

**NSTIC Standards Coordination Committee**  
**DRAFT Standards Adoption Policy**  
~~April~~**March** 2013

**Outline**

	1. Introduction	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Role of standards within the IDESG</li> <li>b. IDESG Standards Registry</li> <li>c. Standards vs specifications</li> </ul>	<i>Source: December criterion document (Clark), and &lt;to come&gt;</i>
	2. Policy statements	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. IDESG/SCC is not an SDO</li> <li>b. Relationship with SDOs</li> <li>c. Standards and the ID Ecosystem Framework</li> <li>d. Suitability for adoption</li> <li>e. Responsibility for standards adoption</li> </ul>	<i>Source: SCC January slides; new text (Clark)</i>
	3. Standards adoption process	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Process flow <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. Gap identification</li> <li>II. Selection of SDO's to work with</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<i>Source: Tilton SCC diagrams; new text (Hughes)</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. Standards adoption life cycle <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. Diagram</li> <li>II. Description of life cycle phases</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<i>Source: Tilton SCC diagrams; new text (Hughes)</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c. Roles and responsibilities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. SCC</li> <li>II. IDESG committees</li> <li>III. SDOs</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<i>Source: Tilton SCC diagrams; new text (Hughes)</i>
	4. Standard criteria	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Purpose and application of the criteria</li> <li>b. Criteria for determining "Is this a &lt;an open&gt; standard?"</li> </ul>	<i>Source: (a) January SCC slides; (b) Existing 'criteria' draft (Clark December 2013 v6)</i>
	5. Annex	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Standards Wiki</li> <li>b. References</li> </ul>	<to come>

## 1. Introduction

The Rules of Association of the Identity Ecosystem Steering Group (IDESG) state that “The purpose of the IDESG shall be to develop and administer the process for policy and technical standards development for the Identity Ecosystem Framework.” It further states that:

- “The IDESG shall not itself be a standards development body, but rather an organization that promotes the development of standards by other existing standards development organizations and develops policies that serve to accelerate the development and adoption of the Identity Ecosystem.”

The first activity within the scope of the IDESG is identified as:

- “Promote and Adopt Standards. The IDESG shall establish forums and procedures to review applicable standards and adopt those that support achievement of the NSTIC vision, conform to the Guiding Principles, and meet other established requirements. Additionally, the IDESG shall
  - recommend standards be established when gaps are identified; and,
  - advocate for standards to be established and adopted in a timely manner and be sufficient to keep pace with emerging technology and market trends.”

Adopted standards form part of the Identity Ecosystem Framework, inform the work of the IDESG committees, and will be relied upon as part of the Trustmark program. According to the Rules of Association: “The IDESG shall encourage harmonization of standards and policies and shall always strive to recognize the impacts of policy and standards on all stakeholders in the Identity Ecosystem.” It is the responsibility of the IDESG Plenary to “Facilitate the timely review, recommendation and adoption of standards related to the development and governance of the Identity Ecosystem.” The IDESG Management Council shall “Review proposals for the standards, policies, and other components of the Identity Ecosystem Framework prior to consideration by the Plenary.”

It is the purpose of this Standards Adoption Policy to define the policies and processes by which standards are adopted into the Identity Ecosystem Framework.

## 1a. Role of open standards within the IDESG

The purpose of an "open standards" criterion within the IDESG system is to implement the call of the White House NSTIC (the "National Strategy") for the use of open standards as the preferred methodology for interactions in data regarding identity between independent parties within identity ecosystems. As noted in the National Strategy, and multiple prior governmental directives and best practices, widespread adoption and success for identity ecosystems depends on the voluntary participation.

[Such open standards will include open standards for open source developed systems]

While some identity ecologies may have their own satisfactory proprietary or closed methods, the NSTIC open and scalable ecosystem concept depends on the ability of large groups of enterprises, institutions and individuals to federate and conduct interactions regarding identity data, voluntarily, with confidence that they will be able to use their own systems and methods, within their own environment, while confidently relying on identity data interactions with each other across organizational boundaries by means of stable, vendor-neutral methods with well-declared meanings.

That requirement of open accessibility to newcomers, in "openly federating" systems, generally can be addressed by the criteria for open standards use that are pervasive in US public policy. "Voluntary consensus standards" use is preferred, as a policy matter, because those methods are:

- \* Neutral as to vendors, and more accessible by DIY implementers. The transparency and quality generated in an open standards process generally results in higher quality, and methods less tied to the peculiarities of any one offering. These requirements also help address competition law issues, so that a government policy is not seen to favor a specific supplier.

- \* Open accessibility of a system to any implementer, regardless of system or software, also enhances positive network scale effects, by making it easier for newcomers to federate and transact without high switching costs. When a higher volume of transactions is enabled, this also can result in cost savings from the creation and marketing of common interfaces, tools and service providers.

[Note comment about "affordable standards" in Section 44.]

## 1b. IDESG Standards Registry

The set of open standards that are officially approved by the IDESG, as part of the Identity Ecosystem Framework, is contained within the IDESG Standards Registry. This registry shall list all standards on which the IDESG plenary has taken action, along with metadata about each such standard. Section 3 describes the process through which IDESG review and approval occurs. ~~{to come}~~

IDESG also maintains an informal web resource, uncritically listing all known standards, specifications and similar guidance, related to identity management and NSTIC's domain, of which the IDESG is made aware. That wiki-based resource is intended to serve as a finding tool; inclusion of an artifact there is not as an evaluative statement.

## 1c. Standards vs specifications

~~{to come}~~ In the course of its work, the IDESG will create, adopt and reference many documents in order to serve its many purposes and activities. Some of these documents may be incorporated into, or be sanctioned as authoritative guidance, within IDESG's become part of the Identity Ecosystem Framework.

In this document, the word "specification" generally refers to a specific data structure which is defined by a document. That may include markup languages, code, methodologies, APIs, policy guidance or other recommended behaviors; and may come from a single source or a group, and from industry, academic or governmental sectors or combinations of them.

Whatever their merit, not all specifications are standards. The word "standard" implies a higher degree of specificity and testability. According to the International Organization for Standardization (ISO):

A standard is a document that provides requirements, specifications, guidelines or characteristics that can be used consistently to ensure that materials, products, processes and services are fit for their purpose.

Section 4 describes criteria to be used by IDESG for determining whether a specification or document is a standard, and in addition, whether it is an "open standard", suitable for use within the standards-based IDESG ecology. *[Also, note comments about "affordable standards" and "conformant to the Guiding Principles" in Section 4.]*

## 2. Policy statements

The following general principles and assumptions apply to the Standards Adoption Process described in this document.

**2a. IDESG/SCC is not an SDO.** Neither IDESG nor its Standards Committee is intended to serve as a primary source for the creation of new data specifications or standards. In this context, the role of the IDESG is to encourage and assist the creation of identity management and identity federation activity within groups of stakeholders (thereby creating or facilitating persistent "ecologies"), by describing needs for information & communication technology ("ICT") methodologies, and identifying and encouraging the development of standards to fulfill those needs. The Adoption Process is intended to structure and define IDESG's requirements, discovery, definition, cataloging, assessment and recommendation processes for ICT standards, which largely are expected to be developed by other, independent host standards development organizations ("SDOs").

**2b/2c. IDESG'S Relationship with SDOs; Standards and the ID Ecosystem Framework.** The National Strategy calls for the identity ecosystems encouraged by the IDESG to be based on open and widely available standards, to ensure wide adoption, vendor-neutrality and ready availability. IDESG expects that SDOs will participate in the development and discussion by the IDESG community of needs for ICT functionality and standardization within its identity management and identity federation scope. IDESG will communicate the discovered requirements and needs of its stakeholders, for new data standards, to SDOs for the purpose of encouraging requirements-driven development of ~~their~~ standards projects. When an SDO's output of standards and specifications is nominated by stakeholders as a method deserving broader adoption or consideration within IDESG's domain and identity ecologies, the Adoption Process will be used to evaluate its appropriateness as an "open standard" (see next paragraph). IDESG also will encourage candidate specifications which have useful functionality in its domain to work with SDOs to become approved as open standards appropriate for inclusion in IDESG's ecology.

**2d. IDESG will establish suitability criteria for standards adoption: openness and availability under these criteria, and fitness for a technical purpose, as evaluated by the relevant expert committee.** "Open standards," as that term and concept is used within the National Strategy, and by governmental policies requiring or encouraging the use of open standards, means data standards which have a set of "open" qualities referring to their availability, transparency, development process, licensing and neutrality. That "openness" will be defined, for IDESG purposes, by the Standards

Criteria (in section 4) as applied by the Adoption Process (in section 3). That quality is distinct from, and that assessment does NOT include, an evaluation of the fitness of a proposed standard for its particular purpose, or a functional assessment of its merit or interoperability with other specific technologies. That second inquiry belongs, within IDESG's activities, to the substantive committees or work panels having expertise in the functions in question. Thus, for example, a proposed cybersecurity standard, suggested for broad use within IDESG-endorsed frameworks, might have:

- \* its security functionality, and suitability for use, assessed by the Security Committee; and
- \* the degree to which it is an "open standard", and thus sufficiently available for use, assessed by the Adoption Process.

**2e. SCC will have responsibility for standards adoption.** The Adoption Process as defined in this document will be managed by IDESG's Standards Committee ("SCC"), as specified in Section 3 below, subject to the governance of the IDESG through its plenary and other governing mechanisms. The primary role of the Standards Committee will be to arrange for evaluation of candidate standards, when nominated for evaluation, using the Adoption Process, which will result in recommendations and reports to the IDESG Plenary.

**2f. SCC will be IDESG's primary point of SDO liaison.** The SCC will be responsible for liaising with SDOs. [Liaison relationships will be initiated as needed and shall go through the [Management Committee liaison approval process].] Day-to-day interaction with SDOs will occur either (a) through the SCC, particularly with respect to IDESG initiated standards projects within those SDOs, or (b) in cases where a particular IDESG expert committee initiates a relationship, will be advised to the SCC.

### **3. Standards adoption process**

The process by which a standard is identified, evaluated, and adopted into the Identity Ecosystem Framework is described herein.

#### **3a. Process flow**

Nominations for candidate standards to be used in IDESG's endorsed frameworks and identity ecologies may come from (a) IDESG's cataloging efforts (described below), (b) substantive IDESG committees (such as the Security Committee) who propose one or more specific candidates for review, or (c) from the results of IDESG's own use case development work. The [SCC]/[Use Cases subcommittee] shall identify applicable

standards and ascertain gaps in existing standards based on the established use cases and those incoming nominations. The SCC shall use designated Identity Ecosystem liaisons for communicating any identified gaps to the owning SDO.

As candidate standards for examination are identified as relevant, they will be queued (by the Standards Committee) for review, as described in the next section.

### 3b. Standards adoption life cycle

Standards Adoption Life Cycle					
Standards Inventory	Standard Revision/ Development	Standard Nomination	Standard Review	Recommended (Submitted)	Approval & Adoption
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Collection of existing identity-related standards.</li> <li>Standards Wiki – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Collection</li> <li>Access</li> <li>Feedback</li> </ul> </li> <li>Source of candidate standards</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>When gaps exist, work with SDO to either: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Initiate a new standards project to develop a new standard</li> <li>Initiate a revision of an existing standard to better meet IDESG requirements</li> </ul> </li> <li>Requirements come from SCC &amp; other committees</li> <li>Liaise throughout project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IDESG committee or SCC nominates a standard for adoption</li> <li>Nomination form (online)</li> <li>Nominator defines purpose/relevance and GPs addressed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SCC reviews nominated standard.</li> <li>Standard criteria applied (answer the question – “Is this a &lt;an open&gt; standard?”)</li> <li>SCC may meet with nominator for Q&amp;A.</li> <li>SCC may liaise with Privacy Committee for preliminary review.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Standard to be balloted by the plenary for IDESG adoption.</li> <li>Adoption means inclusion in the IDESG Standards Registry.</li> <li>Undergoes all MC and plenary approval processes as defined in the RoA.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approved IDESG work product.</li> <li>Included within “IDESG Standards Registry” – list of standards which form part of the Identity Ecosystem Framework.</li> <li>Ready for use to inform (and be normatively referenced within) other IDESG work.</li> </ul>
<b>Progression gate:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Standard is nominated for consideration.</li> </ul>	<b>Progression gate:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New/ revised standard published</li> <li>Standard entered into inventory</li> </ul>	<b>Progression gate:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nomination form submitted</li> </ul>	<b>Progression gate:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meets ‘standards’ criteria.</li> <li>SCC approves forwarding standard for adoption (recommends it for adoption).</li> </ul>	<b>Progression gate:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plenary ballot passes.</li> </ul>	<b>Progression gate:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A.</li> <li>Standard may be removed from the approved list or may be replaced by newer version by ballot.</li> </ul>
Individual/ AHG	SDO	Committees	SCC	MC/Plenary	IDESG

The Standard Adoption Lifecycle phases are designed to provide a framework for effectively achieving the goals of the SCC to review applicable standards and adopt those that support achievement of the NSTIC vision, conform to the Guiding Principles, for standards to be established and adopted in a timely manner and be sufficient to keep pace with emerging technology and market trends. The Standards Adoption Lifecycles consist of six dynamic phases:

**Standards Inventory:** SCC will lead the collection of existing identity related specifications and standards, on an uncritical basis, welcoming all data, and establish a standards Wiki for access and feedback and identifying theirthe standards sources.

**Standards Revision and Development:** SCC will work Work with SDO’s to close gaps. If needed, SCC may initiate or seek the initiation of new standards development projects, and/or revisions to existing standards, for alignment with IDESG requirements. SCC will assist integrate IDESG committees in integrating their substantive requirements into those communications. Appointment liaisons.



**Standards Nomination:** When a candidate standard is proposed for use in an IDESG-endorsed process, by an IDESG committee or SCC standards nomination (from its gap analysis review), then it is flagged for official review as described below. The Plenary's approval process should include a step in which the Adoption Process is invoked and applied. SCC should develop a nomination form for the Standards Wiki for all such submissions and nominations, which - Establishes a forum for a nominator to articulate the purpose, relevance, and source information GP's for candidateproposed standards.

**Standards Review:** SCC will review each nominated candidate standards, against the - Apply established sStandards Adoption Criteria, and post a notice to the IDESG community inviting feedback on the candidate standard's open attributes (including e.g. open standard or not. In addition consider any Privacy and IPR issues). The results of that review and open feedback process will be compiled into a report provided by the SCC to the IDESG Plenary, as described in Section (4c) "Implementation."

**SCC Recommended/Submitted Standards for Plenary Ballot:** IDESG Plenary action which includes the endorsement of a candidate standards should include (in addition to the functional suitability recommendations from the appropriate IDESG Committee(s)) an explicit decision to endorse, or reject, the SCC's report on the candidate standard's openness and availability. The outcomes of those ballots, and that report, should be incorporated into ballot and vote for standard in compliance with MC and Plenary approval processes for adoption into the information made available in the -IDESG standards registry.

### 3c. Roles and responsibilities

**Standards Committee** - The SCC will build on and use existing standards and specifications as much as possible. The SCC will identify and publish lists of new and/or existing open standards relevant to the NSTIC Identity Ecosystem. When there is a need to modify existing Standards, then the SCC will work with the IDESG committee having expertise in that domain to document the recommended modifications and work with the relevant SDO to initiate the work. In cases where it is not feasible for the owning SDO to modify the standard and there are no alternative standards, the SCC maywill provide recommendations on how to proceed. committees to receive their requirements and in turn to make standards recommendations.ID Eco-System working groups and The SCC will work with other

**IDESG Committees** - The substantive committees may nominate candidatea standards for adoption, as being relevant to the ecosystem or an included element in a set of procedures recommended for IDESG endorsement. IDESG committees may offer

requirements for identified standards and seek new projects, or modifications to existing projects, from relevant SDOs. ~~\*\* IDESG committees may be leveraged by SCC in reviewing identified standards to ensure their alignment with NSTIC committee level criterion. \*\* (speculative)~~

**SDOs** - SDOs should identify existing standards applicable to the NSTIC effort, and suggest new standard's projects or revisions of existing standards to meet NSTIC identity ecosystem needs. The SCC will focus on direct collaboration with relevant SDOs standards development and standards setting organizations such as de jure, consortia, professional society and industry associations (e.g., IETF, OASIS, W3C, ISO, ITU, and relevant other consortia), in the area of Security and Identity Management.

#### 4. Standard criteria

~~<see inserted pages>~~ <From prior draft>

NOTE: Suggested addition sections on "affordable standards," and "standards conformant to the NSTIC Guiding Principles", have not been added here. This requires discussion by the SCC during its review of this draft.

## SECTION 2. STANDARDS CRITERIA

From the foregoing, it appears that there is a common constellation of principles generally used to determine the suitability of proposed specifications, for broader implementation in the service of public policy goals. Each of the following requirements appears in some manner in each of the principal systems described above:

- *Primary deliverables:*
  - *Participatory openness*, in the sense that anyone can participate within reasonable restrictions.
    - Facilitates balanced input, retards the exclusion of stakeholders or use cases. Some standards bodies have explicit "balance" composition rules. Others believe that better results come from proactive recruiting, and level-playing-field rules that make participation attractive for minority stakeholders, than from quota approaches.
    - Some degree of participation fees have generally been found appropriate, although it's possible that a "rich players club" with too high an entry barrier might be found inappropriately exclusionary.
  - *Fairness and due process* rules to enforce balanced decisions and consensus methodology.
    - At a minimum, published rules and an absence of a track record of ignoring them seem essential.
    - Usually includes enforcement mechanisms reasonably assuring that the rules are followed. This can be difficult to measure or assess in the case of small or volunteer-run groups.
    - In practice, it appears that some agencies run spotchecks on this issue by seeking and evaluating assertions that significant points of view were excluded.
  - *Transparency*, or openness in the sense of public access to inputs and results.
    - Some charges for published standards, to pass along the reasonable costs of development generally have been found appropriate, particularly in industries with relatively large commercial players. There is some pushback on this principle from the "open data" movement, on the grounds that public policies which are amount to regulatory requirements should be freely available, to enable review and compliance.
    - The degree of availability of draft material (as opposed to final products) varies widely among consortia at present. Their justifications for securing draft information range from preserving it as a member-only benefit, to keeping it distinct from final work ready for implementation, to assertions that technical debates may be more robust if not conducted transparently.
    - There is a related but difficult-to-measure problem with groups who have transparency rules in theory (such as posting and archiving practices, and meeting notice rules), but tend not to honor them in practice.

- 86 • *Function-oriented description*, as opposed to specifying design or product-specific  
87 characteristics.
  - 88 • This requirement obviously retards lock-in or tying to a single product or  
89 methodology other than the specification itself.
  - 90 • Description of the proposed functions also allows a review process to assess the  
91 market demand, and the ecosystem niche or role which the reviewed method  
92 may fill – thus supplying guidance on the appropriateness of its inclusion.
  - 93 • Descriptions by performance feature (as opposed to "do it like this exemplar  
94 product") tend to give better guidance to developers of new conforming products,  
95 and are more readily adaptable into useful conformance clauses for testing  
96 purposes. Examples of function-oriented descriptions usually can be found in the  
97 scope statements of open standards projects, where intended outcomes and  
98 boundaries are described in detail, but proprietary processes generally are not  
99 referenced.
- 100 • *Requirements derived from the primary deliverables:*
  - 101 • *Minimum public review procedures* creating genuine opportunities for, and  
102 consideration of, feedback from non-participants.
    - 103 • Parties who do not wish to invest the time or licensure necessary to actively  
104 contribute to a standard still may represent stakeholders whose views should be  
105 considered.
    - 106 • Several of the above bodies explicitly require minimum durations for public  
107 review, or replies or acknowledgments of public comments received, or both.
  - 108 • *Stable hosting arrangements* likely to support the intended access and permanence of  
109 the outputs and relevant archival material.
    - 110 • The access and openness deliverables noted above are of little value if artifacts  
111 cannot be found and relied upon, over time, after their issuance. Even in the  
112 relatively fast – moving ICT sector, it appears that the lifecycle of use for data  
113 standards may be measured in decades, while the hype cycle that supports their  
114 dot.org activity may be limited to years, or even months.
    - 115 • This archival imperative may apply to draft inputs and metadata as well as final  
116 approved outputs.
    - 117 • To some degree, provisions for monitoring and enforcing the maintenance phase  
118 of published standards – managing errata, maintaining their integrity via copyright  
119 management, and maintaining conformance or interoperability criteria – also may  
120 be relevant. The need for these functions may vary widely depending on the  
121 nature of the standard.
  - 122 • *Intellectual property rules* with sufficient certainty, access and enforcement.
    - 123 • The same principles of clearly-stated rules, and reliable enforcement, noted for  
124 process rules, above, also should apply here, so that stakeholders who adopt or  
125 contribute to a project can do so with reasonable knowledge of the known rights  
126 consequences.

- Outputs that are only available on extraordinarily-limited license terms may not serve the goals of a broadly implementable standard. Some governments take this issue further, and express a preference for royalty-free, freely-available or open source standards in order to support wide implementation and access.
- Standards whose development allows contributors to attach complex conditions, of the outset (hostage-taking at the design stage), may not develop freely in response to feedback from other stakeholders.
- Overly-restrictive licenses required to implement a final standard, especially those which require negotiation or surveillance by competitors (hostage-taking at the implementation stage), may impede use of the standard or related technology, as is implied in the SEP cases.

## SECTION 5



### SECTION 3. SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS FOR EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAMS

One weakness of the foregoing traditional analysis is that it treats all standards as if they don't really exist until they are finally issued. In practice, modifications and new technologies are coming along constantly. At any given time, there always are worthy projects in development that have not yet fully brought themselves into an accredited standards process. At the same time, of course, there also are private projects that either have no intent of becoming open, or publicly available; or that present themselves as "standards" without ever satisfying the openness needs suitable to public policy use. Accordingly, any identity ecosystem, and its implementers, must make choices about the adoption of methods that might later lead to open standards, or might turn out to be a unsupported dead end, or a proprietary path under the control of a single vendor or stakeholder group.

A balanced approach that allows for flexibility and innovation may need to establish some general principles for working appropriately with new, incomplete proposed methodologies for handling and structuring information. Here are some draft principles for further consideration:

While long-term, large-scale deployments and dependencies require the assurances and qualities sought by the NTTAA and the National Strategy, any developing ecosystem also will have a number of pilot projects, small implementations, and experiments. These may not yet be the basis for a mandate or wide roll-out, so the use of not-yet-standardized methods may be perfectly appropriate. Among the foregoing (draft) common criteria, the requirements of:

- *Participatory openness,*
- *Fairness and due process, and*
- *Stable hosting arrangements.*

probably are premature. and reasonably might not be applied to experimental pre-standardization projects. The other four criteria, plus one additional special one, should still be applied even to the assessment of early-stage efforts:

- *Transparency to the public;* Transparency often still is needed, even if to a lesser degree, so that the outputs of a proposed methodology can be evaluated by a ecosystem participants. As an example, note that the NSTIC funded pilot projects have been required by NIST to make public interim reports to the IDESG. The

171 projects are not obligated to produce all results publicly. However, some some degree  
172 of public information and reporting puts the IDESG and stakeholders in a position to  
173 assess whether to consider incorporating a candidate technology into broader  
174 systems; and whether open standardization or sourcing of that technology would be  
175 an appropriate next goal.

- 176 • *Function-oriented method descriptions:* The ability to understand a project's methods,  
177 free of specific proprietary product or method use, significantly assists implementers in  
178 replicating the experiment's success with different tools. That view into a project more  
179 readily lends itself to future standardization and broad use , than would a statement  
180 like "we used the Foo Inc. product."
- 181 • *Minimum public review procedures:* Similarly, external projects that seek preliminary  
182 endorsement or use in the ecosystem should be subject to exposure for meaningful  
183 feedback, as the cost of that interim recognition. Without that mechanism, there would  
184 be little opportunity or motivation for those emerging methods to socialize into, and  
185 collaborate with, other technologies so as to become sufficiently interoperable.
- 186 • *Intellectual property rules:* To some degree, the eventual license availability of a  
187 developing technology should be clear from a project's launch. Often the license terms  
188 applicable to a final standard are dictated by the practices used, and contributions,  
189 permitted during its formation. For that reason, any experimental method that seeks to  
190 be embraced as part of a large and widely available ecosystem should be able, *at its*  
191 *initiation*, to demonstrate adequate open licensing and availability will be possible, on  
192 terms are reasonable in light of its intended use. In that way the ecosystem can be  
193 reasonably assured that its resources are doing more than providing public support to  
194 private for-profit product development. For that reason, [a] / [some kind of] statement  
195 of intent or declaration about future IPR availability [should be required] / [may be  
196 appropriate] at a very early stage. (For example, if a particular functional domain was  
197 expected to be directly accessible to consumers without cost, it might be an  
198 appropriate constraint, imposed by the IDESG endorsement process, that projects to  
199 develop standards needed to implement that function be scoped not to bear royalties.)
- 200 • *Prospective commitment to open standardization:* If an identity ecology is asked to  
201 give early recognition or support to an emerging method which is not yet standardized  
202 -- as contemplated by the applicable public policy -- an IDESG endorsement process  
203 should [assess whether to] require a commitment to completing its standardization, as  
204 a condition of the initial support or endorsement. A variety of approaches are possible,  
205 including (a) seeking aspirational but unenforceable statements of intent; (b) making  
206 some kind of support contingent on progress; or (c) taking binding contributions on a  
207 delayed basis for later use, subject to updating.

## 208 209 **SECTION 4. IMPLEMENTATION**

210  
211 The IDESG workplan assumes that various projects and methods will be brought forward for  
212 endorsement or approval, and that the Standards Committee will be asked for its feedback as  
213 a part of that process. A primary goal of that inquiry is confirmation that the goals of the  
214 National Strategy and IDESG regarding use of open standards are being met.  
215

This section assumes that the Standards Committee will use a set of criteria, like those described above, in that evaluation. Thus, if they were to be used as described above, the committee would use some process to evaluate the following matters for each candidate standard or method:

*(This chart summarizes the criteria described in the prior sections.)*

For established projects:

- *Participatory openness*
- *Fairness and due process*
- *Stable hosting arrangements*
- *Transparency to the public*
- *Function-oriented method descriptions*
- *Minimum public review procedures*
- *Adequate intellectual property rules and licensing*

For experimental or pilot-scale projects:

- *Limited transparency to the public*
- *Function-oriented method descriptions*
- *Minimum public review procedures*
- *Adequate intellectual property rules and licensing*
- *Commitment to open standardization*

After consideration of multiple evaluation process options, the Committee recommends that the foregoing criteria be applied to relevant ICT standards using a structured feedback process, hosted but not dictated solely by the Standards Committee. When a methodology or project is proposed for endorsement or approval by the IDESG, for use within its identity ecosystem, the specifications and standards used in that proposal will be evaluated against the criteria in this paper, as part of the proposal's evaluation, as follows:

(i) Early in the life of the proposal, the subject methodology or project should be examined for the inclusion of ICT specifications, and those which are included should be explicitly announced as potential standards on which IDESG seeks feedback according to the criteria;

(ii) Each of those specifications should be made the subject of an open opportunity and meeting to review the application of the criteria; and

(iii) The Standards Committee shall prepare a summary report integrating received feedback on application of the criteria, to that methodology or project, to be approved by the committee and forwarded to the Plenary prior to its approval action, so as to inform the Plenary about the extent to which the proposal conforms to open standardization expectations (as represented by the criteria).

See the "Standards Adoption Timeline" draft document.

## ~~5. Annex~~

### ~~—5a. Standards Wiki~~

### ~~—5b. References~~

~~<to come>~~