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