

IDS Face-to-Face Minutes

August 8, 2012

Meeting was called to order at approximately 9:00am local August 8, 2012.

Attendees

Carmen Aubry*	Oce
Nancy Chen	Oki Data
Matthew Hansen*	Toshiba
Justin Hutchings	Microsoft
Ira McDonald*	High North
Joe Murdock	Sharp
Ron Nevo	Samsung
Janine Pedersen*	NIAP
Glen Petrie*	Epson
Yogesh Rajaraman*	PrinterOn
Brian Smithson	Ricoh
Alan Sukert*	Xerox
Mike Sweet*	Apple
Jerry Thrasher	Lexmark
Randy Turner*	Amalfi
Larry Upthegrove	
Bill Wagner	TIC
Bryan Willet*	Lexmark
Rick Yardumian	Canon

*Dial-in

Agenda Items

Note: Meeting slides are available at <ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ipp/slides/ipp-wg-agenda-august-12.pdf>

1. IP Policy and Minute Taker
 - a. IP Policy accepted with AI Sukert taking the minutes
2. Approved the minutes from the July 26, 2012 Teleconference.
3. Conference Call Schedule Change
 - a. Joe announced that the Conference Calls are being moved to every other Monday at 11 AM starting on Sep 10th.
4. IDS WG Officers
 - a. Need a Vice-Chair and a new Secretary. AI Sukert volunteered to become Secretary.
5. Action Items
 - a. All 3 Open Actions (#81, #112 & #125) marked as completed.
6. PWG-Log
 - a. <ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ids/wd/wd-ids-log10-20120726-rev.pdf>
 - b. Global: Use document title references instead of RFC references.
 - c. Add in both Section 9, Security Considerations and the introduction that best practice is to use secure TLS session.
 - d. Verify that no new user role has been included in the PWG-Log spec.
 - e. Decision: Status of next PWG-Log draft will be 'Stable' and go to the WG for "last call".
7. IDS-ATTR
 - a. ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ids/wd/wd-idsattributes10-20120724_rev.pdf

IDS Face-to-Face Minutes August 8, 2012

- b. Section 4.1, ResidentApplicationPatches attribute – Change last sentence to read “Note. Any application patches applied to the HCD MUST **NOT** result in change in the ResidentApplicationVersion attribute.
 - c. Section 4.1, UserApplicationPatches attribute – Change last sentence to read “Note. Any user-downloadable application patches applied to the HCD MUST **NOT** result in change in the UserApplicationVersion attribute.
 - d. Decision: Status of next IDS-ATTR draft will be ‘Stable’. Will leave the spec as is until NEA is finalized.
8. HCD-NAP
- a. <ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ids/wd/wd-ids-napsoh10-20120725.pdf>
 - b. Cover Page: Status should be changed to ‘Prototype (Dormant)’.
 - c. Add to the Abstract the current status and that work on this spec has been suspended.
 - d. Decision: Work will be suspended on this spec until prototyping is completed.
9. IDS-Model
- a. <ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ids/wd/wd-ids-model10-20120806-rev.pdf>
 - b. Italicize the terms being defined and fix the indentation in Section 2.2. Randy Turner volunteered to provide an updated set of definitions to the terms being defined in Sections 2.2 and 7.
 - c. Add a Use Scenario in Section 3.2 around addressing encrypted data (e.g., scan data or print data) that is at rest on the device.
 - d. Section 6: Change second sentence to read “The security actors that can **play** a role in the PWG Security Model...”
 - e. Global: In Section 6 capitalize ‘User’, ‘Device’ and ‘Service’ whenever they are used as Security Actors in this section.
 - f. Section 6.1: Revise the first two sentences to read “A device is a physical hardware **entity** such as a smart phone, tablet, computer, or Imaging Device. Devices are the **base** element of the Security Model...”
 - g. Section 6.1: If you want to mention applicability of this section to subunits point to the MFD model.
 - h. Section 6.2: Add that a Service is always hosted on a device (i.e., a network-visible entity).
 - i. Section 6.2: Revise the last sentence to read “...that a User or another Service connects to perform a function.”
 - j. Section 7: Revise the first sentence to read “The **characteristic** of Visibility as applied to a device...”
 - k. Section 7: Change the wording for the definition of ‘Addressable Device’ to read “The device can be **reached** by **another** device, e.g. there is a communications pathway **between two reachable devices**. This specification applies the concept of **addressability** to physical devices...”
 - l. Section 7: Reword to divide up visibility of a device from visibility of a service.
 - m. Section 7: Be clear how you use ‘Accessibility’ in the definitions in this section.
 - n. Section 7: Remove the Network Visible Entity definition and incorporate it into the other definitions in this section and in Section 2.2.
 - o. Section 7: Revise the definition of ‘Visible’ at a much higher level using existing terminology. Incorporate the following:
 - Change the wording in the definition of “Visible” to avoid the use of the term ‘available’ in favor of ‘idle’ or a similar term.
 - Remove the definition of ‘Invisible’.
 - Put the definitions of ‘Network Visible’, ‘Directly Visible’ and ‘Securely Visible’ as subnotes under the more general ‘Visible’ definition.
 - Incorporate the concepts of ‘Discoverable’ and Reachable (from a Level 3 perspective).
 - p. Section 8.1: Incorporate the roles from RFC 3805 provided by Ira (<ftp://ftp.ietf.org/rfc/rfc3805.txt>).
 - q. Randy volunteered to work with Joe on these definitions to better reflect actual use.
- Note: Both Randy Turner and Al Sukert provided comments on this draft spec before the meeting. Because of time limitations neither set of comments were reviewed at the meeting; Joe agreed to address them off-line in the next draft of this spec.
10. Presentation by Janine Pedersen, NIAP
- a. <ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ids/Presentation/mfp%20pp%20status%20v2.pptx>
 - b. Key points raised:

IDS Face-to-Face Minutes August 8, 2012

- Joint international effort was kicked off at RSA in February 2012 to develop a new MFP Protection Profile (PP) to replace IEEE 2600.2. Current scope of this PP will be full function MFPs only (as opposed to single function MFPs), although IPA is pushing to include network printers in the PP.
 - IPA (Japanese scheme) was chosen to be the lead on this activity because they were felt to be stronger in this area than NIAP was.
 - Initial schedule by IPA was to have a draft PP available by the ICCC in September 2012; NIAP thought the schedule was aggressive.
 - IPA delivered an initial draft in June which was reviewed and commented on by NIAP. Part of the NIAP response was to submit revised Sections 1 and 2 dealing with the Environment and Security Problem Definition. IPA has provided a partial response to the NIAP proposed new sections; Janine felt IPA did not present any "significant issues" to the NIAP revisions, but more comments are expected in the next 1-2 weeks.
 - NIAP now wants to work on the Security Functional Requirements and Assurance Requirements and get US vendors to cooperatively participate in the preparation of these sections and the review of this PP. This presentation is part of that effort to get more Vendor participation. NIAP will send out the current draft PP from IPA and the NIAP response to Vendors for review and comment. NIAP is also setting up a joint IPA-NIAP Meeting at next month's ICCC; details are not yet finalized.
 - NIAP does not plan to do any type of formal certification of the new MFP PP; once it is published NIAP will consider the PP approved.
 - NIAP has a plan on transitioning from IEEE 2600.2 to the new MFP PP once it is published. NIAP's transition plan will only apply to MFP certifications done in the US after the MFP PP is published. NIAP will accept MFP certifications done outside of the US as long as they are done against a NIAP approved PP.
 - NIAP initially proposed a 6 months transition period. During that transition period a vendor has the choice to use either 2600.2 or the new PP; after the end of the transition period only the new PP can be used.
 - The IDS WG members all felt that 6 months was too short a transition time; Janine indicated she was willing to consider a longer transition time.
 - NIAP has not kicked off a Technical Community for developing this new MFP PP yet out of sensitivity that IPA is the lead on this PP, and is not yet ready to do so. They may be ready to do so after the ICCC, but for now Vendor reviews will be by email response.
 - NIAP had no problem with PWG IDS preparing a joint set of comments to the draft PP.
- c. After the presentation the IDS WG discussed how there could be a group review of the PP. The general consensus was that because the PP is not a public document but the IDS WG is an open forum, no review of the PP could be done as part of an IDS WG Meeting. For now, IDS WG members will have to review the PP as individuals.

Next Steps

- Next Conference Call September 10, 2012 at 11am ET.
- Post updates of all reviewed documents.
- Action: Ira to review how to include the Sys Log MIB in Section 9, Security Considerations of the PWG-Log spec.