

**IEEE P2600 Meeting #40**  
**December 11-12, 2008**  
**Equitrac, Plantation FL**

**Attendees**

Chair: Don Wright, Lexmark  
Vice Chair: Lee Farrell, Canon  
Secretary / Lead Editor (2600.n): Brian Smithson, Ricoh

Carmen Aubry, Océ (by phone)  
Peter Cybuck, Sharp  
Nick Del Re, Canon  
Ron Nevo, Sharp  
Glen Petrie, Epson (by phone)  
Amir Shahindoust, Toshiba (by phone)  
Alan Sukert, Xerox (by phone)  
Jerry Thrasher, Lexmark (by phone)

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  |
| Introductions.....                               | 2  |
| Agenda review.....                               | 2  |
| Minutes and Agenda approvals .....               | 2  |
| IEEE patent policy .....                         | 2  |
| IEEE WG guidelines.....                          | 2  |
| Officers and Editors.....                        | 2  |
| PWG-IDS update [Nevo].....                       | 2  |
| TCG update [Smithson] .....                      | 3  |
| CCVF update [Sukert].....                        | 3  |
| Action items from previous meeting [Wright]..... | 3  |
| PP evaluation status [Nevo].....                 | 4  |
| Email issues [Wright] .....                      | 6  |
| P2600.1/2/3/4 Comments review [Smithson] .....   | 8  |
| PP Guide review [Sukert].....                    | 8  |
| PP-E review [Sukert].....                        | 9  |
| Schedule [Wright].....                           | 9  |
| Meeting schedule updates [Wright] .....          | 10 |
| Next meeting details [Wright] .....              | 10 |
| Closing [Wright].....                            | 11 |

\* **Called to order at 9:15 AM EDT 12/11/2008** \*

## **Administrivia [Wright]**

The following administrative items were reviewed:

### ***Introductions***

### ***Agenda review***

Refer to meeting slides for detail <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/presentations/P2600-Dec2008.ppt>

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

The October 2008 minutes were approved without changes. The December 2008 agenda was presented and approved with no changes.

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

See slides for the policy: <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/presentations/P2600-Dec2008.ppt>

Patent policy was reviewed. No holders of potentially essential patents or applications were identified.

### ***IEEE WG guidelines***

IEEE guidelines on such things as inappropriate topics were reviewed. No issues were identified.

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

No changes.

Officers:

Chair: Don Wright, Lexmark.

Vice Chair: Lee Farrell, Canon.

Secretary: Brian Smithson, Ricoh.

Lead editors:

Editor (2600): Jerry Thrahser, Lexmark.

Editor (2600.n): Brian Smithson, Ricoh.

## **PWG-IDS update [Nevo]**

(PWG web site: <http://www.pwg.org>)

- HCD assessment attributes have been drafted
- A protocol binding document for NAP is being developed, and expected to be complete in Q1 2009
- A protocol binding document for NEA is also planned, likely to be complete in Q1~Q2 2009

- IDS is discussing these with Microsoft and Cisco to finalize the specs and perhaps get those companies' endorsements
- status and schedule information is in the P2600 meeting slides, <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/presentations/P2600-Dec2008.ppt>

## TCG update [Smithson]

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

- The hardcopy workgroup (HCWG) may be re-started after a long period of inactivity
- Shah Bhatti (Samsung) is coordinating this effort
- We are considering having a conference call to discuss it in January
  - {some discussion about TCG members versus non-members who might want to become members}
  - the teleconference should be announced on the P2600 and PWG mailing lists (in addition to an announcement on the HCWG mailing list) and the initial teleconference should be open to non-members

## CCVF update [Sukert]

(no CCVF web site yet)

- Most of the activity has been email traffic about coordinating CCVF liaisons with the CCDB working groups
- There was some interest in CCVF activities at a recent Software Assurance WG meeting [Cybuck]

## 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-20081210.xls>

End-of-meeting meeting:

<http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/actionitems/P2600-action-items-20081212.xls>

Post-meeting reconciliation:

<http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/actionitems/P2600-action-items-20081218.xls>

- AI #246 (IEEE copyright issues for PPs) is still being worked on.
- We have a draft license that will make it possible for ST authors to use PP text in their STs  
(see <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/presentations/Plantation2008/License%20Agreement%20for%202600.1,%20.2,%20.3,%20.4%20%20Nov.%2016.pdf>)

- Is that for anyone, or just for sponsor companies? [Cybuck]
  - There is no text about that in the license
  - Use of the PP text was one of the original sponsor benefits [Farrell]
  - What would a non-sponsor need to do to write an ST? [Smithson]
  - They would need to negotiate the license with IEEE. It would be free to sponsors

## PP evaluation status [Nevo]

Refer to presentation <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/presentations/Plantation2008/IEEE-PP-Validation-12-2008.ppt>

- NIAP will link to the IEEE site for free access to PP (when we get a license buy-out)
- NIAP has drafted a cover page (see presentation slides)
- NIAP is assigning an evaluator and will begin looking before atsec is done
- atsec will give us ETR by end of year
  - they say it is a stable PP
  - schedule issue with RevCom, because RevCom deadline is 2/6 for an approval date of 3/19 [Smithson]
  - we can submit to RevCom when we start final recirculation [Wright]
  - so when we have all comments from atsec, NIAP, the WG, etc, we can submit to RevCom [Wright]
  - if we don't make 2/6, there is a late-march deadline with approval in late May [Wright]
- IEEE wanted about \$95K to buy out copyright for all four PPs, now we have negotiated to \$46,800 [Wright]
  - we have \$30K so we need another \$16,800 [Wright]
  - companies will object to paying more money, we should not pay more
  - this is how IEEE-SA pays for their operations; they sell standards [Wright]
- there was some discussion that we could get a subset of the PPs for \$30K
  - that was before they came down from \$95K to \$46K [Wright]
- it will be difficult to explain to our companies why we need to pay more money
  - if six companies pay, it's only \$6K each, not worth arguing about [Wright]
  - that doesn't mean that companies won't argue about it [Smithson]

- having a PP to conform to will save companies a lot more than the money needed to make the PPs available [Wright]
- what happens if we do not pay? [Farrell]
  - then NIAP won't evaluate it and it won't be a US government PP [Wright]
  - BSI has the same position, they won't evaluate it [Smithson]
- One thing we could try is to offer to make the PP Guide an IEEE informative guide that they can sell [Smithson]
- Will we need to go through this if we do a production printing PP? [Sukert]
  - Yes, even if we get done at BSI [Smithson]
  - Should we start negotiations with IEEE about that? [Farrell]
  - We might negotiate to agree to some terms with IEEE now that allow us to do a derivative work [Wright]
  - And also amendments to the first four PPs [Smithson]
- Another reason to go ahead and pay what is necessary is that NIAP isn't accepting any ST evaluation projects that are not either EAL4 or based on a US Government PP. If we don't get PP-A as a US Government PP, it will cost a lot more to get an EAL4 evaluation of a standalone ST. [Wright]
- What is our time constraint on this? [Farrell]
  - BSI won't start until we resolve this, and NIAP has only started with the assumption that PP-A will be resolved
- Can NIAP help pay? [Farrell]
  - No, we asked them already
  - How about DAPS? [Farrell]
  - No
- If we do need to raise \$16,800, do we need to collect from all of the original 14 sponsors? And if one can't or won't, then what? [Smithson]
  - We can't give anyone an explicit veto right on this [Wright]
  - That makes it a little more difficult because we don't know the exact amount to ask for, it depends on how many companies will pay [Smithson]
- It will help to show some value for the extra money, otherwise it just looks like we should have anticipated this in our original budget for PP evaluation [Smithson]
  - We raised the original money to do the evaluation. Now we hit a new roadblock, NIAP and BSI won't do the evaluation unless the PPs are available for free, so we will apply what we have left over but we need a little more. It saves us from needing to do EAL4 evaluations. [Wright]
- {some additional discussion about next steps with IEEE}

## Email issues [Wright]

- **Proposal to change FTP\_CIP\_EXP.1 so that confidentiality and integrity could be selected instead of (both) required.**
  - Originating  
email: <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/email/msg01232.html>
  - Resolution: split it up with a selection of either integrity or both integrity and confidentiality.
- **Changing the way rules are specified from "his/her own documents" to "his/her own jobs" (October Comment 13)**
  - Originating  
email: <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/email/msg01220.html>
  - Response to Carmen's  
comments: <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/email/msg01224.html>
  - Tom Benkart's  
comment: <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/email/msg01225.html>
  - Resolution: use "his/her own function data"
- **Removing the tabular access control rules from the Common PP and replicating them in each of the applicable SFR packages (October Comment 4)**
  - Originating  
email: <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/email/msg01221.html>  
[Proposal](#)
  - Response to Carmen's  
comments: <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/email/msg01226.html>
  - Hirota-san's  
comments: <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/email/msg01234.html>
  - Response to Hirota-san:  
<http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/email/msg01244.html>
  - Resolution: add text similar to what is in the DSR package about "authorized by some other role or mechanism" in other packages, based on comments from Hirota-san and perhaps atsec
- **Specifying which (if any) of the audit and management suggestions that are in our extended components should be**

**required or recommended in the SFR packages (October Comment 12)**

Originating

email: <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/email/msg01239.html>

- Resolution: in NVS, recommend both audit items (failure condition that prohibits the function to work properly, and detected attempts to bypass the functionality), no requirements or recommendations for management.
- Resolution: in SMI, no requirements or recommendations for audit or management.

- **Conflict between "major security feature" that all users are I&A'd and anonymous senders of incoming faxes.**

Originating

email: <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/email/msg01241.html>

Haapanen's

comment: <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/email/msg01242.html>

Response to Haapanen's

comment: <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/email/msg01245.html>

Haapanen's follow-up

comment: <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/email/msg01246.html>

Response to Haapanen's follow-up

comment: <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/email/msg01247.html>

Randy's

comment: <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/email/msg01243.html>

- Resolution: Add text to 5.4.1 (and an AppNote to the Fax section?) stating that: It may not be possible to identify or authenticate the sender of an incoming fax. The owner of a received fax is an administrator or other user designated by an administrator.

- **Proposed text for SAR rationale (AI #483)**

Originating

email: <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/email/msg01228.html>

- Resolution: use text from the originating email.

- **Question/issue with network print job owners and I&A.**

Originating

email: <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/email/msg01216.html>

- Resolution: If a protocol doesn't provide appropriate capabilities as specified by the PP and ST for authenticating and securing the channel then it should be turned off in the evaluated configuration. No changes to PP.

- **Question about FMT\_MSA.1 and FMT\_MSA.3: attributes are TSF data, but the SFR refers to User data.**

Originating

email: <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/email/msg01217.html>

Response: <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/email/msg01218.html>

Follow-

up: <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/email/msg01222.html>

Response to follow-

up: <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/email/msg01223.html>

Benkart's

comment: <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/email/msg01219.html>

- Resolution: no action required. The SFR is poorly worded but we cannot change it.

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

Refer to comments:

[http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/comment-tracking/P2600X\\_2008\\_12\\_v01.pdf](http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/comment-tracking/P2600X_2008_12_v01.pdf)

and comments with resolutions:

[http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/comment-tracking/P2600X\\_2008\\_12\\_v02.pdf](http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/comment-tracking/P2600X_2008_12_v02.pdf)

for these PPs:

[http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/drafts/ProtectionProfiles/P2600.1-40b\\_ncb.pdf](http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/drafts/ProtectionProfiles/P2600.1-40b_ncb.pdf)

[http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/drafts/ProtectionProfiles/P2600.2-40b\\_ncb.pdf](http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/drafts/ProtectionProfiles/P2600.2-40b_ncb.pdf)

[http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/drafts/ProtectionProfiles/P2600.3-40b\\_ncb.pdf](http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/drafts/ProtectionProfiles/P2600.3-40b_ncb.pdf)

[http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/drafts/ProtectionProfiles/P2600.4-40b\\_ncb.pdf](http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/drafts/ProtectionProfiles/P2600.4-40b_ncb.pdf)

- {Most comments were editorial or non-controversial. Refer to the comment resolution files. One thing was noted by Aubry: the NVS package in PP-B protects User Data and TSF Data, but we had previously agreed that it should only protect TSF Data; this will be corrected along with other approved comments.}

## **PP Guide review [Sukert]**

Refer to comments:

[http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/comment-tracking/P2600X\\_2008\\_12\\_v01.pdf](http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/comment-tracking/P2600X_2008_12_v01.pdf)

and comments with resolutions:

[http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/comment-tracking/P2600X\\_2008\\_12\\_v02.pdf](http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/comment-tracking/P2600X_2008_12_v02.pdf)

and to the Guide draft:

<http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/drafts/PP%20Guide/P2600%20PP%20Guide-40b.pdf>

- What is new in this draft:
  - Clause 5 reorganized and updated
  - Need to work on app notes and FAQs
- Comments were reviewed and resolved (see comment documents)

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

Refer to document:

<http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/drafts/ProtectionProfiles/P2600.5-40b.pdf>

- AFPC may not want to participate in joint development
  - they may want us to develop it and give it to them to use
- we have the PP expertise, but not so much expertise in production printing
  - they are expecting us to take the lead, so we need to get them involved
- work with Harry Lewis to get a core group established and then look at getting a PAR [Wright]
- will keep updating it according to PP-A updates

## **Schedule [Wright]**

Refer to document:

<http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/presentations/lexington2008/schedule40a.pdf>

- need to start the final recirc by Feb 5 then we are OK to submit to revcom
  - recirc for 10 days
- is it a good idea to do a recirc after atsec's comments? [Smithson]
  - would be good, maybe the week of jan 5th
  - only take absolutely wrong stuff, not editorial
- how do we handle atsec's comments, we don't have a meeting in January [Smithson]
  - quick e-mail review, only to see that the updated drafts faithfully incorporate approved and atsec changes
- if we miss feb 6 for mar 19 approval, we can do an off-cycle submission around end of march for approval around mid May
- action item (Smithson): update schedule
  - remove older stuff
  - add early consideration and mid year RevCom cycles
  - final pub 3-6 months out
- if PPs are certified but not yet approved by IEEE, how can it be used? [Sukert]
  - IEEE can make an unapproved draft available, and after approval but before publication, an approved draft

- after NIAP approval, then IEEE editors work on it, will that break the certification? [Cybuck]
  - no technical changes can be made after sponsor ballot
  - we will also review IEEE editor changes [Smithson]
- where will the B/C/D be posted? [Cybuck]
  - should be posted on BSI site and/or CC portal [Smithson]

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

The most current P2600 meeting information is always available at: <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/meetings.html>

#### **February 19-20, 2009**

- Waikoloa Beach Marriott, 69-275 Waikoloa Beach Drive, Waikoloa, Hawaii, HI (along the Kona coast)
- PWG is meeting at this location, February 16-18

#### **March 26-27, 2009 (tentative)**

- Location TBD, likely somewhere on the east coast, not far north

#### **May 20-21, 2009 (tentative)**

- Location TBD, likely in California

#### **July 14-15, 2009 (tentative)**

- Location TBD

No schedule conflicts or issues were identified during this meeting.

### **Next meeting details [Wright]**

Refer to meeting slides for detail: <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/presentations/P2600-Dec2008.ppt> and to the meeting web page for most current status of upcoming meetings: <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/meetings.html>

- Deadline for posting documents: February 5, 2009
- Deadline for posting comments: February 12, 2009
- Next meeting will be February 19-20, 2009
  - Waikoloa Beach Marriott  
69-275 Waikoloa Beach Drive  
Waikoloa, Hawaii (along the Kona Coast)
  - Sleeping Rooms -- \$200 per night plus \$20 resort fee
  - Cutoff: 26 January 2009
  - \$75 per day meeting fee
  - PWG meeting at this location on February 16-18
  - PWG will have a registration page for both meetings

## **Closing [Wright]**

*\* Adjourned at 10:55 AM EDT, 12/12/2008 \**