

CS1/06-0254

Date: December 8, 2006

Final Letter Ballot Results and Comments on CS1/05-0253:

Do you approve the attached project proposal for the EDAC Model (CS1/06-0236)?

Final tally: 15, 3, 3, 5 (26) Letter Ballot PASSES

	Voting Members	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	NO RESPONSE	COMMENTS
1	Atsec Information Security Corporation	X				
2	Axalto				X	
3	Booz Allen & Hamilton Inc				X	
4	Cisco Systems Inc	X				
5	Computer Sciences Corporation		X			<i>See Comment</i>
6	Concordant Inc	X				
7	EWA - Information & Infrastructure Technologies Inc		X			<i>See Comment</i>
8	Forsythe Solutions Group				X	
9	Hewlett-Packard Company	X				
10	Hitachi Data Systems	X				
11	HotSkills Inc	X				
12	IBM Corporation				X	
13	KPMG LLP				X	
14	Lucent Technologies			X		<i>See Comment</i>
15	Mitre Corporation			X		<i>See Comment</i>
16	National Security Agency		X			<i>See Comment</i>
17	NIST	X				
	PREMIER Bankcard Inc DEACTIVATED	-----	-----	-----	-----	
18	Raytheon Systems Company	X				
19	RSA Security Inc			X		<i>See Comment</i>
20	Surety Technologies Inc	X				
21	Systems and Software Consortium Inc	X				
22	The Center for Internet Security	X				
23	The SANS Institute	X				
24	The Zygma Partnership	X				
25	US Dept of Defense	X				
26	VHA Health Information Architecture Office	X				
TOTALS (26)		15	3	3	5	

COMMENTS:

EWA:

We do not support this proposal on the grounds that it seems to be applicable to only a very narrow segment, and have only limited interest to the community, thus we feel that it is inappropriate to support it.

Lucent:

No sufficient interest in the company

Mitre:

Lack of expertise to review within available time period

NSA:

NSA does not believe that this proposal is appropriate for standardization as it reflects implementation detail from one organization and is not widely in use.

RSA Security:

Lack of time

CSC:

CSC does not support the creation of this standard. Developing such a standard, at this time, would tend to be didactic rather than codifying.

The proposal referenced INCITS 359-2004 RBAC Standard states this premise quite well. "This standard describes RBAC features that have achieved acceptance in the commercial marketplace." "...in accordance with commonly known and understood terminology and functional specifications." "As such, it is widely deployed and familiar technology." "This feature has often been mentioned in the literature and has precedence in existing RBAC implementations..." "There is a strong consensus on this issue." The notion of EDAC does not enjoy such a requisite industry consensus.

The industry should be allowed to develop and produce evidence for what is required for standard(s) relating to emerging access control techniques before such a standard would be useful. There are a number of industry consortia working on next generation access control methods e.g., the Jericho Forum and the Trusted Computing Group, etc.. Also, the National Security Agency and the Defense Information Systems Agency are evaluating policy (attribute) based access control in connection with developing net-centric access control techniques suitable for the Global Information Grid. This work looks similar to EDAC. The Network and Information Technology Research and Development Initiative (NITRD), under the National Science & Technology Council, has recently issued a call for white papers for Research & Development on securing the nation's critical infrastructure. Among the NITRD priority research topics is next generation access control. Existing Standards, for example, SAML 1.1 and 2.0 and XACML 1.1 and 2.0, already yield a non-proprietary ability. Workflow related to access control can already be incorporated in BPEL (Business Process Execution Language). These venues should be allowed to develop some

direction and momentum before the notion of an enterprise dynamic access control standard is undertaken.