



**Minutes of the EURIM Personal Identity Group meeting, 21 April 2005,  
10.30 – 12.30 at 1, The Abbey Garden, Westminster**

Chairman: Jim Lound (Experian)  
Rapporteur: Dave Wright (EURIM)

***SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS***

1. The purpose of the meeting was to review progress on the various Group workstreams, and to make forward plans.
2. The Personal Identity Subgroup on Data Sharing has produced a consensual Group Status Report on secure data sharing intended to support eGU in its mission of ensuring that IT supports the business transformation of Government to provide more efficient public services.
3. Two further papers are planned on the same topic for different audiences:
  - a Briefing for the new intake of MPs on the benefits of secure data sharing, with detailed, back-up appendices for House of Commons Library staff and the Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology;
  - a paper for eGU looking specifically at identity relationships.
4. The 'circle of trust' pilot project that will manage information related to professional and educational qualifications will in future be referred to as the 'VALUE Project' (Validation/verification and Accreditation of Lifelong Updating and Experience). More details can be found on the EURIM website: <http://www.eurim.org.uk/activities/skills/0503valuepaper.pdf>
5. Progress on the EURIM-DCA process map will continue with the DCA maintaining a 'watching brief' while their resources are focused on freedom of information issues. An update is awaited from a FAME meeting on data sharing on 8 April. The current version can be accessed on the EURIM website at <http://www.eurim.org.uk/activities/pi/0503processflow.pdf>
6. The first meeting of the ID Cards Bill Subgroup will be held at IBM on 26 April. A major aim will be to prepare briefing material for the new intake of MPs after the General Election. The subgroup aims to identify:
  - what the legislation actually allows;
  - the current state of implementation plans;
  - the issues under debate and where to find the views of those active on them;
  - any issues that have arisen which are not already being well covered elsewhere;
  - possible actions that may extend the functionality of ID cards while enhancing security.
7. There is an urgent need for an agreed UK approach to policy and implementation processes. Debate is likely to focus strongly on the specific content of the new ID Cards Bill, especially what flexibilities are afforded compared with codes of practice and regulations requiring compliance.
8. A draft personal identity initiatives grid has been assembled. Please send information and additions to Jim Lound ([Jim.Lound@uk.experian.com](mailto:Jim.Lound@uk.experian.com)) so that the grid, to be hosted on the EURIM website, can be maintained and updated.
9. A second meeting of the EURIM PI Subgroup on online security and access is planned for the afternoon of 4 May, to review a draft forward plan, and determine future actions.

## **1. Progress on workstreams**

1.1 The purpose of the meeting was to review progress on the various Group workstreams, and to make forward plans.

## **2. Progress on workstreams**

### The eGU paper and sequels – report from subgroup

2.1 The Personal Identity Subgroup on Data Sharing had worked hard over the last few months to achieve consensus around a Group Status Report on secure data sharing. This is intended to support the eGU in its mission of ensuring that IT supports the business transformation of Government to provide better, more efficient public services.

2.2 The paper examines different models for secure data sharing and how they might be implemented within the public sector, lists some current examples and in conclusion suggests quick wins. A covering letter is being drafted, and after final sub-editing, the paper will be despatched to eGU, countersigned by EURIM for impartiality. The report will then be circulated digitally to members and posted on the EURIM website. A meeting between EURIM staff and eGU is planned for 12 May.

2.3 Two further papers are planned on the same topic for different audiences:

- A Briefing for the new intake of MPs on the benefits of secure data sharing, with detail relegated to back-up appendices for House of Commons Library staff and the Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology. The guidance material for MPs needs to be attractive and readable whilst covering issues of interworking between different types of model, including those based on hierarchies, rings of trust, and federations - all of which may or may not overlap. It is hoped that the draft will be circulated for feedback during the election period, and ready to launch in late May or early June.
- A separate paper for eGU looking specifically at identity relationships, and issues such as where integration makes sense, where federation makes sense and how the various models referenced in the secure data sharing paper can be brought into play. This should focus on ground rules and policies, consents and permissions.

2.4 With regard to the paper for the new intake of MPs, the non-parliamentary members of EURIM have clearance to cooperate with eGU and OGC etc., but not to publicise the material more widely unless and until the MPs expected to be responsible for the educational programme are returned to Parliament and can be consulted on format and content.

### The circle of trust model

2.5 Consultants with practical knowledge of the market have been commissioned to produce a position paper on the practicality of an exercise that will use the circle of trust model to help internationally validate/verify records of achievement and experience across continuous professional development, workforce updating and university alumni programmes. Market research has shown that ~70% of CVs contain significant exaggerations and as many as 30% are actually fraudulent. This has many implications for vetting personnel provided by suppliers and job applicants, especially in the areas of child protection, computer security. The checking of claims raises issues of consent and data protection etc. Such an exercise is therefore a useful, but also demanding and potentially expensive, test of governance routines, efficiency and motivations. The checking of information is key, not the technology or trust model employed.

2.6 Concern was expressed about the continued use of the term 'circle of trust' for the financial services model, because the same term is used in federated models of Liberty Alliance. Moreover, there are a number of different approaches to data sharing issues within education. A number of consent models would be tested during an otherwise intrusive exercise and it was agreed that future reference should be to the 'VALUE Project' (Validation and Accreditation of Lifelong Updating and Experience), instead of to the 'circle of trust' pilot. More details can be found on the EURIM website:

<http://www.eurim.org.uk/activities/skills/0503valuepaper.pdf>

2.7 The VALUE Project is being undertaken with the Conference of Professors and Heads of Computing and IMIS in association with Experian, and is not a EURIM project. Any link to EURIM would be in the area of Skills and Life-Long Learning, not Personal Identity. HEFCE may fund university-based CPD, and both e-Skills and Skills for Justice (where both individuals and courses/qualifications need to be tracked and accredited)) are looking at work in this area.

### The data sharing process map

2.8 The Department of Constitutional Affairs had agreed to report back from a FAME meeting on data sharing on 8 April. However, an update is still awaited as the officer concerned is attending a training course. Progress on the EURIM process map will continue with the DCA maintaining a 'watching brief' while their resources are focused on freedom of information issues. In June, DCA will put forward evidence-based proposals to ministers on what they consider to be the best way forward. The scale of DCA's involvement will then depend on resources.

2.9 The aim of the process map is to develop an interactive website that will enable a practitioner to follow a question and answer flow chart in determining courses of action on data sharing issues. It is proposed to look first at the local government sector, providing sufficient detail to allow drilling down to relevant areas of the Data Protection Act, best practice guidance and local authority exceptions. Members were reminded that the current draft version of the EURIM-DCA data sharing process map can be accessed on the EURIM website at <http://www.eurim.org.uk/activities/pi/0503processflow.pdf>

### Establishment of ID Cards subgroup

2.10 The meeting of the Personal Identity Group, on 9 March 2005 had agreed, in response to a request from EURIM Council, to form a subgroup to address issues of concern around personal identity in the ID Card Bill. In particular, the Subgroup was tasked to identify what had and had not been decided in the text of the Bill, what had been decided as a planning or implementation issue, and to comment on relevant issues that did not appear in the Bill.

2.11 The first (planning) meeting of the ID Cards Bill Subgroup will be held at IBM offices on 26 April. Although the remit was originally to consider the implications of the now withdrawn Bill, the same work and issues are likely to arise and it would be helpful to produce a checklist of issues for any new Bill, an impact assessment exercise and likely issues for public debate ready for the new Parliament and likely reintroduction of the ID Bill. This should facilitate analysis of the new Bill when it arrives.

2.12 A major aim will be to prepare briefing material for the new intake of MPs after the General Election. The subgroup should identify:

- what the legislation actually allows;
- the current state of implementation plans;
- the issues under debate and where to find the views of those active on them;
- any issues that have arisen which are not already being well covered elsewhere;
- possible actions that may extend the functionality of ID cards while enhancing security;

and which of these issues are priorities. If the ID Cards Bill does not deal with the relationships with the finance sector, mixed economy and central Government, the Subgroup would wish to see these issues debated and decided. There is a great deal of difference between a generically useful ID card and a Home Office 'national security' application. MPs should be alerted to the decision that may have to be taken between an application designed to deliver a single departments' programme, and a card that has significant economic and social uses.

2.13 The cross-departmental Strategy Unit had already noticed that digital strategy had already widened in some respects, e.g. the Home Office talks with the Finance Industry about common measures for the identity card process. **PV suggested that a representative of APACS be invited to join the group.**

2.14 The subgroup would not attempt to provide answers, but would highlight areas where decisions had been, or needed to be, taken. The Office of the Information Commissioner would be taking an interest in the Subgroup, and would be happy to comment on the group's deliberations.

2.15 There is an obvious supplier interest in ID cards as a business opportunity, and Intellect had been talking about their viability process to Home Office. A manifesto mandate is likely, and it would be preferable to issue an objective commentary on a list of topics that need a decision process rather than attempt to find an answer to the many issues.

2.16 The Subgroup should also produce a list of sources that might be useful to the professional researchers of HoC Library, if/when they need to update their Briefing. It would be useful to discover what this document (<http://www.parliament.uk/commons/lib/research/rp2004/rp04-093.pdf>) did not cover. The EURIM detailed document on data sharing is intended to help HoC Library researchers by providing reliable information and pointing to relevant source materials and contacts.

2.17 Most of the many other reports on ID cards focus on the practicality of information systems engineering and technologies, as opposed to the political context, and much of the material available lacked objectivity. The subgroup should deliver an objective commentary, covering what is present and what is omitted from the new Bill, on what will be a difficult and emotive debate.

2.18 The Group should also consider the issues within a European context - many member states have reservations around ID cards, and are advancing their own proposals for the citizens' health insurance card for Europe. These proposals might be incorporated in EU directives, to be transposed into UK legislation over time. It may therefore be useful to consider a European commentary for compatibility with the UK proposals, and anticipate possible conflicts.

2.19 There is an urgent need for an agreed UK approach for policy and implementation processes – something that has not been achieved to date. Debate is likely to focus strongly on the specific content of the new ID Cards Bill, and what flexibilities are afforded compared with codes of practice and regulations that will require compliance when an ID system is upgraded as technologies and standards, as well as access security and hacking techniques, evolve. **How to manage ID cards going forwards is therefore an issue to be flagged.**

2.20 There is also potential for issuing alerts when enabling legislation is activated for developments such as the proposed satellite tracking system for all motor vehicles (currently planned to go live in 2015)? OIC had already flagged the emergence of an infrastructure for the 'surveillance society', and shared concerns on the practical aspects of the technology - though much would depend on how this developed. The lack of substantive measures on this in the Bill had the advantage of affording flexibility, but also the disadvantage of uncertainty: it would be important to ensure that appropriate standards are in place for all services and transactions, rather than the 'lowest common denominator' standards. On the other hand, many governments are using the standards set by ICAO at the behest of the United States as a justification for introducing biometric-based passports without a thorough debate at national level.

2.21 Another issue is determining the ways in which ID cards *might* be used for a wide variety of IT-mediated applications, from parking tickets and traffic offences through benefits (whether or not these include medical treatment) to taxation. Similar questions of accountability, reliability, liability and tracking arise but in very different social contexts. Will there be an open and interoperable architecture that enables others to use the ID (i.e. closed versus open systems) for confirmation purposes?

2.22 Public confidence in the system is also a potentially serious issue. While the use of CCTV cameras in the fight against crime receives broad support, there is increased equivocation about its use in e.g. bus lane enforcement. The future use of facial recognition technology during road surveys with checks against the ID card might stimulate resistance. It may be that while reference to stored digital information for apprehending criminals is acceptable, the use of proactive surveillance and tracking is more likely to provoke concern.

#### The personal identity initiatives grid

2.23 The idea for a grid had arisen from the recognition that there is a proliferation of personal identity initiatives; a list of URLs had now been assembled and can be found at [www.eurim.org.uk/activities/pi/PI\\_InitiativesGrid.doc](http://www.eurim.org.uk/activities/pi/PI_InitiativesGrid.doc). While each URL was 'live' as from the beginning of this week, there is no claim that the grid is comprehensive, though the list is already large. The last cell in each row is for explanatory narrative.

2.24 The grid is modelled on the successful EURIM e-Crime grids, which perform a useful role as a resource with the proviso that they are draft working documents, and not authoritative in any way, being constantly updated by users. Individual schemes may or not involve the creation of a new personal ID database or reference number – this information could be added, perhaps as a simple tick-box. Data sharing information, reports, directives and standards are also included (though by no means complete). Please send information and additions to Jim Lound ([Jim.Lound@uk.experian.com](mailto:Jim.Lound@uk.experian.com)) so that the grid, to be hosted on the EURIM website, can be maintained and updated.

2.25 The number of initiatives could be used to support the case for ID cards, to enable consistent authentication across a range of Government departments and agencies: if this is what the legislation permits. Where initiatives involve new cards, token or reference numbers, the grid could carry comments on whether the relationship to the national ID card project had been defined.

### Good practice in security and access

2.26 The EURIM PI Subgroup on security and access was set up following the recognition of a need for guidance for improving the security of online access. The first meeting was held on 23 March, at which John Walker (chair of the BS 7799/ISO9000 group and vice-chair of the EURIM e-Crime Group focusing on reducing vulnerability) was the guest speaker - the summary report can be accessed at <http://www.eurim.org.uk/activities/pi/050323pireport.pdf>. A major issue was the recognition that a number of Government databases are extremely vulnerable to online access, not just through transactions, but also e.g. through the use of tools acquired through the Google search engine.

2.27 A second meeting of the Subgroup planned for the afternoon of 4 May will review a draft forward plan, and determine future actions for the Subgroup. The issues include guidance for SMEs on secure customer transactions, and whether the same standards should be mandatory for all public sector systems. This may be something eGU might wish to recommend.

2.28 A joint EURIM-CESG event in November 2004 on the large-scale roll-out of biometrics had been very successful, and a similar exercise with CESG on practical online security for a similar audience might be useful, with a key aim being to inform security people in the public sector of contacts within CESG who can help for particular services. Dave Wright reported that he had corresponded with the Events Manager at CESG, who had passed the message to the appropriate contact.

2.29 One member reported that he had received regular phishing emails at work from major banks to his corporate email address; APACS were aware of this. Another commented that improved security technology led to more attacks against operations staff, the most vulnerable point in the system. A most worrying and neglected aspect is the number of low-paid, temporary staff with privileged access to files, particularly in the public sector. While local government is a particularly soft target, many supposedly secure central government systems are operated by unvetted temporary staff.

### **3. AOB**

3.1. A statement was made in the House by the Chief Secretary to the Treasury (Paul Boateng MP) in October 2004 concerning the development work for a UK population register by the Citizen Information Project team. The work confirmed the feasibility study findings that a UK population register has the potential to generate efficiency benefits and service improvements across Government. The CIP team investigated the costs and benefits of a range of potential options for delivering a population register, and recommended that proposals for a national identity register, as part of the last Government's proposals for ID cards, mean that if ID cards were to become compulsory then it may be more cost effective to deliver these benefits through the NIR, rather than develop a separate register. The last Government accepted this recommendation.

3.2 Since then, the CIP has examined in more detail how the NIR could function as a population register and explored opportunities for adding value to existing databases that could be cost effective ahead of the NIR reaching maturity. There is a window of ~10 years for the take-up of ID cards during which time such initiatives can be tested. CIP still hopes to get its report (Citizen Information Project feasibility study stage 2) to ministers by June 2005. An unpublished Annexe to the study report deals specifically with the efficiency gains, which also formed part of the October 2004 statement.

3.3 The 'PKI Club' run by Royal Holloway (University of London), which produced an authoritative document on public key infrastructure use in the UK and some international companies, has been disbanded and re-formed as the Authentication and Identity Management Group. Their first meeting on 19 May will feature work done by the EURIM Personal Identity Group. Contacts established jointly between EURIM and Royal Holloway aim to avoid duplication of effort while looking for areas for cooperation. Royal Holloway will look at authentication and identity management issues in the context of the degree course it runs on information security under a research team led by Fred Piper.

3.4 The eGU conference (Transforming Public Services) will be held in November 2005, and papers should be submitted on or before 29 April 2005. 3 topics have been suggested to EURIM members:

1. Pre-conditions for success (lessons from case studies around the EU).
2. Managing the balance between data protection and joining up (including identity management).
3. Ensuring confidence in the security and reliability) of public on-line (including via call centre) services.

The Information Age Partnership is believed to be planning input on (1), among other related topics.

3.5 The Government Connects Project had been the stimulus for a recent proposal that the Personal Identity Group look specifically at identity relationships, and issues on data sharing such as where integration makes sense, where federation makes sense and how the various models referred to in the EURIM data sharing paper for eGU (Secure Data Sharing as the Key to Efficiency in Service Delivery) can be brought into play, from a business rather than technical perspective. This work is now in hand, with a planning meeting scheduled for 25 May 2005.

3.6 A question was asked about the circumstances of t-Scheme. There have been suggestions that t-Scheme has no future relevance to Government identity programmes, though no definite information was available. The problem may be related to duplication of effort: t-Scheme invests a great deal of time establishing and checking identity before issuing a certificate, but when the certificate is used for Gateway, the process is repeated with the individual tracked back to their address, rendering the initial verification unnecessary. The contract of the CEO of t-Scheme terminated in December 2004, and had not so far been replaced.

#### **4. Future meetings**

4.1 The date of the next meeting of the main Personal Identity Group will be the morning of 2 June 2005. The next PI Subgroup meeting on data sharing will be the afternoon of 25 May 2005. A further meeting of the subgroup preparing the Briefing for MPs would be decided later.