

# DRAFT Unified Accreditation Program Feasibility Study



This material is DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION only and has not been reviewed by the HIAWG.

DELETE THIS ROW IN ACTUAL FORM		DELETE THIS GUIDANCE COLUMN ONCE THE FORM IS COMPLETED
Work Product Title (short)	Unified Accreditation and Approval Program Feasibility Study Report	<i>The name by which this work product will be known. Keep it short. Should end in "Report", "Proposed Standard" or other noun signifying the 'physical' deliverable.</i>
<b>Work Product Information</b>		
Type of work product	Feasibility Study	<i>"Report", "Proposed Standard", "Reference Document", "Feasibility Study", "Glossary", "Registry", "Assessment Criteria", or similar noun.</i>
Commissioned by (Sponsor)	??? TBD	<p><i>Identify the Sponsor - the person who declared the need for this work product. Should be an individual. The individual may represent a group or organization - if so, include that information.</i></p> <p><i>This should be an entity with a direct interest in the outcome of the work product. The Sponsor is not necessarily the target consumer of this work. The Sponsor is accountable for advising and directing the working team on content to ensure the purpose is achieved.</i></p>
Commissioned for the purpose of	Determining the feasibility of and options for the consolidation or unification several Trust Framework Accreditation and Approval Programs to reduce administrative burden and cost to Approved IDP, Credential Service Providers and other Service Component Organizations.	<i>State the rationale behind doing this work and creating this deliverable. Work Products should be publishable (post-approval) and directly add value to the Commission-er and the Target Consumer. Indirect or general work should be the exception, not the rule.</i>
Synopsis	<p>Analysis of the Trust Framework Accreditation and Approval Programs of FICAM TFS, Kantara, DirectTrust, Federal Bridge CA, tScheme or NIST-based Trust Framework schemes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification of common processes, requirements and governance features between the Program.</li> <li>• Identification of conflicting or unique processes, requirements and governance features between the Programs.</li> </ul> <p><i>This work product will not examine the Assessment Criteria for commonality or conflict - that will fall to a separate work product.</i></p>	<i>Describe the expected content. Is this Research on a subject? Guidance? Requirements? Standards? Criteria?</i>
Work Product Beneficiaries	<p>Credential Providers and Identity Verification/Proofing Providers seeking Approval under the FICAM TFS, Kantara, DirectTrust, Federal Bridge CA, tScheme or NIST-based Trust Framework schemes.</p> <p>Assessors and Auditors Accredited under these Trust Framework schemes.</p> <p><i>For convenience, the term Credential &amp; Identity Service Provider (CISP) will be used to describe the Credential Provider and Identity Verification/Proofing Provider beneficiary group.</i></p>	<p><i>Who or what will benefit and realize value from this work product? This can be individuals, types of entities, organizations or industry associations.</i></p> <p><i>These are typically called 'stakeholders' - representatives of these beneficiaries should be eager to contribute to the work, see real reasons to do the work, and be able to provide either Requirements or Content directly based on their experience or needs.</i></p>
General Approach	The high level approach will be to compare the published documentation about each of the Assessment and Approval Programs with respect to processes, requirements and governance features. Experts from Credential & Identity Providers and Accredited Assessor communities will provide expertise based on their working knowledge of the programs and schemes.	<i>Describe the high level approach to create the work product. Interviews? Subject Matter Experts contributing material? Internet/document research? Case Study? Testing?</i>
Meeting Minutes Cross-Reference	TBD	<i>Reference at least one HIAWG meeting where the Work Product was discussed during origination.</i>

Work Product Timelines		
Terms of Reference Date	TBD	<i>The date this Terms of Reference was substantially complete and ratified by the HIAWG. This is effectively the start date of this work.</i>
Deadline Date	unknown TBD	<i>If there is an actual deadline date for the work product, state it here. <b>Do not</b> use false dates to try to force progress - they have negative long term effects.</i>
HIAWG First Review Date	TBD	<i>The date by which the HIAWG should expect to see work in progress for discussion or review. Adjust as needed until it occurs.</i>
HIAWG Final Draft Date	TBD	<i>The anticipated for the Final Draft to be delivered to the HIAWG for next steps (ratification, review cycle, etc.)</i>
Sponsor Receipt Date	TBD	<i>The anticipated date for delivery to the Sponsor (in draft or final state - you choose)</i>
Work Product Desired Outcomes and Results		
The Expected Value Increase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CISP decreases number of different annual Assessments</li> <li>• CISP decreases process, policy and governance variations required to satisfy different schemes</li> <li>• CISP increases transparency of assessment results to their customers</li> <li>• Assessor decreases number of different processes to support</li> <li>• Assessor increases potential market opportunities for assessments</li> <li>• Assessor decreases confusion in the marketplace</li> </ul>	<p><i>Identify how the beneficiaries will realize value and benefit from this work. Use phrases like: "Beneficiary X decreases time to become approved" or "Beneficiary Y increases market penetration". The pattern is {{ Beneficiary }} {{ Increases OR Decreases }} {{ Business objective or thing }}</i></p> <p><i>For each Beneficiary, there should be at least 3 beneficial outcomes - if fewer, they are probably not Beneficiaries.</i></p>
Work Product Resource Assignments		
Leader responsible for delivery	Terry Gold	<i>The individual (plus <b>one alternate</b> if needed) who is accountable for delivering the completed Work Product to the HIAWG. The Leader must stay in contact with the Sponsor as the work progresses.</i>
Individual Contributors		<i>The list of individuals who are actively contributing. Optionally, indicate how they are contributing (Writer, SME, Reviewer, Editor, etc). Please try to avoid listing contributors who do not actually contribute to the work.</i>
Kantara Resources	TBD	<i>Staff required to support this work product (pre-approval by Executive Director required)</i>
Work Product File Locations		
Wiki		<i>A link to the Wiki space for this work product</i>
Listserv		<i>If email tools other than the normal HIAWG lists are used, declare them here</i>