**IHO Security Scheme PT Meeting 2 Thursday 30th November 2023**

**Agenda**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Timing** | **Topic** | **Presenter** |
| 10:30  2000 | Welcome  Appointment of Vice Chair - Michael Andrew | Chair |
| 10:45  2015 | Review of completed actions;   * Outstanding finial work plan needs to be completed. * TM -Git hub hosts the start of the draft process for comment * MA - 5/6 code participants are they existing, signed up under the current agreement or are we holding any agreements in abeyance? * TM- Signing up to the agreement that is on the IHO website maybe best to not allow sign up then sign a open ended agreement TM, MA agreed. KH - same agreement use should have a limit. Same agreement limited time e.g. 12months * Secong part of meeting   **A - Matthew Paris at the IHO should join the meetings. Ask him to provide a summary each meeting into who has applied. This is to aid visibility who is applying.**  **A - The 5 or 6 should be on an interim agreement (they may have signed up to the old agreement).**   * Developed interim process for IHO to manage S-100 Security Scheme * Legal points reduce risk associated with S63   Next point  S100 Singapore IHO security group.  Outstanding Items   * PT Workplan | Chair |
| 11:00  2030 | * Implementation of part 15, Australian situation is we are in all parts of the scheme. * What was allowed in S63 for duplication is not in S100 * We see a number of situations, thing like shore based systems where provision of multiple use has merit. * Described paper and issue and AU / NZ situation. Meeting agreed that the matters set out in my S100WG paper will be addressed by this WG and will be permitted with clear controls. Need to come up with T&C and processes to enable this to happen. * TM explain examples of where multiple UPN is for ease of usability however it need to be auditable (cases are known) and transparent. The requirement to stop licence piracy is significant. * Administrative control used in Aus MA are happy to share, simplicity avoids mistakes.   Thus allowing this in a controlled way is paramount.   * For ECS market looking at different ENC encryption and therefore different pricing for different uses. * TM highlighted the possibility of different uses, price points via different SS per uses? * With S100 adoption, differences in uses needs to be discussed more, as more a variety of may be more practical depending on the user groups * HB - Use of data in web services. Look at this in more detail.   HB was against using different algorithms,  Increase implementation complexity.  Solution difference licence model? Legal not technical solution.   * TM argued that legal controls will and have not worked thus the technical more than 1 SS algorithm has merit. * MA highlight a bigger issue in the web services space. GIS can get into S63 and serve out unencrypted data. Service internal but could be served to the outside web. * May be duel legal and technical   **MA action: duplicate UPN methodology to GitHub (process description and methodology). Should investigate web services issue more**   1. investigate the IHO certificate vs global certificate authorities.   Holger – a few issues mixed together global certification vs self-signed. Revocation of data servers should be discussed. Signing NtM etc is out of scope of Pt15 of the standard.  DR – agree with HB, part15 allows signing of other data (not encrypted). So wanting to use IHO to sign data eg nautical publications better with official IHO certificate.  TM IHO has no Legal, so hold less weight the other authority.   * Holger suggests that license terms are the solution to ECS vs ENC vs Web services * IC-ENC possible funding goal support the development of IHO standards. SS implementation development in S100 is very important to IC-ENC   MA: Opt in fund. Bids being considered now, including a request to fund acquisition of legal advice on updated agreements and as it may be useful to the IHO to obtain legal advice related to migrating existing agreements and terminating agreements either for cause or inactivity.   * Legal discussions   Need to decide jurisdiction before starting to draft. This is something that IHO will need help with.  No audit clause so they cant get to the heart of any issues as they have no rights.  Termination and enduring clauses.  Action : IHO to decide governing law (popular, member or something else). May need to   * Agreement considerations     KH – main thing no governing law clause, legal wrangle which substantive law is relevant, system of law applies to the interpretation of the law. This 1 only has a derestriction clause. Need to consider governing clause.  Important to determine, what law am I doing this under?  Important clause missing, e.g. termination provisions, no audit clause boiler plate one missing which can be added.  MA : Noting that some members of the scheme are contracting governments we need to consider and get advice on how many agreements are necessary.  MA – Monaco what do you think? KH many variables to consider which makes Monaco not the best, e.g. common language  We should also consider what practical operational matters should be in the agreement vs what should be in associated guidance and procedures.  MA – need to focus on:   * getting legal advice and starting to work with IHO to put together the scope and content of suitable agreements.   -Developing a suitable set of questions and a decision matrix.  - need to define the scope of audit/inspection scheme for the agreement.  - which parties are going to be subject to audit ? Noting the Defence users of the scheme.  - need to define technical criteria around appointment (is that software validation etc).  - a ‘performance management process’  We might also get advice on grounds to deny participation to parties. | Chair  Michael Andrew  Karen Hellier |
| 11:45  2115 | Coffee | |
| 12:00  2130 | IHO SS PT Proposed Work Plan  S-100 Data Protection Scheme Operational Procedures   * **MA – team to look at the process currently and to look at what questions are asked and perhaps suggest a process model and questions.** * Noted that the new processes may require more resources / will need to capture whatever is the additional work effort etc. * Holger Bothien = key exchange procedures need to be updated in v6.0 so that we introduce a security scheme ‘worth its name’ modelled more on banking or similar methods. | Chair |
| 12:20  2150 | Next Steps,   * IC-ENC submission * Update extant agreement to make them time based. * Meeting with Nyberg and Magnus around timeframes so will discuss when expects PT work to finalise. * In HSSC report will look at resources needed to operate scheme. * Holger will put up his suggestions on keys * Members to put up their ideas. | Chair |
| 12:30  2200 | Next meeting date and time | Chair |