

PWG -Imaging Device Security (IDS) Working Group

PWG F2F Meeting

February 18, 2009

Ron Nevo(Sharp), Dave Whitehead, (Lexmark)

PWG IP Policy



- Meeting conducted under rules of PWG IP Policy

Agenda



- Select Minute Taker- Lee?
- Morning session:
 - Approve Minutes from February 5 Conference Call
 - Review Action Items from February 5 Conference call
 - Review Secure time slides/proposal
 - Ciphersuite
 - Review Microsoft updates to their SOH document –How it will impact us?
- Afternoon session:
 - Review Attribute document – any comments?
 - Review NAP Binding Document with Brian Smithson updates
 - Decide how to present the bit-level contents of NAP packets?
 - Do we need IDS mapping document? NAP, NEA, TNC?
 - NEA Binding Document –start process- Who is the editor?
 - HCD-NEA Spec plans and schedule
 - New Action Items and Open Issues
 - Closing Summary

Action Items from February 5 Conference call



- Randy Turner will try to find other contacts that would be willing to work with the PWG to help deploy NEA health assessment. (Juniper, Symantec, Cisco are suggested candidates.) Is someone willing to sit down with the PWG and “have discussions”?
Still needs to pursue this further. No new information to report.
- Randy Turner will post the Microsoft name(s) for the PWG to make contact with regard to logo requirements.
Randy has requested a contact name, but no response yet.
- Joe Murdock will add NAP protocol information to document and update the conformance section.
- Joe Murdock will include sequence diagrams as illustrative examples for the NAP binding document.
- Dave Whitehead will coordinate with Randy Turner to generate a proposal to Microsoft on proceeding with obtaining NAP information on what they envision would be the content of a profile—including remediation. Need to identify the appropriate point of contact within Microsoft.

Action Items from February 5 Conference call



- *Randy said that Erhan Soyer-Osman has given him a name of someone (Chandra Nukala) that is willing to take architectural questions. However, it is important that we first do our homework on reading the available information on NAP and becoming familiar with it. We should avoid questions that have answers available in the current documentation. Randy will post links to relevant informative documents.*
- Everyone will review the latest Attributes document draft prior to the next teleconference, and prepare comments for discussion.
- Ron Nevo will examine which time protocols could be used for providing authenticated time (with high integrity), and make appropriate recommendations.
- Everyone will consider the Quarantine State attribute issue that Nancy Chen has raised and will provide recommendations for resolving.
- Brian will provide a proposed example illustrating the suggested format for review and acceptance.
- Issue- Which of the defined transport(s) are required to be supported in order to guarantee a device can attach to the network? MS defines DHCP, 802.1x, IPSec, and VPN and has extended each to add SOH information. So, in an environment where we are attaching wirelessly via 802.1x and receive our IP address from DHCP, what happens if we only support SOH over DHCP (or 802.1x)? Will we attach or fail?