

Minutes of NNSC teleconference of April 18, 2008

Chair: David Brown (DAB), Intel

Attendees: Graham Whitehead (GDW), NASPO; Chick Hardester (CH), NAPHSIS; Bob Addlesberger (BA), Gemalto; Robert Sherwood (RS), Sekuworks; Win Bayliss (WB), Semiconductor Equipment and Materials International (SEMI).

The telecon meeting opened at 10:00am Pacific with the NASPO Anti Trust policy reminder by the Chair. All attendees signified acceptance.

Minutes of the last NNSC teleconference held on April 4, 2008 were reviewed. A motion to approve the minutes of the last meeting was made by BA, seconded by RS and approved by all. A copy of these minutes is now available for download from the NASPO website.

1st Agenda Item – Drug screen requirement, NASPO 6-4. Consensus was reached that the interpretation be changed to indicate that, as a minimum, testing of employees may be carried out at random with a sample size of 25% of all security classified employees. The wording of the requirement and definition to remain unchanged.

No further actions required.

2nd Agenda Item – continuation of discussion on NASPO 4-19. Changes to the wording of the requirement, definition and interpretation were proposed by GDW based upon discussions that took place at the April 4th telecon. The proposed changes in wording were all accepted with the exception of a reference to “all blank documents” in the list of items under Guidelines that are considered to be vulnerable to lack of protection and misuse. Consensus was reached when this reference was changed to read “all blank personal identity credential documents” and words were added to remind the reader (of the “Interpretation”) of the requirement to assess the need for customer use agreements as part of the security management assessments to be carried under the new security risk management requirements specified in section 6.9.

Action was placed on GDW to update the interpretation.

3rd Agenda Item – Re-Wording of the Physical Intrusion Risk Management Objective- GDW explained that the re-wording of this risk management objective was proposed by NASPO auditors who find the existing wording to be inconsistent with the goal of substantially delaying the progress of intruders using multiple physical barriers. Consensus on the proposed new wording was that :-

- the term “time budget” be changed to “time frame”
- the word guarantee in “guarantee the arrival of local law enforcement” be changed to ensure.
- the new wording of the Class I objective, given in the publicly available standard, must remain as onerous as possible is to make the possibility of successful intrusion appear utterly futile to readers with bad intentions.
- An explanatory note be added at the start of the “Interpretations” document to explain the difference between specified objectives and risk reduction requirements.
- The “Interpretations” document must reveal the criteria that auditors will use to judge whether or not this and other objectives are being met.

Action was placed on GDW to update the interpretation as indicated.

4th Agenda Item – NASPO 5-30 managing different modes of intrusion – armed and unarmed etc. As a result of prior discussion the consensus of the group was to delete requirements 5-30, 5-31, 5-32 and 5-35 and replace them with a single statement to require the management of all modes of intrusion. Hence new wording was prepared by GDW to replace all of the above requirements with a single more comprehensive requirement 5-30. The new wording was accepted with details of the different modes of intrusion to be addressed in the “Interpretations” document.

Action was placed on GDW to re-word the interpretation.

5th Agenda Item – NASPO 5-23 Security Control Room – Although the use of a security control room (SCR) is not a requirement of the ANSI/NASPO Classes there was strong consensus that if one exists and is used then it must be intrusion resistant and properly access controlled. Agreement was reached that :-

- the definition of this requirement must be re-worded to simplify it
- the requirement for a SCR remain “elective” for all Classes
- if one exists and is used then the “interpretations” document must make it clear that intrusion resistance and access control is mandatory for all Classes.

Action was placed on GDW to re-word the definition and interpretation for review at the next NNSC telecon.

6th Agenda Item – NASPO 5-21, Truck and driver trap. Consensus was reached on this requirement to make it mandatory for Class II as well as Class I to reflect the high level of vulnerability associated with open shipping and receiving areas.

No further action required.

7th Agenda Item – NASPO 6-17, Use of Internal Security Awareness Communications. Discussion focused on the need for these internal communications to avoid giving visitors an unintended impression of security problems while at the same time fostering a security culture by reminding people to be vigilant etc. There was strong consensus on this point and the need to simplify wording of the definition with more examples given in the “interpretations” of what would be considered acceptable to display to members of staff that would also yield positive visitor reaction.

Action was placed on GDW to re-word the definition and interpretation for review at the next NNSC telecon.

8th Agenda Item – NASPO 8-15, A personnel track and trace system. Further consideration was given to this requirement. It was considered essential that a Class I organization be able to account for the whereabouts of all staff when carrying out security breach investigations. Hence the consensus of the group was in agreement with the proposal to make this requirement mandatory for Class I but to leave it as an enhancement for Classes II and III. No further action required.

The teleconference meeting was adjourned at Noon Pacific.

Next NNSC Teleconference
Thursday May 1, 2008
10:00am-Noon Pacific time
Dial 1 (916) 356-2663
Bridge 2, Passcode 8533637