

NNSC Teleconference May 1, 2008

Chairman: David Brown, (Intel)

Callers: Graham Whitehead (Greenleaf) Eric Geiger (Brady), Chuck Hardester (NAPHSIS)

Number of callers did not make a quorum, so there were some brief discussions, but no official votes on consensus could be taken.

It was noted that TAPA have changed their name – still TAPA, but now means Transported Asset Protection Association. The TAPA requirements still exist. Still need to get their permission to reference their Freight Security Requirements (FSR), even though it is available publicly and can be downloaded from their website. The ability to download free copies exists now but this may not always be the case. TAPA could decide at some time in the future to make it available only to members of TAPA in which case it can no longer be referenced in the public ANSI/NASPO standard. The best solution would be for NASPO to obtain permission from TAPA to make the latest version available for download from the NASPO website.

Would also like to ask TAPA to put notice of public review of the updated standard on their website when the document is released for public review.

May be possible to get NASPO on the agenda of the next TAPA meeting, June 3-4 in Miami.

David brown took an action to contact TAPA representative in Intel to discuss availability of the TAPA FSR to NASPO.

Noted that NAPHSIS also has a meeting at the same time, June 3-5, in Orlando.

Discussion of Section 5.23 Security Control Room. New wording, also references 5-13, 15 and 20

Question of whether the requirement was an M or an E. The plan at present is for it to remain an E, but basically, if there is a SCR then it must be properly done. To date, all companies had a SCR with CCTV etc. All companies with CCTV have monitors – is this the equivalent of an SCR? The next meeting needs a quorum to vote on this issue. Based on the premise that if they have one there should be controls, maybe the requirement should be upgraded to M.

Moving to 6-17.

The original definition is abandoned. The detail should not be in the requirements that are public. Training is a separate item. Main purpose is to remind people to be diligent with appropriate notices in employee places.

The new requirements need to be review and discussed, therefore it was decided to call for another teleconference in a few days and to work on assuring a voting quorum.

Next teleconference

Monday May 5

Noon-2.00pm PST

916 356 2663

bridge 34

passcode: 6614017

NNSC Teleconference May 5, 2008

Chair: David A. Brown

Attendees: Graham Whitehead, NASPO (GDW), Chuck Hardester, NAPHSIS (CH), Eric Geiger, Brady (EG), David Elliott, Ashton Potter (DE), Bob Addlesberger, Gemalto (BA), Jason Orloff, Nanoink (JO), Kevin Kaporch, GPO (KK), Robert Sherwood, Sekuworks (RS).

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

Minutes of the last NNSC teleconference held on April 18, 2008 were referenced. A motion to approve these minutes was made by CH, seconded by DE and approved by all. A copy of these minutes is now available for download from the NASPO website.

1st. Agenda item. Section 5-23. Secure Control Room.

GDW commented that to date all audited companies have had a SCR. Decision of M or E is still open for discussion. Since it is required to have cameras etc. with respective security protocols, companies do in fact have SCR, therefore the requirement should be M. Should it be M for all classes? Clarification on meaning of Room - Person doing a security function from an unsecure area (i.e. security person in lobby, opening secure entrance door) is not a secure room.

Need clarification of a secure room, referencing an internal room, which should be enclosed rather than fortified. The SCR room must comply with NASPO 5-13, 5-15 and 5-20 i.e. it must be an enclosed area with access control and CCTV monitoring. The consensus was to make 5-23 an M for Classes I and II and an E for Class III.

Action on GDW to reword the definition and interpretations to clarify meanings.

2nd. Agenda item. 6-17 Internal security communications

Two concerns expressed – bulletins should not convey any vulnerabilities to visitors. Definition has not changed, but the Interpretation needs to be expanded and the update reviewed.

Details of any security changes should not be posted on these bulletins (i.e. new security procedures could be referenced, but not the actual details) Maybe change wording to security updates, not procedures. Is the description as eye catching visual display necessary?.

Considered that it will do no harm and raise peoples attention. What is “eye catching” ? Does it have to be a poster – can it be electronic?

Purpose of notice is awareness. There is no reference to change of notice to maintain awareness.

DB commented that GDW did not get good guidance for the rewording. He merged a) with b) and c) with d). The purpose is to help improve the security culture over time. It was suggested that this should be detailed in the interpretations. The actual requirement definition is okay and the Intention is understood.

Action on GDW to refine the purpose in the interpretations.

3rd. Agenda item - Move to new requirements – items 4A, 4B, 4C and 5A in the Master Worksheet. (please note that item 4C became NASPO 4-25 and 4A became NASPO 4-26 in the draft version of the 2008 ANSI/NAPO standard. Item 5A became NASPO 5-36)

4A. The existing standard is considered to be weak with respect to transport assurance. There is a need to specify a strong requirement for transport assurance. Prefer to make Reference to the TAPA FSR (freight security requirement) rather than write a new set of requirements. The issue of where to specify the requirements – in the Definition or Interpretations – was debated. It was decided that it should be put into Definition.

4, A, B, & C are all additions to Supply Chain requirements. Discussion was whether these should remain as three requirements or be encompassed as 1. There is an overlap of the three with 4A

really being the over arching need. They could be added as a transportation assurance requirement.

4C There was discussion of the situation of goods which are sold FOB. In this situation, ownership and responsibility changes at the shipping dock. When the shipment leaves the dock the legal ownership changes hands. At this point there is often not enough responsibility taken by either organization. Some purchasers have their own trucks and insurance. Discussion followed which considered that there is a need for the standard to require that there is assurance of security responsibility during the period of responsibility change and hence that this should be a stand alone requirement – it became NASPO 4-25.

4B was a need to give serious consideration of the TAPA FSR. There needs to be some assurance that the TAPA guideline will be available, and accessible, at least for the period up to the next review (2 years)

It was thought that 4B could be removed and reference to the TAPA guidelines be included in 4A. More detail should be added in the Interpretations.

Discussion moved to the situation of plain sight transportation, which in effect is anonymous transportation. Point 2 of the definition really covers this requirement. Try to get a teaming of the supplier and buyer. So, if the method of plain sight is agreed between the two parties then it is acceptable. Write it into the appropriate section of the standard or interpretation.

Any reference to the TAPA FSR in requirements NASPO 4-25 & 4-26 can only be made if TAPA agrees that their FSR will be publicly accessible for the next 5 years.

Requirements 4A and 4C will be added to the standard as NASPO 4-25 and 4-26 and be Mandatory for Class I and Class II. Details in the Definition and Interpretations can note that any company using TAPA certified freight forwarders is meeting this requirement. If a company is not using TAPA, but is using some other acceptable method of freight security this is acceptable. The auditor will need to make sure that other methods are still meeting the requirements. The TAPA standard is really a benchmark that companies can use to measure their own freight security method.

Action on GDW to write the Requirements, Definitions and Interpretations for 4A and 4C as NASPO 4-25 and 4-26 for review at the next teleconference.

4th. Agenda item - 5A The Piggybacking issue. There is no other reference to piggybacking in the existing standard. Previous discussions had shown strong feelings that it makes nonsense to allow piggybacking. The topic was reworded.

DAB asked if anyone had any problems with the new wording.

All Agreed to accept the requirement. Consensus. It will be a new physical security requirement, NASPO 5-36.

Action on GDW to also write an Interpretation for NASPO 5-36.

5th. Agenda item - Section 5 of the Master Worksheet addresses entirely new security assurance requirements. This section was reviewed earlier by the NNSC and requires only ratification of wording at this time. (please note that these new requirements are specified in a new section 6.9 of the 2008 ANSI/NASPO standard. The new requirements in section 5 of the Master Worksheet became NASPO 9-1 to 9-5 with existing requirements 2-17 and 6-15 moved to become 9-6 and 9-7 respectively)

5A Perform Security Risk Management. To be added as NASPO 9-1.
Consensus was reached on the wording of the requirement and definition.

5B-1, 5B-2 and 5C To be added as NASPO 9-3, 9-4 and 9-5.
Consensus was reached on the wording of the requirement and definition of these requirements.

NASPO 9-2 is a requirement to identify and classify all security sensitive physical and information items. This requirement was added in response to a need that arose in an earlier NNSC telecon that dealt with external transmission of security sensitive information, NASPO 2-22.

The specified objectives of security risk management that appear at the start of new section 6-9 were briefly examined but carried over the next telecon for consensus on their wording.

It was proposed that all of these updates should now be incorporated into a mock-up of the 2008 standard to facilitate a final review by the NNSC prior to a formal letter ballot to go to public review.

Action on placed GDW to produce a mock-up of the 2008 version of the Standard and Interpretations for review and vote for public review to be taken at the next teleconference.

Agenda for next teleconference;

1. Ratify wording of 6-17
2. Agree on use of the TAPA FSR reference
3. Review new section 6.9 objectives
4. Go through the full document which will then be ready for public review.

If there is consensus at the next telecon to proceed to public review of the proposed changes to the 2005 version, a Formal letter ballot of the official roster of 15 people will then be required. To proceed to public review will require a 66% favorable vote from the 15 members. It does not have to go to the NASPO Board, or general NASPO membership. They have the opportunity to make comment during the public review period.

The original roster of 15 members of the review committee were considered approved by ANSI when they accepted the roster of the consensus committee. This is the group that will be asked to cast letter ballot votes.

Next meeting. Move back to Thursday

Thursday May 29, 2008

10.00am PST

916 356 2663

bridge #4

passcode: 4669614