## Comment Template for: NIST SP 800-63-4 Suite (Initial Public Draft)

Please submit responses to dig-comments@nist.gov by April 14, 2023

| Organization:                   | Incode Technologies, Inc |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Name of Submitter/POC:          | George Theobald          |
| Email Address of Submitter/POC: | [REMOVED]                |

| Comment # | Publication<br>(Base, 63A, 63B, 63C) | Section   |     | Dage # | Line #  | Comment (Include rationale for comment)                                                                                     | Suggested Change                                                                                                             |
|-----------|--------------------------------------|-----------|-----|--------|---------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Comment # | (5050) 0571, 055) 050)               | Jection   |     | age #  | LITIC # | (menue internet or comment)                                                                                                 | Suggested change                                                                                                             |
|           |                                      |           |     |        |         | NIST should acknowledge that remote proofing of identities of people calling into a call center/support can be of value,    | While the focus of the document is outside of call centers, acknowledge that integrity for such transactions is improved     |
|           |                                      |           |     |        |         | particularly in cases where financial or other sensitive transactions are being conducted.                                  | by remotely proofing individuals before sensitive information is exchanged between the individual and the call center        |
| 1         | 63A                                  | Purpose   |     | 2      | 360     | particularly in eases where initiation of other sensitive transactions are being conducted.                                 | staff.                                                                                                                       |
|           | 05/1                                 | i di pose |     |        | 500     |                                                                                                                             | While understand that the list is not exhaustive, recommend explaining that collecting physical attributes about the         |
|           |                                      |           |     |        |         |                                                                                                                             | individual can further bind the person to the identity. For example, if eye color is an element that appears on the          |
| 2         | 63A                                  |           | 4.1 | 6      | 450     | Example attributes do not include physical attributes about the individual.                                                 | evidence, that attribute can be compared against the actual eye color found in the selfie to further match the individual.   |
|           | USA                                  |           | 7.1 | - ŭ    | 733     | States that photocopies of evidence are acceptable, yet many of security features on forms of Strong and Superior           | evidence, that attribute can be compared against the actual cyc color round in the series to further materials in marviadas. |
| 3         | 63A                                  |           | 4.3 | 9      | 505     | evidence cannot be validated from photocopies.                                                                              | Recommend that photocopies of evidence be limited to fair or weak strength evidence                                          |
|           | 05/1                                 |           | 15  |        | 505     | evidence connected from protocopies.                                                                                        | necommend that photocopies of evalence of minited to turn of weak strength evalence                                          |
|           |                                      |           |     |        |         | Allows for attribute information from multiple sources, however there is no qualifications for said sources. Concern is     |                                                                                                                              |
| 4         | 63A                                  | 4.3.4.4   |     | 14     | 653     | that just about anybody could be a source and there could be collusion among each source                                    | Recommend that there be qualifications for "sources" that they are in good legal standing and be creditable.                 |
|           |                                      |           |     |        |         | Master Death Files are know to have numerious errors. In one State DMV, several Driver Licenses were revoked upon           |                                                                                                                              |
|           |                                      |           |     |        |         | recieving notification that a Driver was added to the MDF. However, the deaths were incorrectly reported and drivers        | Recommend that multiple sources along with the MDF be used to check for data correlation that ensures accuracy and           |
| 5         | 63a                                  | 5.1.1.2   |     | 17     | 736     | were penalized for the misreporting of their death.                                                                         | consistancy.                                                                                                                 |
|           |                                      |           |     |        |         |                                                                                                                             | Recommend that Real ID compliant DL/ID be catagorized as SUPERIOR when the the selfie is match against the photo             |
| 6         | 63A                                  | 5.4.2.1   |     | 28     | 1105    | Strength of evidence for Real ID Driver License                                                                             | on record with the actual issuing DMV, should such connectivity be established in the future.                                |
|           |                                      |           |     |        |         | The identity proofing process involves the presentation and validation of the minimum attributes necessary to               | Recommend including the RP to be respponsible for notification in instances where they are using a CSP as a 3rd party        |
| 7         | 63A                                  |           | 4.1 | 6      | 454     | accomplish identity proofing - this should be applicable to the RP and not the CSP                                          | service for their offering.                                                                                                  |
|           |                                      |           |     |        |         | In many cases, the Relying Party is interacting with the invividual being served with the CSP providing a 3rd party service |                                                                                                                              |
|           |                                      |           |     |        |         | on behalf of the Relying Party. In these cases the relying party is better positioned to satisfy Proofing Notification that | Recommend including the RP to be respponsible for notification in instances where they are using a CSP as a 3rd party        |
| 8         | 63A                                  | 5.1.7     |     | 22     | 888     | the CSP.                                                                                                                    | service for their offering.                                                                                                  |
|           |                                      |           |     |        |         |                                                                                                                             |                                                                                                                              |
|           |                                      |           |     |        |         | Software-based authenticators that operate withinthe context of an operating system MAY , where applicable, attempt         |                                                                                                                              |
| 9         | 63B                                  | 4.2.2     |     | 9      | 525     | to detect compromise(e.g., by malware) of the platform in which they are running                                            | For AAL2, why just suggest attempt to detect. Recommend Shall attempt to detect, where applicable.                           |
|           |                                      |           | T   |        |         |                                                                                                                             | Should Not language suggests there is an option to not complete the operation when detected. If it's detected,               |
| 10        | 63B                                  | 4.2.2     |     | 9      | 526     | They SHOULD NOT complete the operation when such a compromise is detected.                                                  | recommend that it Shall Not continue.                                                                                        |
|           |                                      |           |     |        |         |                                                                                                                             | Recommend following any period of a minimum of 30 minutes. If a CSP or RP desire for a shorter period of inactiviy,          |
| 11        |                                      | 4.2.3     |     | 9      |         | SHALL be repeated following any period of inactivity lasting 30 minutes or longer.                                          | then it should be acceptable.                                                                                                |
| 12        | 63B                                  | 4.2.1     |     | 8      | 516     | Second sentence is confusing, seems to contradict third sentence.                                                           | Simplify sentence                                                                                                            |