

# IDS Working Group

2008-09-18 Conference Call Minutes

## 1. Attendees

Randy Turner (Amalfi Systems), Lee Farrell (Canon), Ira McDonald (High North), Jerry Thrasher (Lexmark), Ron Bergman (Ricoh), Ron Nevo (Sharp), Bill Wagner (TIC), Pete Zehler (Xerox)

## 2. Agenda

1. Identify Minute Taker
2. Approval of minutes from 9/4 teleconference
3. Review Action Items
4. Discuss Glen Petrie's email:  
"RE: IDS> Updated PWG HCD Health Assessment Attributes document"
5. Review latest NAP Binding Specification
6. New business

## 3. Identify Minutes Taker

Lee Farrell

## 4. Accept Previous Minutes

There were no objections to the previous Minutes.

## 5. Review Action Items

ACTION: Randy Turner will compile feedback comments from the NEA, and will forward them to the IDS group.

→ *Randy said that the NEA mail list has been pretty quiet, although Steve Hanna has made some responses. The group seems to be closing the window on additional contributions this week. Randy said that he will forward Steve's comments for the group to review. Randy said "they're pretty much on board with the majority of our comments."*

*Randy noted that the minimum cipher suite is one of the items that Steve had objection to. How it is applied and to what application(s) it is applied are issues of concern.*

→ **OPEN**

ACTION: Randy Turner will forward the IDS e-mail proposal originally sent to NEA.

→ **CLOSED**

ACTION: Jerry Thrasher will add the NULL value to be used in the Attribute Specification.

→ **CLOSED**

ACTION: [TBD] will figure out how and where the description of each attribute applies to each interface being assessed.

→ **WITHDRAWN**

# IDS Working Group

2008-09-18 Conference Call Minutes

ACTION: Ron Bergman will add string representation of versions for firmware application, resident application and downloadable application in the optional table.

→ **CLOSED**

ACTION: Ron Bergman will update the Firewall Setting to be consistent with the new NEA format.

→ **CLOSED**

ACTION: Joe Murdock will investigate whether a PEAP request is made to a switch, and then the switch makes the request to RADIUS.

→ *Randy said no, it is invisible to a printer. He thinks an MFD would [typically] not be an authenticator. But Ron said that based on some of the Microsoft diagrams, this is not necessarily obvious. We need to verify this still.* **OPEN**

ACTION: Jerry Thrasher will make the following modifications to the Attributes Specification:

1. In the definition of HCD\_Resident\_Application\_Name, the acronym “POR” should be replaced with “power cycle.”
2. For HCD\_Downloadable\_Application\_Name definition, change the second sentence to: “...are added via an administrative *or maintenance* offline procedure.”
3. Remove “Applet” from Section 2.2.

→ **CLOSED**

## **6. Glen Petre's Comments on PWG HCD Health Assessment Attributes document**

Glen reviewed his comments on the PWG Health Assessment Attribute :

1. Add definitions for the following
  - a. Resident Application
  - b. Downloadable Application→ OK
2. For the Attributes HCD\_Firmware\_Version, HCD\_Downloadable\_Version, HCD\_Resident\_Application\_Version; change the second half of the sentence from “... and can uniquely describe...” to “... and MUST uniquely describe”  
→ OK (change to “MUST uniquely”).
3. Under HCD\_Downloadable\_Application\_Name and HCD\_Resident\_Application\_Name; move all of the content after the first sentence of each attribute to the definition section.  
→ OK
4. I do not understand the definition for the HCD\_Name attribute. Is this meant to be the ‘user-friendly name’???  
→ The attribute title is causing confusion. Given that Model exists, it is not clear what to put in this attribute. Is it a necessary attribute? The Model name uniquely defines all devices of a particular generation. The group decided to merge the two attributes, and clean up the wording accordingly. Perhaps an example would also be useful. It should be clarified that the term is used to uniquely qualify the device for remediation purposes.

# IDS Working Group

2008-09-18 Conference Call Minutes

Do we want to create a Hardware Version attribute? Probably not.

Are we talking about the individual interface, or the entire device?  
As long as the attribute fields can be multiply instanced, this should be handled ok.

Jerry pointed out that some of the attributes are not multiply instanced.

Bill: When trying to deal with the entire device, we still might have problems. A MFD might have several processors, and there's no guarantee that you might get different components in a single model. Different firmware or hardware versions might not be reflected in the Model. For example, a given Model might use a variety of NICs.

Randy: A NIC is usually subservient to the MFD in which it is contained, in terms of the MFD announcing itself on the network.

Bill: Sometimes the NIC identifies itself.

Randy: Sometimes a vendor might want to expose the firmware load.

Randy: A multiply instanced firmware table would probably solve this issue. The NEA said that they are basically using this model.

**ACTION:** Randy will summarize what we need to support multiple systems within an MFD. He will also confirm if the NEA model supports it adequately—and if remediation is possible.

5. There is a definition for "Applet" which seems to be distinct from "Application" but there is no associated attributes for downloadable/resident name/version/patches/enabled applets. Should these attributes be added or should the definition of application be extended to include applets? If the later is considered, then a simple bit-field (boolean) attribute could be added to denoted the application is an applet type.  
→ OK
6. I suggest that Conformance statements be reworded such they use one of the Conformance Terminology key words (MUST, SHALL, etc.). In most cases, it just means changing the current key words to capitalization within the sentence.  
→ OK

## **7. Review latest NAP Binding Specification.**

This topic was deferred until next teleconference.

## **8. Next Teleconference**

October 2, 2008.