Open Issues and Discussions for the TPE

M. Schunter, 2013-05-07

Status

- TPE Working Draft Published
- Substantial Progress between Working Draft 3 and Working Draft 4:
  - http://www.w3.org/2011/tracking-protection/drafts/diffs/TPE-WD3-to-WD4.html
- ISSUES:
  - 31 CLOSED
  - 7 PENDING REVIEW
  - **6 OPEN!**

Agenda

- Session 1: 9-10.30AM
  - Quick Summary of Major changes since our last WD (Roy)
  - Discuss the preference collection, transmission, and acceptance/disregarding of preferences:
    - ISSUE-194: How should we ensure consent of users for DNT inputs?
    - ISSUE-161 Do we need a tracking status value for partial compliance or rejecting DNT?
- Session 2: 11AM-12.30PM
  - Review of issues that are marked PENDING Review
  - Discussion of potential changes to address DAA principles

Session 1: Preference Transmission

Goal: Reliable Capture and Transmission of Preferences

- Our Agreement:
  - Preferences must be USER preferences
  - Preferences should be explicit and informed

- Some Examples and Assessment wrt current spec:
  - OK: Preferences entered into a browser preference dialogue
  - OK: Install-time dialogue asking a user for his preference
  - Not OK: Router firmware transmitting a preference

Two Challenges

- Challenge 1 (ISSUE-194):
  How can a site determine whether a user agent that has sent „DNT;*x*“ actually followed the guidance in this document?

- Challenge 2 (ISSUE-161):
  A site has received a preference that does not satisfy the given criteria – what should the site do?

ISSUE-194: Reliable Capture and Transmission of Preferences

- Challenge 1 (ISSUE-194):
  How can a site determine whether a received „DNT;*x*“ actually contains a preference „x“ that satisfies these criteria?
- Practical challenges:
  - Existing (legacy) tools sending „DNT;1“
  - User agents that do not follow our spec sending DNT; 1
  - User agents that correctly implement our spec and send DNT;1

ISSUE-194: Reliable Capture and Transmission of Preferences

- Alternative 1: New Signal to distinguish legacy signals
  - DNT;1u (u for „user input“)
  - DNT;7 (7 != 1 to ensure that UA claims spec conformance)
- Alternative 2: Improve Channel
  - Authentication, Cookies, ...
- Alternative 3: Rely on existing data
  - UA string

ISSUE-161: How to react to unreliable signals?

- Alternative 1: Reject unreliable signals
  - Only process signals that are deemed reliable
  - „Reject" the unreliable signals by returning a disregard signal
- Alternative 2: Ignore unreliable signals
  - Only process signals that are deemed reliable
  - Ignore other signals
- Alternative 3: Err on the privacy side and escalate with UA provider
  - If the signal is unreliable and says DNT;1,
    follow the signal nevertheless

Session 2: Issues
PENDING REVIEW

Part II: Pending Review ISSUEs

ISSUE-112 How are sub-domains handled for site-specific exceptions?

Answer: Cookie-like Matching Rule

ISSUE-137 Does hybrid tracking status need to distinguish between first party (1) and outsourcing service provider acting as a first party (s)

Currently, the same-party gives related information

and the "s" flag is not part of the spec

ISSUE-152 User Agent Compliance: feedback for out-of-band consent

- Site is required to indicate if out of band consent is used.
- UA is not required to provide feedback
  (although user agents are free to provide feedback)

Part II: Pending Review ISSUEs

ISSUE-153 What are the implications on software that changes requests but does not necessarily initiate them?

Intermediaries are not permitted to modify.
ISSUE_194 discusses how to detect modifications

ISSUE-167 Multiple site exceptions

No mechanism for multi-site exceptions: Currently iFrames are needed

ISSUE-195 Flows and signals for handling out of band consent

New flag for delayed out of band consent and „edit“ link to inform users

Part III: Potential Changes required to Address #6 of the Draft Framework

a) Implementation through browsers this is about browsers and not other user agents-. Other user agents (UA) would not seta DNT flag in this round of the W3C work, and would be prohibited from activating a browser's DNT flag

b) The browser choice setting would be available in the browser settings panel, accessible from the traditional browser settings — not through an installation process or other similar mechanism.

c) Develop technological measures that, together with non-technological measures, greatly reduce the risk that anyone other than consumers are setting the choice. Develop a process on how to achieve this in a short time frame (3 months)

d) Brief and neutral description of the impact of turning the setting on. The browser choice setting would communicate the following to consumers: […]