

MINUTES
Commonwealth of Virginia
Identity Management Standards Advisory Council (IMSAC)
Monday, May 2, 2016
Commonwealth Enterprise Solutions Center
11751 Meadowville Lane
Chester, VA 23836
Multipurpose Room 1222

ATTENDANCE

Members Present:

Lisa Kimball, Chairperson
Dave Burhop
Katie Crepps
Jeremy Grant (via conference line)
Tom Moran
Jeffrey Zubricki
Michael Watson
Nelson Moe

Others Present:

Dr. Joseph Grubbs
Janice Akers

Members Absent:

None

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Kimball called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m. in the VITA Multipurpose Room 1222 at the Commonwealth Enterprise Solutions Center in Chester, VA.

Roll call was taken for all members. All members were in attendance. Jeremy Grant was not present at CESC, but, attended the workshop via conference call from his Washington DC office due to unexpected business not allowing him to leave his geographic area.

CIO Nelson Moe presented a certificate of council appointment from Governor McAuliffe to all members.

Note: The IMSAC meeting agenda packet including all of the presentation materials may be accessed on the VITA website at:

<http://www.vita.virginia.gov/ITAC/default.aspx?id=6442472422>

Workshop Discussion Items

Dr. Grubbs provided background on the two documents to be reviewed by the council with the following points:

- The documents do not define all of the requirements and specifications required for trust frameworks or identity proofing and verification, but rather, represent the results of the analysis for minimum specifications

- The format for the documents is based on the template used for the Commonwealth of Virginia IT arena so that it would reflect IT resource management for the commonwealth and align with trust frameworks to follow.
- He advised that he would begin the discussion by going through each document and identifying modifications for preparation of the final working draft for June 2016 meeting of the advisory council.

A. **Operation Trust Frameworks** – Report on Staff Analysis and Draft Guidance Document Review, *Joseph W. Grubbs, PH.D. IMSAC Staff Analyst, Virginia Information Technologies Agency*

At 9:14 a.m. the working draft was displayed on the screen as the council members for content review. Dr. Grubbs provided background information on each section as it related to analysis and content. Council members advised return commentary to Dr. Grubbs as follows:

- Section 3 – Statutory Frameworks elicited no commentary.
- Section 4 – Definitions
 - Dr. Grubbs expressed that the definitions originated and aligned with existing standards and definitions used in the documents cited for analysis. The list was a result of a harmonization analysis whereby all definition components were included from the various sources.
 - No action was taken on the suggestion to include adding a reference to the Commonwealth Security Standard 501 (SEC501) or the Commonwealth's IT Resource Management Glossary. Dr. Grubbs stated that the Commonwealth policies, standards and guidelines governed state agencies and the IMSAC guidance documents would be for non-state agency entities.
 - Discussion focused on making the document more forward thinking resulted in the need to find the *balance* between defining minimum specifications that would make a meaningful impact within the identity management ecosystem while not being so prescriptive that they limit scalability and become irrelevant with changes in technology.
 - A need to focus on overall privacy as the paramount issue was cited stressing that these terms may have various definitions across industries from both a technical and legal perspective. A suggestion to include a definition comparison for privacy vs. technical aspects in a future iteration to span the balance resulted.
 - Chairperson Kimball asserted that any specific dictionary references should be included in the document as a specific source. When the source updates, so do the terms.
- Section 5 – Background
 - Non-inclusion of a framework addressing limited liability responsibilities was addressed with the goal of the document being to recommend minimum specifications of components with any forthcoming effort to impact liability to use existing commonwealth processes and protocols.
 - Commentary was made to include a stronger reason for the document and was noted as an update.
- Section 6 – Minimum Specifications

- In response to commentary concerning a concern that the document does not cover disclosure requirements when “things go wrong.” It was agreed that the document would be strengthened.
- After discussion it was agreed that the document would include aspects of business continuity along with the prevalent business processes.
- It was agreed that a review cycle would be added to the document.
- All members decided to seek feedback from other groups and subject matter experts, “interested parties,” on the document content and framework.
- Section 7 – Alignment Comparison
 - Discussion included a concern that the findings documented areas of alignment but did not address areas of misalignment. Dr. Grubbs indicated that he would provide a copy of the analysis completed previously to document areas of misalignment.
 - Chairperson Kimball took under advisement the commentary that the document did not seem to include international standards.
- Appendix 2 – Alignment Comparison Matrix
 - Nelson Moe took an action item to determine if there are any states which are SICAM certified.
 - Nelson Moe also recommended that the comparison analysis document that international standards also were reviewed.
 - Chairperson Kimball advised the need for all members to compare and contrast the models. The DURSA and InCommon trust frameworks were cited as good models. Dr. Grubbs offered to provide to the council a copy of the “white paper” prepared for Virginia’s pilot under the National Strategy for Trusted Identities in Cyberspace.

B. **Identity Proofing and Verification Minimum Specification and Standards** – Report on Staff Analysis and Draft Guidance Document Review, *Joseph W. Grubbs, PH.D. IMSAC Staff Analyst, Virginia Information Technologies Agency*

At 10:35 a.m. the working draft was displayed on the screen as the council members for content review. Dr. Grubbs provided background information on each section as it related to analysis and content. Council members advised return commentary to Dr. Grubbs as follows:

- Sections 2, 3, 4 and 5:
 - The Chairperson cited that these sections include the same information as found on the previous document and should include updates as previously discussed.
- Section 6 – Minimum Specifications:
 - The members agreed to have a subject matter expert present to the group the topic discussion on publication NIST SP 800-63-2 revisions.
 - Discussion prompted the need for the document to reference government sources or general standards for criteria for identity requirements. The members agreed that a reference by example using an illustrative table showing different industries with different levels of security may be helpful.

- It was agreed that the document shall be updated to include time frame guidance for tracking and record retention/maintenance.
- It was agreed that the process flow would be updated for record retention, registration and token application.
- It was commented that the Levels of Assurance section should be updated to highlight strength of identity proofing vs. strength of credentialing.
- It was commented that “approved cryptographic methods” and “single factor authentication network” are terms that may need more explanation and prevalence in consideration of the audience.
- It was agreed that a requirements are to be added to the document to address the need to historically capture the level of assurance for a person over time either by technically handling the way the person is credentialed or through the system audit process.
- The Privacy and Security section prompted discussion on the use of “should”, “shall” and “must” in requirements due to the interpretation behind their strength. Chairperson Kimball confirmed the member approach of looking at the specific requirements individually for commentary and use the ITEF to make recommendations.
- Discussion was prompted in addressing enforcement or certification of these guidelines. This discussion was tabled to the next meeting.
- Section 7 – Alignment Comparison
 - Guidance was sought from the members on structuring this section of the document. A matrix of standards was suggested that includes a range of extremely prescriptive to high level as well as misalignment with alignment through the use of component swim lanes citing standards for US, EU and UK. It was agreed that this matrix would be presented at the next meeting. Chairperson Kimball approved this approach.
- Congratulatory commentary was shared by all members to thank Dr. Grubbs for his excellent work.

Public Comment

At 11:20 a.m. Chairperson Kimball opened the floor to public comment. The commentary from the public included: excellent documents.

At 11:20 a.m. a motion was taken, and seconded, to move the June 6, 2016 scheduled meeting. Discussion of attendance and personal calendars proceeded. A motion was made and seconded to hold the IMSAC meeting on June 23, 2016. The motion passed.

Adjournment

At 11:29 a.m. the meeting was adjourned.