



NASPO

NORTH AMERICAN SECURITY PRODUCTS ORGANIZATION

NNSC Standards Review Minutes of Teleconference November 29, 2007

Chairman: David Brown, Intel (DB)

Attendees: Graham Whitehead (GDW), Bob Addlesberger (BA), Chuck Hardester (CH) Jim Shaffer (JS), Ann Whitehead (ABW)

Apologies were received from Lew Kontnik and Bob Tillman.

GDW introduced Jim Shaffer and asked JS to speak about himself.

JS commented on the quality of the NASPO work. Explained he is Chairman of the X9 Committee, working in the banking/retail interoperable standards i.e. PIN security. ACI, the company he works for is a worldwide organization involved in moving money around and ensuring credit card authorizations etc.

DB asked if there was any report from the Producer Group as Eric Geiger was not on the present call.

BA responded and detailed the teleconference that the group had held. The group had all sent individual input to ABW who had consolidated it into one file. The group had worked through that file and made recommendations in response to items of concern. Any topic that was considered to affect all the groups in the review process were tabled for further discussion at the face-to-face meeting to be held in Dallas.

With regards to the General Interest group, GDW stated that they had not had a full group gathering. After reading the ANSI/NASPO Standard, Bob Tillman that he was limited in his ability to comment, but has made general comments which at this time were only verbal. He had stated that he would send his detailed input to GDW and GDW noted that if he did not receive them, then he himself would write up BT's verbal comments.

GDW reported that Lew Kontnik was very busy, having just formed a Pharmaceutical Industry group to respond to new FDA requirements on pedigree of prescription drugs. GDW hopes to talk to LK next week to get his input.

TAPA have not been able to participate to date as the TAPA representative had changed jobs and location and TAPA had not given the NNSC a replacement contact. David Lightfoot (an independent auditor) has been asked for his comments on the Worksheet.

JS noted that one item he sees as needing strengthening is the security management personnel. DB asked whether with the drop out from TAPA etc. the NNSC was in jeopardy of not meeting the criteria of input from across the industry. GDW responded that we are still in compliance with our policies and procedures as we actually had a larger group than previously, so there were still sufficient participants, although the balance may not be as equal as before.

DB also noted that LK had been involved in the first NNSC and was of a personality that would have brought any concerns to our attention. DB also commented that he thought that the general Interest group would probably be the group to bring something new to the review.

With no further input from the general Interest group DB asked for input from the User group. As KK was not present CH offered to report. He stated that they had had a good face-to-face meeting, hosted by Tom Pickard at Bristol-Myers Squibb in New York. He thought that all the notes had been given to KK and that KK was planning on consolidating all the comments into one document which he would forward to ABW.

There was discussion about the planned meeting in Dallas. DB asked whether we were in compliance with our Policies and Procedures requirements. GDW stated that we were, even with the small group on the teleconference we still meet the quorum requirement. He did note that there would need to be a Letter Ballot after the completion of the review and updates and that would be after the Dallas meeting.

GDW commented that some 'bugs' in the process, mainly duplications, had shown up during an audit he carried out the previous week. Such duplications could be eliminated during the review. He also commented that the NNSC should look at the work carried out by Dan Thaxton's group in NASPO who had reviewed the Standard Interpretations. There will probably be some insights from that work. He also thought it would be prudent to review/analyze the work of the IDSP for key problems and identify any security risks pertinent to the ANSI/NASPO standards. These items should be added to the Worksheet.

DB commented that most of the preliminary work has been done and the work done in Dallas will be significant.

GDW thought it would be good if we could find a replacement from TAPA, although it may be too late for this session of work. DB commented that TAPA is important as they work on shipping, freighting and logistics rather than the counterfeiting of goods. The TAPA standards are private, not public so whether they can be included in the NASPO standard may need discussion in Dallas.

GDW offered to speak to Jim Thompson at ANSI to seek guidance on whether a private standard can be referenced in a public (ANSI) standard if the group are in concurrence with the inclusion. If not then it may be an item to be added to the guidelines for Auditors.

GDW said that it will be necessary to notify ANSI of any changes of the official roster of NNSC participants.

DB asked for any other comments.

JS thought that there should be more effort given to risk management or a risk management system. DB considered that that should be added to the workshop.

GDW reminded that it is important to also reference ISO standards where relevant.

JS commented that NIST should probably be referenced too as they have several standards relating to security. i.e. 800-30 covers risk assessment, 800-100 internal security management

Meeting adjourned.

Next meeting: Embassy Suites DFW South, Irving, TX. December 13, 1.00pm-4.00pm