

IDS Face-to-Face Minutes

December 6, 2012

Meeting was called to order at approximately 1:00 pm local December 6, 2012.

Attendees

Russ Brudnicki	Kyocera
Nancy Chen	Oki Data
Matthew Hansen	Toshiba
Dan Manchala	Xerox
Ira McDonald	High North
Joe Murdock	Sharp
Glen Petrie*	Epson
Brian Smithson	Ricoh
Alan Sukert*	Xerox
Mike Sweet*	Apple
Randy Turner	Amalfi
Larry Upthegrove*	
Bill Wagner	TIC
Rick Yardumian	Canon

*Dial-in

Agenda Items

Note: Meeting slides are available at ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ids/Presentation/2012-12-06_IDS_F2F.pdf.

IP Policy and Minute Taker

- a. IP Policy accepted with Al Sukert taking the minutes
2. Approved the minutes from the November 26, 2012 Teleconference.
3. IDS WG Officers
 - a. Still need a Vice-Chair. Al Sukert is now the Secretary.
4. Action Items
 - a. Action #126 has been completed. The Action Item list will be updated accordingly
5. HCD-NAP Binding Anonymous Prototype Report
 - a. Was done by an anonymous PWG member company.
 - b. As the slide indicated did find an issue with multiple administrative passwords in terms of which ones should be checked. The consensus was that if any default admin password has not been changed then the device should report itself as not being secure (i.e., all the default admin passwords have to be changed). Ira indicated this change will have to be reflected in several of the specs such as HCH-NAP and HCD-ATTR.
 - c. Had a discussion of the PWG Prototyping Policy. A PDF version of the policy is available at <ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pwg-prototype-policy-20121029.pdf>. As the policy indicates, the process for an anonymous prototyping is:
Email of prototyping effort (or posting of prototyping effort on a publicly accessible site or discussion at a PWG Face-to-Face Meeting) → Two or more PWG or WG Officers notification of effort → WG notification of effort → Inclusion of Results in "Last Call" spec. The PWG member doing the prototyping is only required to tell the WG if it found any issues.
6. HCD-NAP, HCD-ATTR and PWG-LOG
 - a. HCD-NAP: <ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ids/wd/wd-ids-naps0h10-20121112.pdf>
HCD-ATTR: <ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ids/wd/wd-idsattributes10-20121113.pdf>
PWG-LOG: <ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ids/wd/wd-ids-log10-20121112.pdf>
 - b. All three specs are now in PWG "Last Call" review through Jan 18, 2013.

IDS Face-to-Face Minutes December 6, 2012

- c. Comments have been received against all three specs. Al Sukert is maintaining a comprehensive list of the "Last Call" comments and their resolution that will be posted on the PWG FTP site by Monday (Dec 10) and then updated weekly thereafter. Joe reviewed the comments received to date; there was no discussion of any of them at the meeting.
 - d. The issue raised in the HCD-NAP Binding Anonymous Prototype Report (see 5.b above) will be addressed in the appropriate spec(s) as part of the fixes for the "Last Call" comments.
 - e. From the HCD-TNC Binding spec review, it was agreed that Joe needed to update Sections 3.2 – 3.4 in the HCD-NAP spec to reflect the wording Ira included in the corresponding sections of the HCD-TNC Binding spec.
 - f. Ira indicated that based on the HCD-TNC Binding spec he planned to add a "Last Call" comment against the HCD-NAP spec dealing with the need to add design requirements in Section 3 and a comment against the HCD-ATTR spec to include the requirement to report the presence and status of Anti-Virus and Firewalls since both are now required.
7. HCD-TNC Binding:
- a. <ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/ids/wd/wd-ids-tnc10-20121202-rev.pdf>
Note: Any line numbers in the comments listed below refer to the line numbers in the version of the spec referenced in 7.a.
 - b. Add an Acronyms subsection in Section 2, Terminology. Make sure to include all acronyms used in the spec.
 - c. Global change: Change "network endpoint *attachment*" to be "network endpoint **assessment**" to be consistent with current PWG definition of NEA.
 - d. Global change: Add the specs referenced in the body of this spec to the list of References in Section 10.
 - e. Reword Section 3.1 to align with Section 3.1 in the HCD-ATTR spec.
 - f. Reword Section 3.4, Item 3) (lines 330-331) for clarity.
 - g. Reword Section 3.4, Item 5 (lines 334-336) for clarity.
 - h. Add in Section 5.1 (see line 577) discussion of the ordering of HCD attributes with respect to TNC components. Note that the WG agreed that the ordering should be TNC NEA attributes first; then unique PWG attributes; then duplicate PWG attributes.
 - i. Reword the Note in Section 5.1 (lines 583-585) for clarity.
 - j. Section 5.1, line 588: Revise the sentence to read "...transport protocol binding MUST include all of **the REQUIRED** attributes defined in this section."
 - k. Joe gave the entire WG an action to look at the list of REQUIRED attributes in Section 5.1, lines 594-600 that could be omitted when using the [PT-EAP] posture transport protocol and provide any suggested changes in the list to Ira.
 - l. Reword the sentence in Section 5.1.1, lines 602-604.
 - m. Section 5.1.6, line 677 should be changed to read "Flags: **0x00** (SKIP)".
 - n. Reword the Note in Section 5.2 (lines 825-827) to read the same as the updated Note in Section 5.1 (see comment 7.i).
 - o. Remove the extraneous bullet in Section 5.2, line 840.
 - p. Provide a list of conformance requirements for this spec in Section 6 after getting agreement of the list with the full IDS WG.
8. New MFP Protection Profile
- a. Al Sukert and Brian Smithson discussed the meeting slides on the new MFP Protection Profile (PP).
 - b. Key points raised:
 - New Technical Committee kicked off in Sep 2012 to develop a new MFP Protection Profile that will replace the currently required IEEE 2600.2 PP in the US. Is a joint NIAP (US Scheme) -IPA (Japanese Scheme) effort with IPA as the lead with participation from US and Japanese vendors.
 - Currently working on the Security Problem Definition (SPD) – note the mistake on Slide 13. Plan was to have the SPD done by end of Dec 2012 and full PP done by Mar 2013. We might have a draft PP by the next International CC Conference in Sep 2013, but that's doubtful given current progress.
 - Still some issues in the SPD to resolve as follows:
 - i. Scope of PP: Current SPD is written to apply to MFPs only. IPA wants to include network printers/scanners in the PP. Current NIAP and vendor position is that we don't want two separate

IDS Face-to-Face Minutes December 6, 2012

- PPs (one for MFPs and one for network printers/scanners) so scope should cover both; IPA favors separate PPs. Issue still to be resolved.
- ii. Address specifics for standardized security protocols like SSLv3: IPA wants a policy for interoperability of security protocols; the IPA concern is that they want the PP to make sure that security protocols like IPSec are implemented properly (apparently that has been an issue in past CC certifications of MFPs in Japan). NIAP's position is that this should be done as part of setup activities and not specified in detail in the PP. Issue still to be resolved.
 - iii. Whether or not to require self-test on start-up and/or self-test associated with repair/trusted updates in the PP: The issue is whether to keep the self-test requirements that were included in IEEE 2600.2. NIAP wants to add the additional self-test requirement for trusted updates to make sure that the device recognizes when untrusted updates are being attempted; seems to be general agreement that this needs to be included in the new PP. NIAP position on self-test on start-up is that it should be the same as in IEEE 2600.2 –only to prevent compromise due to malfunction. Issue still to be resolved.
- c. We discussed what the IDS's role in the development of this PP should be. There was a general consensus that because the IDS is dealing with security it just couldn't "not do anything". The consensus was that this topic should be included in all subsequent IDS Face-to-Face Meetings and that the IDS will attempt to serve as a forum for vendors to provide ideas on what should go in the PP and help review the PP. If any IDS members want a more active role they are welcome to join the MFP PP Technical Committee (the link is included on Slide 15).
9. TCG Update
- a. Ira went over the latest TCG status (see Slide 16).
 - b. Updates from the slide:
 - The PT-TLS spec was approved last week by the IESG.
 - The PT-EAP spec is undergoing IESG "Last Call" review. All comments from this review will be addressed in the spec.
 - Implementation of TEAP will be made mandatory in the PT specs.
 - Is a big effort on the part of the TCG to cooperate with OASIS on XACML.
10. Future Activities (Slide 17)
- a. Randy Turner brought up the issue of SCAP and how it might be implemented in the IDS specs. Joe gave Randy, Brain Smithson and himself an action to monitor the TCG's SCAP Mapping spec for implementation in the IDS specs.

Next Steps

- Next Conference Call January 7, 2013 at 11am PT/ 2 pm ET
- Post updates of all reviewed documents.
- Actions:
 - a. **Joe Murdoch**: Update the HCD-NAP and HCD-ATTR specs to address all of the "Last Call" comments received by Jan 18, 2013.
 - b. **Joe Murdoch ad Mike Sweet**: Determine how to address Mike's "Last Call" comment against the PWG-LOG spec.
 - c. **Mike Sweet**: Update the PWG-LOG spec to address all "Last Call" comments received by Jan 18, 2013.
 - d. **Ira McDonald**: Update the HCD-TNC Binding spec to address the comments presented and discussed during review of this spec at the 12/6/12 PWG IDS Face-to-Face Meeting.
 - e. **IDS WG**: Look at the list of REQUIRED attributes in Section 5.1, lines 594-600 that could be omitted when using the [PT-EAP] posture transport protocol and provide any suggested changes in the list to Ira McDonald before the next IDS Face-to-Face Meeting.
 - f. **Joe Murdoch, Randy Turner, Brian Smithson**: Monitor the TCG's SCAP Mapping spec for implementation in the IDS specs.