



SECURITY COMMITTEE / FUNCTIONAL MODEL MEETING NOTES

October 15, 2015

Attendees:

Mary Ellen Condon

Steve Orrin

Adam Madlin

Christine Abruzzi

Martin Smith

Linda Braun, Global Inventures

Meeting Notes:

Mary Ellen led the call. Notes taken by Linda Braun.

Agenda Review: Distributed by Mary Ellen in advance of the call (approved)

Roll call; quorum determination. Quorum was met.

IPR policy reminder:

<https://www.idecosystem.org/system/files/filedepot/103/IDESG%20IPR%20Policy.pdf>

Approval of minutes: Notes taken for October 8, 2015 to be approved at next meeting.

Minutes:

Adam Madlin said the intent of the meeting today was to review the Strategic Plan with the goal of addressing any items that impact the Security Committee directly. The Strategic Plan is in the review cycle and he hopes to finalize within the next few weeks. This is one of the deliverables as part of the NSTIC grant, due by the end of December.

Adam reviewed the Table of Contents. He said there was a full SWOT Analysis in the plan. Section 7 is the part that Adams owns; Key IDESG Functions. First thing related to the Security Committee is the Functional Model. It was identified as a key deliverables. Key updates in this section are ownership and updates going forward. The Functional Model should not be owned by the Security Committee as far as Adam and Mary Ellen is concerned and this was added in the document. Recommendation was to have cross-committee responsibility of the Functional Model overseen by the IDESG Management Council.

Adam shared the *Management Council Scoping statement, including program listing and certification scheme* document with the team. Within the document it states that IDESG will do v2 of the Functional Model.

Action: Adam will add something in the Strategic Plan about how/when the Functional Model will be updated.

Guiding Principle Requirements – there is still work to be done in this section.

Risk Assessment Framework (review in progress) for the entire IDESG organization. This section was identified by the NPO that this was a deliverable of the organization. It is a framework for participants of the organization in guiding them on the risks involved in their participation. Security Committee members did not think it reasonable or appropriate to identify risks. They did think a ULA was more appropriate. Benefits and risks discussed. What problems are we mitigating? ULA needed instead? One of the key issues that have been holding back big initiatives in this area is the concern around the liability aspects. NIST is coming out with several guidance documents in this area – it might be more appropriate to have the Standards Committee look at this. Better to align with a credible organization already doing or have done this type of work. IDESG doesn't have authority to allocate liability. Best thing IDESG could do is to note that liability is whatever it would be under existing contract/torte law.

Tools – Field Manual discussed - the Privacy Committee proposed they start to work on a manual. The Security Committee had the requirement under Security Evaluation Methodology – an aid to help organizations understand how they are meeting the security requirements. This is still in the strategic plan as a requirement and deliverable. We need to quickly move and decide on roles. We didn't break down the requirement by role earlier. Adam brought up the original charter of the SEM committee. The team needs to decide if this is something the Security Committee should still be doing. Is the work useful and necessary now? (Note: this has been discussed before and the thinking was it was not something the Security Committee thought was needed.) Adam mentioned that the Charter needs an update. IDESG Rules of Association are being updated. There is an acknowledgement that re-alignment of committee charters need to be done as well. (Note: this has been discussed before Security Committee is waiting for guidance from IDESG/MC on the framework/template for what belongs in the charter and what is addressed in the ROA. Thus Committee only wants to do it once. Post receipt of the guidance..) Need to step back and look at SEM in a different way and determine what is needed from a Security Committee perspective (self-assessment versus third-party assessment).

Action: Adam to go back to Management Council to ask how to address this. There are things we can't define; do we put in as a place holder? How do we work through this? What do we need to do over the next two-years from a Security Committee perspective? Determine how to evaluate key objectives of the Security Committee over the next two years.

Interaction Model work is being eliminated from the Strategic Plan.

Taxonomy document – use case and reference implementation. Security Committee would like to contribute to the reference implementation.

New business:

New IDESG website targeted to launch October 15, 2015.

Wrap up and actions for next week:

See above.

Next meeting: October 22, 2015

Adjourn: Meeting was adjourned at 2:10 p.m. EDT.