

SACM

2-Aug-2013

Use Case Discussion

Dave Harrington

Terminology - should it be up front in discussion in use case document?

Will be in discussion points

Requirements done by end of Sept

Area Director - "no" strong on taking use cases / arch / req to trade shows

Paul Hoffman

Charter has UC1, UC2, UC3 in it. Is this use case one of three use case documents? Why only UC1?

Chair - this is the use case document for this phase of the work; must recharter after

Paul - then terminology should go to separate doc at the end

Dave H - terminology in each draft to allow parallel work but at the end terminology in separate doc

SACM

3 Aug - 2013

Chair - why not do separate term
doc how

Nancy - since 3 working on doc 5
collaborator; those 3 then be
the editor of the terminology doc

Dave W - post doc src where
any of 3 can check it out

Paul H - should terminology be
constrained to UC1?

Dave W - arch doc constrained
primarily to endpoint assessment

Paul H - doesn't like 3 terminology,
3 Arch, 3 ...

Jon Baker (Gary Kaspinski) - does
UC1 constrain to mobile
devices UPNed in

Dave H - one administrative domain

Dave W - a device that needs
to assert something to acquire
access to some domain resource

SACM

3-Aug-2013

Steve Hanna - mobile devices e.g. 4G
devices that connect 'should be'
in scope

Paul H - network remoteness not
a factor to posture of connecting
devices

Dave W - how do you handle patch
management ~~in~~ for example, in the
broader context?

Only a portion of understanding
UC1 will capture full needs

Steve H - remote monitoring is
doable, NFA used on his remote
machine, now

Should we gather requirements before
CSG CASG is finished?
no objection to starting now

comparison discussion on the list

Don R - two conversations here

- 1) on language
- 2) on content

1) is IETF lang plain english
enough?

- 2) should it be use cases w/ or w/out
technology..

SACM

3-Aug-2013

Dave H - like Adams actor rotation
use cases, but too verbose, but
very clear

Dave W - +1 on form of use case
descriptions

really liked the post condition aspect
included in Adams

Concern of problem from making assumptions
about underlying arch; too constraining
for arch

form; like the idea of the
actors being described

Jon Baker: would like to be able to
engage externally more;

AD - individuals are free to do that, but
IETF doesn't/won't

Steve H - do individual reach out and
encourage them to come or
bring their viewpoints back

Dave H - should we be focused only on
Internet related things?

e.g. reporting endpoint status to
the boss is (is not?) an IETF
function

SACM

3-Aug-2013

Elliot Lear - Please explain question
in better depth

Dave H - creating a report to right

Steve H - it is important to
understand what people want
SACM to accomplish but
not describe the structure/form
of human report

relevant to use case / req's

Dan R - Is something like
asset has physical protection
something that should be conveyed?

Steve H - Yes. That is something
that users care about and
combine w/ other data

Dave W - We are trying to
map data that we can observe
with data that must be human
provided, e.g. OCTL

Dave H - good to establish what
IETF solves and doesn't

Sean T (AD) - mailing list should help regulate

SACM

3-May-2013

Paul H - talking about the
use case document; so talking
about non-ITIL work items is
fine

Steve H - should we talk about
other use cases?

Asset Discovery - use case includes
the results not the use case

Chris Tracib - Steve +1

~~Joe Clark~~

Dave H - lots of possible identifiers
and asset right is hard

Dave W - +1 Chris, Steve, & Dave H
need multiple ID's to be able to
correlate them

Joe Clark - Is vuln right a sub
task of asset right / config mgmt
or is it more about managing
vuln's

describe vulns
understand impact
understand mitigations

then relate to asset & config mgmt

SACM

3-Aug-2013

Elliot L -

Hank - want as many sources & ability
to ID asset's & viewpoints
need to resolve discrepancies

Ton Baker - vuln mgmt:

the WG will have to determine the
bounds with Vuln Mgmt some of
that data is higher order and
maybe out of scope but might
need to include parts for in
scope efforts

Dave W - we likely need to figure
out transports and ability to
Requirements Nancy CW

Nancy CW - need to come & do
better asset ID we tend to
associate asset's w/ people but
in IoT that's no longer true
but those IoT devices are still
malicious potential hosts

Chair - Any objections to adopting
draft as WG doc?

[no objections] take to list

SACM

3-Aug-2013

Nancy CW - going to up level doc and
get rid of prescriptive parts and
capture design patterns

attempt to capture what it means to
capture what it means to be an
asset; to includ IoT devices

Chair - can comment on ODP as
asset identifier mechanism

Nancy CW - haven't read it yet

Nancy CW - also looking for help

Dave W - will help w/ parts

Nancy CW - also working towards better
security model and transport & auth

- privacy impacts e.g. human
binding of device might not be
needed to do soft vuln mgmt
analysis

SACM

Architecture Status

Dave W

3-Aug-2013

Dave W - to send email pointer to
email archive

what should approach to architecture description
representation?

Chris Inacio - would like more informative
text to precede to normative text
for good motivation

Paul H - where is there a separate
Architectural and Reg doc? Aren't
they too tightly tied?

Chair - this comment is why chair is
only polling to make use case
doc as COG doc

do one more revision of Reg's 1
Arch to determine how go forward

AD - continue as we are now so
that WG doesn't get dinged

Steve H - likes the hybrid approach

SACM

3 Aug - 2013

Steve H - We will eventually need to have one Arch to rule them all
Timing - bringing the I & Vancouver? or multiple in Vancouver?

Dave W - Multiple in Vancouver resolved on Vancouver

Chair - Next agenda item to plan

Dave W - Should arch be constrained to IETF focus

Paul H - tried this in IPsec for years; complete failure
need to constraint to IETF scope

too hard to do before Arch doc;
nobody cares after Arch doc

Use case doc WG draft
Terminology separate doc
Use case structure

list decisions
divide
x0