

**OPENID FOUNDATION
WHITEPAPER PROCESS
(Effective October 9, 2023)**

OpenID Foundation Whitepaper Process: The Governance and Supporting Processes for OI DF- sponsored Whitepapers

- Introduction - Why the OI DF Writes Whitepapers3
- Develop the Proposal4
- Develop and Revise Outline7
- Agree to the SOW7
- Collaboration Framework8
- Research & Due Diligence9
- First Draft9
- Invitation-only Comment Period10
- Draft Revision10
- Public Comment Period & Disposition of Comments10
- Final Draft.....12
- Final Report Review12
- Publication.....13
- Updates13
- Standard Compensation14
- Appendix15
 - Preparing a Paper for Public Comment.....15
 - Suggested Fields for a Disposition of Comments Form16
 - Sample Blog Post Public Comment Announcement16

This Whitepaper Process document v1.0 was approved by the OpenID Foundation Board effective 10/9/2023

Introduction - Why the OIDF Writes Whitepapers

In the early days of the Internet, the capabilities of technology were often years ahead of any laws or regulations providing practical, implementable guardrails. Over time, however, regulators in many regions of the world have caught up and moved ahead of what has been defined in the standards space. Rather than the capabilities of technical standards driving regulation, regulation is starting to drive the development of technical standards. This introduces tension in that regulators and specification writers rarely work from the same understanding of what is both possible and desirable, resulting in legal text and technical specifications that are poorly aligned.

As regulators debate and develop laws and treaties surrounding Internet-based activities, those same regulators are looking for material to point to that fills the gap between what is in the technical specifications and what that can mean for the real world.

The OpenID Foundation also offers specifications in a complex landscape of interlocking identity standards with organizations including but not limited to ISO, ITU, IETF, FIDO, W3C, OASIS, ToIP, DIF, GLEIF, and many others. Even within the identity community, the linkages between standards can be complex and difficult to follow. This is further complicated by the many nonprofits that address different parts of the ecosystem, from certifications to trust frameworks to capacity building, such as Kantara, OIX, IDPro, Women in Identity, etc. Last, the topic of identity itself tends to overlap with many other domains and verticals, including Security, Financial Services, Open Data, Health, Government Services, Education, and more.

As a result, the OpenID Foundation is positioning itself as a thought leader in more than just the development of technical standards. As part of the 2022 strategy, the Board agreed on a new vision and mission that recognized the role the OIDF needs to play today:

Vision: Help people assert their identity wherever they choose.

Mission: To lead the global community in creating identity standards that are secure, interoperable and privacy-preserving.

The OpenID Foundation strategy for 2022 and 2023 proposed delivering on this vision with various tactics. One of those tactics included developing a series of whitepapers to help governments and other ecosystem stakeholders understand the wider landscape and the role of OIDF standards within that wider landscape. Such whitepapers make OIDF's global, technical expertise more accessible to ecosystem stakeholders, technical experts, and laypeople alike. In 2022 and 2023, the Board agreed on topics worthy of research, analysis, and recommendations to the community. The first series of papers addressed topics ranging from Open Banking and Open Data (FAPI family of standards) to Digital Identity (OpenID Connect and OpenID for Verifiable Credentials families of specs) to Health and Identity (various OIDF specs).

However, as the OIDF developed and published these whitepapers, we observed variances in the processes followed, such as depth and quality of the analysis, comment periods, partner engagement, and communication of the drafts and final versions. Such variances could introduce new reputational risks that could adversely impact core work in the Foundation, such as specification development and certification.

This document proposes a more formal and transparent approach to whitepapers. It suggests a process for the OpenID Foundation Board for scoping, drafting, publishing, and updating whitepapers. It also includes processes to engage partner organizations in OIDF-led or co-led papers, manage the distribution of comments and conform feedback, and update the material post-publication. A thoughtful and transparent approach to whitepapers will help ensure any future OIDF whitepapers consistently deliver on the OIDF's Vision and Mission while mitigating any reputational risks whitepapers could introduce.

Develop the Proposal

The OIDF Board will determine what topics will help the Foundation deliver on its Mission and Vision by carefully considering the paper objectives, audience, role of OIDF, and the paper approach.

The OpenID Foundation will focus on topics that the Foundation has unique expertise on, and which can provide actionable guidance to government, technologists, and other stakeholders as we advance the identity ecosystem. Ultimately, it is up to the OIDF Board to be clear on the scope of the whitepaper by reviewing each proposal, discussing it as a group, and taking an informed decision to proceed or not. It is also up to the Board to ensure that a Subgroup is formed for each whitepaper that can reflect the interests of the Board and help calibrate the scope and approach during the lifecycle of the paper.

Developing the proposal requires the following (further details are below):

- **Draft the Whitepaper Proposal** (Prepared by OIDF member or staff)
 - Working Title
 - Objectives
 - Audience
 - Initial description of scope
 - Why should the OIDF produce this paper?
 - How does this topic strategically align with the OIDF's Mission, Vision, and specifications? How are we uniquely positioned to create useful and actionable guidance on the topic? (If it is not strategically aligned or we do not have unique expertise on the subject matter, we should decline to produce the whitepaper on that basis.)
 - What are the benefits to the OIDF community and stakeholders? Any

- metrics of success for the paper?
 - Benefits to OIDF and partners of completing this paper.
 - Risks of the paper (including to the OIDF brand, OIDF resources, or OIDF priorities) and any appropriate mitigation of those risks.
 - What is the collaborative approach for the paper?
 - Identify a Whitepaper Subgroup: three to five OIDF members that will provide oversight for the evolution of the paper. (This will include at least one Board member and one representative of a relevant OIDF specification Working Group or Community Group; the Executive Director will participate by default.)
 - Identify lead editor(s) and draft appropriate milestones.
 - Propose and contact potential partner organizations to collaborate and/or co-brand the white paper.
 - Those defined to be “Founding Partners” on the paper and their participating representatives are expected to play a meaningful role in scoping the paper and its approach. Founding Partners of the whitepaper should be defined upfront as part of the Board decision. A lack of alignment by a Founding Partner to the final version of a paper could lead to a delay in the publication of the final version of that paper.
 - Additional individuals recognized as “Collaborators” may be invited to join the Whitepaper Subgroup with the group’s agreement, and those Collaborators may be from the Founding Partners or independent experts outside of the OIDF membership but with unique expertise on the subject.
 - Those anticipated to “Co-brand” the paper will not take part in the scope or approach of the paper. They will be offered an opportunity to indicate support for the contents of the paper before final publication. Discussions with potential co-brand partners must not delay the publication of a paper.
 - Optional: Draft outline
 - Optional: Conduct interviews and one or more public listening sessions to validate the proposal and, in particular, the scope.
 - Draft milestone dates for the paper to be linked to compensation and note the circumstances under which additional compensation may be negotiated (e.g., how is \$12k spread over the delivery period and target dates, if not the standard phases below).
- **Initial Discussion at Board, EC, or Task Force by the initial Proposer(s)** (optional EC resolution) leads to proposal revision, pause paper, or decline paper.
 - **Proposer(s), Whitepaper Subgroup, and Executive Director consensus to take the proposal to the Board**
 - **Board Decision to Fund Paper based on the proposal.**

If the Board takes a decision to fund a whitepaper before all members of the Whitepaper Subgroup have been confirmed, then the decision by the Board to proceed will be subject to a call for volunteers among OIDF members to join the Whitepaper Subgroup for the paper. Any pre-existing Whitepaper Subgroup volunteers and at least two OIDF staff will confirm any additional Subgroup members based on their subject matter expertise and capacity to contribute. The Executive Director will participate in the Subgroup by default.

At least one lead editor should be an OI DF member familiar with the work of the OI DF. If the Board takes a decision to fund the paper before the lead editor (s) are identified, then the Whitepaper Subgroup is responsible for signing off on the selection of the lead editor (s). It is more likely that a lead editor will help develop the proposal, organize any (optional) initial interviews and listening sessions, and establish the rough white paper outline that will go in a package to the Board to request funding for the writing of the paper.

The proposal must make clear which (if any) organizations may be good fits as potential Founding Partners for the paper and if any Collaborators from Founding Partners or other ecosystem experts are anticipated to be part of the Whitepaper Subgroup. Founding Partners of the whitepaper and Collaborators should be defined upfront as part of the Board decision. Additional Co-brand organizations may be added at other times during the whitepaper process, and other Collaborators may be invited to join the Whitepaper Subgroup if agreed by consensus of the current standing Whitepaper Subgroup members.

If there are critical interviews or listening sessions that are vital to the whitepaper process, these should be highlighted as milestones. For example, if some members of a working group should be interviewed due to their specifications expertise, or listening sessions organized at OI DF or at partner forums to ensure the integrity of the process, these must be planned for.

There will be default milestones for papers and standard compensation (currently \$12k per paper). If there is known to be a material reason for a different approach, e.g., an additional milestone that requires additional compensation, then the Board must agree that up front, or the request must come back to the Board in due course. There are specific exceptions to changes in scope and approach that may be proposed by the lead editors or a member of the Whitepaper Subgroup to the EC for funding decisions. These exceptions avert the need to consult the Board for more minor changes to scope and approach, which could add significant delays to the whitepaper due process.

If the lead editors are engaged before the Board takes a decision to fund the proposal, then the lead editors should bring their experience to the proposal, particularly around the anticipated scale of effort and whether the milestones are achievable. If the lead editors are not all appointed prior to the proposal being approved by the Board, then the SoW should include provisions to allow for at least one full revision of the proposal, which must then be agreed upon by the Whitepaper Subgroup before the proposal, including scope, is completed and writing commences.

Board Updates

After the Board makes a decision to fund the paper, the Board will authorize the Whitepaper Subgroup to address other minor changes to scope and approach on their behalf.

The Board will be given progress reports on the whitepapers via email or during Board meetings, as appropriate, by the Executive Director, the Whitepaper Subgroup, and the lead editors.

If there are material changes to the objectives of the paper outside of the scope of what the Whitepaper Subgroup or EC can reasonably decide, then the Board must be informed before the next milestone payment can be made.

In order to ensure new topics are addressed in a timely way, additional whitepaper topics may be introduced for the Board's consideration and investment as the year progresses. If the Board agrees to invest in a topic, they must follow the proposal process as defined above, including assigning at least one OI DF member to an additional Whitepaper Subgroup.

Develop and Revise Outline

The purpose of an outline is to provide a logical framework for a document that aligns with the proposal. The lead editor (s), working with the Whitepaper Subgroup, should use the proposal to establish broader buy-in to the development of the white paper. The outline will then be included in the proposal and later the SoW. Since the first outline will probably be created before diligence and interviews have started, the outline may require revision a month or two into the diligence process. This is to be expected and should be agreed upon in partnership with the Whitepaper Subgroup.

Agree to the SOW

Once the Board has agreed to the proposal, the Executive Director will enter into a contract for the Summary of Work (SoW) between the OI DF and the lead editor (s). This SoW will include three critical milestones: first, developing the proposal and outline; second, writing the paper, including the review and disposition of comments process; and third, final publication.

Milestone 1:

- Develop the proposal (e.g., scope, objectives, audience, etc.), including any revisions made by lead editors and agreed upon by the Whitepaper Subgroup.
- Optional: Early interviews and at least one listening session to inform the outline.
- Draft outline, including identification of an initial set of key reference materials, specifications, and individuals or working groups to be interviewed.
- Overall whitepaper timeline
- Deliverable: Proposal for Board decision

Milestone 2:

- Minimum number of interviews and key targets, including OI DF stakeholders
- Appropriate engagement with Founding Partners and Collaborators.
- Additional listening sessions and proposed venues

- Appropriate research, writing, and basic editing of the paper
- Review and disposition of comments process
- Deliverables: Initial Draft, Draft, and Final Whitepaper

Milestone 3:

- Publish the final paper.

It is up to the Whitepaper Subgroup to proceed with the proposal as is, request a revised outline or approach from the lead editors, or propose to the Board to cancel the effort. Prior to signing off on any changes to the approach, if the Whitepaper Subgroup observes the objectives changing substantially, or if new information received could lead to OI DF risks and not deliver on OI DF Mission and Vision, then the Whitepaper Subgroup will pause efforts. While paused, the Whitepaper Subgroup may wish to engage the community and corporate representatives, the Executive Committee, the Strategic Task Force, and/or the full Board for additional perspectives and exploration of mitigating tactics.

Collaboration Framework

After signing the SOW, the lead editor (s) should, as part of the records they will share with the Whitepaper Subgroup, prepare the following working materials to aid collaboration and transparency:

- Create an online document, such as a Google doc, enabling collaborative editing of the outline and collection of initial feedback on the work from the Whitepaper Subgroup Topic Task Force, Founding Partners, and Collaborators.
- Create an online document, such as a Google spreadsheet, enabling collaborative efforts to document potential interviewees, their contact information, any particular subject expertise that is relevant, when last contacted, whether feedback was ultimately received, and whether their name may be used in the draft vs. final.
- Create an online document, such as a Google spreadsheet, enabling collaborative efforts to identify and track Founding Partners, Collaborators, or Co-branding organizations, their contact information, any particular expertise or role in the whitepaper, whether any financial funding or expertise was received, and whether the entity is likely to co-brand, and final decision on co-branding and receipt of their logo.
- Create a group chat (e.g., Slack) for members of the Whitepaper Subgroup and lead editors to stay connected through the stages of the project.
- Confirm the latest templates for use in the whitepaper draft (e.g., OI DF branded or unbranded for use in co-branded papers).
- Create a shared folder for any whitepaper-related materials (e.g., approved logos, diagrams for the document held in other formats, reference materials).

Research & Due Diligence

There are likely to be three parts to due diligence, which may happen concurrently:

- Literature review
- Expert interviews, including any OI DF working group consultations
- Listening sessions with expert communities, which may be closed and/or open sessions to the public.

In most whitepapers, all three of these steps can add material value to the paper beyond the expertise of the lead editors and the Whitepaper Subgroup. The literature review is important to ensure the whitepaper is well situated in the current literature and serves to be additive to work already done.

When writing the first draft, the lead editor may refer to blog posts, popular news articles (i.e., mass media), conference proceedings, or product information when necessary. These sources should support the primary source material (e.g., relevant laws, regulations, or standards), peer-reviewed scholarly articles, or interviews with subject matter experts.

The expert interviews and working group conversations ensure there is context and contemporary insights on the subject matter. The lead editor must also be certain to gain permission regarding the use of material from interviews before using it in the paper.

Last, the listening sessions provide a safe space for conversation across stakeholders and for the wider public to engage on the topic. They should also be prepared to host listening sessions at events such as IIW or OI DF side meetings to encourage interest and feedback. Those individuals providing feedback in a listening session should be informed that participation allows for the feedback to be used as input to the paper and that no individual will be quoted by name from the listening session without permission.

Altogether, this due diligence serves to help inform the assessment of the current landscape and ground the insights and recommendations offered by the paper.

First Draft

When writing the first draft, the lead editors must be thorough in their research and interview process and be prepared to defend any claims made in the paper.

The first draft should align with the outline pre-agreed with the Whitepaper Subgroup. If there are material deviations in the outline during the course of writing the draft, the lead editors will confirm the Whitepaper Subgroup supports the changes. The first draft will be complete when all the key topics in the outline are complete, the drafting is clear and easy to follow, the table of

contents, exhibits, and other formatting is stable and clear, and the baseline analysis, insights, and recommendations are mature.

Regarding the editorial process, the lead editor should follow the current Chicago Manual of Style (CMOS) and any specific OIFD style guidelines, if available.

Invitation-only Comment Period

When the lead editor and the Whitepaper Subgroup agree that the first draft of the whitepaper is substantively complete, it is time to invite the OIFD Board, the Founding Partners, Collaborators, and potential Co-branding organizations to review the draft. This stage does not require a detailed Disposition of Comments process (see below) and can be done within a Google Doc, PDF, or Microsoft Word document, depending on what the reviewers request. The Whitepaper Subgroup should confirm the distribution for the Invitation-only comment requests.

It is up to the lead editor to contact all collaborating organizations and request feedback in a 14-day timeframe (that time may be extended with approval from the Executive Director but should be at most 30 days).

The lead editor must keep track of the outreach process, updating the Google sheet with collaborator information, when they were contacted, and their responses. The lead editor must also be prepared to integrate feedback into a single document, archiving that document for reference.

Draft Revision

Ideally, the lead editor will have actionable feedback to work on after the Invitation-only Comment Period. Incorporate what comments make sense, research where necessary to back up claims, and make sure to stay in scope.

The lead editor must incorporate feedback as appropriate and prepare the document for public comment (see the [Appendix](#) for more details on how to prepare a document for public comment).

The lead editor will provide the Whitepaper Subgroup with the revised paper for their consent to release the whitepaper for public comment.

Public Comment Period & Disposition of Comments

Most papers of the OIFD are likely to have a comment period open to the public to ensure the widest possible group of commenters are invited to engage on the contents. However, in some

instances (such as a report to the Board), the Board may choose to skip the public comment period, or the comments may be limited to a smaller group, such as OI DF members only. If there will be no comment period or the comments will be restricted to a smaller group, that should be defined in the proposal as part of the Board review or by the decision of the Whitepaper Subgroup.

The goal of the public comment process is to both collect input from a wide range of subject matter experts and to socialize the existence of the paper with a broad audience. There is no way to predict how many comments may be received or how many people and organizations may participate in the process. As such, the process for the public comment period differs from the invitation-only comment process. Most critically, every comment must be documented and publicly addressed in such a way as to maintain the OI DF's reputation for openness and transparency. Public comment periods generally last 30 calendar days but may be expanded with approval by the Executive Director.

Lead editor time should be concentrated on the triage of comments received and less time on the manual tasks of capturing or compiling comments. In order for lead editor time and the overall timeline to be optimized, the OI DF Foundation would benefit from two recommendations:

- The development or purchase of a tool to automate the submission and collation of whitepaper comments into a single file or database for triage.
- The approval of a policy to require the submission of comments solely via this approved channel once such a tool is in place.

For context, the disposition of comments is one of the most time-consuming parts of the current OI DF whitepaper process, and it poses a considerable risk of errors. OI DF whitepapers tend to have more people commenting than is viable for a shared doc (e.g., a Google Sheet), and many institutions cannot access Google tools. That said, a web form that uses a Google document or similar on the backend may be viable. Allowing reviewers to submit their own marked-up PDF files is possible but problematic on several levels: it runs the risk of missing data and is time-consuming for lead editors to review. Successful public comment periods are generally measured in the number of responses; a recent white paper from the OI DF saw over 350 comments submitted. Attempting to cut and paste comments out of a PDF into a single form risks missing or incorrectly transcribing relevant comments and is a significant time sink for the person or people doing the work.

As part of the public comment period, the lead editor must document in a manner suitable for the public record the response to each of the comments received, indicating what (if anything) was changed as a result of the comment, whether the comment was regarding material out of scope for the paper, or some other response appropriate to the comment received. See the [Appendix](#) for the suggested fields for a disposition of comment form.

The lead editor should:

- Work with the Executive Director (or their delegate) to open calls for feedback via social media, newsletter, and direct message announcements for public comment periods;
- Work with the Executive Director (or their delegate) to request feedback via the relevant channels if there is a limited distribution for the requests for comments, such as to OIFD members.

Final Draft

Once the public comment period is closed, it is up to the lead editor to review and address all the comments received. Some may require additional research to address. Some may be out of the scope of the paper. This is the most intense time for the lead editor; they should plan their schedule accordingly. This stage should target a 7-day turnaround time.

The lead editor should:

- Work within the collection of comments to clearly document how each comment has been handled in the proposed final paper.
- Consult with the Whitepaper Subgroup on comments that are challenging to conform to, or that might introduce OIFD brand or partner brand implications.

The result of this stage will be three documents:

- A document with all changes tracked from what was released to public comment to the final copy.
- The disposition of comments form with all feedback acknowledged.
- A clean copy with all changes accepted.

Final Report Review

After the lead editor completes the disposition of comments and has updated the document accordingly, it is time to present the proposed final report package to the OIFD Board and collaborators. This includes the marked-up copy, the disposition of comments, and a clean copy with all changes accepted. This material goes to each organization, including the OIFD Board, that has pre-agreed their intention to have their organization's logo on the final product, subject to their review of the final version of the paper. This stage should target a 14-day turnaround time, though this may be extended with the approval of the Executive Director.

Founding Partners, Collaborators, and Co-branding organizations are expected to revert with any issues that could risk publication of the paper within seven days to give a further week to resolve any issues with the whitepaper lead editor(s) and the Whitepaper Subgroup as needed. If an organization does not wish to co-brand the final paper, it may withdraw before publication.

The lead editor should work with the Whitepaper Subgroup when submitting the final report to encourage a timely response to the request for approval to publish.

Publication

The white paper should be published on the OpenID Foundation website under “Papers.”

It may also be published on other sites with the agreement of the OIDF Executive Director and paper collaborators.

The lead editors or a member of the Whitepaper Subgroup should draft the OIDF blog post and social media to announce the paper, with that copy a consensus view of the Whitepaper Subgroup and Lead Editors (see sample blog post text in the [Appendix](#)). The OIDF blog post and social media may be replicated or revised by Founding Partners and Co-brand partners at their discretion.

The lead editors should also contemplate any presentation materials they may be called upon to share during the whitepaper development process (e.g., listening sessions or working group consultations) and upon completion of critical milestones such as publication of a draft or final version of the paper. These presentations will serve to amplify feedback and impact of the whitepaper, helping to achieve the metrics of success for the whitepaper itself.

Updates

As much work goes into a white paper, it is still necessary to update them periodically as the relevant landscape changes. There are different levels of updates possible, from a complete overhaul of the entire document to minor content updates to self-contained additions of relevant material. This section offers two recommendations for considering updates to OIDF-produced white papers.

The OIDF Executive Committee should review the existing white papers annually (at a minimum) to determine whether there have been substantive changes in the landscape requiring a significant revision of the document. If yes, treat this as a new document and follow the process as described above with an increment to the version number (e.g., 1.0 to become 2.0), subject to Board approval of the funding for the new paper. If only minor changes are required, an abbreviated process that excludes the public comment period and formal disposition of comments is sufficient, provided the Executive Committee provides their approval of the minor changes proposed and any funding dependence.

For minor updates, the OIDF Director should:

- Include a short notice at the front of the original blog post that states a narrow set of corrections were made by the author for the accuracy of the paper. Replace the existing notice at the start of the blog post, if there is any.
- Replace the link to the PDF with the new version of the paper (e.g., 1.0 changes to 1.1 for minor changes).
- Archive the old paper.

- Contact the collaborators to alert them to the updated blog post and revised download link.

The OI DF Strategic Task Force should consider a process and an online location (e.g., a web page, wiki, or other document repository) where OI DF members or partner organizations may offer self-contained, discrete updates that result in a “living document” aspect to the white papers. For papers such as the “Government-issued Digital Credentials and the Privacy Landscape,” where additional sections might be added as new countries, states, regulations, or standards become relevant, the goal is to allow such updates to happen without having to go through an extensive publication and review process. This will streamline the processes and allow for minor changes to be made more consistently with a lighter touch. Such a process would need to be incorporated into this governance document.

Standard Compensation

As traditionally defined by the OI DF, lead editors should receive standard compensation as a gesture of thanks for the whitepaper work. It is not intended to represent the value of the lead editors’ time spent on the paper relative to other work they may do or otherwise be compensated for delivering.

The current standard compensation is \$12k, as agreed by the OI DF board. These payments will be issued at three critical milestones as per the timeline provided in the initial proposal as follows:

- 1) Milestone 1 (\$4k)
 - a) Refine the proposal (e.g., scope, objectives, audience, etc.), including any revisions made by lead editors and agreed by the Whitepaper Subgroup.
 - b) Optional: Early interviews and at least one listening session to inform the outline.
 - c) Draft outline, including identification of an initial set of key reference materials, specifications, and individuals or working groups to be interviewed.
 - d) Overall whitepaper timeline
 - e) Deliverable: Proposal for Board decision
- 2) Milestone 2 (\$4k)
 - a) Minimum number of interviews and key targets, including OI DF stakeholders
 - b) Appropriate engagement with Founding Partners and Collaborators.
 - c) Additional listening sessions and proposed venues
 - d) Appropriate research, writing, and basic editing of the paper
 - e) Review and disposition of comments process
 - f) Deliverables: Initial Draft, Revised Draft, and Public Comment Disposition
- 3) Milestone 3 (\$4k)
 - a) The final paper is published on openid.net

**If the paper is being written as a Report to the Board, then the payments will be timed with the release of the draft and final to the Board.*

If the Board chooses not to pursue the development of the paper, they will have the option to decline Milestone 2 and associated milestones.

There are conditions under which the scope of the paper may change, or issues arise. The following ad hoc compensation may be relevant in these circumstances:

- If a second draft is required before moving to final (\$2k)
- If there is a material change of scope or approach documented in the SoW (e.g., rewrite of the proposal by new editors, a major change in outline due to diligence work, many more interviews/ listening sessions than projected in the SoW, a need for a second public draft arises) then additional compensation of \$2-4k may be requested from the Executive committee as a gesture related to this unexpected, additional work.
- Version 1.1 revisions (e.g., < 25 corrections or errors of omission discovered by other parties post-publication, or co-brand additions unable to meet the original publication deadline) will be compensated at \$2k upon publication on openid.net
- If there are material changes to the paper (e.g., version 2.0), then the full process repeats with the full \$12k budget applied, unless otherwise agreed.

In some cases, the OI DF may choose to pursue a paper jointly with another entity that will help co-fund the paper, and the process above may be modified accordingly. Otherwise, the OI DF process and funding will apply by default. If a partner invites OI DF to co-brand a paper and OI DF is not funding or lead editing the paper, that effort is out of scope for this whitepaper process and will be considered on an ad hoc basis by Board decision as appropriate.

Appendix

Preparing a Paper for Public Comment

- 1 - Download the Google Doc/online Word doc/etc. as a local MS Word doc; do **NOT** clear comments/changes first! You'll want that history intact.
- 2 - Accept/reject changes and clear comments in the Word doc
- 3 - Turn OFF track changes (temporarily)
- 4 - Create a title page, ToC, Contributors page, and Exec Summary
- 5 - Add page number and line number (it's an option on the Layout tab)
- 6 - Add a Draft watermark (usually under Insert menu bar), but make it fairly pale to minimize contrast issues
- 7 - Turn ON track changes
- 8 - Print as PDF
- 9 - Ship it to Mike L

At the end of public comment

- 1 - Collect ALL comments before you open the doc again
- 2 - Feel free to reject suggestions, though you'll need to justify why (e.g., out of scope, have references to point to say you disagree)
- 3 - Make sure track changes are still on as you make the substantive changes
- 4 - Send a final marked-up copy to collaborators/signatories AND a clean copy with all changes accepted.

Suggested Fields for a Disposition of Comments Form

- Date Received
- Commenter Name and Affiliation
- Commentor Email Address
- Line Number
- Feedback
- Disposition

Sample Blog Post Public Comment Announcement

Title/Subject: Open for Comment “Human-Centric Identity: a primer for government officials”

Government officials, policymakers, technologists, legal scholars, and human rights advocates are invited to offer feedback on a new white paper, [“Human-Centric Identity: A Primer for Government Officials”](#). This follows the publication of [“Government-issued Digital Credentials and the Privacy Landscape”](#) (Flanagan, 2023), which delved into the challenges of creating a globally viable privacy-preserving Digital Identity landscape. This paper zooms out and takes a higher-level view of the role of Digital Identity Systems in delivering on the role of government. In particular, it grounds that role in the international human rights agenda.

Part 1 explores the opportunities and risks inherent in Digital Identity technologies. The paper then moves into Part 2, which analyzes existing and emerging Digital Identity paradigms and identifies common trade-off decisions. Part 3 builds upon existing principles-based literature - especially the recently published OECD Recommendations on the governance of Digital Identity - to navigate a path through these decisions. It recognizes that no one size fits all nations, that no technology or architecture is a panacea, and that multiple systems may coexist even within borders. However, it argues that there are design practices and strategic approaches that will lead to Digital Identity Systems that sustain and promote human rights.

The paper results from many months of due diligence, starting with public listening sessions at Authenticate, the November 2022 OIWF workshop, and IOWs IOWXXXV-XXXVI, and many interviews with active people in this space. In particular, the editors would like to thank the

contributors who challenged the paper to give voice to the challenges of vulnerable populations, including stateless people, migrant families, and those “edge cases” that just might be central to our humanity (to quote contributor, Henk Marsman).

Your feedback will help ensure this paper serves as a strong platform to inform further dialog with governments, civil society, and technologists. Further, the OpenID Foundation warmly invites other nonprofits that support the contents of the whitepaper to consider co-branding prior to its release for Final publication in September. Contact director@oidf.org for more information.

The comment period will be open until 15 August 2023. You may submit your feedback to director@oidf.org. Please use [this template](#) and reference specific line numbers for your proposed changes where appropriate.

We will share more on the final outcomes and recommendations at events throughout 2023-24 and look forward to further collaboration.