

## Discussion for the CVSS SIG meeting – 01/16/2007 Meeting:

This meeting was held on Tuesday, January 16, 2007  
Conference Call

**Attending:** Peter Mell, Jerry Bongard, Sasha Romanosky, Luann Johnson, George Theall, Tim Keanini, Gavin Reid, Mike Scheck, Art Manion, Robin Sterzer

### Agenda/Discussion:

- 1) Report status on action items from previous meeting on, 12/19/06:
  - a. Karen/Peter – Progress on CVSS equations – There are access vector concerns. It should be similar to version 1.
  - b. Peter/Karen/Team – Take a sample of a few vulnerabilities and score them both ways – Gavin will take a recent vulnerability and score. Mike and Peter will score some both ways. George has been using the calculator and is happy with the scores
  - c. Karen – Discuss with the mathematicians the changes in scoring in Version 1 to Version 2 for access vector local vs. access vector remote – Peter has worked on it
- 2) CVSS Structure, Strategy and Process:
  - a. Discuss discrepancy in Version 1 to Version 2 in sample scoring:

#### Vector

AV:L/AC:L/Au:NR/C:C/I:N/A:N/B:N = 2.0

AV:L/AC:L/Au:NR/C:C/I:N/A:N = 7.8

#### Base Score

2.0

7.8

Change weighing of difficulty and impact to 50/50 and not 40/60. George will place this in the calculator. George did this during the meeting and it does not change the scores. Peter will look into this.

- b. Define remaining actions for Version 2 and set timeline to complete and vote.  
Example of action item – Test impact bias –  
Chart out other steps that remain.
        - i. Test weighing difficulty vs. impact
        - ii. Impact bias
        - iii. Update environmental quotation
        - iv. Bring document up to date (Karen has a draft complete). Peter will send to team
- 3) Administrative:
  - a. CVSS v1.x documentation status update and proposed changes – N/A
  - b. Propose new time for meetings – Robin will send a list of new meeting time proposals.
- 4) Roundtable: Updates/Needs/Questions  
Sasha – The reason behind the survey is to figure out who is using CVSS? The types of audiences and do they find it difficult having three scores

### Action Items:

- 1) Gavin/Peter/Mike – Take a sample of a few vulnerabilities and score them both ways
- 2) Karen – Discuss with the mathematicians the changes in scoring in Version 1 to Version 2 for access vector local vs. access vector remote
- 3) Peter – Look into changing weight of difficulty and impact to 50/50
- 4) George – Update the calculator
- 5) Robin – New meeting time proposals