2011-10-06 Face to Face Meeting Minutes

1. Attendees

Carmen Aubry * Océ Nancy Chen Oki Data

Ira McDonald * High North / Samsung

Akiko Mochizuki Fuji Xerox Joe Murdock Sharp Glen Petrie **Epson** Brian Smithson Ricoh Michael Sweet Apple Jerry Thrasher Lexmark TIC Bill Wagner Jay Wang Toshiba Rick Yardumian Canon

* by phone

2. Agenda

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

• 9:00 – 9:15 Administrative Tasks

• 9:15 – 9:45 NEA and TCG Convergence

• 9:45 – 10:30 NIAP and ICCC report

• 10:30 – 10:45 Short Break

• 10:45 – 11:15 HCD Attributes

• 11:15 – 11:45 IAA and Model

• 11:45 – 12:00 Wrap up

3. Minutes Taker

Brian Smithson

4. 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.

5. Approve Minutes from previous meeting

Minutes from the previous meeting are at ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ids/minutes/IDS-call-minutes-20110922.pdf. There were no objections to the previous meeting's minutes.

6. Review Action Items

The most recent Action Item spreadsheet is available at: ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ids/ActionItems/. Action item updates will be reflected in the updated action items spreadsheet.

2011-10-06 Face to Face Meeting Minutes

7. <u>Document status</u>

• 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
- HCD-Health Remediation

ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ids/wd/wd-ids-remediation10-20100930.pdf

Initial Draft

8. NEA/TCG Convergence

New drafts from IETF NEA WG:

PT-EAP - Datalink layer posture transport

- for use in initial assessment (before IP address is acquired)
- based on shipping TCG TNC IFT-EAP per IETF Applications AD decision
- http://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-nea-pt-eap-00.txt

PT-TLS - Transport layer posture transport

- for use in re-assessment (after IP address is assigned)
- based on shipping TCG TNC IFT-TLS per IETF NEA WG consensus
- http://tools.ietf.org/id/draft-ietf-nea-pt-tls-01.txt

Both specs address the Ashokan attack (this is also being added to the source TCG TNC specs).

IETF NEA PA-TNC (RFC 5792) and PB-TNC (RFC 5973) are already technically aligned with their source TCG TNC specs. Therefore, a future IETF NEA implementation will also be a conforming TCG TNC implementation and vice-versa. Revised TCG TNC specs actually recommend use of the IANA registered IETF NEA common attribute OIDs (instead of previous TCG ones).

9. ICCC Report

See separate slide deck:

ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ids/Presentation/12th%20ICCC%20Report%20to%20PWG%20IDS.pdf

There are conflicting directions on how to develop protection profiles (PPs): the CC Development Board (CCDB) has drafted a vision statement regarding "Collaborative PPs", and NIAP and some other schemes (UK, CA, and AU-NZ) are following a different approach that NIAP calls "Standard PPs".

2011-10-06 Face to Face Meeting Minutes

Both approaches call for a single, approved PP for each class of technology product (e.g., hardcopy devices). The CPP approach emphasizes international participation in development and recognition, and the SPP approach focuses on de-emphasis of EAL packages in favor of SAR choices and refinements that are tailored to the technology class.

There is further confusion about what constitutes a "technical community" (TC) for developing PPs. NIAP lists some TCs on their web site – new ones like Enterprise Security Management and "pre-existing" ones like IEEE P2600 – but the CCDB is seeking input from vendors and others to help define the "terms of reference" (which I believe can include such things as membership and operating rules) for Collaborative Technical Communities, and since it has not defined those terms of reference, it cannot identify any qualified technical community.

Adding to the confusion and conflict is the state of the CC Forum (an informal group formed last year to include all interested parties) and the CC Vendors Forum (an informal group formed many years ago for vendors only). They have not worked well together, and the CCDB asked the two groups to "unify" and work together on the aforementioned terms of reference. A proposal from the CCVF to unify under a new entity did not get much support, and neither group seems to work well enough by itself (much less together) to expect any meaningful collaboration on terms of reference.

Brian gave a presentation that contained a brief history and status report on hardcopy device CC certifications, a critique of some of the NIAP-led PP efforts, and a proposal for CPPs to be structured as a high-level PP plus some supporting documents (SDs) to address specific issues that are problematic when they are addressed in a monolithic PP.

In addition to the presentation slides, a companion paper was submitted to the conference. Both will be on the conference web site, but you can get them now from the P2600 web site:

- http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/presentations/12iccc/smithson-slides.pdf
- http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/presentations/12iccc/smithson-paper.pdf

This presentation generated quite a bit of interest from CC schemes other than the US/UK/CA/AU-NZ camp, because it could be used as a functioning example of "Collaborative PP" development and a working alternative to the NIAP "Standard PP" approach. NIAP has asked the Japanese scheme (IPA) to take the lead on managing the hardcopy devices technical community and its work, and there was interest expressed by Germany and Sweden as well. Korea and The Netherlands may also be interested.

There are several steps that might be taken to help ensure the longevity and international recognition (including US recognition) of the IEEE 2600-series PPs:

- 1. Propose "terms of reference" for TCs that generally follows the operation of IEEE P2600 and the PWG.
- 2. Strengthen the existing HCD TC by inviting schemes, labs, and others, to join. This might be done under the PWG-IDS group, a new PWG group, or a new entity outside of PWG (but perhaps still part of ISTO).
- 3. Get that TC approved by the CCDB as a "Collaborative TC".
- 4. Using the rationale that the IEEE 2600-series PPs were developed under substantially the same terms of reference as that TC, get the existing PPs approved as "Collaborative PPs".
- 5. Work within the HCD TC to develop or solicit development of supporting documents.

2011-10-06 Face to Face Meeting Minutes

New action item:

117	Brian Smithson	2600 SD	provide a review copy of the proposed "terms of reference" to the IDS mailing list

10. HCD Attributes

There is a proposal to normalize the naming conventions of the HCD attributes document HCD_ATR to be consistent with those of the Semantic Model SM. In addition to the names, the attribute codes and data type names may also be changed. These are summarized here: ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ids/white/ids-hcd-attr-normalization.pdf.

Because the generic names (e.g. HealthMachineTypeModel) might conflict with other non-HCD names, we resolved to retain HCD instead of Health (e.g., HCDMachineTypeModel).

In HCD_ATR, OctetArray is used as a data type where base64Binary is used in the SM. However, in binding specifications, the native data type names must be adopted.

New action item:

_ , _ , , _ ,	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		
118	Joe Murdock	HCD-ATR	Go through the HCD_ATR and HCD_NAP and change the names, data types to the ASN.1 data type names with a mapping table to other data type naming conventions and codes so that the attributes sort functionally.

11. IAA and Model

• IDS-IAA Specification Review

ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ids/wd/wd-ids-iaa10-20111005-rev.pdf ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ids/wd/wd-ids-iaa10-20111005.pdf

Schema and WSDL

ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ids/wd/schema/October%202011/PwgSecurity.wsdl ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ids/wd/schema/October%202011/PwgSecurityOpMsg.xsd ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ids/wd/schema/October%202011/Security.xsd ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ids/wd/schema/October%202011/SecurityOperations.xsd

New action item:

-	11011 0	Ction itemi.		
	119	Joe Murdock	IAA	Update the security schema to match the latest PWG authentication type

 IDS-Model Specification Review ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ids/wd/wd-ids-model10-20111005-rev.pdf ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ids/wd/wd-ids-model10-20111005.pdf

- Integration into PrintTicket and Cloud Printing
 - What IDS elements should go into the PrintTicket Document elements
 - User Identification
 - Document Security

2011-10-06 Face to Face Meeting Minutes

12. Summary of New Action Items and Open Issues

12.1 New action items

117	Brian Smithson	2600 SD	provide a review copy of the proposed "terms of reference" to the IDS mailing list
118	Joe Murdock	HCD-ATR	Go through the HCD_ATR and HCD_NAP and change the names, data types to the ASN.1 data type names with a mapping table to other data type naming conventions and codes so that the attributes sort functionally.
119	Joe Murdock	IAA	Update the security schema to match the latest PWG authentication type
120	Joe Murdock	Admin	use Google calendar for IDS meetings

12.2 Old issues (not considered for a long time)

- 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)

13. Wrap up and adjournment

The next IDS teleconference is on Thursday, October 20, 2011, at 1:00PM EDT / 10:00AM PDT.

IDS meeting adjourned.