

# IEEE P2600 Meeting #31

## December 6-7, 2007

### Sharp Latin America, Miami FL

#### Attendees

Chair: Don Wright, Lexmark  
 Vice Chair: Lee Farrell, Canon  
 Secretary / Lead Editor (PPs): Brian Smithson, Ricoh

Carmen Aubry, Océ  
 Peter Cybuck, Sharp  
 Nick Del Re, Canon  
 Satoshi Fujitani, Ricoh  
 Jennifer McClain, IEEE (partial day 1)  
 Harry Lewis, InfoPrint  
 Ron Nevo, Sharp  
 Yusuke Ohta, Ricoh  
 Alan Sukert, Xerox  
 Brian Volkoff, HP

In the following sections, names of speakers are indicated by [brackets].  
 The primary speaker for a session is noted at the beginning of the session  
 as a default; others are noted in place. Some comments may appear in  
 these minutes, indicated by {braces}, inserted by the Secretary for clarity.

Attendees.....	1
Administrivia [Wright] .....	2
Agenda review.....	2
Minutes and Agenda approvals .....	2
IEEE patent policy .....	2
Officers and Editors.....	2
Meeting schedule updates [Wright] .....	2
IEEE Standards Information Network [McClain] .....	3
INCITS CS1 update [Smithson] .....	5
CCVF update [Sukert].....	5
Ballot status [Wright] .....	5
TCG update [Volkoff] .....	7
Action items from previous meeting [Wright].....	8
PP evaluation ad-hoc status [Nevo].....	8
PP Guide ad-hoc status [Sukert].....	8
P2600.1/2/3/4 comments review [Smithson].....	10
PP Annex A review [Sukert].....	11
PP Annex B review [Sukert].....	11
PP-E review [Sukert].....	11
Closing [Wright].....	16

**\* Called to order at 9:06 AM 12/6/2007 \***

## **Administrivia [Wright]**

The following administrative items were reviewed:

### ***Agenda review***

Refer to meeting slides for detail

<http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/presentations/P2600-Dec2007.ppt>

### ***Minutes and Agenda approvals***

The October 2007 minutes were approved without changes. The December 2007 agenda was presented and approved without changes.

### ***IEEE patent policy***

Patent policy was reviewed. There were no patent disclosures made by attendees.

### ***Officers and Editors***

No changes.

Officers:

Chair: Don Wright, Lexmark.

Vice Chair: Lee Farrell, Canon.

Secretary: Brian Smithson, Ricoh.

Lead editors:

Editor (P2600 Std.): Jerry Thrahser, Lexmark.

Editor (PPs): Brian Smithson, Ricoh.

### ***Meeting schedule updates [Wright]***

There may be a need to schedule a special session in January 2008 to deal with Sponsor Ballot comments on P2600 and/or for selecting a CCTL for P2600.n PP validation.

#### **Feb 5-6, 2008**

- Canon Development Americas, Inc.  
15975 Alton Parkway  
Irvine, CA 92618-3731  
with TCG HCWG (on Feb 4) and PWG (on Feb 7-8)

#### **Mar 11-12, 2008**

- Host TBD, Tokyo, Japan (decision to be made by JBMIA around December 17 2007)

### **Apr 14-15, 2008**

- Location TBD, Tucson/Phoenix, with PWG

### **May 21-22, 2008**

- Xerox, Rochester NY area

### **Jun 23-24, 2008**

- InfoPrint or TBD, Boulder/Denver, with PWG

No other schedule conflicts or issues were identified during this meeting. The most current P2600 meeting information is always available at <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/meetings.html>

## **IEEE Standards Information Network [McClain]**

(SIN web site:

<http://ieeestandards.org/ct.html?rtr=on&s=8go,voej,28it,583c,dv6p,cqf7,u2d>)

- instead of writing a separate guide document and going through the approval process, we might consider this as an alternative [Wright]
- {introducing} Jennifer McClain, Managing Editor, IEEE Standards Information and Industry Publishing [Wright]
- what is SIN?
  - a publisher of peer reviewed handbooks, guides, tutorials, and other products that are relevant to standards
  - has IEEE brand recognition, knowledgeable peer review
- why use SIN?
  - publisher/author relationship, pays royalties to authors based on sales
  - liberal use of materials from IEEE standards because IEEE owns the copyrights
  - books are available through amazon.com and IEEE sales channels
  - can also do online tutorials or workshops with educational activities partnership
  - also may use IEEE.tv to promote book and technology
  - guidance for new authors is available
  - typical authors are engineers, technical editors of standards, etc
- process
  - submit proposal
  - make author agreement
  - create first draft
  - peer review
    - minimum 3 people, better to have about 6
  - modify draft, create final manuscript
  - IEEE editing, layout, index, cover design
  - publish

- some example titles:
  - national electrical safety code handbook is best seller
  - a series of wireless handbooks based on 802.11
  - electromagnetic compatibility guide in CDROM
  - lightning protection, a license guide
  - soon, the IEEE dictionary in searchable form
- softbound or hardbound? [Wright]
  - most are softbound
- we're developing protection profiles, a way to describe security goals that are then made into a specific product document called a security target; this is a very small niche for hardcopy documents, but if we broadened it to cover other products, it might be more marketable; since IEEE holds the copyright on our protection profiles, we could use those as examples [Wright]
- if the goal is not very profit-oriented, are you still interested? [Farrell]
  - we publish things with as small as 250 copies, but there are costs associated with publishing and warehousing
  - if it was very targeted, we might do it in electronic form
  - our goal is to push the adoption of standards
- to make it marketable, the authors would need to do more work than if it was not so polished [Farrell]
  - you'd be taking on more effort, it would need to be good for your industry and your own professional development
- is there a minimum audience size for books or online market? [Smithson]
  - It depends, we'd need to do some market analysis
- Is this something we should do? [Wright]
  - I'm concerned that we're going to write what we think people will need to know, but we won't really find out until we've published something, then we might want to update it with new information [Smithson]
  - How do you do something that is a live document? [Wright]
  - We would update, but probably after a year or so, but you could have a link to frequently asked questions or to the direct standard
  - How would you protect that information? [Wright]
  - You could have a subscription online document of some kind [Smithson]
  - a guide would have the same issues of update as an SIN publication [Wright]
- the guide would not be needed for manufacturers because they are getting experience already [Ohta]
  - if that was the scope, then it would not be a large audience [Wright]

- we could expand its focus to include more than hardcopy devices, then it could be more marketable [Wright]
- we could even use other PPs as examples, since many don't have copyrights [Wright]
- what is the typical royalty? [Wright]
  - 10-12% of net revenue
  - for a \$60 book, it might be \$30 net revenue through IEEE channels, less if sold through Amazon because Amazon buys on consignment and takes a large percentage
- how long to publish? [Farrell]
  - about 3-4 months from final draft to publishing in hardcopy, 1-2 months for electronic form

## **INCITS CS1 update [Smithson]**

(INCITS CS1 web site: <http://cs1.incits.org/>)

- Next meeting is in January in San Jose CA

## **CCVF update [Sukert]**

(No CCVF web site)

- working on gathering input to give to CCDB for consideration in CCv4.0

## **Ballot status [Wright]**

Refer to meeting slides for detail

<http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/presentations/P2600-Dec2007.ppt>

- P2600
  - 35 members in the balloting group, invitation period is closed
  - 9 returned ballots so far, all voted affirmative
  - 0 comments so far
  - Voting period closes 20 Dec
- P2600.1/2/3/4
  - Ballot invitation is active
  - 20 people have signed up so far
  - Invitation closes 28 Dec
  - When does the ballot period start for the PPs? [Ohta]
    - It is our choice, but we need to do it within six months from 28 Dec
- next process? [Nevo]
  - assuming we get comments, we will go through ballot resolution process
  - we go through each comment and accept or reject
  - we may meet in a smaller group before the February meeting to resolve comments; everyone would be invited but not everyone may be interested

- we answer comments and create a new draft, then do a 10-day recirculation
- people can change their vote (either direction), but comments at that point are limited to what was changed
- if we have comments, then we would do another recirc
- how do you handle something that was overlooked? [Farrell]
  - we have the authority to make such changes, but we would need to do it before a recirculation if it was a technical error
- do all ballot members need to respond? [Sukert]
  - 75% need to respond and 75% of those must approve
- after recirc is done, then what? [Nevo]
  - when we have sponsor approval, we do some paperwork and then submit to revcom (review committee) of the IEEE standards board
  - revcom looks at it and recommends approval to the standards board
- how long does that take? [Nevo]
  - standards board meets quarterly, but they can do some easy approvals in between meetings by teleconference
  - submissions to the SB must be done 40 days before the meeting
  - IEEE commitment is to publish within 6 months after SB approval, can be shorter if there is not as much of a workload, it is currently running about 4 months
- So that would make P2600 published around August, PPs would be closer to the end of 2008 [Nevo]
  - We need to deal with the CCTLs, it is hard to predict
- Can we put it on commoncriteriaportal.org before then? [Smithson]
  - we can't do that because IEEE holds the copyright [Nevo]
  - One alternative we have is to pay off the IEEE to buy the copyright and then publish it freely, if we have money left over after validation, the market is small for those documents and so IEEE may sell it to us, we will need to negotiate that
- IEEE said that we should not make it public anymore [Nevo]
  - We have a password-protected area on the website
  - We should do that for P2600 now and the PPs when they go to the sponsor ballot phase
- I didn't realize that we can't make it public, I am not aware of any other PP that is only available for a fee [Smithson]
  - We should be able to negotiate something
- PPs should not be public
- Are there other IEEE standards associated with a PP? [Aubry]
  - No
- That is strange not to make it available [Aubry]
  - Compared with the cost of evaluating a product, buying an IEEE standard is a small cost

- With NIAP, you have a nondisclosure agreement and can make some things private if you consider it proprietary [Cybuck]
  - For a PP? Or an ST? [Aubry]
  - For a PP. The ST is the property of individual vendors [Cybuck]
  - A lot of recent Japanese STs are not published [Smithson]
  - You can request them, but they will be in Japanese [Aubry]
  - There is value in publicizing your ST [Cybuck]
- I thought you always needed to make the PP public [Aubry]
  - We will try to do that, but the market is small and is mostly companies in P2600
  - Other people would be interested, like customers, integrators, governments [Smithson]
- I was told that it was mandatory to publish the ST [Aubry]
  - Someone should take an action item to find out about PPs
  - {Nevo agreed to take the action item}
  - It seems like to be recognized as a CC PP, you need to make it available [Smithson]
  - I will also check with IEEE because they may not understand [Nevo]
- If we decide to buy out the copyright, we will need to make that decision because the money was paid in for validation and not for copyright [Nevo]
  - Yes, the companies that contributed would need to make that decision
- I am wondering about the case where a company writes a conformant ST and wants to get it evaluated, but they need to be able to show that the PP has been validated [Ohta]
  - We could negotiate to make a pre-publication draft available
  - But how to prove that it has been validated? [Ohta]
  - There would be a note on the validation lab web site [Cybuck]
  - There are certification reports along with links to the PPs, so even if we couldn't get copyright release, the link on commoncriteriaportal could possibly point to IEEE [Smithson]

## **TCG update [Volkoff]**

(TCG web site: <http://www.trustedcomputinggroup.org/>)

- We met on dec 5
- wrote a formal proposal to PWG asking for help
- we are asking them to create a set of hardcopy device attributes that are appropriate for network access control (NAC, NAP, TNC, and NEA)
- IETF NEA is co-chaired by Cisco and a guy from Juniper who is also the chair of the TNC workgroup

- PWG is chaired by Jerry Thrasher who is also in TCG HCWG
- Microsoft is working with TNC for NAP

## **Action items from previous meeting [Wright]**

No action items were recorded or updated on presentation slides. The action item spreadsheet was reviewed and updated.

Pre-meeting:

<http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/actionitems/P2600-action-items-20071205.xls>

End-of-meeting meeting:

<http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/actionitems/P2600-action-items-20071207.xls>

Post-meeting reconciliation:

<http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/actionitems/P2600-action-items-20071213.xls>

## **PP evaluation ad-hoc status [Nevo]**

Refer to the presentation slides:

<http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/presentations/Miami/IEEE-PP-Validation-12-2007-v3.ppt>

- 12 companies participating
- sent out 15 RFQs, 2-3 said no, 4-5 said yes
- RFQ responses due by 12/20/07
- need to make decision in January
- rechartered this ad hoc for continued work [Wright]

## **PP Guide ad-hoc status [Sukert]**

Refer to the presentation slides:

[http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/presentations/Miami/IEEE-PP-Guide-Status-12\\_2007%20v2.ppt](http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/presentations/Miami/IEEE-PP-Guide-Status-12_2007%20v2.ppt)

- had teleconferences to talk about format and content
- audience
  - ST authors
  - labs, consultants (for ST authoring)
  - customers involved in procurement
  - vendors and their developers
  - labs (for ST evaluation)
- content
  - interpretation of environments and products
  - actual examples of how to construct an ST
  - discussion of scheme-specific policies and interpretations apply

- additional explanation of app notes
- where/to whom to send questions
- why we did things the way we did it (why some threats included, others not, etc.)
- examples of confidential versus protected
- mapping of SFRs/threats/objectives to each environment
- how to deal with CC updates
- forums, mailing lists, live FAQs
- format
  - combination of paper and FAQ
  - only web-based
  - etc
- structure
  - intro
  - separate sections for different audiences
  - published main doc plus online FAQ
- schedule
  - should finish before first ST to be written
    - wouldn't the the first ST be useful input to the guide? [Wright]
    - depends on if you want to use it for the lab doing evaluation [Aubry]
    - a standard documents the outcome of decisions, but it doesn't provide an explanation of how we made those decisions [Wright]
  - initial version is high-level
  - later versions have more detailed guidance
  - start and make initial draft outlining content for Feb meeting
  - full content draft in Mar meeting
- issues
  - appropriate scope
  - choice of audience(s)
  - do we have all of the expertise needed for these audiences?
- Should we go with something like SIN? [Wright]
  - It's a useful way to publish without going through the standards approval process, but I don't think we have enough of a market to print something [Smithson]
  - Is it large enough to even go through SIN? [Volkoff]
  - Maybe not, unless we extend the scope to include more than hardcopy devices and write a more general guide on PPs and STs [Wright]
  - I don't know that we have the credibility to write something like that [Smithson]
  - There are some guides available [Ohta]
  - But has anyone put it all together? Is there a definitive book? [Wright]

- The closest thing is the ISO tech report {15446} that is currently under revision, and a book that is many years old and is based on CC 2.X [Smithson]
- We could take some of that information plus our own experience and put it in a book, more tutorial, more advice, could give examples. It is an opportunity for someone to be an IEEE author [Wright]
- It wouldn't solve our current problem about having a PP guide, it would be a completely different timeline, and it probably wouldn't spend much time on the family of PPs approach because there are so few examples [Smithson]
- My concern is that would we even have the time to do it [Sukert]
- The feedback to IEEE for now will be that we're not sure that we can use SIN at this time [Wright]
- Next step with the guide? [Wright]
  - First task was to explore requirements and issues [Sukert]
  - Could we just write an informal document and put a PDF on the web site? Would IEEE be OK with that? [Smithson]
  - Yes, but it would not get much visibility. Also, if it is an official IEEE document, then we can use examples that are IEEE copyright material [Wright]
  - We would want to pull text out of the PPs [Sukert]
  - The options are: put it on the web site, but we would have copyright issues; make it an IEEE guide, but we would go through the approval process [Smithson]
  - We could ask for 2601. I will begin talking to IEEE about the copyright issue [Wright]
  - I think we need to have the copyright release because we need to make frequent updates and that would not be possible in an IEEE Guide [Sukert]
  - Minimum time would be about six months [Wright]
  - Maybe it could be a hybrid, some basic information in a guide and then a pointer to the web site for FAQs [Smithson]
- Feedback from the working group? [Wright]
  - {crickets...}
- Keep working on it and bring an outline, maybe a detailed outline, for February
- rechartered this ad hoc for continued work [Wright]

## **P2600.1/2/3/4 comments review [Smithson]**

Refer to documents:

[http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/drafts/ProtectionProfiles/P2600.1-31a\\_ncb.pdf](http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/drafts/ProtectionProfiles/P2600.1-31a_ncb.pdf)

[http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/drafts/ProtectionProfiles/P2600.2-31a\\_ncb.pdf](http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/drafts/ProtectionProfiles/P2600.2-31a_ncb.pdf)

[http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/drafts/ProtectionProfiles/P2600.3-31a\\_ncb.pdf](http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/drafts/ProtectionProfiles/P2600.3-31a_ncb.pdf)

[http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/drafts/ProtectionProfiles/P2600.4-31a\\_ncb.pdf](http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/drafts/ProtectionProfiles/P2600.4-31a_ncb.pdf)

Refer to comments file with dispositions

[http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/comment-tracking/P2600\\_2007\\_12\\_v02.pdf](http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/comment-tracking/P2600_2007_12_v02.pdf)

- {comments were reviewed and most issues were approved, a few “submit to sponsor ballot” action items were generated related to the P2600 standard}

## **PP Annex A review [Sukert]**

Refer to document:

<http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/drafts/ProtectionProfiles/P2600.n-31a%20-%20Annex%20A%20v1.0.doc>

- {annex was reviewed and minor edits were made in place, new version to be appended to next draft of PPs}

## **PP Annex B review [Sukert]**

Refer to document:

<http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/drafts/ProtectionProfiles/P2600.n-31a%20-%20Annex%20B%20v1.0.doc>

- {annex was reviewed and minor edits were made in place, new version to be appended to next draft of PPs}

## **PP-E review [Sukert]**

Refer to document

<http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/drafts/ProtectionProfiles/P2600.5-31b.pdf>

- new abstract, scope, keywords, etc
  - abstract in other PPs came from PAR [Smithson]
- removed fax toe
- no SMI TOE because it is always on a closed network
  - how does the information get from, say, the art department to the printer? [Wright]
  - there will be an intermediate machine [Aubry]
  - there may be a job submission system [Del Re]
  - so there is no RJ-45 connector [Wright]
    - not necessarily, it will be network attached and it may be on the same network as everything else [Del Re]

- it depends on the environment, we were taking advantage of the fact that most environments are closed
    - but you still need to account for systems that have an embedded management station, internally with two NICs, one that is internal and the other connects to a regular network [Del Re]
- we made the decision not to worry about network threats on the assumption that it would not include a management station
  - wouldn't that be a problem for a company like Xerox? [Del Re]
    - I checked with our guys and they had no problem with it
    - Do they understand CC issues? [Farrell]
    - Or security? [Smithson]
  - If the management station is embedded, how can you not account for it? [Del Re]
    - We are trying to establish a common base; if you have an embedded management station, then you need to add threats and objectives beyond the PP [Aubry]
- In my experience, the most important part for security is the management, job management, and billing software, wouldn't it make sense to focus our requirements around that? [Del Re]
  - Why do we do that for production, but not for other systems? We decided that in the case of a print server, that was out of scope [Lewis]
  - This is different because it is much more integrated with the production printer [Del Re]
  - We don't have a model for this today [Aubry]
- We have options in the other profiles such as for whether you have a network or not so we don't burden everyone with required implementation of a network. Could we create a model that had such options for production printing that made the management station an option? [Smithson]
  - You would add those requirements outside of the base PP [Aubry]
  - But then you would create those requirements ad hoc, and lose the benefit of having a standard [Smithson]
  - It would depend on the implementation, some of the management stations are third-party and we couldn't certify it even if we wanted [Aubry]
- Look from the customer standpoint, don't you want to certify the whole system or just the marking engine? [Del Re]
  - The whole system, but we didn't do that for the other environments that used a print server [Lewis]

- It is quite the same, because in the print server case, we didn't reduce the threats on the MFP, you still need to protect against other connections and you still need to authenticate users. We only made sure that we could accommodate a print server as an authentication device that the MFP could use.
- There is another issue, that we are trying to create a single standard for two kinds of production systems, one is roll-fed and the other is a very fast cut-sheet machine [Lewis]
  - What do you think the security concerns are in production printing? [Ohta]
  - We did an ST for a transaction system, and the main concern is whether you have any traces of data after the job is finished, and that the management interface cannot be bridged across to the data during the job [Aubry]
- We should focus on the most important part, which is printing, no scan and copy concern [Ohta]
  - We included scan and copy because some systems have that ability
  - Then the vendor would need to certify those functions if they are present [Ohta]
  - They should be trivially simple [Smithson]
  - There is no difference from the other environments [Lewis]
- Why make a special environment for production? [Del Re]
  - There are things you can't do, like encryption because you need the performance, and authentication because some of the protocols do not have any ability to handle authentication [Aubry]
- I would still want to have a whole system certified, not just the marking engine [Del Re]
  - I agree, but why did we not require the same thing for environment A? [Lewis]
  - The software is different in production [Del Re]
  - If you are using third-party software, you can't certify it [Nevo]
- EFI gets their products certified, separately, so the customer can buy a certified EFI front end and a certified Océ printer. They might also buy a certified router or firewall, it's not like they expect to get everything in one package [Smithson]
- Is the management station always in a separate skin? [Smithson]
  - No, sometimes there is an embedded system [Del Re]
  - Is there enough in common with the embedded type, maybe it's less functional, doesn't do distributed job submission, etc., but enough in common that a baseline management station TOE could be part of the production PP and used only when

- the product contains it? Otherwise, you would just use the printer TOE? [Smithson]
- We'd need to figure out what the requirements would be for something like that
    - No traces after the job [Lewis]
    - No bridging [Aubry]
    - You're handling sensitive data like social security numbers [Lewis]
    - But that data would hit the management station first [Del Re]
  - So we're saying that if there is a disk in the management station, and a disk in the printer, you need to wipe them both after the job is done. But in the case of an office environment, you have a disk in your PC and a disk in the MFP, but we only require that you wipe the disk in the MFP. Why do the rules change? [Lewis]
    - The PC side is external and the user has control, but in the production environment, the management station is more integrated [Del Re]
    - The office customer should buy a certified print server, or a certified PC. But if the management system is inside the skin, if it is part of the product that the customer buys in one piece, then it should be certified in the same PP [Smithson]
  - Maybe this group isn't the right group to create those requirements, maybe the AFP Consortium { [www.afpcolor.org/](http://www.afpcolor.org/) } for example would be better to do it. [Lewis]
  - It's a system, and I don't think the customer would place enough value on just a piece of it [Cybuck]
    - The interaction between an MFP and a print server is generic, but the interaction between a production printer and management station is much more intimate and specific in its interfaces, protocols, [Del Re]
    - Just because a system is complex, isn't it still valuable to be able to certify that you wipe the drive and prevent bridging from the management interface? [Lewis]
    - You have that in other profiles [Del Re]
    - You don't have wiping drives without encryption [Lewis]
    - You do in environment C [Smithson]
    - But you don't have strong management data protection and no user data protection in C [Nevo]
  - I think we need to answer whether the high speed device that's used in a corporate repro center needs its own environment. Wouldn't they be happy with A or B? [Del Re]
    - We asked DAPS and they didn't want certified production machines [Aubry]
    - There is only one certified production system now, from Océ, so do we need a standard? [Aubry]

- As soon as you have two more more vendors writing security targets, then you're better off with a standard [Lewis]
- Is the complexity and differences so large that we can't do a PP? [Wright]
  - We should do a minimum requirement [Nevo]
  - I think the commonalities exist, but how they come about differ [Del Re]
  - Could be multiple manufacturers, multiple skins, ... [Wright]
- One approach would be to have a PP for the printing part, and another PP for the management part. If you have separate products, then you certify them separately. If you have them integrated, then you write an ST that conforms to both PPs. Maybe we aren't the right group to write the management PP, but it's an approach we could consider [Smithson]
- Is PP-E very different from PP-C? [Aubry]
  - I haven't checked. I suspect there is a lot of similarity
- The people I talked to are seeing an increased awareness of security issues than before, but they are lagging the office environment. That doesn't mean that they want certified products, but it is something that I think will come
  - Like in the office environment, where just an overwrite kit was good enough in the past now they want the whole system [Del Re]
  - They also want separation of bridging from management [Aubry]
- We need to decide if we are doing one production environment, or two, and are there customer needs for both [Farrell]
- I could go to the AFPC and talk with them [Lewis]
  - Would it be appropriate to present our work to that group? [Wright]
  - There are about 30 companies in AFPC, just a few overlap like InfoPrint, Xerox, Océ. [Lewis]
  -
- {moving on...}
- In the print TOE, the only threats we deal with are for protecting TSF data, and there is identification, authentication, and authorization associated with that
- A major change is that the Originator and Delegate are replaced by an Operator
  - The I&A for Operator is more for accountability and permission to run the machine than it is for data access control [Smithson]
- Scan and copy are pretty much the same as for print
- We kept the DSR TOE because there are some document storage issues, and here there is some user data protection

- Is DSR in this environment for something like you store a template and then use it over and over again while applying variable data? [Smithson]
- Yes, that's the idea
- It may be better to use a different name, since it isn't really DSR in the office MFP sense [Smithson]
- And you don't submit a document with one job and retrieve it with another, the template is more of an initialization step at the beginning of a job [Aubry]
- Will you keep PP-E up to date with changes that we're making in the other PPs [Wright]
  - Yes, it is better to keep them up to date than to try to do it all at once later

### **Closing [Wright]**

- Next meeting is at Canon Development Americas in Irvine CA (near Orange County airport) on February 5-6. There will be a TCG HCWG meeting at the same location on February 4 (for TCG members only), and PWG meetings on February 7-8. No hotel blocks have been arranged, "you're on your own". For more information, refer to: <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/meetings.html>.

**\* Chaos resumed at ~1:00PM, 12/7/2007 \***