IDS Working Group
2008-12-03 Face-to-Face Meeting Minutes

1. <u>Attendees</u>

Randy Turner*	Amalfi Systems
Lee Farrell	Canon
Glen Petrie*	Epson
Ira McDonald	High North
Jerry Thrasher	Lexmark
Dave Whitehead	Lexmark
Nancy Chen	Oki Data
Brian Smithson	Ricoh
Shah Bhatti	Samsung
James Jung	Samsung
Nayantara Pandit	Samsung
Dinesh Srirangpatna	Samsung
Joe Murdock	Sharp
Ron Nevo	Sharp
Bill Wagner	TIC

    * via telephone

Ron Nevo opened the IDS session and provided the planned agenda topics:

- Select Minute Taker
- PWG Operational Behavior
- Approve Minutes from November 13 Conference Call
- Review Action Items
- Changes to the attributes per the IEEE meeting in Minneapolis
- Review NAP Binding Document with Brian Smithson updates
- NEA Binding Document –start process – Who is the editor?
- HCD-NEA Spec plans and schedule
- "PWG Plug-in"
- IDS Wiki Page(s)
- New Action Items and Open Issues

2. <u>Minutes Taker</u>

Lee Farrell

3. <u>PWG Operational Policy</u>

It was noted that all attendees should be aware that the meeting is conducted under the PWG Membership and Intellectual Property rules. There were no objections.

4. <u>Approve Minutes from November 13 Conference Call</u>

There were no objections to the previous Minutes.

5. Review Action Items

> ACTION: 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"?

→ *ONGOING*
→ *Randy reported that has been no interest expressed (so far) beyond developing any relationship more formal than e-mail interaction.*
→ *Jerry noted that the NEA has expressed interest in receiving the results of the PWG activity in this area.*
→ *Microsoft is also interested in "keeping aware" of the PWG progress in this area. Randy said that at WinHEC, the topic was raised about whether a "imaging class" logo requirement should be established to include printer health attributes support.*
→ *Microsoft is currently targeting a mid-2009 Windows server beta.*

> ACTION: Randy Turner will post the Microsoft name(s) for the PWG to make contact with regard to logo requirements.

→ *NEW*

> ACTION: Joe Murdock will add NAP protocol information to document and update the conformance section.

→ *NAP protocol information not yet added, but conformance section has been updated.* *OPEN*

> ACTION: Dave will pursue answers on the 7 questions to Mike Fenelon and Erhan Soyer-Osman of Microsoft.

→ *Dave said that Microsoft has received the seven questions, and they are currently reviewing them to consider answers.* *OPEN*

→ *Questions for Microsoft:*

> *1. The NAP spec states UTF-8 string encoding and TLV elements. There is also a statement about strings being NULL terminated. We believe the NULL terminator was inadvertently added since it is not required for TLV elements. That is, do we really need NULL termination?*

> *2. Is it Microsoft's current and future desire/intent/direction for strings to be UTF-8 encoded?*

> *3. Is Microsoft planning any type of interoperability between NAP and Network Endpoint Assessment (NEA) from the TNC? Maybe a gateway?*

> *4. What happens when a device passes assessment under one mechanism but then is challenged again? For example, first over 802.1x to attach and then DHCP to receive an address. Do we need to start the assessment again from scratch or is there a shortcut?*

> *5.   It looks like most, if not all, of the evaluation attributes will be extensions to NAP. The only NAP attribute that may be applicable is the Product Name. Is it*

appropriate for the PWG to use Product Name or should we define all our attributes as extensions?

6. How can we get the extended PWG attributes to be recognized by the Microsoft validator/assessor? Is this a plug-in supplied by a third party? If this is an industry supported solution, would Microsoft be willing to supply any required plug-in? If not, then where can we get the required specification that would explain how to write a plug-in independently?

7. Just to make sure we understand it, the PWG members would really like someone familiar with NAP to profile how it would operate with print devices. Would this be possible?

> ACTION: Brian Smithson will update and re-write the Network Access Protection Protocol Binding document, taking into account the comments from the October meeting and the comments that Dave Whitehead has posted.

→ *Some progress has been made, but still not completed. **OPEN***

> ACTION: Ron Nevo and Dave Whitehead will update the IDS Wiki pages to reflect current status.

→ ***OPEN***

6. Changes to the attributes per the IEEE meeting in Minneapolis

Jerry said he had nothing formal to present, but he led a review of the Nov 13 Attributes specification document, focusing on the latest modifications.

The changes in Section 4.1 General Attribute Definitions were examined and accepted without objection. Several data types had been changed to octet-array and a few UTF-8 string versions were added.

It was agreed that HCD_Certification_State and HCD_Configuration_State (and others) should be changed from string to octet-array (or UTF-8 string).

There was some discussion about the adequacy of the "HCD_Certification_State" attribute with regard to the need of supporting multiple Certifications within a single product. Should this attribute be multiply instanced?

Jerry highlighted the additional note that he had added to the attribute table:

> Conformance Goal: Any binding that supports the attributes defined in this table MUST support multiple instances of the Name, Version, and Patch attributes related to downloadable and resident applications.

There was a comment that the explanation of Conditionally Mandatory items was not sufficiently clear and obvious.

Jerry noted that the NEA specifications require *both* the numerical and the string versions of certain attributes. He suggested that the PWG should adopt this practice and require both versions as well. The group agreed.

Randy asked if given the current definition of "resident", whether a resident application can be remediated. If it is remediated via a download of a new version, then how is it different from a "downloadable" application?

It was agreed that the definition of "resident" should be re-examined for better clarification.

> ACTION: Jerry Thrasher will attempt to re-write the definitions of "resident" and "downloadable".

After a long discussion about the interpretation of HCD_Secure_Time_Enabled and "secure time," it was suggested that the condition for HCD_Secure_Time_Enabled be clarified—or to clearly define what is meant by "secure time." To what extent is accuracy and validity required?

> ACTION: Dave Whitehead will write up a definition of "secure time" for inclusion in the Attributes document.

It was agreed that "UTC" and "GMC" should not be referenced as a time requirement in the document.

Ira suggested that reporting the Boolean value indicating whether HCD_Secure_Time_Enabled is supported should be mandatory—even if the value provided in an implementation is always false.

Randy believes that both Microsoft and NEA will probably not recognize the Secure Time attributes—and feels that it is important for us to clearly (and unambiguously) document the semantics associated with them.

Jerry explained that both Forwarding Enabled and Factory Default Password Enabled were adopted by the NEA WG, but with some variation.

The NEA includes "unknown" as a third value for Forwarding Enabled. The attendees agreed that for the IDS specification it will remain as a Boolean, but the NEA binding document will address the difference.

For Factory Default Password Enabled, the group agreed to redefine the IDS attribute to align with the NEA definition.

It was suggested that the attributes be re-ordered into alphabetic order instead of the current grouping order. Jerry said he will consider this.

7. <u>TNC Binding</u>

Shah Bhatti announced that the TCG Hardcopy Working Group will be attempting to revitalize itself after a long period of inactivity. He says they will consider defining some new task items. One item they are wondering about is the IDS binding to TNC.

8. <u>Review NAP Binding Document</u>

Joe discussed the Conformance section modifications that he added to the document, explaining each of the subsection contents.

It was noted that although the information Joe provided is very useful, it does not all strictly qualify as "conformance" information to the IDS specification. It was suggested that a list of the required and conditionally mandatory attributes should be added—either explicitly or via reference.

The links to the Microsoft documents listed in the Reference section have already been modified at least once, and there is some concern that the links will change again in the future. (Hopefully, Microsoft will maintain the links more consistently.) It was suggested that the version number of referenced documents should be included in the Reference list—in anticipation of future updates.

Joe said that he would include some sequence diagrams as illustrative examples for the document.

> ACTION: Joe Murdock will include sequence diagrams as illustrative examples for the NAP binding document.

9. <u>Progression of the Specifications</u>

There was a short discussion of the "chicken and egg" problem of progressing both the abstract specification and the binding specification(s) through the PWG formal approval process. Because the current process does not allow a specification to advance if it references another "in progress" specification, the group agreed that it might be best to consider processing multiple specifications in parallel.

10. <u>NEA Binding Document</u>

To date, no one has volunteered to be the Editor for the NEA Binding document. Jerry said he is willing to help with the editorial tasks (e.g., formatting and document creation), but he indicated a lack of familiarity with the protocol detail. Randy said he would consider his availability to work on content creation. Dave said he will "help a bit."

11. <u>"PWG Plug-in"</u>

Will Microsoft write a PWG Plug-in for NAP? How can we encourage them to do so? Randy noted that Microsoft tends to be more receptive if they can see a benefit with regard to vendor interoperability. He suggests that a remediation plug-in could be attractive to Microsoft.

Jerry said that if Microsoft would request the PWG to provide something that conforms to their desired remediation architecture, it would be a very positive step.

It was noted that the first step to making progress on this topic is to get answers on the 7 questions submitted to Microsoft.

12. Summary of New Action Items and Open Issues

In addition to the existing OPEN Actions Items, the following new items were generated:

ACTION: Randy Turner will post the Microsoft name(s) for the PWG to make contact with regard to logo requirements.

ACTION: Jerry Thrasher will attempt to re-write the definitions of "resident" and "downloadable".

ACTION: Dave Whitehead will write up a definition of "secure time" for inclusion in the Attributes document.

ACTION: Joe Murdock will include sequence diagrams as illustrative examples for the NAP binding document.

13. Next Teleconference

Because of holidays, vacation plans, and a conflict with the December 11 P2600 meeting, the group decided to schedule the next teleconference on Monday, Dec 15 at 1:00pm Eastern Time.

Subsequent teleconferences are scheduled for January 8, 22, and February 5.

IDS meeting adjourned.