# Attendees

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Carmen Aubry \* | Océ |
| Michelle Brinkmeyer \*\* | NIAP |
| Nancy Chen \* | Oki Data |
| Shaun Gilmore \*\* | NIAP |
| Justin Hutchins | Microsoft |
| Ira McDonald \* | High North / Samsung |
| Scott McKay \*\* | NIAP |
| Joe Murdock | Sharp |
| Ron Nevo \* | Samsung |
| Glen Petrie \* | Epson |
| Jerry Thrasher | Lexmark |
| Brian Smithson \* | Ricoh |
| Amir Shahindoust \* | Toshiba |
| Michael Sweet | Apple |
| Bill Wagner | TIC |
| Rick Yardumian | Canon |
| Pete Zehler | Xerox |
|  |  |

\* by phone

\*\* by phone during 10am-11am segment

# Agenda

Joe Murdock opened the IDS meeting and provided the planned agenda topics:

9:00 – 9:15 Administrative Tasks

9:15 – 9:40 IDS IAA

9:40 – 10:00 IDS Model

10:00 – 11:00 Common Criteria

11:00 – 11:15 Short Break

11:15 – 12:00 IDS Model and Use Cases (+ NAC/IDS Attributes)

# Minutes Taker

Brian Smithson

# PWG Operational Policy

It was noted that all attendees should be aware that the meeting is conducted under the PWG Membership and Intellectual Property rules. There were no objections.

# Approve Minutes from previous meeting

Minutes from the previous meeting are at <ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ids/minutes/IDS-call-minutes-20110512.pdf>. There were no objections to the previous meeting’s minutes.

# Review Action Items

The most recent Action Item spreadsheet is available at: <ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ids/ActionItems/>.

Action item updates and comments:

* AI #77 was marked “Abandoned”, only because we have several specs that need or will need a prototype

# Document status

## Stable documents

* HCD-Assessment-Attributes
  + <ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ids/wd/wd-idsattributes10-20110127.pdf>
  + Stable (needs a binding prototype)
* HCD-NAP Binding
  + <ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ids/wd/wd-ids-napsoh10-20100930.pdf>
  + Stable
* HCD-NAC Business Case White Paper
  + <ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ids/white/tb-ids-hcd-nac-business-case-20100422.pdf>
  + Final
* IDS Charter
  + <ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ids/charter/ch-ids-charter-201100503.pdf>
  + Updated charter approved by Steering Committee

## Active documents

* HCD-TNC Binding
  + Initial Draft still under development
* HCD-Health Remediation
  + <ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ids/wd/wd-ids-remediation10-20100930.pdf>
  + Initial Draft
* IDS-Log
  + <ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ids/wd/wd-ids-log10-20110326.pdf>
  + Draft
* IDS-Identification-Authentication-Authorization
  + <ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ids/wd/wd-ids-iaa10-20110524.pdf>
  + Draft
* IDS-Model
  + <ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ids/wd/wd-ids-model10-20110524.pdf>
  + Draft

# IDS IAA

Refer to document <ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ids/wd/wd-ids-iaa10-20110524.pdf>

Document was edited live during the meeting. New actions resulting from this segment:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 95 | 5/26/2011 | Joe Murdock | IDS=IAA | Make all of the identification UUIDs in the schema required elements |

# IDS Model

Refer to document <ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ids/wd/wd-ids-model10-20110524.pdf>

Document was edited live during the meeting. (continued as item 11)

# Common Criteria

Scott McKay, Michelle Brinkmeyer, and Shaun Gilmore joined us for this segment. Scott has been assigned to work with us, Michelle is the NIAP point of contact, and Shaun is the general expert on NIAP’s new PP approach.

We discussed the overall objective of creating one or more Supporting Documents (SDs) that would make it possible for NIAP to recognize products evaluated at EAL3 if they conform to IEEE 2600.1 plus that/those SDs. That objective was rejected by NIAP. Shaun said that the new approach of tailored assurance is such that any supporting evaluator guidance or mandatory actions we might come up with are unlikely to exactly match the “arbitrary” set of security assurance requirements (SARs) of the EAL3 SAR package. Indeed, NIAP’s admittedly “arbitrary” selection of EAL2 as a transitional assurance baseline is likely itself to go away, perhaps making a transition through EAL1 and ultimately being replaced by entirely tailored assurance requirements. [This is similar to Security Functional Requirements (SFRs). SFRs are tailored for each protection profile and not chosen from generic SFR packages in the way that SARs are chosen from generic SAR packages. –editor]

That said, we discussed how we should proceed to work together toward NIAP’s goal for a fully tailored PP for HCDs while taking into account the relatively new PP into which the HCD technical community invested a substantial amount of time and money to produce, and which the HCD market is now coming to expect from vendors.

NIAP prefers that we begin writing a new PP immediately. The vendors prefers that we extend the life of IEEE 2600.1 and/or 2600.2 until those standards need to be reaffirmed or revised (in mid 2014 and early 2015, respectively). NIAP pointed out that the US government could drop its endorsement of 2600.1 and 2600.2/Policy #20 at any time. Similarly, vendors pointed out that even if they declined to work on a new PP, it is unlikely that the US government or other customers would cease purchasing HCDs. We did not reach a specific consensus on timing for developing a new PP. Instead, we focused on jointly investigating what is needed to move from the current HCD PP approach to the new NIAP approach, and then decide how best to make that transition.

NIAP recommended that the vendor community look at the recently published Network Device Protection Profile (NDPP) <http://www.niap-ccevs.org/pp/pp_nd_v1.0/> and consider how/where it applies to HCDs and 2600.1/2600.2. In turn, NIAP will review 2600.1/2600.2 SFRs and look at what assurance requirements are needed to support them.

We’ll meet by teleconference approximately once per month, starting Thursday, June 30, 1PM EDT.

After the conference with NIAP, the WG decided to proceed with this activity without a charter until the activity becomes better defined.

New actions resulting from this segment:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 97 | 5/26/2011 | Brian Smithson | 2600 SD | Provide link to NDPP to IDS group and ask for review/comment by 6/16 meeting |
| 98 | 5/26/2011 | Brian Smithson | 2600 SD | Invite NIAP to June 30 teleconference |

# IDS Model and Use Cases

Refer to document <ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ids/wd/wd-ids-model10-20110524.pdf>

(Continuation of item 9) New actions resulting from this segment:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 96 | 5/26/2011 | Joe Murdock | IDS-Model | Expand scenarios into use cases for security-related cases |

# NAC/IDS Attributes

We did not cover this item, due to lack of time.

# Summary of New Action Items and Open Issues

## New action items

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 95 | 5/26/2011 | Joe Murdock | IDS=IAA | Make all of the identification UUIDs in the schema required elements |
| 96 | 5/26/2011 | Joe Murdock | IDS-Model | Expand scenarios into use cases for security-related cases |
| 97 | 5/26/2011 | Brian Smithson | 2600 SD | Provide link to NDPP to IDS group and ask for review/comment by 6/16 meeting |
| 98 | 5/26/2011 | Brian Smithson | 2600 SD | Invite NIAP to June 30 teleconference |

## New issues

None

## Old issues

1. How are administrators notified of remediation issues? Does the HCD ever initiate a notification, or is it always the remediation server that initiates notification? Does this same issue apply to policy servers?
2. What is a “fatal” error? Under what circumstances (if any) do we require the HCD to be shut down?
3. Increase interaction and work tracking with other working groups (IPP-Everywhere)

# Wrap up and adjournment

The next IDS teleconference will be on Thursday, June 16 2011, 1pm-2pm EDT.

IDS meeting adjourned.