

IEEE P2600 Meeting #32
February 5-6, 2008
Canon Development Americas, Irvine CA

Attendees

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

Shah Bhatti, Samsung
Nancy Chen, Oki Data
Nick Del Re, Canon
Kim Dongkeun, Samsung
Satoshi Fujitani, Ricoh
Tom Haapanen, Equitrac
Harry Lewis, InfoPrint
Ron Nevo, Sharp
Ole Skov, MPI
Alan Sukert, Xerox
Brian Volkoff, HP (day 1)
Bill Wagner, TIC
Craig Whittle, Sharp (day 2)
Sameer Yami, Toshiba

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
IEEE WG guidelines.....	2
Officers and Editors.....	2
Meeting schedule updates [Wright]	2
INCITS CS1 update [Thrasher].....	3
CCVF update [Sukert].....	3
Ballot status [Wright]	4
Action items from previous meeting [Wright].....	4
TCG update [Volkoff]	7
PP evaluation ad-hoc status [Nevo]	8
PP Guide ad-hoc status [Sukert].....	10
SFR ad-hoc status [Smithson]	11

CIM Mapping for PP-B [Nevo].....	12
WG Ballot on P2600.1/2/3/4 [Smithson].....	13
PP-E discussion [Sukert]	14
Schedule review [Wright]	14
Closing [Wright].....	15

*** Called to order at 9:15 AM 2/5/2008 ***

Administrivia [Wright]

The following administrative items were reviewed:

Agenda review

Refer to meeting slides for detail

<http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/presentations/P2600-Feb2008.ppt>

Minutes and Agenda approvals

The December 2007 minutes were approved without changes. The February 2008 agenda was presented and approved without changes.

IEEE patent policy

Patent policy was reviewed. There were no patent disclosures made by attendees. Note that there are a few new words in the IEEE patent policy. See slides for highlighted changes:

<http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/presentations/P2600-Feb2008.ppt>

No disclosures were made by WG attendees.

IEEE WG guidelines

IEEE guidelines on such things as inappropriate topics were reviewed.

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]

Mar 11-12, 2008

- Fuji-Xerox, Midtown West, 9-7-3, Akasaka Minato-ku, Tokyo 107-0052, Japan (more details are on the meetings page).

Apr 14-15, 2008

- PWG, Courtyard Phoenix Mesa, 1221 South Westwood, Mesa, AZ 85210. **Note that PWG has a commitment to fill a block of rooms at this hotel and so it is important that attendees use this hotel.**

May 21-22, 2008

- Xerox, Rochester NY area

Jun 23-24, 2008

- InfoPrint, Boulder/Denver, with PWG

Aug (week of 11th), 2008 -- tentative

- Sharp Labs, Camas WA, 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>

INCITS CS1 update [Thrasher]

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

- Met at Hitachi in Santa Clara, Jan 23-24
 - The draft Standard for Protection of Personally Identifiable Information ran into too many copyright issues with PCI
 - now being tied into a project by NIST for SMB security guidelines
- There is an SC27 meeting in Madrid to discuss the future of security evaluation, e.g., CC version 4.0
- CCVF is also talking about this meeting and intends to supply some input

CCVF update [Sukert]

(No CCVF web site)

- The US Army wrote a letter regarding IA tools and products with new requirements, and it is causing quite a bit of discussion in the CCVF community
 - NIAP certified, not just CC certified
 - FIPS-140
 - another certification beyond that, based on mission
 - also
 - IPv6 capable
 - Kerberos and CAC
 - then it could be put on the list for Army procurement
- DOD "fixing" product security evaluation process [Thrasher]
 - Article in Federal Communication Week (or something) Jan 22 2008)

- problem is that after CC, a lot of additional certification and accreditation is done
- they want to standardize the process as much as possible
- there will be someone at the next INCITS/CS1 meeting to talk about it

Ballot status [Wright]

Refer to meeting slides for detail

<http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/presentations/P2600-Feb2008.ppt>

- P2600 (main standard)
 - original ballot 89% affirmative
 - resolution committee met by teleconference
 - recirc #1 97% affirmative
 - IEEE editors and legal came in with some last minute requests
 - one more recirc, currently at 100% affirmative
 - recirc 2 closes on 11 Feb
 - will submit to RevCom for their March meeting
 - approved document at end of that meeting
 - final publication date TBD, but within 6 months
- P2600.n (PPs)
 - ballot bodies are ready
 - 26 members in ballot body for .1 and .2
 - 27 members in ballot body for .3 and .4
 - It will be a 30 day ballot
 - need to send them to m.kipness@ieee.org for editorial review ASAP, and remind them about the format for PPs

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-20080103.xls>

End-of-meeting meeting:

<http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/actionitems/P2600-action-items-20080205.xls>

Post-meeting reconciliation:

<http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/actionitems/P2600-action-items-20080208.xls>

Two action items generated some discussion of record:

- AI#246 IEEE copyright terms [Wright]

- we are talking to IEEE about making PPs freely available on scheme web site
 - can also be sold on IEEE site
 - is this holding up our decision on PP validation because it is sharing budget? [Smithson]
 - no, our first priority is to make the best choice on PP validation and then if there is money left over we can use, good, otherwise we could go back for more money if needed
 - we will get an initial answer from IEEE by 2/15/08
- AI#448 Propose scope of HCD User Data for salvage threats [Nevo]

{The following discussion actually took place on 2/6 because the action item was not completed until then}

 - Proposal was presented (refer to <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/presentations/OrangeCounty2008/Scope%20of%20HCD%20Data.doc>)
 - Issue was what to protect for document data
 - We decided that all document temporary data needed to be protected by encryption and overwrite because anyone could remove a hard disk and salvage the data
 - We decided it should be done in all environments, A B C & D
 - It is only one disk? [Chen]
 - Yes, because for memory it would be too complicated
 - Your proposal is for all environments? [Thrasher]
 - No, overwrite for all environments but encryption only in environment A; that would give us some more differentiation between A and B
 - If you don't do encryption, overwrite can be interrupted
 - Is this conflicting with P2600 standard? [Sukert]
 - In the compliance clause?
 - Yes, we wouldn't want to come out with a PP that was conflicting with the P2600 [Sukert]
 - We could always do an amendment [Wright]
 - The action item was only to try to scope the data that is to be protected, not to redefine in which environments it is protected or how it is protected; we already require encryption and overwrite in environment B, for example [Smithson]
 - I agree, I don't want to remove encryption from B [Sukert]
 - Otherwise what is the difference between A and B? [Nevo]

- There are more logging requirements, and encryption of document data over networks, but I don't think we should be revisiting these things. The task was to define the scope of what is to be protected – deliberately-stored images, or swap files and other operating system artifacts, or whatever. [Smithson]
- So are you proposing that the scope should be all forms of document data, including swap files? [Smithson]
 - You need to protect it, yes. All forms.
 - Are you really going to burden your operating system with distinguishing document data from other data and encrypting or overwriting it? [Smithson]
 - If you don't, it is possible from someone to retrieve it from a hard disk.
 - It is possible, but everything is possible. We don't protect against EMI sniffing the machine, or recover frequently-written data from powered-off RAM, but we don't go that far.
 - It is not trivial to recover data from swap files, it isn't a linear file of document data, it is an image of memory in whatever structure the system uses [Haapanen]
- There are hard drives that do encryption on all data, so you wouldn't need to burden the operating system [Thrasher]
 - But you need both encryption and overwrite [Smithson]
- We didn't go into specifics about swap data, we just said temporary buffered data
 - Unfortunately, that is the task we were intending to perform [Smithson]
- Do we really need to have overwriting in environment D? [Yami]
 - I don't think so, but we are not trying to redefine where things are protected, we are trying to scope the protection where it is already specified [Smithson]
- I don't think we should change what protection is required in which environment. [Smithson]
 - It's already in the main P2600 document [Thrasher]
- There is no assumption of privacy in environment C [Wright]
 - But we do have overwrite required for C [Smithson]
- Regarding scope, I don't think that "all", or leaving it unspecified, is acceptable. [Smithson]
 - We didn't think it was possible to specify, so we thought "temporary buffered data" was good enough language and each vendor could decide

- I'll need to think about this more, it wasn't received within the comment time limit and so there has been no time to review and consider the proposal [Smithson]
 - I would need to talk to people also, but I don't think we should include swap space [Sukert]
- Can we put something in here and then let people comment on it so we can move forward with this comment? [Wright]
 - We could leave it as is, because I think the proposed definition is not more specific except that it says "temporary" which limits in the wrong direction [Smithson]
 - You agree that it is not defined now [Wagner]
 - Yes [Smithson]
 - And it should remain undefined? [Wagner]
 - No [Smithson]
- Can we use Aubry's proposal? [Wright]
 - That proposal is that all data is protected by encryption, but only easily-identifiable things like spool files would require overwrite [Smithson]
 - That is more specific. Is that what we want? [Nevo]
 - I think we want to characterize it somehow, but maybe in an app note so we don't artificially imply or define implementation [Smithson]
 - Structured temporary data like spool files versus unstructured data like swap files [Thrasher]
 - We can't really say temporary, because you have cases like document servers [Smithson]
 - Structured stored... [Thrasher]
- I don't think we should try to write it here, I think we should create a new action item and work on it over email and then submit the proposal to sponsor ballot, maybe another ad hoc ; there must be something in computer science that distinguishes between whole deliberate files versus OS artifacts so we can describe this without using industry terms like spool files and bitmaps [Smithson]

{ad hoc created with Aubry to chair, Thrasher, Nevo, Smithson, Sukert as members}

TCG update [Volkoff]

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

- A proposal was sent to PWG to develop hardcopy device attributes that are appropriate for network access control (NAC, NAP, TNC, and NEA)
- Imaging Device Security WG is on the agenda for discussion at PWG plenary on Thursday 2/7/2008

- The charter for this WG is narrowly defined around the definition of attributes for network access control support (Refer to this document: <ftp://ftp.pwg.org/pub/pwg/BOFs/ids/wd-ids-charter-20080118.pdf>)

PP evaluation ad-hoc status [Nevo]

{Presentation cannot be published because it contains sensitive cost and other information from CCTL bidders}

- CCTL selection
 - we were chartered to review the RFQ responses and make a recommendation for the 12 sponsor companies to choose a CCTL
 - we have not collected all of the money from sponsor companies, Oki has a second payment due and Konica Minolta joined late and we are awaiting their payment
 - we received seven responses
 - three labs are out of our budget range, and one other did not want to do a fixed price contract

- did the fixed price mean “not to exceed”? [Wright]

- {we reviewed that RFQ response and there was no indication that it would be “not to exceed”}

- We had conference calls and most were in agreement on one of the remaining three.

{Specific discussion of the RFQ responses and candidate CCTLs is not published in the minutes because it would disclose sensitive information from the RFQ responses}

{Carmen Aubry’s comments and CCTL choice on behalf of Océ was read to the group from email}

- How do we handle the opinions of companies who sponsored the validation but who are not at this meeting? [Smithson]
 - I assume that they abstain [Wright]
 - I would not come to that conclusion [Farrell]
 - Konica Minolta, Kyocera Mita, Océ, and Fuji Xerox are not here. We have an opinion for Océ. [Wright]
 - I will not be here tomorrow but could vote today [Volkoff]
 - We could email them an ask to send their vote by tomorrow [Smithson]
 - We should send the presentation slides. [Wright]
 - One of the slides compares the CCTLs but I do not think it was reached by consensus [Farrell]
 - We will finalize the slides and send them at lunchtime. People in Japan can respond tonight, people in the US can respond this afternoon. [Wright]

- *{Discussion of contacts for non-attending companies}*
- Nancy Chen didn't receive a notice that the vote would be taken at this meeting [Farrell]
 - It is in the posted agenda [Wright]
 - Those who are not in the ad hoc committee have not seen this presentation [Farrell]
- Let's take a straw vote to see if there is an overwhelming vote [Wright]
 - *{4 for atsec, 2 for BAH, others abstain}*
 - Not an overwhelming opinion [Wright]
- Let's reach a consensus on the comparison slide [Nevo]
 - Maybe instead of showing some number of "+"s in a subjective comparison, why don't we put the actual data in those cells? We could list the prices, the number of evaluations, etc. [Smithson]
 - *{Agreed; the group put real data in the comparison table so that sponsoring companies could draw their own subjective conclusions; the outcome is not published because of sensitive information.}*
- We will vote tomorrow. [Wright]

{The following discussions took place on 2/6}

- CCTL selection voting results: [Wright]
 - Fuji Xerox (by email): atsec
 - Océ (by email): atsec
 - Ricoh: atsec
 - Xerox: atsec
 - Canon: atsec
 - Oki Data: BAH
 - Sharp: BAH
 - Lexmark: atsec
 - Toshiba: atsec
 - HP (voted yesterday): atsec
 - Konica Minolta did not respond to email requests, therefore abstained
 - Kyocera Mita did not respond to email requests, therefore abstained
- Totals: atsec (8), BAH (2), abstained (2): atsec selected
- Validation option selection: [Wright]
 - It is the same price, let's do all four PPs (Option 3) [Smithson]
 - We should prioritize Option 1, 2, then 3, if we have problems and we should have them do it at NIAP [Sukert]
 - It is good to have an option to use BSI in case there are problems with NIAP [Smithson]

- I would revisit our vote if we did not require NIAP [Thrasher]
 - I have no problem with requiring NIAP [Smithson]
 - {no objections}
 - Decision: option 3, done at NIAP, with priority on PP A then B then C then D [Wright]
- Sponsor PR
 - IEEE will issue 3 or 4 press releases with link to backgrounder
 - Is this built into the IEEE's \$10,000 fee? [Wright]
 - Yes
 - There will be a few sentences about each sponsor in the backgrounder; I will contact each sponsoring company for that information
 - We talked about having a web page that lists certified products, but IEEE wants to charge money for that
 - We could put something on the P2600 web site, a news page or something that thanks the sponsors, lists certified products [Wright]
 - We cannot put company logos on the documents
 - We can put text on the documents in the front matter [Wright]
 - Should I put that in the next draft? [Smithson]
 - Yes, write something that seems neutral and let the IEEE editors look at it [Wright]
 - Would the "key messages" on the press releases be statements from executives or something like that? [Smithson]
 - Yes

PP Guide ad-hoc status [Sukert]

Refer to the presentation slides:

http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/presentations/OrangeCounty2008/IEEE-PP-Guide-02_2008%20v1.ppt

- approach
 - initial version, high level guidance
 - later versions, more detailed guidance
- schedule
 - march meeting scope and outline
 - may meeting draft of introduction, initial content, initial FAQs
- but who will do it, what will be the timeframe?
 - if this WG ends in June, how do we handle it?
 - don't necessarily need to have F2F meetings [Wright]
 - is it under P2600? is a new PAR needed?
 - no PAR needed if it is not an IEEE Guide [Wright]

- rechartered this ad hoc for continued work [Wright]

SFR ad-hoc status [Smithson]

Refer to the submitted comments from this ad-hoc:

<http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/presentations/OrangeCounty2008/SFR-ad-hoc-comments.pdf>

and the related proposals for SFR enhancement and Protected/Confidential data categories:

<http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/presentations/OrangeCounty2008/SFR%20enhancement%20proposals%20v1.2.doc>

<http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/presentations/OrangeCounty2008/Prot-Conf%20Data%20Categories%20v3.doc>

- We split into two subgroups, one reviewed all of the SFRs and the other looked at examples of data that we should recommend to be categorized as TSF Protected or TSF Confidential
- SFRs
 - The major changes are in the areas of access control and information flow control SFPs and their related SFRs. There were two approaches proposed, one was to implement the SFPs in the SFRs and the other was to make the SFPs more clear and concise and then reference them more clearly in the SFRs.
 - We chose to make the SFPs and SFRs more clear because implementing all of the access control and information flow control rules in the SFRs would make it very difficult to understand the overall rules that are being required.
 - One other problem was fixed: the access control SFPs contained information that was relevant to identification and authentication, and therefore didn't belong in the access control SFP; it was removed and those rules were placed in the FIA-class SFRs
- Data categories
 - Existing STs from hardcopy devices (any manufacturer) were reviewed to see what kinds of data they categorized as CONF and PROT.
 - One distinction to note is that
 - identification information (e.g., usernames) would be protected, and
 - authentication information (e.g. passwords) and any credentials (e.g. for an HCD to log into a remote email or file server) would be confidential
 - these recommendations will be placed in some kind of app note associated with the Entity definition for Objects (Assets) at the beginning of each PP [Smithson]

*{some minor changes were made to the files during the meeting:
<http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/presentations/OrangeCounty2008/SFR%20enhancement%20proposals%20v1.3.doc> and
<http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/presentations/OrangeCounty2008/Prot-Conf%20Data%20Categories%20v4.doc>}*

CIM Mapping for PP-B [Nevo]

Refer to the updated file from this meeting:

<http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/presentations/OrangeCounty2008/Basic%20Robustness%20CIM%20mapping%20to%20PP-b%20Requirements-v2.xls>

{This was an older item, we previously decided not to comply with NIAPs CIM because they have not published final versions for CCv3.1 and we also do not think some of their requirements would be appropriate for hardcopy devices, so we reviewed this document to see what would be required to change if a vendor wanted to comply with CIM in an ST}

- FAU_STG.3 – is for actions to take when an audit log reaches some limit (not full yet); we could add it with not too much harm [Smithson]
- FDP_RIP.2 – it is like RIP.1, but instead of being able to choose which objects are given residual protection, you must protect all objects; I don't think we can do that [Smithson]
- FIA_SOS.2 – we don't typically generate secrets [Smithson]
- ALC_AFL.2 – gets into notifying customers with guidance about problems [Sukert]
- FMT_MOF.1 – this for who can enable/disable/change security functions on the device [Smithson]
 - Seems like something we should have [Wright]
 - Restricts the ability of who can do it, like to administrators [Sukert]
 - Maybe we didn't want to imply that we have that functionality if the function was always on and couldn't be turned off [Smithson]
 - That would be OK if we assign the value "nobody" [Wright]
 - Yes, so this one could be added without much harm [Smithson]
- FIA_ATD.1 – we had previously removed it because it wasn't a dependency of others, it would not harm things to put it back [Smithson]
- We should pay attention to the NIAP refinements, they are likely to be troublesome to fulfill and doing so would give us problems in other schemes [Smithson]
- Are we confident of the differences that we're looking at? [Thrasher]

- This is a draft CIM, there hasn't been a final version published [Smithson]
- Is there a way we could put the changes in an app note? [Thrasher]
- We talked about doing that and decided not to because it ties our PP to another document which hasn't been finished, or even if it was finished, might change [Smithson]
- We would need to say "the currently published document" [Wright]
- This would be a good candidate to put in a PP guide [Smithson]
- FAU_SAR.3 is selective audit review, and I don't think anyone wants to require that in an MFP. I am not certain how it differs from FAU_SEL.3, I would need to look into it [Smithson]
- FIA_TAB – why don't we have that? [Wright]
 - We don't have an objective for that [Nevo]
- So for FMT_MOF, we could put it in and not specify anything, and let the ST author choose something or nothing [Wright]
 - But an evaluator could ask us why we put it there without specifying anything [Smithson]
- If we aren't going to put all of this in there, and we don't know what the final CIM requirements are going to be, do we buy anything by putting any in there? We are unlikely to put in FAU_SAR.3, at least [Wright]
 - And the NIAP refinements would get us in trouble with other schemes [Smithson]
 - I think we would be opening Pandora's box if we put any in there [Sukert]
- We should document what we've discussed in case it comes back later [Nevo]
 - I will document it in the minutes [Smithson]

WG Ballot on P2600.1/2/3/4 [Smithson]

Refer to comments:

http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/comment-tracking/P2600_WG-Ballot02-dot1-v01.pdf

http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/comment-tracking/P2600_WG-Ballot02-dot2-v01.pdf

http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/comment-tracking/P2600_WG-Ballot02-dot3-v01.pdf

http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/comment-tracking/P2600_WG-Ballot02-dot4-v01.pdf

Refer to comments file with dispositions:

http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/comment-tracking/P2600_WG-Ballot02-dot1-v02.pdf

http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/comment-tracking/P2600_WG-Ballot02-dot2-v02.pdf

http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/comment-tracking/P2600_WG-Ballot02-dot3-v02.pdf

http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/comment-tracking/P2600_WG-Ballot02-dot4-v02.pdf

- The WG ballot passed unanimously, some with comments
{We reviewed all comments and resolved all except the comment about defining scope of salvage protection for overwrite/encryption, see Action Item Review for AI#448 above}

PP-E discussion [Sukert]

- Harry Lewis will talk about this at the AFP Consortium conference in March
- PP has been updated to reflect comments made in Miami and will be updated again based on comments from this meeting
- Last meeting, we struggled with adding another profile because where does it fit? Another organization might be better to look at it, but thinking later, I think that this group is more appropriate to do the work [Lewis]
- Would it help to get some people from AFP to participate here? [Smithson]
 - Aubry, Sukert, and Lewis have been representing production printing, but Océ and Infoprint are doing continuous feed and Xerox is doing cut-sheet, so would one profile suit both? [Lewis]
- Where does job management workstation fit in? Would we do two profiles? One for job management, and one for printing engine, and if you had a product that integrated both then you would conform to both profiles [Smithson]
 - That was another observation from last meeting. [Lewis]
- Also, most production systems do not want to have encryption because they cannot afford the performance cost [Lewis]
 - Maybe encryption is not a bottleneck at 30ppm, but it is at 300ppm [Smithson]
 - Or 1200ppm [Lewis]

Schedule review [Wright]

Refer to meeting slides for detail

<http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/presentations/P2600-Feb2008.ppt>

{Schedule has been updated}

Closing [Wright]

- Is there any reason to have a conversation with IPA while we're in Tokyo? [Wright]
 - It would be nice if they would bless our PPs [Smithson]
 - Could JBMIA facilitate that? [Thrasher]
 - Yes, and I will try to have drafts updated before the end of next week so they could look at what we are sending to the CCTL [Smithson]
 - Should we be specific about the purpose of that? [Farrell]
 - We could tell them that we have decided to validate the PPs in NIAP but they have the opportunity to submit comments through the sponsor ballot process [Thrasher]
 - Would they benefit if Smithson gave a presentation of the structure of the PPs and how they relate to hardcopy device architectures?
 - Only if I could do it in Japanese. Maybe I could get Mr. Ohta to do it. [Smithson]
 - We don't want them to open everything to discussion again [Nevo]
 - They can provide comments, but we may reject [Wright]
 - I will contact JBMIA [Smithson]
 - If someone from IPA wanted to be on the sponsor ballot, what are the rules? [Smithson]
 - I can have technical experts added to the sponsor ballot, but it would need to be approved by the Standards Board, so it couldn't happen until the end of March. The sponsor ballot would likely be over by then.
 - We'll need to do recirculations for comments from atsec, so it may go for a while [Smithson]
- Do we need any more meetings?
 - August meeting is in Camas at Sharp [Thrasher]
 - We blocked out the week, so we could handle it [Whittle]
 - Is PWG using three or four days?
 - Three days [Thrasher]
 - PWG is meeting the week of August 11th.
 - Depending on what the AFP Consortium decides, we may need to meet to work on PP-E. Also, I don't think the PP Guide will be done in June, but we may not need to meet for that [Sukert]
- Everything is under change control, documents need to be posted by February 26th and comments on those by March 4th.
- Next meeting is at Fuji Xerox in Midtown, Tokyo, Japan. No hotel blocks have been arranged, you're on your own, some are on the web site. For more information, refer to:
<http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/2600/meetings.html>.
- The IEEE web administrator put a password on the drafts directory, so if I can't get it undone, use the same password as we use for the private area.

*** Disorderly conduct resumed at ~12:00PM, 2/6/2007 ***