

**Meeting: TCF Governance Board, Q1**

**Date and Time: Tuesday 19 March 2024 at 15:00 (CET)**

**Venue: In Person & Virtual**

**Present:** Christer Ljones (Schibsted Marketing Services) (Chair)

Colin O'Malley (Integral Ad Science) (VChair)	Ben Humphry (Huawei)
Karsten Rieke (Criteo)	Benoit Oberle (Sirdata)
Romain Gauthier (Didomi)	Markus Rhul (Publicis Groupe)
Jaakko Kuivalainen (Sanoma)	Robert Blanck (Axel Springer)
Gareth Burkhill-Howarth (WPP)	Ben Barokas (Sourcepoint)
Thomas Peruzzi (Virtual Minds)	

**Apologies:**

Jochem Schlosser (Adform)  
Arne Steinmetz (RTL Group/AdAlliance)  
Jean-Marc Vidal (TF1)

**Board Observer:**

Leigh Freund (NAI)  
Conor Murray (egta)  
Magdalena Bublewicz (IAB Poland)  
Christie Dennehy-Neil (IAB UK)

**In attendance:**

Townsend Feehan (CEO, IAB Europe, Managing Organisation)  
Ninon Vagner (Director Privacy & Compliance, IAB Europe, Managing Organisation)  
Gosia Kowalska (Digital Advertising Privacy Officer, IAB Europe, Managing Organisation)  
Hassan Siddaq (Business Administrator, IAB Europe, Managing Organisation)  
Thomas Mendrina (Chair, TCF Steering Group)

Anne Goodman – Secretariat (IAB Europe)

**Chair**

The Secretariat declared the meeting quorate.

The Chair opened the meeting welcoming all and introducing those attending in person. Thanking the Board for the conclusion of the vote to update the TCF Governance Board vademecum, increasing the number of terms from 2 to 3 that Board members can serve. The Chair advised the board that this change to the vademecum was awaiting formal agreement from the IAB Europe Board. Due to the full agenda of the Q1 IAB Europe Board meeting this was moved to the Q2 meeting of the Board

The Chair introduce the first substantive item on the agenda the review of the status of the action items from the Q4 Board meeting

### **Action Items Q4 meeting (status)**

There were 2 action items recorded at the Q4 Board meeting:

**Action:** *Board Members Adform and Criteo agreed to share information on GPP adoption as a starting point for the Board assessment of market readiness*

**Action taken:** On behalf of both Adform and Criteo Karsten Reike advised that the analysis of data provided by both companies concurred with a 1% position on global representation of the GPP string in the bid stream. There was no data on the representation of sub-sections of the GPP string but both companies acknowledged that this detail would be most likely be tracked in the future.

**Action:** *MO to include in 2024 planning a scoping exercise to consider the inclusion of other use cases such as retail into the TCF, to better accommodate advertisers and first-party data providers 'first party' use cases*

**Action taken:** The Chair noted that action taken was on today's agenda as a separate item so would be considered there

**CJEU Judgement** – update presented by Ninon Vagner, Director Privacy & Compliance, IAB Europe, Managing Organisation (MO).

The MO gave a comprehensive summary of the CJEU ruling issued on 7 March, followed by the next steps on IAB Europe's appeal of the APD's 2022 decision, of which the referral to the European Court was part. The MO also explained the interaction of the different milestones in the litigation with submission and execution of the "Action Plan" that the TCF working groups had been developed. The orders from the APD decision that were impacted by the referral were highlighted; the update concluded with a review of the PR activity and communications that the MO had implemented following the issuing of the ruling and the additional communications planned for the coming weeks.

The Chair asked the members to provide any feedback on the judgement from the markets that they had witnessed and the key questions that the markets were raising.

- The Board asked if the CJEU ruling would have an impact on the proposal to retire the TCF API in favour of the GPP API. The MO responded that the Policy WG had been considering the proposal but had delayed formal considerations until after the CJEU ruling
- the Board noted that coverage was contradictory in some markets, likely due to the complexity of the case and the fact that the ruling was essentially about IAB Europe's role in the TCF rather than the Framework itself.
- The Board agreed it was important that all members of the board reached out to the market to support the communication efforts and improve the clarity of understanding that would uphold the confidence in the Framework.

### **Proposal that the TCF API is deprecated in favour of the GPP API – timeline update – presented by Julien Delhommeau, Chair of the FSWG**

*Note:* At the Q4 meeting the Board raised a concern about the time associated with the technical implementations of this proposal and the importance of a considered timeline to ensure a successful adoption. At the same time, the Board, suggested that account should be taken of the recent implementation of TCF v2.2 and the impact on the market resources to successfully manage this, therefore careful planning was crucial and the timing of the rollout needed to take full account of everything else that was in the pipeline for delivery by the market. Today’s update, provided by the Chair of the FSWG, is a response to these considerations by the Board.

The update highlighted that in the first instance key stakeholders had been identified and for each of these groups a thorough assessment of the “Tasks” they would need to perform had been made to facilitate this migration. This was followed by a review of the “Effort” required to complete each task. Dependencies and risks were also considered and recorded. Using this detail, the Tech Lab developed a comprehensive timeline for the FSWG to consider which the Chair of the FSWG presented to the Board. Significant in the timeline was consideration of preparation time and also consideration of time post implementation to take account of prioritisation.

- The Board asked if the Tech Lab were in agreement with this timeline given that it would result in a completion of a transition significantly later than had been originally suggested. It was confirmed that the Tech Lab were fully across this longer timeline, having developed the timeline following FSWG guidance.

- The Board also asked for clarification of the actual proposal, flagging that there is confusion amongst observers as to whether what is being considered is deprecation of the TCF itself, or just of a particular way of accessing the signal containing users’ choices. The Chair of the FSWG clarified there is absolutely no plan to deprecate the TCF. The proposal referred to the TCF API only, in favour of the GPP API, the TC String specification would remain unaffected and under the policy management of the TCF instances. The MO also advised that FAQs provided by the Tech Lab that were intended to educate the market on the proposal would take account of this feedback and ensure that these questions were clearly answered.

- The Board were supportive of this longer timeline.

### **TCF accommodation of emerging first-party use cases – presented by the MO in response to the Q4 meeting action item**

The MO presented a summary slide of the “problem”, highlighted “key questions” and indicated “next steps”. The Chair asked all for their consideration of the key questions.

- it was highlighted that advertisers and also retail media were likely hesitant to integrate with the TCF, maybe as a of lack of understanding of their compliance obligations and of the benefits and opportunity, therefore communication was key to adoption.

- the Board also highlighted that there was an increasing need to establish proof of consent, citing Google Consent Mode as an example of an initiative to answer this requirement. The TC String enables the recording of consent in the context of GDPR, in contrast to the presentation of a privacy policy that does not necessarily enable the capturing of proof for downstream communication. Therefore, this could be seen as an opportunity for other use cases, to enable downstream signalling, particularly in instances where a direct relationship between companies did not exist.

- in summary the Board agreed that there were opportunities but that adoption by other uses cases would likely require considered communication that would explain to potential uses case that the opportunity would not lead to an increase in friction and that it could possibly mitigate risk and add value.
- the Board suggested that the TCF WGs should be enlisted to consider whether there are indeed gaps in the current functionality of the Framework that leave new and existing first-party scenarios unaddressed and to propose iterations if so. Suggesting that the opportunity for a ‘simple string’ in GPP could also be a consideration.

**Steering Group (SG) update (PAPER 2\_14-11-23) for noting** – The Chair of the SG Thomas Mendrina presented the update from the SG and its working groups (WGs) on recent TCF developments that the SG oversaw. The update circulated to the Board prior to the meeting, in line with previous reports, focused on the work of the TCF working groups.

The Chair highlighted to the Board that for the first time the SG Vademecum has been made available for all members of the SG to [view online](#). The Vademecum gives comprehensive details on the working process of the TCF instances and working groups, including voting rules, where applicable. The Chair presented the key work streams highlighted in the report for each of the WGs, noting that whilst CJEU ruling was pending the working groups had focused on a smaller number of items, but nonetheless important to continuing to drive the relevance of the TCF.

There were no questions from the Board.

**Managing Organisation (MO) update (PAPER 3\_14-11-23) for noting** –The CEO of the Managing Organisation, Townsend Feehan presented highlights from the update. The update had been circulated to the Board prior to the meeting.

The MO update included a detailed presentation on **TCF Compliance** presented by members of the MO compliance team Hassan Siddaq and Gosia Kowalska. The MO advised that as from 2024, the intention was to publish an annual report on the compliance work. This would be shared with the Governance Board in draft form prior to publication. The MO was also working on ways to extend the compliance procedures to better serve the in-App environment.

- The Board asked if the compliance process had actually resulted in suspensions and where these were listed, including if publicly. The MO confirmed that vendor suspensions had occurred and to date in 2024, 2 vendors had been suspended as a result of non-compliance (23 vendors were suspended in 2023). The MO clarified that public notification of suspension is reserved for the differentiated enforcement procedure linked to the tampering of TC String, but not for the other procedures. However, the MO plan to work on a public annual report that would provide aggregated statistics about the number of procedures triggered annually, and where applicable the number of suspensions that occurred during the year.
- The MO confirmed that in the majority of cases of the issue of a suspension warning, these were followed by an immediate response from the vendor or CMP that resulted in the correction of all issues to ensure compliance. In no circumstance has a participant that is found to be non-compliant been allowed to remain on the GVL without correcting the non-compliance.

Action Item – MO agreed to circulate to the Board the enforcement process that had been previously presented to the Board.

**TCF 2024 Work Plan** – presented by Ninon Vagner, Director Privacy & Compliance, IAB Europe, Managing Organisation (MO).

IAB Europe's Board of Directors is currently finalising the draft 2024-2025 work plan, which will be tabled for the approval of the General Assembly in May. The proposed TCF workplan focuses on 4 workstreams. The 4 workstreams were: APD procedure; TCF Development; TCF Compliance; and, Legal and Guidance and support. It was noted that this final pillar was not confined to TCF but a broader remit of support for the market on key issues beyond the TCF.

The workplan also included a significant update to the GVL registration platform and supporting services.

**GVL registration architectural update** – presented by Heinz Baumann, Technical Consultant, MO. Having identified that an update of the TCF registration architecture was a significant requirement, a comprehensive RFP detailing the work required was prepared and was made publicly available here:

<https://iabeurope.eu/request-for-proposal-tcf-vendors-cmps-registration-and-management-portal/> The RFP included the opportunity to improve the compliance work flow as well as better handle the increasing complexity of the registration process and subsequent management of the participation in the GVL and CMP list. The RFP gave rise to 7 expressions of interest and resulted in a short list of 3 proposals and the selection of a final candidate. The MO confirmed that the intention was to deploy the update after the summer break.

- the Board asked what factors in the response had influenced the selection, the MO confirmed that costs, acquaintance with the TCF and the reasonably complex range of tasks incumbent on the MO to perform, and time to market were key influencers, as well as costs for ongoing SLAs.

- the MO confirmed that the update to the architecture would not change the management of the registration site, which would remain inhouse

### **AOB**

There was no other business raised.

### **Close**

The Chair reminded the Board that the Q2 meeting would be the last meeting of the current 2-year term.

It was agreed that the next meeting (Q2) would take place first week of June w/c June 3 2024. It was noted that while ideally the TCF Governance Board would meet before the IAB Europe Board to facilitate a timely update to the Board, on this occasion, it would likely not be possible. The Chair advised that he would update the IAB Europe Board at their next meeting on the content of the Q1 meeting.

The Chair thanked the members of the Board who had travelled to meet in person and thanked the Robert Blanck and Axel Springer for hosting the meeting.

The meeting closed at 17:00 CET