

# IDS Working Group

2009-08-18 Face-to-face Meeting Minutes

## 1. Attendees

Randy Turner	Amalfi Systems
Lee Farrell	Canon
Neil Iwamoto	Canon
Rick Landau	Dell
Ira McDonald*	High North
Harry Lewis	InfoPrint
Jerry Thrasher	Lexmark
Dave Whitehead*	Lexmark
Jane (Evguenia) Maliouta	Microsoft
Mike Fenelon	Microsoft
Nancy Chen	Oki Data
Brian Smithson*	Ricoh
Peter Cybuck	Sharp
Joe Murdock	Sharp
Ron Nevo	Sharp
Craig Whittle	Sharp
Bill Wagner	TIC
Pete Zehler	Xerox

\* via telephone

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

- Approve Minutes from Aug 6 Conference Call
- Review Action Items from Aug 6 Conference call
- Review results from the F2F Microsoft meeting
- Review NAP Binding document – Joe’s changes
- Do we need to add any additional MFP attributes (IRA)?
- Discussions on NEA/NAP Binding documents
- Discussion on remediation techniques -- need an authorized method for remediation
- Plug in development
- Developing an SHV
- IDS futures and “Phase II” activity
- New Action Items and Open Issues
- Closing Summary

## 2. Minutes Taker

Lee Farrell

## 3. PWG Operational Policy

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.

**IDS Working Group**  
2009-08-18 Face-to-face Meeting Minutes

**4. Approve Minutes from August 6 Conference Call**

There were no objections to the previous Minutes.

**5. Review Action Items**

AI 001: 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”?

- *No new info to report. Randy believes that we need to make more progress on the NEA Binding document before they show*
- **ONGOING**

AI 010: Brian Smithson will investigate whether a formal relationship document can be created between TCG and PWG. He will find out their position on liaison agreements.

- *TCG Board of Directors will meet and discuss this at their next face-to-face meeting (Oct 27-29), and get back to us with a response.*
- **OPEN**

AI 017: Joe Murdock will send an e-mail to one of the Microsoft NAP team members asking his opinion on the use of an opaque value for HCD Certification State—and specifically the topic of using vendor-specific plug-ins.

- *Joe sent an E-mail to Program Manager for Server 2008 R2 and we are waiting for a reply.*
- **CLOSED**

AI 019: Ron Nevo will collect all questions for the Microsoft NAP team that are submitted to the IDS reflector and will pass them along to Microsoft.

- *Ron plans to update the list of questions and then forward to Microsoft after posting for review.*
- **CLOSED**

AI 020: Randy Turner will post a link to the RSA discussion of TPM alternatives.

- *Randy will post some information that he received from Steve Hanna.*
- **OPEN**

AI 021: Joe Murdock will update the NAP Binding specification to address the comments from the June face-to-face meeting and post for review.

- **CLOSED**

**6. Review Results from the Face-to-face Meeting with Microsoft NAP Team**

Ron explained that whatever work that the PWG does will be of interest to the NAP Team, but they are not the appropriate group to develop the SHV plug-in that would be needed by Printers.

# IDS Working Group

## 2009-08-18 Face-to-face Meeting Minutes

Mike Fenelon said that Microsoft is not yet in a position to commit to developing a NAP plug-in. However, it is something that they will *consider* for possible inclusion in future plans.

Ron suggested that a “first phase” of agreeing upon a downscaled attribute requirement that fits the current NAP features available might be useful. The accomplishment of getting *something* out in the field to achieve some level of assurance would be beneficial.

Which of our PWG attributes can directly fit into the existing NAP attributes? How can we force fit them if necessary?

Jerry Thrasher suggested that it might be a viable work item for the PWG to develop a standardized XML schema for describing “the Policy” (the information that would be provided to the SHV as the basis for evaluating the client.)

Mike agreed that that could be possible, but he noted that solving the problems of how to store the information and update it in a secure and trusted manner is a more difficult problem than defining the schema itself.

Randy Turner said that he thinks the policies needed by Printer/MFD devices are probably simpler than what is supported by some complex policy languages. He explained that our policy requirements might be adequately handled by a list of attributes—and may not require any complex predicates such as “If x, then y, else z.” However, after some discussion it was considered that conditional policies might be useful (e.g., “if Port X is open, then do ‘xxx’” or “Do ‘yyy’—except on weekends”).

To help focus the discussion, the group attempted to identify a list of possible steps for future IDS WG activity.

Phase I characteristics (do not develop an SHV; use an existing one if possible):

- Map the PWG attributes to SCCM policy and values (identify the overlap)
- Examine SCCM policy language and values
- No remediation, except manual intervention (might include message to Admin console)
- Hardcopy Device / MFD message: “you can use me”

Phase I Steps:

- Identify the mapping to SCCM
- Assess the value/benefit of Phase I—and whether to pursue it
- Suggest a list of extended attributes for Microsoft

Randy noted that if we plan to use Microsoft’s System Center Configuration Manager (SCCM), then the responses will assume the device is running Windows. We would need to interpret the status responses as appropriate.

# IDS Working Group

2009-08-18 Face-to-face Meeting Minutes

It was noted that after examining the overlap between the IDS HCD Attributes and the support provided by NAP/SCCM, we might find that there is no valuable information for HCD health assessment. If this is the case, the group *might* determine that “Phase I” is not worth pursuing.

Because of the possibility that “Phase I” might be a dead end, it was suggested that “Phase I” and “Phase II” should be done in parallel as much as possible. [It was suggested that the word “Phase” was inappropriate because it implied a temporal sequence of events, rather than parallel activity.]

Joe Murdock volunteered to do the mapping and value assessment of Phase I.

AI 022: Joe Murdock will examine the possible mapping of HCD attributes to SCCM and evaluate the resulting “HCD health assessment” benefit. [This should also result in a list of deficiencies and recommended extensions to be suggested to the MS NAP team.]
--

→ **NEW**

It was noted that Phase I will result in a “SCCM Binding” specification—and that this might require modification or deprecation of the existing NAP Binding specification.

Randy identified three tasks for the IDS group:

- SCCM Binding
- Discussions with Mike Fenelon regarding a SHV development
- Discuss changes with NAP team about possible NAP extensions to support non-Windows devices

Jane Maliouta asked if the attendees had a sense of the market demand for NAP integration with HCD products. [A long discussion of perceived customer needs ensued. It included a few anecdotes of customers that have already experienced dissatisfaction with existing capability.]

Although there were no specific claims for NAP customer requirements, it was generally agreed that awareness and market demand is growing for health assessment technology. It was also suggested that if NAP does not provide the capability of supporting HCD health assessment, Microsoft should consider it a deficiency in their product offering that will be viewed unfavorably by savvy customers.

AI 023: Jane Maliouta will take on the responsibility for creating a “value proposition” document to help justify the reason behind HCD NAP development. Peter Cybuck and Ron Nevo will provide market information as possible.
---

→ **NEW**

## **7. NAP Binding Document – Joe’s changes**

It was noted that references to a specific version of NAP documents are not durable. As the documents get updated, the references change. The NAP Binding document should include a note of this fact in the reference section.

# IDS Working Group

## 2009-08-18 Face-to-face Meeting Minutes

Joe Murdock led a review of the various modifications to the NAP Binding specification document that addressed several items raised at the June face-to-face meeting. During the review, Craig Whittle recorded a few editorial changes that were suggested for additional modification.

Randy commented that the code enumerations in the NEA Binding document will need to be reconciled with the ones in the NAP Binding document for consistency.

It was determined that there is probably no need to provide PWG guidance on application naming to avoid cross-vendor confusion, because the SMI Vendor Code attribute should distinguish this across vendors.

### **8. Do we need to add/define any additional MFP attributes?**

No additional MFP attributes are identified at this time.

### **9. NEA Binding Document**

Randy Turner led an introduction and overview of the initial draft of the NEA Binding document. He provided a page-by-page narrative describing the section content. In some cases, the document review included some additional explanation of the NEA technology details. Because the document was not available prior to the meeting, no one had generated any review comments or questions on the document.

Randy explained that the PA Subtype value set can be extended beyond the NEA specification values. However, in the first draft of the document he has used the PA Subtype value of '1' (Operating System) in the message format example. He suggested that the group should identify a list of possible Subtypes. Ira McDonald said that an initial list could include the various subunits contained in the MFD Semantic model.

Nancy Chen suggested that the Subtype for "NEA Client" might be more applicable.

Jerry noted that the Subtype values defined in the TNC specifications are currently software components. He suggested that the NEA group should be asked whether the idea of subunits as Subtype values is an acceptable approach. Jerry pointed out that NEA does not model the BIOS as a component of the desktop PC. Before the IDS group attempts to define subunits as Subtypes, he thinks the group should try to understand why the NEA (and NAP?) technologies do not apparently model devices to reflect hardware [sub-]components.

AI 024: Randy Turner will ask the NEA e-mail list about their assumptions on modeling [sub-]components with regard to MFD subunits. (Why does NEA not address BIOS and/or NICs as components within a PC?)
--

→ **NEW**

Randy was unable to complete the NEA Binding document review before time ran out.

The group members are encouraged to do a more critical review of the full document and provide relevant feedback and comments via e-mail.

**IDS Working Group**  
2009-08-18 Face-to-face Meeting Minutes

**10. Remediation Techniques**

The group has agreed to accept the use of a manual remediation technique for the near-term. This will be re-visited in the future as appropriate.

**11. Target Schedule**

It was generally agreed that the expectation for achieving the IDS developments within the year is greatly optimistic—and not likely. No specific dates were identified.

**12. New Action Items and Open Issues**

AI 022:	Joe Murdock will examine the possible mapping of HCD attributes to SCCM and evaluate the resulting “HCD health assessment” benefit. [This should also result in a list of deficiencies and recommended extensions to be suggested to the MS NAP team.]
---------	--

AI 023:	Jane Maliouta will take on the responsibility for creating a “value proposition” document to help justify the reason behind HCD NAP development. Peter Cybuck and Ron Nevo will provide market information as possible.
---------	---

AI 024:	Randy Turner will ask the NEA e-mail list about their assumptions on modeling [sub-]components with regard to MFD subunits. (Why does NEA not address BIOS and/or NICs as components within a PC?)
---------	--

**13. Next Teleconference**

The next IDS teleconference will be held on September 3.

IDS meeting adjourned.