CTI-TC Monthly Meeting: Session #1

Meeting Date: September 15, 2022
Time: Session #1 Notes + Attendance
Purpose: Monthly CTI TC Meeting
Recordings: Meeting Recordings Link

Attendees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carroll, Sean</td>
<td>National Security Agency</td>
<td>Voting Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caselli, Marco</td>
<td>Siemens AG</td>
<td>Voting Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey, Tim</td>
<td>DarkLight, Inc.</td>
<td>Voting Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coderre, Robert</td>
<td>Accenture</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cullinane, Kelly</td>
<td>Copado</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darley, Trey</td>
<td>Accenture</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desai, Kartikey</td>
<td>Mitre Corporation</td>
<td>Voting Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keirstead, Jason</td>
<td>IBM</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith, Robert</td>
<td>Accenture</td>
<td>Voting Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, Chenta</td>
<td>IBM</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenk, Chris</td>
<td>Mitre Corporation</td>
<td>Voting Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masuoka, Ryusuke</td>
<td>Fujitsu Limited</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mates, Jeffrey</td>
<td>US Department of Defense (DoD)</td>
<td>Voting Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noguchi, Kazuo</td>
<td>Hitachi, Ltd.</td>
<td>Voting Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Brien, Chris</td>
<td>Google Inc.</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick, Paul</td>
<td>DarkLight, Inc.</td>
<td>Voting Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piazza, Richard</td>
<td>Mitre Corporation</td>
<td>Voting Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratliff, Emily</td>
<td>IBM</td>
<td>Voting Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricard, Chris</td>
<td>Financial Services Information Sharing and</td>
<td>Voting Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron, Aviv</td>
<td>IBM</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satomi, Toshitaka</td>
<td>Fujitsu Limited</td>
<td>Voting Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studer, Christian</td>
<td>CIRCL</td>
<td>Voting Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, Marlon</td>
<td>DHS Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Secur</td>
<td>Voting Member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agenda:
- Welcome
- ITU Cross Standardization Update
- TC Updates
  - STIX SC
  - TAXII SC
- Community Development Corner
- Q&A
Welcome back from summer break

ITU Cross Standardization

Where are we in the process?

- ✔ TC Motion to proceed - passed on 19 May
- ✔ TC to submit official request to OASIS staff - completed on 25 May
- ✔ OASIS will conduct a Special Majority Vote to approve the submission of request to the OASIS President
- ✔ Upon Special Majority Vote passage, OASIS will open a 15-day staff review period
- ✔ Next, a public 30-day call for comment to OASIS membership occurs
- ✔ Post this comment period, if there are no issues, the President has up to 15 days to approve/reject the submission.
- ✔ If approved, 15 days to submit to ITU, then the ITU review and approval process takes over... Preliminary package delivered to ITU on 1 September.

What is happening now?

- The ITU has responded to OASIS on 2 September 2022
  - ITU-T SG17 will take up discussion of accepting STIX/TAXII as ITU standards as STIE and TAEII
  - There are concerns with the trademarks associated with STIX and TAXII
- What does this mean?
  - History: Bringing STIX/TAXII into OASIS back in 2015, OASIS and US DHS were unable to come to agreement on transferring the intellectual property rights (trademarks) to OASIS, leading to a potentially “encumbered IPR” scenario
  - To solve this issue, DHS granted a licence to use the STIX/TAXII terms (while retaining ownership) and OASIS Board of Directors accepted this license grant (see https://www.oasis-open.org/committees/cti/ipr.php)
  - Every time we issue a revision of the standards, the OASIS BoD needs to explicitly waive OASIS IPR rules and allow the special license grant.
What Are Our Options?

- TC leadership is working with OASIS and our ITU liaison (Duncan Sparrell) to identify next steps.
- As of now, these are:
  - A: Negotiate with the original contributors (US DHS/CISA) about removal of the trademark license and restrictions, so that no third party trademark claim obstacle remains to the Study Group’s hesitancy to proceed.
  - B: Negotiate some kind of paring back of the same license, short of complete removal. We’re not yet sure if that approach would address ITU-T’s concerns.
  - C: Accept the Study Group’s implied suggestion that the name of the works be modified slightly so that there no longer is any question of infringement of the trademarked names.
  - D: Withdraw the submission.

Timelines

- ITU-T SG17 has indicated they will take up STIE and TAEII at their next work session in March 2023.
  - Duncan Sparrell and Michael Rosa are the designated editors.
- HOWEVER, we cannot stay idle until then.
- We need to find a solution to the IPR issue prior to the end of 2022.
  - Ideally, we will have a solution (one of the aforementioned options) finalized by late October / early November.
- PLEASE GET INVOLVED!

Jason Kierstead
We should get started on C, while we are working on option A. Option B is likely not going to solve the problem. We need to make it clear to DHS that going with Option C makes their trademark worthless

Sean Carroll
As background & from my understanding, DHS kept the ™ bc they wanted to ensure no impediments to the standard. Now that they are the ones impeding the standard, that needs to be made clear. Russia didn’t like the submission to the ITU - felt like they didn’t get time to review detail – despite OASIS following the timeline rules.
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Jamie Clark (OASIS General Counsel - Guest for this TC call)
The timing was on the late side (but still within rules) - natural reaction from the Russian reps. Option C – might still require working with DHS given the extent of the™. OASIS is having these discussions

***Jamie’s Ask of the TC***
- Create a letter/list of official opinions on what the TC. OASIS will take that to DHS.
  - This letter ideally contains a rank list of options with reasonings and concerns

Rob Coderre
Should we create a study group to work on this issue? Aim to have something late OCT/early NOV to bring back to the TC.

Trey Darley
Regarding option C - we have places in our code where changing the name would be very challenging. This is more than surface work. Forking STIX would be damaging.

Sean Carroll
  - **MOTION:** Move to adopt a preliminary resolution that the 4 options as presented in this meeting are in this order are our preference. The TC will set up a tiger team to write a letter and share with the TC. Vote on this in a special meeting in the very near future. Reserve the right of the co-chairs to open a ballot on the letter if a special meeting can’t be held.

Jason Kierstead
This is important. We should open a ballot on this, not vote in the meeting. We need to have a solid understanding of the preferences order. Don’t think we’ve had enough discussion. Then we move forward with the tiger team to draft a letter. We also need a clear list of benefits by even submitting to the ITU. We are talking about an enormous industry if we have to edit the standard. We need to be certain that the benefits of the standard outweigh the effort to change.

Trey Darley
I heard about a competing standard in China. Withdrawing the submission to the ITU could give China the competitive advantage on threat intelligence.

Sean Carroll
To my knowledge, China has not proposed a solution like STIX. They did propose a cyber threat standard for automotive vehicles - the nature is different. It is more of a framework than a standard, and referenced TAXII, therefore implied STIX.

Benefits of submitting to the ITU: ITU is part of the UN. If they adopt it, they cover translations and adoption campaigns. Further push for global adoption and market will likely create tools around STIX/TAXII

  - **MOTION AMENDMENT:** Sean Carroll moves that a tiger team be set up to present a letter/proposal in 2 weeks time to a special session of the TC. In turn, the TC will either adopt, reject, amend this letter/proposal. In the interim the tiger team is empowered to, and can set up electronic ways to poll membership about the 4 presented choices to ensure the letter is in line with the TC’s feelings as a whole. This work product, once approved by the TC at a special session, is geared to OASIS to inform them of the TC’s desires.
  
  **MOTION SECONDED by** Jeff Mates
Voting was conducted by raising hands in zoom
Quorum achieved: Yes - 60% of voting members were present at this session. 18 eligible voters were present at the time of the vote.
  Voting:
    ○ Yes/In Favor: 14
    ○ Abstain: 4
    ○ No/Against: 0

Vote passes and results will be combined with 9pm session.

Rob Coderre
Please reach out to the Co-Chairs if you want to be on the tiger team
  ○ Sean Carroll volunteered in chat

Seeking members in the following roles:
  ● Co-Secretary
  ● TAXII SC Chair/Co-Chair
  ● Please reach out to the co-chairs or listserv for more information

STIX SC Update

Emily Ratliff

Request authorization to publish [Best Practices](#) as a Committee Note via voice vote

Updated [FAQ](#) - let us know if additional Q&A are desired

Reviewed OpenSSF Scorecard results for OASIS Open repos

All info is on the slide. Main order of business is to hold a voice vote to publish the best practices document as a committee note.

Voting was conducted by raising hands in zoom
Quorum achieved: Yes - 64% of voting members were present at this session. 19 eligible voters present.
Results:
Yes/In Favor: 18
Abstain: 1
Vote passes and results will be combined with 9pm session.

**TAXII SC Update**

Kartikey Desai

Recent plugest was good, the group learned a lot. Companies are making improvements to their products as a result.

**Looking Forward**

- Host more PlugFests
- More participating organizations
- Create more-automated test suite(s) for use:
  - During PlugFests
  - Potentially make available a fully-contained test suite for orgs to use for individual testing outside of PlugFests
- Revision(s) to the Interoperability Test Documents
- OASIS socialization of PlugFests

Meeting Terminated