be "Governance", "Standards" and "Legal, Privacy and Ethical issues" and request made for volunteers to lead and participate.

In relation to standards, Tania Marcos Paramio (United Nations, Smart and Sustainable Cities) drew attention to the ongoing work which we should join in with, stressing the need for long-term thinking and helping to create the conditions for future take-up.: https://www.etsi.org/deliver/etsi_tr/103400_103499/103455/01.01.01_60/tr_103455v0101 01p.pdf

Feedback was requested on all the issues discussed in order to refine the initiative further.

A repository for documents/work space as well as more interactional software will be investigated for next time.