

NNSC Meeting
Harrison, Ohio
June 16, 2005

Chairman: David Brown, Intel

Attendees: Eric Schetina, Trustwave (ES), Tim Gelsinger, Challenge (TG), Pat Palazzo, Sun Chemical (PP), Rich Carter, AAMVA (RC), Ken Branch, Latitude 49 (KB), Bob Jocham, Keller Crescent (BJ), Mike O'Neil, Northstar (MON), Stephen Schwartz, Kurz (SS), Graham Whitehead, NASPO (GDW), Brad Long, Kurz (BL), Louann Siebert, Boise (LS), Dan Thaxton, Standard Register (DT), Jeff Turmel, Brady (JT), Glenn Sola, Challenge (GS), Bill Kenny, Challenge (BK), Robert Sherwood, Sekuworks, (RS), John Schutte, Sekuworks (JS)

DB – Antitrust statement

Introduction of all attendees.

Request regarding any changes to the agenda. No changes requested.

GDW reported on the last letter ballot. 11 of the 12 committee members voted in the affirmative. One, Lew Kontnik, voted in the affirmative with comments. LK requested that the wording referring to users be softened.

Group looked at wording in 3.2

KB & RC moved to not change words. Considered that wording already makes it optional.

Discussion on strengthening of IT security

Section 5.2 - Proposed to change ILLEGAL to UNAUTHORIZED and add LOSS (need to avoid loss, theft and disclosure)

ES proposed that wording in definitions should be more technically correct. Action on ES to do this

Add section 5.2.1

STRONGER ACCESS CONTROL SYSTEMS could replace PASSWORDS

A motion to remove 5.2.1.1. & asterisks on line above. Also to move M under Class I to E under Class II. Voted unanimously

Also voted unanimously to have 2.17 be M in all Classes

5.4.12 Chain of Custody. Strongly advised to have this included, but some question of whether it should be M or E. It was decided that legal advice was needed on this matter. MON concerned that the principal is good, but the practice may be a challenge.

DT proposed that the standards include a section on Chain of custody, but that it be made an E as it cannot be mandated as NASPO cannot police all the way down the chain.

MON suggested asking producers for their methodology.

GDW suggested looking at end use. This is really best practice.

GDW would like to keep for Class I and Class II, not for Class III

DT questioned whether this is a recommendation for the Standards committee?

JT said Standards Committee will take legal advice on wording and report to NNSC. Action on JT

DB commented that JT's committee is now pacing the NNSC schedule. He also commented that the letter ballot system seems to be working well.

JT proposed putting the time schedule to the Board.

Ballot #2 cannot be taken yet.

GDW explained the ANSI-ISO process

DT asked if there was any preparation that NASPO needed to do?

GDW responded No.

KB asked if there was any ISO standard already in existence. This should be checked.

ES questioned how much ANSI will look at if they are going to move to ISO?

GDW – moving to ISO it becomes a draft, whatever state it is in for ANSI, complete or not.

MON considered that if we are to go ISO we need to move forward now.

JT advised that a 1 day meeting should be sufficient for his committee to review and decide on all open issues related to v.2.1P

DB stated that not going ISO means Intergraf will probably step up first.

BJ we should do things concurrently

GDW suggested that the committee fix any outstanding issues a.s.a.p. and BOD establish the policy. The standards have to be made public for 45 days and NASPO has to respond to any concerns

RC stated that going ANSI and ISO, NASPO can operate normally in the meantime

GDW questioned who sells the ISO standard & who gets the money?

DB motioned that the NNSC should recommend to the Board that the Standards be submitted to ISO at the same time as they are presented to ANSI for public review.

Motion was voted unanimously in the affirmative.

GDW noted that the ISO Security Advisory Group is headed by John Arnold of ANSI.

JT proposed a Standards Committee face-to-face meeting and asked for availability from all committee members for a meeting date.

JT will find a location and best possible date and circulate.

JT made a motion to close meeting, seconded by DT and approved by all.