Global Supply Chain Security for Microelectronics

Information and IP Protection Session Report Out–July 29, 2022

27 – 29 July 2022 workshop



Information & IP Protection Session



FACILITATOR Roger Smith U.S. Navy

ANSI

Supported by the following organizations:

Aerocyonics Aerospace Industries Association Amazon Web Services (AWS) Battelle Memorial Institute **Booz Allen Hamilton** Defense Contract Management Agency **DLA Land and Maritime** DUST Identity **Global Operations - Advanced** Sourcing Indiana Innovation Institute (IN3) Institute for Defense Analyses Lockheed Martin NASA

National Electrical Manufacturers			
Association (NEMA)			
NIST			
Office of Naval Research			
OUSD(R&E)			
Qualcomm Technologies, Inc			
Siemens Gov Technologies, Inc &			
Siemens EDA			
Sierra Lobo, Inc.			
Synopsys			
Telecommunications Industry			
Association (TIA)			
Tenet3			
U.S. NAVY			
USD R&E DDRE CT (ME)			

Breakout Question # 1a

What recommendations do you have regarding standards or sets of standards that provide commercially viable mitigations in support of FY20 NDAA Section 224 requirements?

- **SBOM / EBOM Enhancement** Additional data supporting provenance and other important info. Sharing and 1. detection practices. How to capture the correct data requirements in addition to the SBOM/EBOMs? (i.e IP / DATA / Digital BOM).
- Leverage HIPPA & privacy models / practices for ME. 2.
- 3. "Deliverable" IP types: define types, specify data rights, mitigations, cyber requirements, integration, when/what to collect, ID safety criticality. Also consider business practices which have IP and come from a different angle.
- Gap assessments between commercial standards and known best practice based on threat assessment processes 4. (how threat vectors and relevance are determined/weighed)
- Define trust, and evaluate trust and verification based on assurance levels desired 5.
- **Design IP** (RTL) source code through design cycles 6.

ansi

- 7. Consider **system hierarchy** as you build it up to not dilute or lose assurance.
- Leverage existing standards on active vs passive components & simple vs complex (testing & determining assurance at 8. the end)
- After Fielding Considerations: Tests / Practices for in-system reprogramming/updates. 9.

*This listing was not generated in order of priority. However, highlighted items were all deemed a high priority by attendees.





Breakout Question # 1b

What recommendations do you have regarding standards or sets of standards that provide coverage across all phases of the microelectronics development lifecycle?

1.	ISO 20243	13.	DoDI 500	
2.	ISO 26262 / FUSA - (RE IEC 61508)	14.	SAE 2143	
3.	ISO 19790	15.	ISO 1502	
4.	NIST SP 800-171	16.	NSA U/C	
5.	NIST SP 800-161		Levels of	
6.	NIST 800-53 Rev 5	17.	Acellera	
7.	CNSSI 1253		annotati	
8.	IPC 1791 / IPC 1782			
9.	IEEE 1735 Encryption and Protection	Note: At this stage, these were identified as relevan intended to be viewed as standard recommended t		
10.	RTCA DO 254			
11.	FIPS 140-3			
12.	FIPS 200	ACTION : Map what standa		

ANSI

00.83 / DoDI 5200.44 (*TBC*)

34

26-2

)0/173659-22 - DoD Microelectronics: ⁷ Assurance Definitions and Applications – SA-EDI Standard 1.0. Security on for electronic design integration.

documents are not recommendation but nt to IP and data protection. They are not singular (or an all-inclusive list) high-level to be leverage across the lifecycle.

ard addresses which issue.

Breakout Question # 1c

What recommendations do you have regarding standards or sets of standards that provide coverage across vendor types (system integrators, original equipment manufacturers, component distributors, original component manufacturers)?

- 1. Sharing of data & verification of security of information from chip to circuit to modules, system.
- 2. For each vendor type (included above), standardize measurement targets and methodologies.
 - Should be discussed broadly with Breakout Groups 1 & 3.





Breakout Question #2a

ANSI

What suggestions do you have for DoD to improve its candidate standards approach in terms of *the modular approach for integrated assured supply chain*?

- 1. DOD approach should take into account industry concerns regarding affordability, scalability, and also supports a risk-based approach.
 - Modularity is seen as advantageous for affordability.
- 2. Develop a matrix of standards accepted for aspects of the supply chain.
 - Example format is the CSIAC "Chicklet" table "Build and Operate a trust DoDIN" – which points to the accepted standards.



6



Build and Operate a Trusted DoDIN





Cybersecurity-Related Policies and Issuances

Developed by the DoD Deputy CIO for Cybersecurity Last Updated: June 24, 2022

Send questions/suggestions to contact@csiac.org

Breakout Question #2b

What suggestions do you have for DoD to improve its candidate standards approach in terms of what methods would you suggest for determining and sharing compliance to standards across supply chain and to acquirer?

- 1. Utilization of existing approaches is appropriate. The current approaches utilize today are:
 - No requirement
 - Self-assertion
 - Customer validation (2nd party)
 - 3rd party validation





Breakout Ouestion #2c

What suggestions do you have for DoD to improve its candidate standards approach in terms of *what section 224 related factors influence sub-tier vendor selection*?

- 1. Only share necessary / limited information – form of mitigation
- Determine how to standardize on what information is shared 2. with 2nd & 3rd tier vendors.
 - "How and What can / cannot be passed down"
- Uncertainty on how much USG influences this. 3.







Breakout Question #2d

What suggestions do you have for DoD to improve its candidate standards approach in terms of *requirements development and flow down*?

- Decide what information needs to be shared 1.
 - How do we standardize how and what can / cannot be shared down to sub-tier vendors?
 - "Role Based Access"







Breakout Question #2e

What suggestions do you have for DoD to improve its candidate standards approach in terms of **DoD adoption strategy and timelines**?

- 1. DoD / USG must resource and compel active and consistent participation on the SDO's committee alongside OCMs.
 - In particular, those committees with standards actively being used by industry.





Breakout Question #2f

What suggestions do you have for DoD to improve its candidate standards approach in terms of *DoD organization of standards*?

- Develop a matrix of standards accepted for aspects of the supply 1. chain.
 - Example format is the CSIAC "Chicklet" table "Build and Operate a trust DoDIN" - which points to the accepted standards.





12

Breakout Question #3

What are the top 2-3 most important take-aways from the discussions in your breakout group?

- standards. standards to choose from. • A map of the standards to address issues across the supply chain is needed. • This issue cannot be solved with an all-encompassing standard.
- 1. DoD does not control development timelines on commercial 2. The modular approach should be considered, there are several

- 3. Overly prescriptive requirements relative to COTS will have adverse impacts on compliance.

ANSI