

**Group blue**

*Partha Das Chowdhury, Claudia Diaz, Batya Friedman, Olle Olsson, Peter Seipel (chair), Gunnar Sjödín, Natsui Takato*

Examples of “interaction” studies proposed by the participants:

- (a) Metastudies of the effects of different starting points (technology, social dilemma, category of solutions etc.). What will be the differences and will the starting points result in different answers.
- (b) Needs and wishes related to what can be achieved. Studies can begin with something that is achievable. Example: Methods of protecting bank accounts. Protocols in models and the deficiencies of models in relation to reality. Deployment of methods in the real world as a special field of study. Consequences of laissez faire policies? Variants of laissez faire?
- (c) Tools and goals. Tools are given and goals are negotiated. But the perspective can be changed and consider the technology as given and the goals as variables. Concepts that link the different areas: the meaning and use of identity, pseudonymity and the like. Markets for privacy. Personal information as a resource with market value. Trading in privacy. Who are the market actors and what are the incentives for trading. What are the enabling factors for the development of markets. Macro level perspective. In what way are privacy markets useful to society. Inhibiting factors.
- (d) How can anonymity provide incentives for merchants to protect privacy? Why do some anonymity schemes don't have a market? Background note: differential pricing is useful and desirable. Connections to the notion of privacy? Group mechanisms. Auditing mechanisms.
- (e) Threats to privacy and models of threat. Expectations and requirements of privacy in relation to threats. Finding of trade-offs. The need of infrastructures for different situations.
- (f) Different conceptions of privacy and the particular situation of legal concepts: how can they be communicated to the technology side and how can an ontology for this communication be developed. To what extent does the communication of legal concepts require knowledge of the application.  
Focus on a basic framework for studies, a basic research strategy. The one that emerged was “Interaction Studies”.

	<u>Social side</u>	<u>Interaction studies</u>	<u>Technology side</u>	
Individual Community	Law	Practice	Microelectronics	
	Institutions	Theory	Programming	
	Grassroots	Structures	System design	Hard
	Ethics	Dynamics	Applications	Soft
	Social / cognitive science	Factual	Possibilities	
Goals	Economy	Intentional	Protocols, standards	Present
Methods	Power Etc.	Concepts* Wholes Metastudies Field studies	Models Trends	Future

\* Note in particular “hot” concepts such as “trust”

