

## AFFINITY GROUP REPORT BACK

Chair

Hans Werner Ksica

Head of IT Organisation, Federal Ministry of Education, Science and Culture

Austria

**Jacob Navot, Israel.** In reporting back from Affinity Group 1 on our deliberations we believe that asking a native English speaker to report is the best way of saving time and clarifying all the things that has been fought over. So I welcome Mr Bob Assirati and ask him to be our representative for the 'Trusted Identity: Getting the Right Balance Affinity Group'.

**Robert Assirati, UK.** Thank you. We had a very good session; many countries were involved. I think the general impression that I formed was that although over several years of ICA, I feel the general approach to e-government is very similar in all the countries. I think the situation and identity and authentication, security is very different, and we are in different positions. And this came through in the Group.

Okay, so the issue we were talking was the introduction of methods of trusted identity and the fairly sophisticated technologies that we can use. We felt that the more sophisticated the systems were seemed to be the more there will be a perceived problem in the minds of citizens about privacy and control by government. Additionally the risk of identity set. Someone mentioned that in their country, the US immigration regulations and the need for more identity checking there was a drive for them. There was also a feeling that what we were trying to discuss was the balance between tighter identification and the risk of privacy. The data protection registrars or equivalents represent the privacy issues in our countries. There was a feeling, certainly among this community that the data protection registrars are over-stating the privacy issues compared with the perceptions of the citizens, or perhaps representing just a small minority.

So we quickly started to find many differences between where we are in different countries. Now, the majority of the countries in our group have, and have had for some time, identity numbers. Some do not: UK, US and Switzerland in particular, in our group. This obviously makes a big difference in where you start. In Singapore and Israel: not only do they have identity numbers and identity cards, but also they are required to carry them, with them. So the culture is different. I think that the feeling we had was that in getting services on-line individual agencies had often decided on their own approach to authentication. And not many cases where there was a national approach, but in Singapore they have adopted a single password approach for all their e-services. Romania is working on a national identity card but has halted the process, waiting for the definition by the EU of what a national identity card should consist of. Some discussion about how long that wait would be, but they are proceeding with the health card. And several, of course, are looking at so-called two factor systems involving biometrics.

It was interesting that in some countries, and I think Singapore and Portugal said this, they regard user ID and password as sufficient authentication for the bulk of their services. So there they are perhaps are using PKI only where there are legal

requirements, perhaps for legal transactions. There was a general feeling that in many countries that government should not be making the investment in the technology; That the lead should come from other people like the banks, or the suppliers. And that way, we will get a more general and universal system, maybe solutions that can be used across society, not just in government.

We heard earlier this morning, about the use of the mobile phone as a method of authenticating the user. And Olov Ostberg described how this perhaps can be made more secure than it might first appear.

Then there was the thought that we need to work not just on the technology but also on the identity management platform. To bring together various aspects of identity services and the real aspiration is for what is termed “federated identity”. This is where the agreement and the management sub-system is such that a single sign-off will give you access – secure access to a number of services but where your information is spread across different systems and therefore the risk of bringing together a complete picture of the individual, for the wrong purposes is minimised.

And finally, we look forward to my government’s solution where perhaps the information that government agencies to provide your services is held by you, perhaps in a vault, in an electronic vault somewhere, and you can say when it gets released. We then moved onto what can ICA do in the future. First idea was that we should write down an index, all the issues that people are facing so that we have a framework. Secondly, it was suggested that since the practices in different countries are so different, we could draw up a comparative table. There was discussion about creating a study group, and lastly since there are many other organisations who are interested in the same issues, like the financial companies and the IT suppliers, it was felt that ICA might work with them, particularly those who work on the international basis.

So, I think that is the end of our presentation.

**Hans Werner Ksica.** Thank you, Bob. I suggest that we take the questions in this case just after the presentation because it is very close to the subject. May we have questions for Jacob’s group?

**Teresa Nasif, USA.** In those countries, in Israel and Singapore where citizens must carry the card with them physically, what happens if you don’t have your card with you? Is this a very big different crime?

**Jacob Navot, Israel.** According to the law, it is a crime. But is usually it is enough to carry with you your driving licence or some identity. Because on the driving licence and on other identity cards, there is this national ID number, on every card that is. Actually , it is carried over all the departments in all of the services, public services. You have to put in your National ID, the one that you have been born with.

**Choy Peng Wu, Singapore.** Just a quick word on Singapore. I think legally is a requirement, but I haven’t heard of any instance where anyone goes to jail because they don’t have the ID card on them. But I think because we use it so often and it is a fairly small credit card size, most of us actually carry it in our wallet and in our handbag. The only time it is not with me is when I come overseas, and I don’t want to

lose it when I am overseas. But it is actually a habit. Everyone always carry all the time. But I have not heard of anyone who has to go to jail because they don't have it.

**Jacob Navot, Israel.** In Israel the identity card is a little bit bigger than a small size and we are talking about producing a digital national ID card. It was due this year, the public was postponed for next year. But in case, just to answer the legal aspect of what you asked, in case you don't carry it and you are caught, you have to report back to the police station within 24 hours, and then you get some fine. That is it.

**Robert Assirati, UK.** I think the point about a requirement to carry identity cards is not to penalise the ordinary person but to give the police the power to detain anyone who they suspect and cannot provide an identity. So it gives them a tremendous power.

**Unknown Speaker.** There is another aspect of carrying the identity card. I think that most people won't carry it if there is no value in it, so we have to think about it. To have a value if you don't have this identity card, you can't get access to certain services, and you cannot go in into several places. So it has to be, it has to have some benefit of the citizen, so everyone will carry it voluntarily.

**Choy Peng Wu, Singapore.** Even foreign workers in Singapore are issued identity cards so everyone get a whole identity card, or what we call a work permit or an employment pass. So I think somebody was smiling: that he has lived in Singapore before so it is quite a standard practice.

**Sean Connolly, Ireland.** Speaking as an ordinary citizen, I find it difficult to accept a need for the 99% of the population to carry an identity card. To cater for the situation where the police have a problem, where the police actually have a doubt about somebody, using technology you can instantly compare what that person, is the person they claim to be or not. So I think that the direction we are going is a misuse of technology.

**Choy Peng Wu, Singapore.** I give you a real kind of example of how identity cards is used. In especially now after 911, when we go to major government buildings some of the American buildings, there are security guards, and you trade in your identity card with the visitor pass. Because the identity card holds a photograph, so it is a they know really you are who you claim you are. So that is why we carry it all the time because any government building you visit, any big corporate American building like the Citibank building, the Marriott or the AIA building: all those have security guards who require your identity cards in exchange for a visitor pass.

**Hans Werner Ksica.** We now can move to the Second affinity Group Report. This is on Open Systems and was lead by Robyn Fleming.

**Robyn Fleming, Australia.** Thank you Hans. I would like to call on Paul Waller. He drew the short straw and Paul is the raconteur for this group. Thank you.

**Paul Waller, UK.** Open Source. A definition would be a good place to start. And as you can see from the words on the screen, definition is cast in terms of a licensing regime. It's nothing to do with the way that the software was developed, how much it costs directly. It is the licensing, the essence of which is that if you acquire open

source software that gives rights to access the source code and modify it, as long as any modification is made available under a similar licence.

You may ask, as we did, what has that got to do with government IT then? And the answer in conclusion was, not very much. There is some value to it but by and large this is rather irrelevant to most of our government IT activities. Indeed, one observation that you actually get into difficulties if government start altering source codes and stuff.

None the less because it is a confusing topic, we did feel that governments needed a procurement policy relating to open source, and indeed most of the countries in our group did have one that was generally quite neutral in terms of open source versus other sorts of software and, or slightly positive. In general, though, the policy when neutral gave common sense advice about evaluating costs, risks, and benefits as you would with any procurement. So, what it wasn't, was anything to do with freeware, to felt reasonably strongly, I think, in amongst the group, that government is not in the business of taking freeware and playing with it. We are much more interested in issues such as those contracts liability, support and so forth.

In talking about open source, we found it very useful to split software into three categories, because we found that the issues around open source are actually different for each of those categories. The first one, operating systems, it is quite interesting yesterday when Jimmy Schwartzkopf said that it was Linux and not Unix that was killing Windows, and that fitted with an observation from our American colleagues that, in their experience, Linux was giving cost savings over Unix in the order of magnitude of three times. It was giving good performance, and it was actually portable as well, so there were, as a product it was a pretty good thing. There are, as it says, you know, many other server systems, available now. However, these are in essence they are just another product. This is nothing greatly directly to do with whether you can access licensed source code or not. However, there is a second user benefit that we identified in having open source operating systems and that is through third party developer market. If you are in the business of developing software applications for sale, then to be able to access the source code of the operating system rather than paying somebody else to licence fees to use it, or how to obscure ABI calls or whatever. There is a definite advantage in your development work, in the cost of development which should, in theory, result in a wider range of third party products to run if you have an open source operating system on your platform. I don't think we actually pinned down real evidence of that happening yet but there is a sort of theoretical benefit cycle there.

Office systems: slightly more complicated story here. They are out there, and Singapore in particular and the European Commission have done a certain amount of work on these. There are a couple of big issues though, that we identified which as yet still seem to be unresolved and pose a question of document interchange. Singapore have done some research which clearly identified that you could not at all rely on documents being passed successfully between open source office systems suites and Microsoft Office suite. Indeed, if you try to open a document, a Microsoft Office document in one of the other open source software products, there is a very good chance you simply wouldn't get some of it. In that table some embedded objects just do not show up. So if you receive a document from a business or another government department or a citizen in that form and you are, you only have an open

source office suite on your desktop, you have no idea whether you have got all the document or not. This seems to be a substantial risk and if I remember correctly, Singapore are advocating that if you are going to do that then your government will have to have the right Microsoft Office suite as well, so if you get a Microsoft Office document arrive, you use that to open it. The other issue up there about the stack: this is slightly deeper and more complex issue, in as much as many organisations now have applications developed on the desktop using the Office system suite which go top to bottom from application through the suite down to the operating system, i.e. full up and down the stack and, again, it is unproven that combination of Office system and operating system actually fully operate in a way that you can do that. At the moment, again, Singapore is doing some work and gone to the market to try and see whether this is feasible or not. So we think the jury is thoroughly out on use of Office as open source office systems.

The top level: applications. We noted some agencies around international governments are still writing their own software, where access to source code of applications for further development could potentially have benefit. Otherwise, there is no specific open source issue here, its simply down to the normal issues about whether your application is maintainable or not and if, for whatever reason, you need access for source code for validation for checking security, certainly the big discussion in relation to electronic voting systems in the world at the moment, about having access to source code. That's fine, but it is a contractual IPR issue, it is actually nothing really to do with open source uniquely.

We did, from that discussion though, identify some areas where there was some more work potentially to be done. The document for interchange standards is one, which we have just mentioned, and indirectly but quite importantly rising from the conversation, was the identification of a number of issues about communicating with citizens. Firstly, when we put up government websites we were pretty much obliged to make them available for any citizen which generally means that whatever browser they choose to use should be able to read our websites and with the proliferation of freeware and other varieties of browsers out there, this is quite a challenge, and of course, indeed with the citizens, we do need new document interchange, issues which we have identified. So, particularly with that last one, I think that there is a little bit of work to be done. Helpfully, the European Commission seems to have done a fair amount of work on this, the European Commission stuff is available on the website and Singapore kindly offered to make their research available to them. Thank you.

**Hans Werner Ksica.** Thank you Paul. Any questions on this subject?

**Robyn Fleming, Australia.** Hans, I just add to Paul's summing-up that one of the ideas from the Group was that in this area, and I think it also relates in part to the trust identity area, there was an opportunity for ICA to bring together perhaps some of the major industry people and some research people to have a look at some of the issues that have been intractable on a country by country basis but might be, and couldn't be legislated for like a common format standard for exchange of documents between open source and Microsoft but that as a collective, this was something that might be useful and the dialogue might stimulate some more action than we would be able to get individually.

**Hans Werner Ksica.** Thank you, Robyn.

**Unknown Speaker.** You know, it would be really interesting to try some other kind of open sources: I am thinking about programming tools. We do have some open sources tools, we have a community around to add value to different applications, things like the same Java, and other tools. Even if it is a standard you can see as open source. And another thing, I would have as an open source is the Java basis, there are others and all this free but you are able to get different kind of piece of programming from the community

**Hans Werner Ksica.** Other comments on this subject of open source?

**Gino Laan, The Netherlands.** One of the arguments I was missing in open source, is customer trust, the citizen's trust which was in the Netherlands anyway, one of our major incentives to open source are e-voting system, and did you ever have any discussion on that?

**Paul Waller, UK.** Not substantially, no. I am familiar with the e-voting system; the question is one of the areas that we are very interested in. And yes, that is a case where validation of the software in terms of it does what it is supposed to do, is absolutely crucial in maintaining the citizen's trust. But, I think, what I said was reflected in the presentation that is about IPR contractual terms. It is not particularly an issue relating to open source, it is an issue about validating and testing software in a way which the citizen recognises rigorous and there is quite a lot of it, for us, a lot of difficulties around doing that as well as whether or not its open source code. Yes, it is a fair observation.

**Hans Werner Ksica.** Thank you Paul. Any other comments? Then I thank you for that report. The next report is from Affinity Group 3 and was to come from Arvo Ott. Arvo has had to leave this morning this morning for very important other reasons and Claudio will present that report now.

**Claudio Interdonato, Mexico.** Thank you, Hans. Good morning. The Chair of this Group was Arvo Ott from Estonia. He was not able to attend the meeting this morning, he has had to fly back home, so I am the reporter, and I am very happy that he chose me because you learn a lot doing this kind of work, how to talk with all my colleagues from the Affinity Group to get all the ideas together. And with senior government to government application, cheek to cheek. And really what we did in the two hours we cannot scratch the little top of every big iceberg. So we had 22 participants from 16 countries, and we add to the Edwin Low from the OECD.

What are the main results we had? First of all, there is the difference between big countries and small countries, of course, complexities get bigger when the country is bigger and not only complexity in technology aspects, the most difficult one related to organisation when we talk about business process, business regeneration, business rules and also other regulatory issues. So we see also the difference between centralised and de-centralised co-ordination. Of course, if it is de-centralised it is getting much more complex on all the different organisation and technology and regulation. And of course, if it is centralised it was much more vertical. This drawing; Arvo gave it to me. It just tells you how complex is the government to government application. Because what we were trying to do is try to collaborate, to interchange information from one into the other one. What are the entities? It could

be maybe the federal government, it could be another government, it could be ministry; for instance in Mexico, we talk about state government, federal government municipalities, and others. There is no logic here. It is just to show you how complicated this is. All this information. And it get much more complex if you think about interchange information between national government. This against something else, a subject of very big issue.

We talked about integration, integrating the back-office. You need to orientate that into an efficient process, most of all. Integrated document management, information and service exchange and resource management and bookkeeping and everything else that has to do with it. What we are looking at here is to see what system we have in the back-office. I am going to be inter-related; I am going to be exchanging information between them.

Also the second component is very important, e-services to facilitate government business. Not only e-services seen as interchanging, or giving information to customers, the first kind of information that use a lot of e-services to interchange between entities. First of all, you are sending information to an entity for internal work. And on the other side, you need for external work also, be able to interchange with the customers.

And the third important component was infrastructure components. We found out that we agreed that, we use less variety of user-identification and authorisation mechanisms inside government. Maybe we like to use, for example, federal entities, we use some PKI to be able to interchange information. And the other topic we discussed was the security. Security related to PKI there but most of all security about how you make sure that when you move information from one system to the other one: internally or externally? Are you going to make sure this information you get is secure?

Okay, so overall - structure, our discussion falls into three main topics. Organisational issue, where we think about business most of all, the process, the rules. The regulatory issues; budgetary issues; and technology related issues. On the first one, the organisational issue, we found different organizational models of coordination. In big countries and in decentralized coordination models different discussion groups and forums are widely used to form strategies on the interchange of information. So they can offer the Working Group a lot of information: but not a lot of them are really building diagrams on that. They would have recommendations but they are not necessarily final. But in the small countries, in the more centralised ones, there were more vertical, more top down approaches and you would get a more dovetailed mechanism to use. We talked also about integration of local government and found it was more like a loose co-ordination.

Regulatory issues: we talked about the implementation of enterprise architecture, interoperability frameworks and IT architecture. Those definitions are not the same, but within our area, they look synonymous. They are not, but because of the ways they are being treated sometimes, it depends on the country, we need to have a definition here.

With different contents; most countries have architecture documents also approved at the government level. In most cases there are "strong recommendations" but they are

not compulsory. Obviously, for the centralised co-ordination models, you have stronger legislation regulations that are more compulsory.

Budget issue: this is a very important issue because it becomes sometimes a barrier to government-to-government applications. It will allow you to have your budget being used horizontally, sometimes you have your budgets restricted, if it is a centralised budget sometimes the governments don't know how to use it across government solutions. And the other problem is that you need to have a system that will activate the government. Because we can say, we are going to do a shirt service centre, so you put everything centralised and then, who is going to pay for the maintenance? Is going to pay for the service? How much is it going to cost? Budgetary mechanisms should be handled also from the point of view of sustainability of the running systems which might be more complicated than development.

The last issue, maybe the easiest one, the IT. Because, as you found out, I think the most difficult issues are the organisational ones. The IT issue: we talked most of all about the G2G application. How we interchange the system. We have many systems, we have some old or a new one, we have information systems, so we need to interchange information between them, we need to build a services infrastructure, so we need to use adaptors, we need to use message structure. How do we connect all that?

Well, agree the standards we are going to use inside the government. We talk about, for example, putting XML, XML web service, and the basic problem building, how we talk about blocks for IT, in a way to be able to recycle all those little pieces of logos we would put on top of it, creating that service architecture, I think that we agreed that the service IT architecture is the key, really to be able to inter-connect, is one of the keys to inter-connect governments between them. And if we are talking, we talk about some fund issue about them getting a government to government, national government. So, Gary was saying to me we should call that NG2NG, national government to national government. It is getting very very complex. So the service of the IT architecture provides you with a little bit encapsulated service, so you are going to be able to build in our centre process between all the entities, be able to offer a service that is like a single Window service. Well, I think that is all I have to say.

**Hans Werner Ksica.** Okay thank you. I have to thank first all participants contributing in the Affinity groups in a very original, very constructive way. Thank you r. And thanks to the chairs and to the rapporteurs for their work. It is not an easy task to meet one day to have a discussion and then, overnight, co-ordinate the right input and technical background of what is sometimes a very hard application, but we did it.