FIDIS

Future of Identity in the Information Society

Title:	"D7.13: *Where Idem Meets Ipse*. Workshop Report"
Author:	WP7
Editors:	Mireille Hildebrandt, Katja de Vries, Els Soenens (Vrije Universiteit Brussel), Bert-Jaap Koops (TILT, Netherlands)
Reviewers:	Denis Royer (JWG, Germany)
Identifier:	D7.13
Type:	[Workshop Report]
Version:	1.0
Date:	30 April 2009
Status:	[Final]
Class:	[Public]
File:	fidis-WP7-del7.13-workshop-idem-ipse-profiling.doc

Summary

To prepare FIDIS deliverable D7.14 on Idem and Ipse Identity in Profiling, a workshop D7.13 was held. The workshop took place in two stages. The first, a parallel session during the General FIDIS Meeting (Berlin) on 26 March 2008, discussed possible contributions for deliverable 7.14. The second part, during the FIDIS Dresden Research meeting on 25 September 2008, discussed first results and the fine-tuning of contributions. This report records details of both stages of the workshops.

Future of Identity in the Information Society (No. 507512)

Copyright Notice:

Members of the FIDIS consortium

1.	*Goethe University Frankfurt*	Germany
2.	*Joint Research Centre (JRC)*	Spain
3.	*Vrije Universiteit Brussel*	Belgium
4.	*Unabhängiges Landeszentrum für Datenschutz*	Germany
5.	*Institut Europeen D'Administration Des Affaires (INSEAD)*	France
6.	*University of Reading*	United Kingdom
7.	*Katholieke Universiteit Leuven*	Belgium
8.	*Tilburg University*	Netherlands
9.	*Karlstads University*	Sweden
10.	*Technische Universität Berlin*	Germany
11.	*Technische Universität Dresden*	Germany
12.	*Albert-Ludwig-University Freiburg*	Germany
13.	*Masarykova universita v Brne*	Czech Republic
14.	*VaF Bratislava*	Slovakia
15.	*London School of Economics and Political Science*	United Kingdom
16.	*Budapest University of Technology and Economics (ISTRI)*	Hungary
17.	*IBM Research GmbH*	Switzerland
18.	*Institut de recherche criminelle de la Gendarmerie Nationale*	France
19.	*Netherlands Forensic Institute*	Netherlands
20.	*Virtual Identity and Privacy Research Center*	Switzerland
21.	*Europäisches Microsoft Innovations Center GmbH*	Germany
22.	*Institute of Communication and Computer Systems (ICCS)*	Greece
23.	*AXSionics AG*	Switzerland
24.	*SIRRIX AG Security Technologies*	Germany

Future of Identity in the Information Society (No. 507512)

Versions

Version	Date	Description (Editor)
0.1	20.04.2009	• Integrated version for internal review (Hildebrandt, M. (VUB), de Vries K. (VUB), Soenens, E. (VUB), Koops, B.-J. (TILT))
1.0	30.04.2009	• Final version

Future of Identity in the Information Society (No. 507512)

Foreword

FIDIS partners from various disciplines have contributed as authors to this document. The following list names the main contributors for the chapters of this document:

Chapter	*Contributor(s)*
Executive Summary	Hildebrandt, M. (VUB), Koops, B.-J. (TILT), de Vries, K. (VUB)
1 Introduction	Hildebrandt, M. (VUB), Koops, B.-J. (TILT), de Vries, K. (VUB)
2 Decisions made during the workshop	Hildebrandt, M. (VUB), Koops, B.-J. (TILT)
3 Participants	Editors
Annex 1: abstracts	Editors

Table of Contents

Future of Identity in the Information Society (No. 507512)

Executive Summary

To prepare FIDIS deliverable D7.14 on Idem and Ipse Identity in Profiling, a workshop D7.13 was held. The workshop took place in two stages. The first, a parallel session during the General FIDIS Meeting (Berlin) on 26 March 2008, discussed possible contributions for deliverable 7.14. The second part, during the FIDIS Dresden Research meeting on 25 September 2008, discussed first results and the fine-tuning of contributions. This report records details of both stages of the workshops.

Future of Identity in the Information Society (No. 507512)

1 Introduction

The workshop D7.13 was partly held in two stages, during the FIDIS General Meeting 2008 in Berlin and during the 2008 FIDIS Research meeting (Sept. 2008) as a starting point for Deliverable 7.14.

Deliverable D7.14 aims at providing a conceptual framework (D7.14a) as well as a practical implication of the concepts of Idem-Identity and Ipse-Identity (D7.14b) in relation to profiling practices. Both reports on Idem and Ipse in relation to profiling are co-edited by Mireille Hildebrandt (VUB), Bert-Jaap Koops (TILT), Katja de Vries (VUB).

As a starting point, the following **definitions** were proposed:

Identity: Idem-identity and Ipse-identity

Idem refers to 'sameness', both in the sense of sameness in time (continuity) and in the sense of sameness between two objects (similarity); ultimately idem can refer to the identity of a thing with itself, the highest degree of similarity. The identity attributed to a person (e.g. a set of characteristics, a name, a number, a passport) is an example of an idem-identity, because it ultimately derives from comparison, even in the case of a unique identifier. Idem is a matter of objectification and categorisation.

Ipse refers to 'selfhood', or sense of self, taking the first person perspective. Ipse is both about being a 'self' or an I (the first person perspective from which I perceive the world and my self) and about having a 'self' or a me (the self as perceived by the I). The I cannot be defined or determined, the me is a dynamic construction that is rebuilt continuously in daily intercourse with one's environment. I and me are relational notions, they emerge as such in the course of one's life, probably nourished by the objectifications made possible by the use of language.

Idem and ipse meet in the 'me', which is permanently reconstructed in the interactions between a self and its environment: in fact the reconstruction of the self coincides with the reconstruction of the environment. As I profile how others profile me, I build up an image of my self, continuously adapting it to new information and knowledge about my self. The 'me' is how 'I' identify myself.

Profiling
Profiling is a matter of attributing a set of characteristics (preferences) to a person, inferred from his or her behaviours or biometrics. Profiles are idem-identities (representations of a person fabricated by data mining technologies). These idem-identities impact the construction of the 'me', by offering opportunities or attributing risks, thus influencing how the 'me' develops in the course of life. In itself this is not a new fact. We have always been profiled by others: by family, friends, colleagues and by organisations and governments.

2 Decisions made during the workshop

2.1 Structure and Time Schedule

The workshop decided that the deliverable should be split into two parts. The first part should provide a conceptual framework discussing the key concepts of idem and ipse identity; this part is therefore largely theoretical in character. The second part should apply the theoretical concepts to various cases of profiling; this part it therefore more practical in character.

Because of the splitting of the deliverable in two parts, the workshop decided to extend the initially proposed time schedule (leading to a report in mid-2008), in order to write the theoretical framework first and discuss this with the contributors who would subsequently aply this framework to profiling practices. The theoretical framework should be ready in draft to be discussed at the second stage of the workshop, in September 2008. Based on the discussions in Dresden, the first, theoretical part of the deliverable, D7.14a, was finetuned and finalised and delivered on 19 December 2008. In the mean-time, the authors of the profiling practices wrote their contributions, based on the first part and the discussions in Dresden. The second part of the deliverable, D7.14b, was edited and delivered on 22 April 2009.

2.2 Preliminary table of Contents of D7.14 (a and b)

The workshop discussed the possible contributions (see Annex) and decided upon the following draft Table of Contents.[1]

Part I. Theoretical Perspectives on Idem and Ipse (D7.14a)

1. Idem and Ipse: Philosophical and Sociological Concepts (Katja de Vries, VUB)
    - Ricoeur, Perry, Goffman, …
    - Includes: Is there a core ipse identity? (Isabelle Oomen, TILT on 'Perry vs. Goffman', 2 p.)
2. A right to (idem and/or ipse) identity? (Paul de Hert, TILT)
3. Modeling idem and ipse (Bernard Dyer, LSE)[2]

Part II. Idem and Ipse in Profiling Practices (D7.14b)

1. Trust Technologies and Profiling Practices (Martin Meints, ICPP)
2. Idem and ipse in the contact of the Social Web (Thierry Nabeth, INSEAD)
3. MMO identities (Arpád Ráb, ISTRI)
4. Implants and cyborgs: the environment and the self (Kevin Warwick, Reading)
5. [to be confirmed] Genetic profiling, idems and ipses (Eva Asscher, TILT)[3]
6. Stereotyping, I and Me (Isabelle Oomen, TILT)

---

[1] Note: in the writing process, it was decided to transfer some contributions, which made a more consistent overall structure of the two-part deliverable.

[2] Note: in the writing process, it was decided not to include this contribution in D7.14, as it was more generally focused on modeling identity and profiling than on ipse and idem, and therefore fitted better in a more general FIDIS deliverable or article for Identity in the Information Society.

[3] Note: in the writing process, it was decided not to continue with this contribution, because of the substantial differences between genetic profiling and the ICT-based profiling that is the key topic of the rest of the deliverable and WP7.

Conclusions

10. Conclusions (Mireille Hildebrandt, VUB; Bert-Jaap Koops, TILT; Katja de Vries, VUB).

2.3 PM distribution

Partner	Name of contributor	PM
3 VUB	Mireille Hildebrandt, Katja de Vries	0.9
4 ICPP	Martin Meints and Harald	0.2
5 INSEAD	Thierry Nabeth	0.2
6 Reading	Kevin Warwick, Mark Gasson	0.2
8 TILT	Isabelle Oomen, Bert-Jaap Koops, Paul de Hert	0.9
15 LSE	Bernard Dyer	0.2
16 ISTRI	Arpád Ráb	0.4

3 Participants

Participants to the First part of the workshop

(1) Bert-Jaap Koops (TILT, representing: Anton Vedder, Paul De Hert and Isabelle Oomen)

(2) Mireille Hildebrandt (VUB, representing: Katja de Vries)

(3) Bernard Dyer (LSE)

(4) Martin Meints (ICPP)

(5) Thierry Nabeth (INSEAD)

(6) Bence Kollanyi (ISTRI, representing: Arpéd Réb)

(7) Mark Gasson (Reading, representing: Kevin Warwick)

Participants to the second part of the Workshop

(1) Mireille Hildebrandt (VUB)

(2) Katja de Vries (VUB)

(3) Bert-Jaap Koops (TILT)

(4) Isabelle Oomen (TILT)

(5) Thierry Nabeth (INSEAD)

(6) Martin Meints (ICPP)

(7) Zeno Geradts (NFI)

(8) Mark Gasson (Reading)

(9) Maren Raguse (ICPP)

(10) Hans Buitelaar (TILT)

(11) Hans Hedbom (KU)

4 Annex 1: First Abstracts (presented during the first part of the workshop @ the FIDIS GM 2008)

4.1 TILT contribution 1: Isabelle Oomen

I, me and stereotyping

Isabelle Oomen will elaborate on research question 3. However, she assumes she will need to answer at least question 1 before being able to elaborate on question 3. Her exact topic needs to be further defined.

The research questions are:
1) What is the relationship between Ipse (I) and Idem (Me)? Is the 'I' influenced by the 'Me' or the other way around, or are they mutually influencing each other?
2) What happens when 'I' and 'Me' are contradictionary to each other? What strategies does the individual employ?
3) Does stereotyping (and hence profiling) influence the 'I', 'Me', or both? And, if so, what are the consequences of stereotyping for the self-perception and identity of a person?

Literature to answer these questions:

- The presentation of self in everyday life (Goffman)
- Mind, self, and society (Mead)
- Oneself as another (Ricoeur)
- Idem, Ipse, and loss of the self (Glas)
- When women can't do math: The interplay of self-construal, group identification, and stereotypic performance standards (Keller & Molix)
- Identity cues: Evidence from and for intra-individual perspectives on positive and negative stereotyping (Pittinsky, Shih, & Trahan)
- Does anonymous computer communication reduce gender inequality? (Postmes & Spears)
- Endorsing a negative in-group stereotype as a self-protective strategy: sacrificing the group to save the self (Burkley & Blanton)
- The spyglass self: a model of vicarious self-perception (Goldstein & Cialdini)
- Whatever people say I am, that's what I am: Social labeling as a social marketing tool (Cornelissen, Dewitte, Warlop, & Yzerbyt)

4.2 TILT contribution 2: Paul de Hert

A new human right: a specific 'right to identity'?

In a world of "Internet of things", computing is enabled to melt invisibly into the fabric of our business, personal and social environments, supporting our economic, health, community and private life. In a world of "Internet of things", it will be easier to establish new relationships, but also to identify people, since all possible everyday objects will be part of a network. After having introduced two notions of identity, viz. ipse and idem identity, we look briefly at the impact of new modern and future computing. The European Court of Human Rights, in its interpretation of Article 8 of the ECHR, in particular the right to respect for private life, has

ruled that this right covers an individual's physical and social identity, such as gender identification, name sexual orientation and sexual life and the right to personal development and personal autonomy. However, in the light of emerging technological threats to the individual and in the light of certain resistance to the privacy right, the suggestion to create or recognise a specific 'right to identity' needs to be taken into consideration. Such rights could be useful, taking into consideration the challenges of the Internet of things, and the problems of existing human rights law to cope with these. Even more weight can be given to the recognition of new human rights when looking at some broader identity issues, such as the double nationality issue. New human rights could be instrumental to the delicate balancing of interests these issues, granted it is conceived as a liberty rights to both aspects of identity.

4.3 VUB contribution: Katja de Vries

Idem or Ipse the rhythm of the self. Ambient Narratives. (exact topic to be defined later)

4.4 ICPP contribution: Martin Meints

Mechanisms for transparency enhancement: Feed-Back systems

Suggested Contribution:

In the context of profiling an idem-identity may be generated or calculated that is not understood or shared by the person to whom it is linked. In many cases profiling is used as a method to ensure **trust** in a relationship mostly between individuals and organisations that is not established for a long period of time or recently has changed its quality. From this point of view mechanisms to ensure trust may be relevant in this context. As already elaborated in previous FIDIS deliverables transparency from the point of view of the data subject is important in this context. In this contribution current mechanisms to implement this transparency are presented and discussed, based on existing examples where profiling in a broader sense is involved. The investigated mechanisms will cover:

- Reactive mechanisms:
  - o Reputation systems
    - ▪ Profiling of sellers and customers
    - ▪ Reputation in identity management systems
  - o Understanding profiling applied to the data subject:
    - ▪ Scoring values in the context of credit scoring
    - ▪ Profiling in the context of anti-money-laundering
- Proactive mechanisms:
  - o Parallel profiling of the data subject
    - ▪ Modelling potential own profiles in the context of employment
    - ▪ History Management function in identity management
  - o Self-profiling in the context of certification and auditing
    - ▪ Web-Seals
    - ▪ Data protection and security seals
  - o Modelling of profiles using simulation techniques
    - ▪ Profiles in online games

These mechanisms will be analysed with respect to their effectiveness, usability and potential for possible improvements from the point of view of the data subject.

4.5 INSEAD contribution: Thierry Nabeth

No official abstract received yet.

4.6 Reading contribution: Kevin Warwick (represented by Mark Gasson)

No official abstract received yet – Reading University would like to see a working outline of a document first to get some ideas.

However they did send in (a) some short ideas in 2007, and (b) the email by Mark Gasson further clarifies their position

(a) some short ideas from 2007:

> We would like to contribute on the following:
>
> "The impact on the sense of self (*ipse*) of being recognised by the environment as a particular individual (*idem*) through the implant, i.e., the interplay between environment and self; This is an area that has been expanded on subsequent to the book, so is entirely in keeping with Kevin's further musings".

(b) Mark Gasson (19th March 2008):

> "It will actually be Kevin Warwick from here who will do this contribution, and so far we have not had a time when both he and I are in the UK to discuss it! Unfortunately such a time is unlikely to occur before the Berlin meeting - I will however attend that, but will have to check if I can make your workshop if there are parallel sessions running. (…)".

4.7 LSE contribution: Bernard Dyer

Putting Idem/Ipse in a workable model/framework as specified in specified in D4.10 "Specification of a portal for interoperability of identity management systems"

Our thoughts on the contribution are based on the work we have performed in FIDIS Work Package 4 and on the Anti-Money Laundering profiling work we did in the Spotlight project.

Outline of LSE's possible contribution

To apply the management model/framework, and related topics, which have been developed in WP4 to the definition, distinction, and analysis of Ipse and Idem identities. We will incorporate the contributions from other partners into the model/framework which has been specified in D4.10 "Specification of a portal for interoperability of identity management systems" and which is to be submitted to the EC at the end of March.

The steps which will be taken are as follows:

- Step 1:   Specify the requirements of Ipse and Idem
  - o Define their characteristics
  - o Set the boundaries of where they may be applied
  - o Identify the controlling factors
  - o Develop a conceptual model
- Step 2: Define profiling processes
  - o Descriptive module
  - o Parameterization module

- o Querying module
- o Data mining module
- o Analysis module
- ▪ Step 3:   Information management
  - o Information

    Specify information relating to Ipse and Idem

  - o Duty of Care

    Specify legal issues and roles of responsibilities of stakeholders

  - o Processes and Procedures

    As stated above

  - o Enabling technologies

    As appropriate including data mining tools and techniques

  - o Audit and Control

    Testing and validation of the process

4.8 ISTRI contribution: Arpád Ráb

No official abstract received yet.

However Róbert Pintér did send an email which further clarifies ISTRI's position

Róbert Pintér (19th March 2008):

> "Dear Katja,
>
> The contribution is prepared by Arpad Rab, who is my colleague in ITTK and an MMO expert (as a cultural anthropologist; for the FIDIS "Identity in a networked world"-booklet (http://www.fidis.net/resources/networked-world/) he gave an anthropological analysis of MMO games).
>
> Arpad promised me yesterday that he prepares the abstract, so I really hope that it can reach you until this Friday. Unfortunately neither me, nor Arpad can participate in the event in Berlin, but Bence Kollányi will represent our Institute in Berlin. I cc him, so hopefully he can join the sub-meeting on this deliverable, and Arpad will inform him about our position in this WP.
>
> Best regards,
>
> Robert"

5 Annex 2: Table of Contents (based on the second part of the workshop @ the FIDIS 2008 Research Meeting)