>> And again, just really spectacular work. I've heard from people that are watching this livestream that they're really impressed at how far this entire group has come.

And the other thing I want to flag is just how obvious it is from all of the work you've done that this isn't just a technical problem, this isn't just a policy problem, this isn't just a business risk problem, this is something that requires us to understand how all three of those things fit together. And just the fact that it keeps coming up and everyone has been embracing that fact is a really powerful tool.

So, after lunch, we're going to try to tackle some of these issues that were just raised. And I think the good ones to sort of make sure we put on the agenda is this namespace problem, right? We have this question are of things unique enough. They are too unique. In fact, they are so unique that each piece of software has a whole bunch of unique identifiers. So let's talk about how to solve that.

We've captured some over the course of the morning and, of course, Art's presentation flagged some. What I want to do now is just a very quick whip around. All of the things that were discussed, are there things that you guys think are priorities that you'd like to put on the table to talk this afternoon?

And in terms of priorities, what can't we move forward on? What are the obstacles to moving forward? And what are some of the things that you think we can actually make some progress on today by having a room full of really smart people.

This is a chance to sort of throw it out there. And then over lunch we'll put up a list and sort of try to have a plan of how we'll work through things. Jim?

>> Opacity.

>> Opacity or opaqueness. We're going to have to -- I like opacity.

>> Legacy.

>> So we've got namespace, we've got opacity.

>> Just next steps of each of the group. I realize it's a chicken/egg problem saying that because you need to do the things you just said first. But what are we actually trying to accomplish by what date.

>> Thank you. And certainly scheduling is something we're going to prioritize.

Tooling has come up a lot, and we're going to sort of unpack what we mean by that and what we can do on that front. But Art and John?

>> I'm just looking at the list from my slides. Service Cloud not on-prem. Maybe a small one, but let's put it on.

>> Yes.

>> This is more common on our working groups week to week, but this is a chance we could embody language. Can we define phase deliveries?

>> Yes.

>> Because I'm really -- there's so many people just really want the inventory and not instead of never doing the rest, but I think we sometimes entangle with things that could be a phase two and I would really like to decouple those if we could.

>> I think that's a really good point.

>> Yeah, I'd second that. And I would say we need to define what is mandatory for phase one.

>> Good. Thank you.

>> And since it's been brought up several times, the software naming or ID consistency, maybe defining an approach to that or at least identifying that --

>> Yes.

>> -- it's a concern and you know it.

>> Namespace. So we've talked about this when I give my sort of general briefing.

IT has successfully solved exactly one global namespace challenge, and that's DNS. And that has a global massive institution to support it. We cannot duplicate that.

>> No, you can't duplicate it, but you might be able to use it, which is something I've done.

This is something I'd like to throw on the heap, not for the phase one but for your phase two, which is discovery and the relationship of the SBOM to network access.

>> Thank you. That's a great point.

And for those who aren't aware, Elliott is one of the drivers of the MuD protocol that just got RCF status. Congratulations. In ITF. And that will be a game changer for thinking of IoT and OT management in both the consumer space and especially in the industrial space.

>> I guess similar, just wonder about like the overall, the integration effort with this standard, is it going to be something that is mandatory, or self-certified or -- because I think early phases we heard about talking about the risk-based approach.

I would like to learn more about specific scenarios about the -- what is like for a risk-based. And show that we can consider that into the integration effort with other compliance requirements. There are so many regulations out there, so how do we do it?

>> That's a fantastic -- what does it mean to do this? If we are doing minimum viable.

I'm going to send us off to lunch with just the caveat that some of you know, which is NTIA is not a regulator. We at the Department of Commerce believe that a lot of this stuff can be market driven if we have the incentives lined up properly.

In fact, that is a big part of this initiative and why we think it is successful because we have so many parts of the market and the supply chain in the room. And so we'll be talking about that.

But, on the other hand, we can't ignore the fact that the FDA has already sort of made their intentions clear that they're going to be requiring this as part of their premarket certification process. And we all know that, you know, government's going to govern and we should have had that in mind.

So, with that, this is an incredibly productive morning. This afternoon is where the really hard work happens. So we have an hour for lunch right now.

At 1:15, we'll be reconvening. And as your incentive to show up on time at 1:15 is that's when we will sort of be giving you the here is our plan of tackling these questions. So if you are late for that, you'll miss your chance to sort of weigh in on that initial discussion.

So thank you all. We'll see you in an hour. For those of you watching at home and listening in, take a break yourself, enjoy the nice weather. And we will talk to you in an hour. Thank you.