Governance Structure

First Day - 1

- Tacit acceptance of NSTIC governance concept
- Regarding actual governance structure:
  - Many extant models, e.g., SGIP, ILO, SAFE, FICAM, NACHA, OIX, Kantara, OASIS, OIDF
  - Must represent fairly all parties/entities
  - Must be consensus-driven
  - Must be routinely assessed for end-user satisfaction
  - Must be a legal entity
  - Must be failure-resistant
  - Must align or at least not clash directly with Int'l models

First Day – 2

- Requirements of Legal Entity
    - Private Sector owned and operated
    - NSTIC Goals core
        - Enshrined in charter and protected through bylaws
    - Feds members via NSTIC NPO
    - Member intellectual property must be protected and zero-fee royalties for implementation the rule
    - Liability/Safe Harbor for early adopters

First Day - 3

- Purpose of Governance Entity
  - To adopt existing standards, policies and practices that enable NSTIC goals
  - To develop new standards, policies and practices when needed or to enable development elsewhere within the ecosystem
  - Responsive to ecosystem needs or it will fail

First Day -4

- Structure
  - Two-tiered with small (9-15) steering committee and segment-wide membership
  - May have standing committees and ad hoc committees to address identified needs
  - Must have an executive secretariat and staff to do daily work
    - Implies membership fees, schedules tbd
    - Funds may come from Feds all or in part, early and continuing

Second Day - 1

- A more challenging session. Less consensus than Day 1
- Rather than focus on the governance issues, a vocal minority spent time questioning the Strategy itself
  - Some suggest Ecosystem already defined by existing entities, viz., FICAM, OASIS, Kantara, OIX, FICAM, ITU-T, ISOC, etc.
    - Some suggest Industry is satisfied with existing environment; could NSTIC retard existing progress?
  - Others ask if there a business case for an Identity Ecosystem? If so, would it not have evolved already?
  - What's the incentive for the citizen?
  - What does 'trust' mean anyway?
  - Some discussion as to the inherent conflict between privacy community and data aggregation sector – and need to mediate this in the body
  - Need to work on interoperability more

Second Day – 2

- Governance Structure – No consensus
  - Can't define one without clear *raison d'être*
  - General agreement that all parties need to be identified
  - Some suggest there should not be just one governance body - possibly many and some in conflict
  - Discussion over whether the body should be a consortium model that manages process but does not touch stakeholders
  - Discussion over whether the governance body should be "lightweight" or "medium" in its authority (group voted for "medium" but term was not defined)
  - Consensus that it should be a community of interest that would help foster NSTIC goals