1. Structure of the Steering Group
There are many models of governance that perform some of the wide range of functions needed to formulate and administer the Identity Ecosystem Framework. While not all of these functions are unique to the steering group, few examples of governance cover the same breadth of the technical and economic landscape as the Identity Ecosystem Framework. The steering group, therefore, has a greater risk of either being too small to serve its purpose, or too large to govern effectively. There is a full spectrum of affected economic sectors, some of which are highly-regulated and some of which are unregulated. The steering group will need to simultaneously integrate the Identity Ecosystem Framework with regulatory requirements faced by firms in a variety of industry sectors. At the same time, the steering group needs to consider and represent the interest of the broader public in security and privacy. It is imperative to find a working structure that accomplishes all these needs.

Questions:
1.1. Given the Guiding Principles outlined in the Strategy, what should be the structure of the steering group? What structures can support the technical, policy, legal, and operational aspects of the Identity Ecosystem without stifling innovation?
The NSTIC steering group should be a consensus decision-making body that promotes and seeks cooperation among all participants. The steering group should be established with broad critical areas of industry representation (i.e. financial services, healthcare, energy, etc.) with more focused constituents able to bring issues through their respective representatives. Ultimately decisions that benefit the initiative are developed with consideration of all representative industries and may require compromise, reducing the likelihood of any one industry being unfairly and overly represented.

1.2. Are there broad, multi-sector examples of governance structures that match the scale of the steering group? If so, what makes them successful or unsuccessful? What challenges do they face?
In the payments industry two initiatives have developed over time and matured to provide for security and authentication technology standardization: the Payment Card Industry Security Standards Council (PCI SSC) which is responsible for the standards including the PCI Data Security Standard (PCI DSS) that help the industry self-govern data security standards across many stakeholders and industries including merchants and retailers, acquiring and issuing financial institutions, competing payment network brands and third party service providers in the whole chain of electronic payments. Additionally, the group comprised of Europay International, MasterCard International and Visa International (EMVCo) was established over a decade ago to provide for standardization of technologies in integrated smart chip cards for payments. EMV technology has been utilized across the world to provide increased and measurable security advancements in a cost sensitive and easy to use technology.
Both of these organizations have been successful in bringing industry stakeholders together and addressing the needs of all parties through a consensus decision-making body. Both organizations have also been able to address issues and needs as they arise as well as having the long term interests for all parties without being influenced by any one member. Consensus bodies, including these two entities also have perceived challenges because of the time required to reach consensus which is often not achieved in a short order of time.

1.3. Are there functions of the steering group listed in this Notice that should not be part of the steering group's activities? Please explain why they are not essential components of Identity Ecosystem Governance.

1.4. Are there functions that the steering group must have that are not listed in this notice? How do your suggested governance structures allow for inclusion of these additional functions?

1.5. To what extent does the steering group need to support different sectors differently?
The steering group should be established with the needs of critical industries and sectors being represented. This is key to the success of the NSTIC initiative – without support from key sectors the initiative will achieve minimal results that will not have a measurable and meaningful impact with limited adoption by consumers who are looking for greater benefits in a voluntary authentication system.

1.6. How can the steering group effectively set its own policies for all Identity Ecosystem participants without risking conflict with rules set in regulated industries? To what extent can the government mitigate risks associated with this complexity?
The formation and selection of the steering group is key to the success of understanding regulation that impacts specific sectors and industries. Government should provide for incentives where organizations have voluntarily invested in, provided support for or delivered such authentication frameworks; in addition to examining where regulation that may impact a participating authentication entity be provided exemptions for other security requirements found in existing regulation (e.g. HIPAA, GLBA, etc.)

1.7. To what extent can each of the Guiding Principles of the Strategy–interoperability, security, privacy and ease of use—be supported without risking "pull through" regulation from regulated participants in the Identity Ecosystem?

1.8. What are the most important characteristics (e.g., standards and technical capabilities, rulemaking authority, representational structure, etc.) of the steering group?
Representational structure will be key and most important in how standards are developed. In addition, while rulemaking authority is important actual representation can help influence which decisions are reached without regard to the actual governance structure.

1.9. How should the government be involved in the steering group at steady state? What are the advantages and disadvantages of different levels of government involvement?

2. Steering Group Initiation
In its role of supporting the private sector's leadership of the Identity Ecosystem, the government's aim is to accelerate establishment of a steering group that will uphold the Guiding Principles of the Strategy. The government thus seeks comment on the ways in which it can be a catalyst to the establishment of the steering group.

There are many means by which the steering group could be formed, and such structures generally fall into three broad categories:
    a) A new organization, organically formed by interested stakeholders.
    b) An existing stakeholder organization that establishes the steering group as part of its activities.
    c) Use of government authorities, such as the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), to charge a new or existing advisory panel with formulating recommendations for the initial policy and technical framework for the Identity Ecosystem, allowing for a transition to a private sector body after establishing a sustainable Identity Ecosystem, or through the legislative process.

Questions:
2.1. How does the functioning of the steering group relate to the method by which it was initiated? Does the scope of authority depend on the method? What examples are there from each of the broad categories above or from other methods? What are the advantages or disadvantages of different methods?

2.2. While the steering group will ultimately be private sector-led regardless of how it is established, to what extent does government leadership of the group's initial phase increase or decrease the likelihood of the Strategy's success?
Government's role will determine the success of the initiative. Private sector industry should lead this effort with adequate stakeholder representation from key industries. While government support is necessary to establish a new steering group and establishing the governance of this body, it should ultimately be left to the steering group to devise the direction of the authentication frameworks and technologies that are driven from the overall body of stakeholders.

2.3. How can the government be most effective in accelerating the development and ultimate success of the Identity Ecosystem?

2.4. Do certain methods of establishing the steering group create greater risks to the Guiding Principles? What measures can best mitigate those risks? What role can the government play to help to ensure the Guiding Principles are upheld?

2.5. What types of arrangements would allow for both an initial government role and, if initially led by the government, a transition to private sector leadership in the steering group? If possible, please give examples of such arrangements and their positive and negative attributes.

3. Representation of Stakeholders in the Steering Group
Representation of all stakeholders is a difficult but essential task when stakeholders are as numerous and diverse as those in the Identity Ecosystem. The breadth of stakeholder representation and the voice they have in policy formulation must be fair and transparent. The steering group must be accountable to all participants in the Identity Ecosystem, including individuals. An essential task for the steering group will be to provide organizations or individuals who may not be direct participants in the Identity Ecosystem, such as privacy and civil liberties advocacy groups, with a meaningful way to have an impact on policy formulation.

Given the diverse, multi-sector set of stakeholders in the Identity Ecosystem, representation in the steering group must be carefully balanced. Should the influence skew in any direction, stakeholders may quickly lose confidence in the ability of the steering group to fairly formulate solutions to the variety of issues that surround the creation and governance of the Identity Ecosystem.

Questions:
3.1. What should the make-up of the steering group look like? What is the best way to engage organizations playing each role in the Identity Ecosystem, including individuals?

3.2. How should interested entities that do not directly participate in the Identity Ecosystem receive representation in the steering group?
Task forces should be established to better understand industries and sectors, where it will be the responsibility of these task force groups to reach out to non-participating stakeholders and seek their input and feedback. Representation for these groups can be achieved through voting representatives that represent 'sectors' of industry groups.

3.3. What does balanced representation mean and how can it be achieved? What steps can be taken guard against disproportionate influence over policy formulation?

3.4. Should there be a fee for representatives in the steering group? Are there appropriate tiered systems for fees that will prevent "pricing out" organizations, including individuals?
The fee should be relative to the size and nature (i.e. non-profit versus for-profit) of the organization in order for participation to be equally representative.

3.5. Other than fees, are there other means to maintain a governance body in the long term? If possible, please give examples of existing structures and their positive and negative attributes.

3.6. Should all members have the same voting rights on all issues, or should voting rights be adjusted to favor those most impacted by a decision?

3.7. How can appropriately broad representation within the steering group be ensured? To what extent and in what ways must the Federal government, as well as State, local, tribal, territorial, and foreign governments be involved at the outset?

4. International
Given the global nature of online commerce, the Identity Ecosystem cannot be isolated from internationally available online services and their identity solutions. Without compromising the Guiding Principles of the Strategy, the public and private sectors will strive to enable international interoperability. In order for the United States to benefit from other nations' best practices and achieve international interoperability, the U.S. public and private sectors must be active participants in international technical and policy fora.

No single entity, including the Federal government, can effectively participate in every international standards effort. The private sector is already involved in many international standards initiatives; ultimately, then, the international integration of the Identity Ecosystem will depend in great part upon private sector leadership.

Questions:
4.1. How should the structure of the steering group address international perspectives, standards, policies, best practices, etc?
Organizations that have global reach should be considered for the steering group, these entities already understand the complexities of global markets and the needs of geographic input to balance stakeholder requirements across the world.

4.2. How should the steering group coordinate with other international entities (e.g., standards and policy development organizations, trade organizations, foreign governments)?

4.3. On what international entities should the steering group focus its attention and activities?

4.4. How should the steering group maximize the Identity Ecosystem's interoperability internationally?

4.5. What is the Federal government's role in promoting international cooperation within the Identity Ecosystem?