

NSTIC Pre-Plenary Event 3/15

Management Council, Plenary, Committee, and Working Group Roles and Participation

Synopsis

Summary:

The goal of this breakout session was to discuss standards within the identity ecosystem and how accreditation should be handled. Discussion focused on leveraging existing standards development efforts and considering the solutions or services the identity ecosystem will produce. Conversations also revolved around the scope of accreditation.

Discussion Points/Outcomes		
No.	Topic	Discussion/Outcomes
1. NSTIC is not the only identity and trust framework.		Discussion around existing standards and impacts of developing a national solution to a particular problem.
		From an international perspective, we need to recognize that successful outcomes require cooperation and involvement. Need to be sensitive that it's a two way communication ('a come to us approach' should be avoided).
		NSTIC should not be a 'standard'.
		There was discussion about the possibility that as standards are defined to meet the needs of the Strategy, some existing standards may need to be revisited (i.e., NIST SP 800-63 and the ISO equivalent were particularly noted.)
2. Standards and accreditation.		Standards mapping and accreditation mapping is something this group, within this space, should do. What is minimum core set of standards and how are they identified? Some suggestions included developing reference architecture; defining a functional set of requirements; mapping.
		Discussion that standards should not hamper innovation.
		Individuals in this group have already started the process of documenting existing standards bodies. ISOC has started doing this and offered to share.
		Discussion around whether "accreditation" is the correct term and relationship with interoperability or conformance. Do current accreditation processes deliver the right outcomes for achieving interoperability? If not, why not and can it be improved upon to meet the NSTIC vision? Some attendees felt that existing accreditation activities could be improved. We must be mindful of 'accreditation' and 'interoperability' and what this may or may not imply.
		Observation that it is difficult to define standards in the absence of architecture. Some discussion on whether we need architecture or a framework.
		Are we seeking conformance? Or are we looking to see if entities are following processes and behaving in a trustful manner?
		How can interoperability incentivized?
		Our approach should be to present a set of functions rather than 'here is the standard.' We must foster innovation and remain flexible with the goal of interoperability as this evolves.
		There was discussion about exit strategies for standards (i.e., how do we know when we're done with the standard?)
		There was a suggestion to consider plug fests for interoperability.
		Suggestion was made that a venue for working through the topics raised at this breakout could be another open forum, such as today, where discussion begins to get more focused, and come up with possible next steps.
4. Can we use what we already have in the strategy to build out and make progress?		Suggestion that we need a standard business case – determine how the NSTIC strategy document can serve as input. There was the point made that the Strategy provides high-level, philosophical requirements versus requirements that drive product interoperability.
		Be cognizant of blending technology and policy.
		Suggestion that we build from existing standards – develop a gap analysis based on existing standards and what we think we need to meet the Strategy requirements
		Suggestion that we need to consider technical standards as well as business standards.
		Consider end user defined requirements, but do not reinvent the wheel, avoid a government driven solution.
5. What can this group do to address the hard		Avoid technology-specific standards right off the bat.
		Consider methods and tactics for encouraging buy-in, consider risk management,

Discussion Points/Outcomes		
No.	Topic	Discussion/Outcomes
problems?		encourage government to lead by example.
		Who is doing risk allocation, what does it tell us?
		Dig deeper – someone suggested doing a survey of what standards exist (formal and consortia).
		Build from the general standards that are established, careful to remain flexible, avoid being too technology specific, avoid recreating what has already been done.
		We should consider bringing RPs into the standards discussion in particular from service provider and liability perspectives. How can the NPO help encourage RP participation?
		It suggested that the private sector and government set the 'bar high' (i.e., think beyond the work that we've done in the Federal government with identity credentials.).