CTI-TC Interop Working Session

Meeting Date: July 19, 2017
Time: 9:00 a.m. US PDT
Purpose: Weekly CTI TC Interoperability Meeting

Attendees:

Allan Thomson – Moderator
Mark Davidson
Harry Peltokangas
Gus Creedon
Jane Ginn - Recorder

Agenda:

- Review of Part 2 – TAXII Testing

Meeting Notes

Allan Thomson
- Update on Part 2 of Test document sequence
  https://docs.google.com/document/d/11MocPK3s8im8O5-7rgZhtVHoxO72aQicJj2v-HDx-Q8/edit#
  -- Tests for TAXII capability supported by various personas
  -- Allan has done a first cut

- Scrolled through the document
  - Outlined the personas from Part 1
  - We’ve added a 6th Persona that represents a TAXII server
  - A TIP could bundle with a TAXII server
  - Reason why represented here as a separate thing
  - You could still certify if not a TIP

- Walked through the various components of the Spec

Mark Davidson
- Suggested using a different configuration for the TAXII test

Allan Thomson
- We may have to be a little flexible

Mark Davidson
- I’ll put a note about the ability to substitute IPs for the test [added to the text]

Allan
- Walked through the connection with the TAXII server – Can do a GET of the API Root
  [Highlighted what is returned on the document]
- Talked about the variations based on Jason’s feedback – Having different collections
  For both Read & Write
  What I did was introduce two data shares – Alternate A & Alternate B

Mark Davidson
- I would be OK if all are required
  For me, the less options, the less variability

Allan
- Jason felt strongly that these things should be separate

Mark
- It is a little different from the Spec because it does not require readable features
  But, I like how this is
Continued to walk through the document
One of the things that Jason noted... I had introduced a GET – a good practice
    Jason noted that it is not in the Spec – I feel that this should be mandated

I think it is OK for the text – In production, I would just store the state

Best Practices might be that if you haven’t refreshed in a while—it might introduce errors

It introduces two modes – In a production setting you’re not going to check every time
It causes the test behavior to deviate from the production behavior – I would have my
    Team write separate code

I would check this once every time that I run it – I’m going to check it periodically
    Any other opinions?

I think it would be reasonable to do this the first time – One test is to go read all
    The collections and display it to your consumer

That is what I was thinking – For each of the test cases that have been defined in Part 1
    You initiate a test – I don’t want to reproduce all of the test data from Part 1
    But, what you get back from the server – you have the count of tests in the Table

I agree with Mark with the fact that this is for a Test only – We may need a different
    Document for Operations – We very clearly want to state that I am operational

I agree, yep... So, this is how we post to a particular collection – As part of the test
    As has already been described in Part 1
    Here we are just referring to it in the context of TAXII

I have one comment – Let’s say you take a test and you get a 202-status message back
    It might be worth having the client make another request

[Describes how the test spec would handle it] there are more advanced tests (paging, filtering)
    We will do that in subsequent revisions

I agree with that

That is the general feature... there are some more notes on some things that we are
    Going to add

Would it be acceptable to put in a JSON blog... and that would be OK
    Or do I need to put it in a database and send forward

I would say the former
    I would rather people take an approach of interpretation and apply to real
    Examples – and show how their product would allow them to do that
    Not to take some canned data

If we are talking about real product functionality – the list is longer
Allan

That is all called out in Part 1 and I didn’t want to have to repeat that
Jason and Jane will fill out this sharing piece… we’ll cover that when done
A want to go over the error handling – this is an initial list, there will be more

[Went over the list of error handling sections]

Feedback?

Mark

[Gave some very detailed wording recommendations]
Suggested adding a test to reject TLS 1

Allan

Added a test for attempts to Read/Write without authorization
Any other suggestions?

Mark

I think that is good – Other negative tests – Like ‘Delete at Collection’
You wouldn’t want to fail a test because of that
A lot of other tests would fall into that.

Allan

That is pretty-much Part 2
A question for the team on this call: Should common handling and error handling be collapsed
Into one

Mark

I’d consider moving it up to keep them next to each other... They map really closely
Basically, I think they are very close to each other

Allan

I like your suggestion to moving it

Gus

You wanted to get this out in August, right?

Allan

I was targeting that... I think that is a reasonable targeted

Gus

As another set of eyes, I’ll take a look at how you rearranged things...

Allan

Jane had reviewed part one and she pointed out some of the editorial things
I’ll call out – We were inconsistent in how we used Producer/Respondent
Jane tried to fix it – we need to make these to Part 2

Gus

Does OASIS have a Spec that I can look at?

Allan

It is a Committee Document – Part Folklore and part Guidance
Chet came back and gave us guidance on how to handle
I’m working on the essence, rather than the rule
They don’t want it to come across... we need to be able to describe those things in
Ways that are clear... I am a realistic person... I’d rather have lots of products that
Are interoperable

Henry

One test case – Supporting updates for Indicators, Second, is for using Revoke

Allan

The two cases are in Part 1 of the Spec – There is a section on versioning
In Part 1 we talk about Versioning – When you create and how you modify
Those are described in the section on Versioning
When we have TAXII, we are just referring to Part 1 – We are not going to redefine
Gus
Jane, do you have some guidance that you used?

Jane
I'll send you my mark-up?

Gus
Ok, thanks.

Allan
I'd like to get your opinion on whether or not we should do a Ballot?

Gus
Yes, I think so

Jane
Based on the update to the new Part 1

Mark
After seeing what we see here, I think so

Allan
I propose that we cancel this call for next week... The next meeting will be 2 weeks from today
I will get the Ballot out for Part 1 before Black Hat
I'd like for everyone on the Committee to start to realize that this is real
Talk to you all in 2 weeks if not at Black Hat

Meeting Terminated
**************************************************************************