

Privacy, Cybersecurity & Identity

Domain Exploratory Group Proposal

FINAL

1. Proposers

Louis Rosenberg, Responsible Metaverse Alliance (RMA)

Kavya Pearlman, XR Safety Initiative (XRSI)

Nikki Pope, Nvidia

Ovetta Sampson, Google

2. Exploratory Group Goals

Build consensus and draft a proposed charter for a Privacy, Cybersecurity, & Identity Domain Working Group

3. Potential Working Group Goals and Deliverables

The proposed charter would set out goals and key activities to generate insights and make recommendations into leading Privacy, Cybersecurity & Identity efforts and curate standards, guidelines, policies and technical frameworks for various metaverse related use cases and across various jurisdictions. Special attention would be paid to opportunities for guiding non-governmental declarations, corporate policies, industry norms, and guidance to enable responsible innovation, mitigate human and societal harm that stem from objective and subjective privacy risks, cybersecurity and identity risk management at the global level.

Early examples of possible activities to be captured in the charter include:

Stakeholder Engagement

- Engage with key stakeholders with the following objectives:
 - Catalog existing key initiatives, projects and frameworks for privacy protection, identity protection, and cybersecurity protection within and between Metaverse environments, including design level, protocol level, and policy level undertakings.
 - addition of so-called "trusted" host, this one being to be defined
 - To learn from Metaverse platform, application & service providers key technical and regulatory challenges and opportunities around privacy, cybersecurity & Identity.
 - To learn from metaverse researchers, users, and watchdog groups about any anticipated or realized harms resulting from insufficient privacy, cybersecurity, or identity controls.
 - To exchange knowledge with regulatory entities, creators and Metaverse citizens on emerging mechanisms of privacy risk management and identity protection.
 - To ensure privacy, cybersecurity, and identity protections are baked in and constantly thought of in every part of the process and protocols.
 - Establishing key performance metrics, in terms of what to measure going forward, to understand whether the proposed recommendations are working towards the desired outcome (i.e., achieve an understanding of need, desire, and value).

Establish scope of Knowledge Curation, Research & Development

- Establish baseline scope of the knowledgebase, research and development related to Privacy, Cybersecurity and Identity. A few examples could be:
 - Safeguarding children privacy & identity in the metaverse
 - Safeguarding consumers privacy & identity in the metaverse
 - Safeguarding patients (medical) privacy and identity in the metaverse.
 - Safeguarding workers (employee) privacy and identity in the metaverse.
 - Safeguarding user data when providers and consumers exchange user data in the metaverse

Documenting risk factors and opportunities related to Privacy, Cybersecurity and Identity

- Identify, outline and document the reasoning as well as associated risk factors that motivate the formation of the working group.

- Through investigative work, the team can come to understand how and why risks and problem(s) occur, what effect the risks have on organizations and society, both regional and global. The working group can thus understand the magnitude of the problem and opportunities for organizations, governments, not-for-profit, and education; entities, products, and services.
- To identify the risk factors, via multidisciplinary alignment to discover the unintentional consequences.
- To disseminate findings about risk factors and actual harms, both anticipated and realized.

Generate key recommendations pertaining to Metaverse Privacy, Cybersecurity and Identity

- Put forward recommendations to adopt principles such as "Human-Centric Privacy by Design", business practices guidance and more.
- Recommend priorities and governance mechanisms around engineering, design, operations, responsible innovation, compliance and regulatory aspects.
- Recommendations around the threshold of enforcement action by the national authorities, and the obligation principle maintaining basic rules of conduct.
- Document best practices and capacity-building concepts that will enable organizations to adopt robust, human-rights based, trustworthy, privacy-friendly, sustainable, transparent and inclusive approaches, towards the use and/or deployment of Metaverse components and building blocks.
- Identify priority areas of action on Metaverse development in alignment with Privacy, Cybersecurity & Identity domains.

<Set out at a high-level what the potential goals of a Working Group would be - to give enough flavor so the Oversight Committee can evaluate the proposal, without writing the detailed charter itself. Can use examples of potential investigations, projects and industry engagement to give additional color and context>

4. Non-Goals:

- The Group within the Forum itself will not undertake any direct advocacy or lobbying activity and such activities are to be left to civic organizations - just as the Forum is not an SDO, but a venue for SDO coordination
- The Group is NOT focused on technical APIs to implement Identity/Security, however, the information and context gathered may initiate additional Exploratory Groups to address technical aspects in this Domain

5. Coordination

<Companies, SDOs, and other organizations whose participation or input would be essential to the success of the Working Group>

6. Risk Factors

<Particular risk factors that may prevent the Working Group from being effective, to encourage proactive amelioration>

Working group size: The more people in the group, the more schedules to accommodate, parts to delegate, opinions to consider, pieces to integrate, etc.

Heterogeneity: Diversity of perspectives is one of the principal advantages of groups and without diversity, the Working Group conclusions and recommendations might be skewed.

Competing Priorities: The scope of the work covers several critical aspects and that may lead to competing priorities, in terms of the order and necessity to address them.

7. Target timeline to create proposed Working Group charter

10 Weeks

8. Additional Contributors (Participants contact Main Contact to be added)

<Forum members who wish to **proactively contribute** to this activity>

Liz Shubov - XRSI Adviser

Sarah Klain - Responsible Metaverse Alliance

Kristina Podnar - Metaverse Reality Check (The MRC)

Kohei Kurihara - XRSI Adviser | CEO - Privacy by Design lab

Eric Klein - Cloudonix, Inc. | COO and CISO

Kat Moynahan - Microsoft

Umit D. Sami - Qabacus, Inc. | CEO

Elijah Tai - Zesty

Antonio Flores-Galea - Global Institute of Advisors | CEO
Rangaprabhu Parthasarathy, Meta
Martha Lyons, Director Future Markets & Insights, CableLabs

9. References

[XRSI Recommendations for the Biden-Harris Administration](#) for building responsible, safe, and inclusive extended reality Ecosystems (the Metaverse)

Adding

European Parliament Research Briefing on the Metaverse

[https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2022/733557/EPRS_BRI\(2022\)733557_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2022/733557/EPRS_BRI(2022)733557_EN.pdf)

Council of Europe Analysis and Research team briefing on the Metaverse

<https://www.consilium.europa.eu/media/54987/metaverse-paper-9-march-2022.pdf>