1 CJIS MOBILE APPENDIX

1.1 Introduction
Mobile devices present a unique security challenge with regard to the correct application of CJIS Security Policy requirements. This appendix is intended to provide best practices based on industry standards and on methods to achieve policy compliance in mobile device employment scenarios. The technical methods used to achieve compliance with CJIS Security Policy will typically be different within the mobile environment than those used in fixed locations. Many of the security features and capabilities inherited by endpoint devices from the fixed environment are either not present or present in a different form in the mobile environment. Additionally, the basic technologies used in some types of mobile devices may adequately fulfill some of the CJIS Security Policy requirements which would require additional software or added features in a traditional fixed computing environment. Due to the complexity and rapid evolvement of the mobile environment, this Appendix will remain as device and vendor agnostic as practical, however certain key requirements for specific mobile operating systems will be identified for the major mobile operating systems (e.g. Apple iOS, Android) as the underlying technologies are fundamentally different and offer different levels of built-in compliance to CJIS Security Policy.

Sections within this Appendix will provide recommendations regarding priorities and level of effort versus value of applying certain security controls in the mobile environment. These recommendations do not supersede or modify the requirements listed in the CJIS Security Policy, and are intended to describe the effect of inherent security functions and inherent device limitations in many mobile platforms that impact the application of policy elements in the mobile environment.

1.2 Mobile Device Risk Scenarios
There are multiple risk scenarios that may apply to mobile devices depending on the category of device (e.g. Laptop, Tablet, and ‘Pocket sized’ devices such as smartphones) and the methods of device connectivity (e.g. cellular service, WiFi + Cellular, WiFi only). Device category and method of connection define the technology types within the device which inherently affects the total level of compliance with CJIS Security Policy that can be obtained by the mobile device.

It is advisable for acquiring agencies to review the mobile device guidance in this Appendix prior to completing selection and acquisition of particular devices. Both the device category and connectivity methods installed and configured on the device will impact the overall risk scenario associated with the device and may significantly affect the effective cost to bring use of the device in compliance with the CJIS Security Policy. For instance, inclusion of cellular radios with the ability to remotely control a device significantly changes the risk scenario by allowing remote tracking, file deletion, and device management which could provide a higher level of CJIS Security Policy compliance than a WiFi only device that does not guarantee the ability to remotely manage the device. However, inclusion of cellular technology may significantly increase the initial device costs and incur ongoing subscription costs. Appropriate choices based on the intended use of the device along with the types and methods of CJI data to be accessed could greatly reduce agency cost and enhance security.
1.2.1 Device Categories

This Appendix defines risk levels for three categories of devices. Prior to reading individual sections of this Appendix, the agency should identify which device categories will apply to their employment scenario. If multiple categories of devices are employed, individual technical configurations and local policy will likely need to be defined for each category of device based on the risk inherent in the technical characteristics associated with each device category.

1.2.1.1 Laptop devices

The Laptop device category includes mobile devices in a larger format that are transported either in a vehicle mount or a carrying case and include a monitor with attached keyboard. This includes all traditional laptop computers that utilize a ‘traditional’, full featured operating system (e.g. Windows or a Linux variant). Also included in this category are ‘tablet’ type full featured computers running a traditional full featured operating system but without an attached keyboard. The main defining factor is the use of a full featured operating system and a form factor too large to be carried in a pocket. In general, devices of this type connect via WiFi only, but may include an internal cellular access card in some cases.

The risks associated with this device type are similar to a standard desktop computer at the technical level, but are increased due to the potential to connect directly to the internet without the benefit of organizational network security layers (e.g. network firewall, IDS/IPS, network monitoring devices). There is also an increased risk of intentional device theft from vehicles or unsecure locations as these devices are too large to be carried on the authorized user’s body. There may be increased risk from the limited technical ability to wipe or track a lost/stolen device depending on the particular technical means used for remote device connectivity (e.g. cellular or WiFi).

In general, the technical configurations for compliance with most of the CJIS security policy that is accomplished via the operating system (e.g. auditing, access control, etc) will remain consistent with normal fixed location computing systems for laptop devices, but some functions may operate in an unexpected manner due to lack of constant connectivity. Thorough testing of applied security policy elements within the expected mobile environments will help ensure the applied policy configurations remain effective and appropriate when applied to mobile laptop devices.

NOTE: Some newer devices running multi-function operating systems (e.g. Windows 8 or similar multi-mode operating systems) may exhibit technical features associated with both laptop and tablet device categories based on their current operating mode which may be reconfigured by the user on demand. If this is the case, it will be necessary to assess and configure multiple operating modes to be compliant with CJIS Security Policy on the device, or restrict the operating mode to one category of operation.

1.2.1.2 Tablet devices

The Tablet device category includes larger format devices transported via vehicle mount or portfolio sized carry case that typically consist of a touch screen without attached keyboard. These devices utilize a limited feature operating system (e.g. Apple iOS, Google Android, Windows mobile) that is inherently more resistant than a traditional operating system to certain types of network based technical attacks due to the limited feature sets. Additionally, limited functionality operating systems are designed specifically for the mobile environment where battery life and power efficiency are primary design drivers. This inherently limits the types of services that can function effectively on the devices (e.g. traditional real-time anti-virus software) as the base operating system may not be designed to allow installed applications...
enhanced execution priority in the background and or the ability to examine the contents or communications associated within another application. However, this same design methodology significantly limits the vectors available for malware transmission and the device or application data actually accessible to malware if a device becomes infected.

Tablet devices will have different risks associated depending on the installed and configured methods for network access (e.g. ‘always on cellular’ vs. WiFi only). Physical risks associated with this category are similar to the laptop category for enhanced likelihood of intentional theft or device hijacking while unattended, while the technical risks are similar to the pocket device category.

1.2.1.3 Pocket devices/Handheld devices
The Pocket/Handheld device category is technically similar or identical to the tablet category and is primarily differentiated by device form factor. Pocket/Handheld devices are characterized as having a limited functionality operating system and a small form factor intended for carry in a pocket or ‘holster’ attached to the body. The bulk of this category will be cellular ‘smartphones’ with integrated cellular data connectivity, however devices intended to be worn or carried on the body (e.g. portable fingerprint devices) may also be included in this category if they operate using a limited functionality operating system. Custom or specialty devices may meet the form factor distinction for this category, but operate using a full feature operating system. In rare cases of this nature the employing agency should apply security guidance and principles in this Appendix for both the laptop and pocket device categories.

Risks associated with this category are a reduced threat of theft to a stored devices (e.g. device left unattended in a vehicle) since these devices are typically carried continuously by the authorized user, but include a greater risk of temporary or permanent loss of control due to the device being misplaced by the authorized user.

Due to the installation of a limited functionality operating system, the technical threat to these devices via a network based attack is significantly lower than the laptop category, however, the threat of unauthorized access at the device level may be higher if the device is lost due to technical limits on multi-factor authentication to the operating system itself and practical limits to device passwords due to screen/software keyboard limitations.

NOTE: Data accessible on pocket or tablet devices simply through the entry of a single device PIN or password should not be considered secure due to the likelihood of enhanced password guessing based on fingerprints/smudges on the device touch screen. Any data stored on devices of these types should be protected within a separate secure container using Advanced Authentication.

1.2.2 Device Connectivity
There are three main categories of device connectivity that are associated with varying risk levels and threats to the devices. The Three categories are: Cellular Network Only (always on), WiFi Only (includes ‘on demand’ cellular), and Cellular (always on) + WiFi network. The risks associated with connectivity categories are general risks and may apply differently to any particular device at different points in its usage or lifecycle. Particular device configurations either through the operating system or a third-party Mobile Device Management (MDM) system may be able to significantly control and define which particular connectivity risks may be associated with a particular device.
1.2.2.1 Cellular Network Only (always on)

Cellular network connectivity is characterized by ‘always on’ network connection through the device internal radio to a cellular network provider. There is a reasonable assurance that devices with ‘always on’ cellular can be tracked, managed, or wiped remotely if lost or stolen. This will significantly reduce risks associated with loss of the device and attempted illicit access to the device. One important consideration for this risk category is characterization of the device as ‘always on’ or ‘on demand’. In effect the difference is typically a configuration setting, which in some cases may be changeable by the user. In particular most cellular smart phones contain ‘airplane’ mode settings that disable all internal radios allowing a user authenticated to the device operating system via password or PIN to disable the cellular system. Access to this functionality may be disabled through the use of some MDM systems which would necessitate a complete power down of the device while carried on aircraft. Additionally, someone illicitly obtaining a device with properly configured password requirements and screen lock timeouts would be unlikely to guess the device password before the device was reported stolen in order for them to disable the cellular connection and prevent tracking or a remote wipe of the device.

Cellular networks do not allow for the same level of exposure of individual devices to random access from the internet. This significantly reduces the potential network based attack vectors that might reach a cellular connected device. The risk scenario in most cases from a network based attack would be similar to a device protected behind rudimentary network defenses (e.g. standard firewall but NOT advanced intrusion detection/prevention) Cellular device communications cannot typically be accessed by other ‘eavesdropping’ devices physically close to them without significant specialized equipment and can be considered well protected against network attacks below the nation/state level of technical capability by the hosting technical infrastructure and technology inherent in the device. However, network based attacks that utilize connections initiated by the user device may still succeed over the cellular infrastructure. For this reason, the technical protections inherent in the cellular infrastructure provide limited protection against user/device initiated actions (e.g. web surfing on a cellular connected web browser). Therefore, the protections provided by always on cellular connections are primarily in the ability to remotely access the mobile device for tracking or data deletion in case of device loss or compromise, which combined with a limited functionality device operating system, the protections are generally equivalent to a ‘personal firewall’ if properly configured and supported by a well designed organizational infrastructure. However, that equivalency does not apply to full featured operating systems connected through cellular infrastructure.

NOTE: It should be noted that a technically capable, intentional, thief knowingly obtaining an ‘always on’ cellular device for the purpose of data theft can physically disable the radio by utilizing a Faraday cage or similar external electromagnetic shield device while attempting to guess the device password. While technically possible these methods require specialized equipment and high technical expertise and would be very unlikely to be employed except for specifically targeted attacks. When always on cellular connectivity is combined with a robust incident reporting process and user training for rapid response to device loss or theft, the associated risks can be minimized.

1.2.2.2 WiFi only (includes ‘on-demand’ cellular)

WiFi only devices do not include cellular radios or include cellular radio that must be manually activated or ‘connected’ to the cellular network. They connect to the network or internet through WiFi ‘hotspots’ or external access points or manually to cellular networks. Some MDM or device configurations may be able
to limit the types and specific WiFi access points the device can connect to, which may change the risk scenario of the device to a similar risk scenario as the Cellular Network Only scenario. However, if mobile devices are permitted (through technical and or policy decisions) to connect to any WiFi access point designated by the device user, the overall device risk scenario is high and the device may be accessible to a large number of potential network based attack vectors. Unrestricted WiFi access is not recommended on any agency owned device, but must be assumed to exist on any personally owned device authorized to access CJI. Significant compensating controls may be needed to ensure devices accessing CJI over ‘public’ WiFi access points are not susceptible to communications network eavesdropping, credential hijacking or any of the various potential man-in-the-middle attacks possible through access point spoofing. The communications security risks can be significantly mitigated by mandatory device configurations (e.g. MDM based policy) that only allow devices to connect to cryptographically verified agency controlled WiFi access points.

WiFi only or devices with ‘on-demand’ cellular access (e.g. user or event driven cellular access initiated from the device and not from a centralized management location) are significantly more at risk from data loss subsequent to device loss or theft as there is no guarantee the tracking or remote wipe can be initiated once the device is out of agency control. This can be mitigated by utilizing tracking/anti-theft products that require a periodic network connection to authorize access and perform automated device locking (‘bricking’) or remote wipe if network connections are not made within a specified period. Software of this nature is generally available for full featured laptops but may not be available for limited feature mobile operating systems.

1.2.2.3  **Cellular (always on) + WiFi Network**
This is a hybrid scenario that has become typical with most ‘smartphones’. These devices contain both the always on cellular connection, but may also be configured to access local WiFi networks for enhanced bandwidth. In considering devices with these technical characteristics, the theft/loss risks are similar to the cellular only scenario (due to tracking and remote access through the cellular connection), while the data and network based risks must be considered to be similar to the WiFi scenario unless the capability of the device to connect to WiFi networks is limited by technology or policy to agency owned WiFi Access Points configured in accordance with the CJIS Security Policy. Careful consideration must be made to the particular configurations, management systems, and human oriented operational policies based on the particular technical capabilities and configurations of these types of devices.

1.3  **Incident Handling (CJIS Security Policy section 5.3)**
Additional or enhanced incident reporting and handing procedures will need to be developed to cover mobile device operating scenarios. Various exploits and methods to compromise mobile devices require either specialized equipment or lengthy operations to implement. Rapid response to mobile device related incidents can significantly mitigate the risks associated with illicit data access either on the device itself or within online data resources associated with the device through an application or specialized interface. However, parallel or special incident handling procedures with associated equipment or systems may need to be put in place to properly respond to incidents involving mobile devices. This section lists three areas where enhanced incident handling and response processes may need to be implemented to ensure mobile device compliance to the incident handling policy in section 5.3.
If personally owned devices are utilized within the environment in a Bring Your Own device (BYOD) scenario, specialized and costly incident handling procedures and processes may need to be developed to support compliance for those devices. The costs associated with enhanced incident handling procedures may need to be incorporated in the cost and risk based analysis to allow personally owned devices in the BYOD scenario, as the technical methods and risk to achieve compliance under BYOD scenarios may exceed any cost savings potentially achieved through BYOD.

1.3.1 Loss of device Control
Mobile device users should be trained and provided with explicit user actions in case positive control of a mobile device is lost for any period of time. Loss of positive control means the device is in the physical control of non-CJIS authorized individual or the device is left unattended in an unsecure location (e.g. counter of the coffee shop). Even if the device is recovered quickly there is significant risk that either the device settings could be tampered with or data on the device could be illicitly accessed. The level of detail and particular scenarios identified in the agency incident response plan should be consistent with the presence of persistent CJI on the device or the technical means used to access CJI from the device (e.g. ask the question: “Is it reasonable to assume CJI could be accessed”) as well as the degree of device configuration control exercised by the user from the device main login. At a minimum, special incident handling procedures should be developed for the following scenarios:

- Device known to be locked, control loss of minimal duration
- Device lock state unknown at time of control loss, duration of loss minimal
- Device lock state unknown at time of control loss, duration of loss extended
- Device known to be unlocked at time of control loss, duration of loss more than momentary.

NOTE: Organizations should define appropriate time value criteria based on the operational environment for the above scenarios. For instance, a ‘momentary’ loss of control might be considered a matter of seconds in a situation where no one could reasonably have accessed the device, while ‘minimal’ durations might include a few minutes of time and ‘extended’ periods would be any time longer than a few minutes.

Other scenarios should be addressed as appropriate to the intended device employment, with explicit user and organizational actions identified based on the device technologies and any organizational management capabilities.

1.3.2 Total Loss of device
Incident response scenarios for the total loss of the device should be developed based on the methods/storage of CJI on the device, the lock state of the device at time of loss (known locked, known unlocked, or unknown), and the technical methods available for remote tracking or wiping of the device. It is critical to implement incident handling procedures quickly in this case. Remote wipe functions can be implemented for always on cellular devices with a high potential for success that may include positive confirmation from the device that the wipe was completed. However, for WiFi only and on demand cellular devices, incident handling procedures that lock the device out of accessing CJI may be necessary, while there would be no guarantee that any CJI stored on the device could not eventually be accessed. For this reason, CJI should not generally be stored directly on WiFi only or on-demand cellular devices unless an extremely robust anti-tamper system is in place on the device itself.
1.3.3 Potential device Compromise (software/application)
Incident response scenarios for potential device compromise through intentional or unintentional user action should be developed to ensure compliance with policy. This includes rooting, jailbreaking or malicious application installation on the device during a loss of device control scenario or inappropriate user action in the installation of applications to the device (compromise can occur from either intentional threat agent actions or accidental user actions). Triggers for this incident handling process may be driven from either user notification or electronic detection of device tampering from an audit or MDM compliance check.

1.4 Audit and Accountability (CJIS Security Policy section 5.4)
The ability to implement some Audit and Accountability functions specified in the CJIS Security Policy on mobile devices with limited function operating systems (e.g. Android, Apple iOS) is not natively included within the operating system. Either additional device management systems (EMM/MDM) or auditing from systems accessed by the mobile device with be necessary to ensure appropriate levels of auditing exist.

1.4.1 Auditable Events (reference 5.4.1)
Some of the specific audit requirements in the CJIS Security Policy may not be technically relevant to the mobile operating system due to its internal functioning. To achieve compliance with the CJIS Security Policy it will be necessary in most cases to utilize some form of Mobile Device Management (MDM) or Enterprise Mobility Management (EMM) system. Additional auditable events that compensate for the technical limitations of limited function mobile operating systems may be available through the use of MDM systems (e.g. association of event with GPS location of the device). Specific auditable events of interest in the mobile environment will depend on the intended device usage, compartmentalization of data on the device, and options available with the specific technologies employed. For instance, item 2 in section 5.4.1.1 indicates an auditable event includes attempts to modify elements of user account modification. Due to the limited internal functions of mobile operating systems, this event type is not relevant to the operating system itself as they are generally provisioned with only a single non-modifiable user account on the device. To achieve compliance in a scenario where CJI is stored or accessed from a secure application on the device, auditing of access to the secure application either through application design, or third party MDM capability may provide an acceptable compensating control. For compliance with the policy each auditable event and event content must be compared to the particular technologies and applications employed to determine if adequate compensating controls are being met for audit items that either do not apply to mobile technologies or cannot be implemented within the technology itself.

Alternative and compensating controls that provide detailed audit of access to CJI either on the mobile device itself or through a controlled application to a central server may provide equivalent auditing capability to the events specified in the policy. However, multiple auditing systems may be required to replicate the auditing provided at the operating system level by a full function operating system. Therefore, the overall auditing design should take into account retrieval and consolidation of events or audit data from multiple auditing systems as appropriate to comply with policy.

1.4.2 Audit Event Collection
Mobile devices without an ‘always-on’ cellular connection may pose technical challenges to ensure any audit records collected and stored on the mobile device itself can be retrieved for review and analysis per
the CJIS Security Policy. Alternatively systems which explicitly require a network connection to a central server to access data or decrypt on-device storage may provide acceptable audit event collection and reporting since there is a guarantee that network connections must be in pace for CJI to be accessed. Careful consideration should be made regarding the accessibility of audit records when developing the mobile audit scheme.

1.5 Access Control (CJIS Policy section 5.5)

Access control associated to limited functionality mobile operating systems will typically operate in a different manner than full function operating systems. For instance there is normally not a provision for multiple user accounts on many mobile operating systems which may mean the policy requirements for access control (e.g. regarding account management) would not be apply to the mobile operating system, but should rather be applied to a particular application, either stand-alone to the device or as part of a client server architecture. Application of access control policy identified in the CJIS Security Policy will often need to be applied to elements of the total system beyond the device operating system.

For example, CJI stored or accessed from a secure mobile application that requires connectivity to a CJIS authorized server architecture could potentially accomplish most or all of the Access Control policy elements based on user authorization via the secured application and be largely independent of the mobile operating system. Alternatively, if storing CJI in ‘general’ purpose data storage containers on a mobile device it may not be possible to achieve compliance with the CJIS Security Policy. Careful consideration and deliberate design of mobile applications or data storage will be required to achieve compliance on mobile devices.

Due to the inherent nature of limited function mobile operating systems, very tight access controls to specific data is actually implemented within the operating system. This effectively prevents applications from accessing or manipulating data associated with other applications to a very high degree of confidence as long as the device is not rooted or jailbroken. However, the device user is automatically granted access to all device data through the associated application unless the application itself has a secondary authentication and access control methodology. Additionally, since basic device functions (e.g. phone) are typically protected using the same password or PIN as the device level encryption, use of a weak PIN to allow easy access to basic device functions largely negates the value of the integrated device encryption.

If personally owned devices are utilized within the environment (BYOD scenario), specialized and costly access control methods may be required to reach compliance with CJIS Security Policy. The costs associated with enhanced access control procedures and technologies should be incorporated in the cost and risk based analysis to determine whether or not to allow personally BYOD, as the technical methods and compensating controls required for CJIS Security Policy compliance are likely to exceed any potential cost savings for implementing BYOD.

1.5.1 Device Control levels and access.

Limited function mobile operating systems are typically very constrained on the levels of access provided to the user. However, intentional user actions (e.g. installing an application and accepting inappropriate security access levels for that application) may bypass some of the built in security protections inherent in the limited functionality devices. Compliance with CJIS Security Policy may be difficult without the
addition of strict device control policy. In a mixed environment (e.g. agency owned devices and BYOD), access control policy with BYOD systems may be impractical or impossible to fully implement.

1.5.1.1 Embedded passwords/login tied to device PIN.
Limited function mobile operating systems typically allow the association of multiple passwords and access credentials with particular applications. The system access provided by these embedded credentials will often be tied to the device password or PIN. An example would be access to device integrated email and calendar applications. Alternatively a ‘corporate’ email application may independently encrypt the data associated with the application and require a separate login from the device itself. Access to CJI utilizing only the device level password or PIN and device embedded credentials is not compliant with CJIS Security Policy unless protected with Advanced Authentication, which is not currently possible on most devices. Therefore, use of integrated device functions (e.g. built in email or chat) to store or transmit CJI would also not be compliant.

1.5.2 Access requirement specification
In general, due to weaknesses associated with password guessing based on analysis of fingerprints or swipes on the device touch screen, short (4-8 digit) device PIN numbers provide limited security to a determined password guessing attack. Conversely, utilization of a robust password at the device level may be inconsistent with quick access to basic device functions (e.g. phone). When developing specific CJIS compliant access control and authentication schemas a layered approach with the device PIN protecting only the basic device functions (e.g. phone, camera, non-secure applications) and a more robust password or multifactor authentication used to protect applications or data storage may achieve policy compliance where the device password/PIN would not. In a layered security deployment, careful attention must be placed on the capability to share data (e.g. cut and paste or screenshot functions) between secure applications with CJI or CJI access and basic device functions with limited security controls.

1.5.3 Special Login attempt limit
Depending on the access and authentication scheme applied to the mobile device, it may be appropriate to fully comply with the CJIS login attempt limits within a secure application or container and not solely at the device level. However, the device itself should have login attempt limits consistent with the risk associated to the data or configurations accessible on the device itself. Since mobile devices are inherently portable, and can easily be removed from a location. Brute force attempts to gain access to the system, especially when protected only by a short PIN, are likely to be successful given sufficient time. Special consideration should be made based on device connectivity methods (cellular, WiFi, etc) on the appropriate number of unsuccessful login attempts that will be allowed and the resultant actions taken by the device. Most devices either natively allow for the device to wipe itself after a failed number of attempts, or allow the application of EMM/MDM applications to perform wiping actions after a predetermined number of failed login attempts.

1.5.3.1 Login failure actions
Mobile devices with or without MDM software can typically be configured to perform actions based on serial unsuccessful login attempts. Appropriate actions to configure may be dependent on the data resident on the device and the connectivity method employed by the device. Most devices can be configured to delete all data on the device and/or issue an alert to the network if a number of incorrect passwords are entered. This is a very advantageous feature, however specific configuration of the number
of attempts and resultant action must be considered against the state of the device after an unsuccessful attempt action is triggered. A full device wipe will typically leave the device in a fully or partially non-functional state which could introduce risk if part of the intended use is time critical phone calls. Where possible, full device wipe associated with unsuccessful attempts at the device level password should be configured but the number of invalid attempts may exceed the CJIS Security Policy at the device level if all CJI on the device is protected by an additional layer of encryption protected by a subsequent secure application authentication method that is technically prevented (via complexity rules or entry rules) from being the same as the device level authentication and the secure application is configured in accordance with the policy and also contains a secure data wipe capability after a specified number of incorrect authentication attempts.

1.5.4 System use Notification (CJIS Policy reference 5.5.4)
Agency policy should include specific mandatory language consistent with the CJIS Security Policy to identify the device restrictions and consent. However, due to screen size limits, some mobile devices may not be technically capable of displaying the full text used with traditional operating systems. To achieve compliance agencies should contact their legal department for appropriate wording of a short version of the system use notification that can be set to display within the constraints of the device lock screen. This may be accomplished through embedding the text into an image displayed on the lock screen or some other external device labeling method if the device does not permit sufficient text to be displayed.

In a BYOD environment or mixed (agency owned and BYOD), it may be necessary to develop or deploy custom applications that can achieve compliance with the system use notification upon access and prior to any CJI access being allowed.

1.5.5 Session Lock (CJIS Policy reference 5.5.5)
Due to the portable nature of mobile devices the session lock limit in the general CJIS Security Policy may be excessive in the mobile environment for certain device functions and insufficient for other functions based on intended device usage. Agencies should examine the minimum lock time practical for all mobile devices based on their employment scenario and ease for which a user can manually lock the device. The actual session lock times should be adjusted as appropriate to the device type, device operational location, and the data accessible on the device when unlocked. Pocket size devices are at greatest risk if screen lock times are insufficient, however, for devices used in emergency response or communication, extended lock times at the basic device level may be considered if CJI is subsequently protected by an application or web interface utilizing more stringent secure locking functions. A well designed solution may include multiple session lock settings at the device and individual application levels to ensure the CJIS Security Policy requirements are met for CJI access, while other device functions are accessible under different session lock configurations.

1.5.6 Device WiFi Policy
Specific WiFi configuration policy should be developed based on the intended use environment and data access requirements for the device. The policy should explicitly cover configuration of device connections. Technical methods specific to the mobile technologies may need to be implemented to ensure all mobile devices are compliant with CJIS Security Policy. Current CJIS Security Policy provides detailed configuration requirements for WiFi connections, however it was originally intended for defining requirements for fixed infrastructure WiFi (802.11) supporting wireless within a facility. The security
requirements identified for fixed infrastructure installations are applicable to mobile usage, however there are several mobile specific scenarios where the requirements may not be clear. The following sections identify areas not specifically covered in the existing policy that will require special handling to ensure wireless connections are compliant.

**1.5.6.1 Hotspot capability**

Many mobile devices now include the capability to activate an internal WiFi hotspot that allows other devices to connect through the hosting device to the internet over the devices cellular radio. While this is a potentially valuable capability when multiple law enforcement devices may need localized internet or network access, mobile hotspots should be configured as consistent with the CJIS Security Policy on wireless access points. Connections must only be accepted from known and approved devices in order to protect the integrity of the hosting device as well as the communications security of other connected devices. Since most mobile hotspots are not technically capable of providing the device authentication required for infrastructure wireless, use of mobile hotspot capability should assume the overall portable WiFi network itself is not secure and CJI should not be transmitted or exposed on the network without appropriate encryption.

**1.5.6.2 Connection to public hotspots**

There are significant risks to connecting to public wireless access points. Rogue access points masquerading as legitimate public access points may allow for man-in-the-middle, eavesdropping, and session hijacking attacks. While not specifically prohibited in the current CJIS Security Policy, it is recommended that connection to public internet access points be technically restricted by device configuration or MDM systems if possible. CJI access mechanisms from mobile devices should include robust authentication methods specifically designed to prevent interception or hijacking of CJI or user information through the use of a rogue access point masquerading as a legitimate public wireless access point. Transmission encryption alone may not provide sufficient protections when device connections originate at public hotspots. Since the public hotspot controls access to all network services at the connection point (e.g. Domain Name System) attacks against the transmission path are possible that would not normally be feasible in a fixed environment where communications exist between two secured network enclaves.

**1.5.7 Cellular Service abroad**

If mobile devices are used outside of the United States, especially if connected to foreign cellular networks, specific handling procedures may need to be developed for the use of the device while abroad and the assessment or configuration check of the device state once the devices are returned to the United States. Certain device internal functions on cellular devices may be modified or compromised by the cellular carrier as the devices are intended to have certain parameters configured by the cellular service provider which is considered a ‘trusted’ entity by the device. Cellular carriers within the United States are constrained by United States laws regarding acceptable modifications to devices. Similar legal constraints cannot be assumed to exist in some areas of the world where laws and regulations for data and personal privacy may allow cellular carriers significantly more leeway in changes made to devices on their networks.

Security plans involving cellular connected devices that will be connected to foreign cellular networks should include technical and policy controls to ensure device use while abroad, data resident on the
device while abroad, and the software integrity of the device once returned to the United States are all appropriate to the specific device and threat levels associated with the expected foreign travel. This should explicitly include considerations for devices in which an internal ‘SIM’ card is inserted into the device to obtain GSM cellular connections abroad to ensure any residual data on the SIM card is properly purged. Additionally, incident handling procedures may need to specify more stringent responses to even momentary loss of device control, and it may not be possible to assume tracking, anti-theft, and remote data wipe functions that work in the United States would be functional in all potentially visited geographic and political regions.

1.5.8 Bluetooth
Mobile devices utilizing Bluetooth should be evaluated for their ability to comply with the CJIS Security Policy Bluetooth requirements prior to acquisition. This includes the data device itself and any authorized Bluetooth accessories which will be associated to the device. While the technical security in current versions of Bluetooth is significantly stronger than legacy versions, mis-configuration of devices can still pose a significant threat in the mobile environment. If not specifically utilized for a required purpose, it would likely be most cost effective to disable or restrict the device Bluetooth radio utilizing device configurations or an MDM product. Additionally, the using agency may need to develop technically extensive training or user awareness programs to ensure use of Bluetooth capability does not render the device out of compliance if device users have the ability to make Bluetooth associations to the device. Specific instructions or guidance for specific devices could be developed to ensure all implementations are compliant.

1.5.9 Voice/Voice over IP (VoIP)
Cellular voice transmissions are distinctly different at the technical level than Voice over IP (VoIP) transmissions using voice/video applications (e.g. Facetime, Skype). The use of VoIP is not specifically granted the exemption identified in CJIS Security Policy section 5.5.7.3.2. Agencies wishing to use capability of this type should ensure the specific technical implementation complies with the Policy on authentication and data encryption.

1.5.10 Chat/Text
Device integrated chat/texting applications and many common third party chat applications authenticate and are identified using embedded passwords or the device identifier only. These functions should not be considered secure or appropriate for transmission of CJI data. Texting functions that utilize a cellular service providers Short Message Service (SMS) or Multimedia Messaging Services (MMS) functions do not constitute a secure transmission medium. Third party applications utilizing appropriate encryption and authentication methods independent of the device password/PIN may provide a compliant solution where the device integrated utilities are will not provide a compliant solution.

1.5.11 Administrative Access
Local administrative access to the mobile device, regardless of device category should be restricted by some mechanism. For traditional operating systems, configuration of a separate administrative account other than that used for normal logins to the device is an acceptable method to ensure appropriate access permissions to the mobile user for which they are authorized. However for limited functionality mobile operating systems (e.g. Android, Apple iOS) internal permissions and accounts assume a single authorized device user with explicitly defined permissions. Those permissions may be modified through
policy applied to the device, but are typically global to the device itself. As a result, to ensure appropriate separation of access permissions, it may be required to ensure specific applications or software on the device are configured with individual authentication methods to separate application data from ‘general user’ access. Without additional authentication at the application level, access to specific application data would be available to any user with the ability to unlock the device. This may be appropriate in some scenarios with a high degree of assurance that the device can only be accessed by a single user, but sufficiently stringent device passwords and short screen lock times may prove problematic for practical use of some device functions. An alternate method to ensure strict separation of ‘routine’ device functions which may be accessed by multiple individuals (e.g. phone function if loaned to someone for a critical call) is to ensure any method used to access or store CJI has a separate and more stringent authentication method configured with rules that make it impossible to use the same authentication credential (e.g. PIN/Password) on both the device authentication and the application or function with access to CJI.

1.5.11.1 Rooting/Jailbreaking

‘Rooting’ (Android OS) or ‘Jailbreaking (Apple iOS) refer to intentional modifications to the mobile device operating system in order to grant the device user or an installed application elevated control that would not normally exist on the device. The security model internal to the various mobile device architectures vary significantly, however the common effect of rooting or jailbreaking the devices is to bypass many or all of the built in security features. The security feature bypass may be universal to all device features and installed applications once completed. Intentionally rooting or jailbreaking mobile devices should be avoided in any scenario as it potentially defeats all built-in data access and segregation controls on the device. Additionally the rooting or jailbreaking process itself has a heightened risk of introducing malicious code as part of the process, and also substantially increases the risk for malware to infect the device through user action. Extreme caution should be used if software is being installed that requires the devices to be rooted or jailbroken for the software or application to function. This is inclusive of purported security software that requires a rooted or jailbroken device to function. For example, on both the Android and Apple iOS platforms, the built-in security features for data access and memory segmentation prevent the effective operation of ‘traditional’ anti-virus and intrusion detection/prevention software. Software or applications purporting to perform these functions but requiring rooting or jailbreaking of the device and may actually accomplish the anti-virus or IDS/IPS function but are also likely to significantly increase the overall risk associated to the device by effectively disabling most or all of the integrated security features. A careful risk-based assessment should be conducted by a trained security professional prior to allowing the operation of any rooted or jailbroken mobile devices regardless of intended use. Significant compensating controls would be required to return a rooted or jailbroken device to minimal compliance with most of the CJIS Security Policy and would likely not be a cost effective approach.

NOTE: There is a distinction between rooting a ‘stock’ Android installation vice the installation of a separately supported secure operating system. There are secure versions of Android available or that can be developed based on the open source Android source code and compiled for installation on a particular hardware device. Installation of a secure, supported mobile operating system that replaces the device original operating system may significantly enhance the security of the device and should not be confused with ‘rooting’ and Android installation. Due to the close integration of operating system security with hardware elements, and the proprietary nature of Apple source code, there are not currently separate ‘secure’ versions of the Apple iOS and it is unlikely they will be developed.
1.6 Identity and Authentication

Due to the technical methods used for identity and authentication on many limited functionality mobile operating systems, achieving compliance to CJIS Security Policy may require layering of identification and authentication mechanisms. With the complexity and large number of potential identity and authentication solutions in the mobile environment emphasis must be placed on designing secure identity management and authentication architecture prior to the selection of individual devices or applications. Failure to consider a robust identity and authentication scheme as part of system design or acquisition will significantly increase the risk of subsequent noncompliance with CJIS Security Policy and potential added costs for a remedial solution. Many identity and authentication schemes used by existing commercial applications may make claims that appear to be consistent with CJIS Security Policy Advanced Authentication requirements, however, extreme care must taken to ensure the actual technical implementation is compliant with policy.

1.6.1 Utilizing Unique device Identification

Some commercial applications and features integrated with some mobile operating systems permit the mobile device to be uniquely identified in a cryptographically robust manner. Any authentication schema that considers the possession of the mobile device as a factor in uniquely identifying and authenticating a CJIS authorized user must also include factors beyond than mere possession of the device. Larger form factor devices that cannot be carried on the person of the authorized user should not rely on possession of the device as an identifying factor, but may still include identifying capability within the device to provide assurance that the device itself is an authorized device. This should still be coupled with multi-factor advanced authentication to the device itself or the application hosting CJI. Coupling unique device authentication with robust advanced authentication of the user provides a high degree of confidence that both the specific device and the operator of the device are correctly identified. Utilizing device unique identification in order to authorize initial connections from the remote device back to the CJI hosting system or enclave provides additional protection to the CJI hosting system to reduce the attack surface of the hosting system and should be considered a good practice, but not in itself an authentication mechanism for the device user.

1.6.1.1 Certificate Use

One method for uniquely identifying mobile devices is to place part of a public key pair on the device in the form of a public key certificate. While there is value to ensuring the device itself can authenticate to a system supplying CJI, and may provide a critical layer of identification or authentication in a larger scheme, a certificate alone placed on the device should not be considered valid proof that the device is being operated by an authorized CJIS user, only that the device itself is authorized to host CJIS users. Additional user identification and authentication should be used to supplement any device certificate installed. Using a PIN or password separate from the device login to ‘unlock’ the certificate from cryptographic storage within a secure application will provide an additional layer of security and may increase the confidence level the device is being used by the intended user. However, use of public/private key pairs or pre-shared encryption keys can be utilized as part of an architecture to protect against certain session hijacking or man-in-the-middle attacks a mobile device may be susceptible to if connected to public internet connections.
1.6.1.2 Certificate Protections
Any certificates or cryptographic keys stored on any mobile device should include protections against the
certificate or key being extracted from the device. Additionally, certificates or other keys stored on mobile
deVICES that grant the device special access or unique identification should be configured for remote wipe
on demand or self-deletion based on a number of unsuccessful login or access attempts. Alternatively,
methods may be used to revoke or invalidate the unique certificate or keys associated with a device.

1.6.2 Minimum Password/Pin (Reference CJIS Security Policy section 5.6.2.1)
The minimum password protections identified in the CJIS Security Policy may not be appropriate for the
device PIN/password due to immediate access requirement for some device functions (e.g. phone
function) secured by the device PIN/password and the difficulty to enter a complex password under
emergency conditions on a small screen. In cases where the risk of a complex password on the device
itself is deemed significant, a layered authentication approach may be necessary where CJI or access to
CJI is protected via one or more additional layers of access control beyond the device PIN/password. In
cases where the CJI or access to the CJI is cryptographically segregated from applications accessible
using the device level PIN/Password (e.g. secure application or secure browser vice the built-in browser)
the authentication mechanism for the secure application or browser may satisfy the CJIS Security Policy
requirements if fully compliant as a stand-alone application.

1.7 Configuration Management
Due to the potential for inconsistent network access or monitoring capability on mobile devices, methods
used to monitor and manage the configuration of traditional full featured operating systems may not
function properly on limited function mobile operating systems. Configuration Management systems in
the mobile environment may be designed in order to duplicate some of the functions typically performed
by traditional anti-malware systems that will not function properly on some mobile operating systems.

1.7.1 Mobile Device Management (MDM)/Enterprise Mobility Management (EMM)
MDM and EMM systems and applications coupled with device specific technical policy can provide a
robust method for device configuration management if properly implemented. MDM capabilities include
the application of mandatory policy settings on the device, detection of unauthorized configurations or
software/applications, detection of rooting/jailbreaking of the device, and many other security policy
related functions. In many cases, the most cost effective way to achieve CJIS Security Policy compliance
on mobile devices is the selection of MDM or EMM applications and infrastructure appropriate to the
mobile operating systems and intended access to CJI on the mobile devices. MDM/EMM functions may
be applicable to most of the CJIS Security Policy requirements and allow for significant compensating
controls in areas where traditional methods of CJIS Security Policy compliance are not technically
feasible. Section 5.5.7.3.3 of the CJIS Security Policy specifies the minimum functions required for
MDM. However, careful selection of the MDM product will potentially provide a cost effective method
for additional areas of compliance in the access, auditing, incident response, authentication, media
protection and system integrity sections of the CJIS Policy.

1.7.2 Device Backups/Images
Device images and backups provide protection against data loss, but also provide a method to quickly
recover a device after damage or potential compromise. Due to an inherently limited ability to access the
internal file structure of mobile devices, it can be difficult to easily identify a device compromise
compromise or illicit modification of the device. Some device imaging and assessment software may provide a secondary forensic capability, especially if there is intent for the device to be used outside the United States.

1.7.3 Bring Your Own device (BYOD) employment
BYOD environments pose significant challenges to the management of secure device configurations. In many cases it may be impossible to apply effective security that is acceptable to the device owner or it may require extremely costly compensating controls to allow access to CJI on personally owned devices. While allowed by the CJIS Security Policy, agencies are advised to conduct a detailed cost analysis of the ancillary costs of compliance with CJIS Security Policy on personally owned devices when they are approved for use. In some cases, a BYOD user may agree to abide by the same device configurations and limitations as imposed on an agency owned device, but signed user agreements should still be in place to ensure the agency has a legal right to recover or clear the device of all data prior to device disposal or employee termination. In other cases, robust secure applications may provide acceptable levels of compliance in a BYOD environment for limited CJI access but application design and architecture should assume the device itself is un-trusted. If MDM/EMM software capable of detecting rooting or jailbreaking of the device is not installed, any CJIS or data access occurring from the device is at a substantially higher risk of compromise.

1.7.4 Configurations and tests
Common configurations specific to all employed mobile devices should be developed to ensure compliance. Configuration tests should be developed and executed on all versions of mobile devices under all possible connectivity scenarios to ensure CJIS Security Policy compliance under all expected operating conditions. Since mobile devices can expect to operate in different physical and network environments, testing and validating correct security functions is more critical than on fixed computing platforms. Additionally, security functions that function properly on one version of a mobile operating system on a particular device may not function in the same manner even on the same version on a different device or a different version on the same device.

1.8 Media Protection
Some mobile device hardware platforms include the ability to add removable storage in the form of memory cards. This function is primarily related to Android and Windows mobile platforms and is intentionally limited on Apple devices, but may be possible through certain application functions. While the Android platform performs robust cryptographic separation of data stores between applications within the ‘internal’ storage of the device, the Android OS does not provide secure separation of data stores on ‘external’ storage. Some Android hardware devices include additional storage hardwired inside the device that is classified by the operating system as external storage and the normal separation between applications accessing that storage is not applied. Each potential device considered for acquisition must be assessed regarding specific ‘external’ media protection requirements which may actually include built-in media or storage.

1.8.1 Protection of device connected media
As a result of the limited protection and encryption capabilities applied to device removable media and SIM cards for cellular provisioning that include onboard data storage, all externally removable media or memory should be handled consistently with the CJIS Security Policy on media protection.
1.8.2 Encryption for device media
While most mobile operating systems have the capability to encrypt internal storage, it may require specific device settings to be enabled. All mobile device storage should meet the encryption requirements identified for media in the CJIS Security Policy. Specific settings may need to be applied to ensure proper encryption is actually employed. Additionally, the device built-in encryption capability is typically tied to the device PIN or password. Depending on the device PIN or password requirements the integrated encryption may be easily bypassed by password guessing and appropriate consideration should be made to ensure additional encryption protected by advanced authentication methods be applied to all CJI.

1.9 Physical Protection
Due to small form factors and the fact that mobile devices are often stored in lower security areas and vehicles, physical protection of the devices must be considered in both policy and training. Physical protections will often be the responsibility of the assigned device user and physical protections typically inherited by individual information systems from a secure facility will not be available to mobile devices which will require compensating controls to achieve compliance.

1.9.1 Device Tracking/Recovery
MDM software as well as some integrated mobile operating system functions may allow tracking of stolen or lost devices via ‘always-on’ cellular data connections and the devices built-in GPS. Device tracking with WiFi only or ‘on-demand’ cellular access may not be reliable. Enabling device tracking capabilities, while not a replacement for secure storage, could be a compensating control used to substantially reduce overall device risk in some scenarios. Device tracking is not currently required in the CJIS Security Policy but should be applied to agency owned devices where possible as a risk mitigation factor. Enabling of device tracking on personally owned devices in a BYOD environment may raise employee privacy concerns and should be considered only for critical systems with the full knowledge of the employee and concurrence of the legal department. This is an enhanced risk that must be accepted for BYOD employments and should be considered when allowing BYOD employment. Device tracking is available for both limited function mobile operating systems as well as traditional operating systems installed on laptop devices.

Access to device tracking software or applications within the organization should be controlled with limits and formal processes required to initiate a tracking action. It is advisable to include appropriate clauses in user agreements under what conditions and controls the organization applies to device tracking.

1.9.2 Devices utilizing unique device identification/certificates
Devices utilizing unique device identification or have installed certificates may require additional physical protection and/or additional incident handling steps in case of device loss in order to ensure the device unique identifier or certificate is immediately revoked or disabled. Additional physical protection rules or policy would be appropriate for any device which contains access mechanisms tied to the device.

1.10 System Integrity (CJIS Policy section 5.10)
Managing system integrity on limited function mobile operating systems may require methods and technologies significantly different from traditional full feature operating systems. In many cases the requirements of section 5.10 of the CJIS Security Policy cannot be met with a mobile device without the installation of a third party MDM or EMM application and supporting server infrastructure.
1.10.1 Patching/Updates
MDM software may provide compliance to the section 5.10.4.1 patch management requirements for particular platforms and software versions. However, devices without ‘always-on’ cellular connections may not be reachable for extended periods of time by the MDM or EMM solution either to report status or initiate patching. Supplementary or manual device accountability methods may need to be implemented to account for devices without persistent connections to ensure their patch and update state is current. Alternatively, some patches or system updates may not be practical over cellular connections and will require connection of devices to a WiFi network. Compliance with CJIS Security Policy requirements through purely technical means may not be practical and considerations should be made for aggressive management of devices through training and mandatory periodic connection of devices to organizationally managed WiFi networks.

TECHNOLOGY NOTE: Apple and Android based devices have different potential issues regarding device operating system updates. Apple maintains support for updating the operating system on Apple hardware for several device generations (typically 3-5 years) and provides a robust mechanism for system updates. However, updates to Android based systems are driven by the individual device manufacturer which may or may not support regular updates to current Android operating system versions. Additionally, different Android device vendors may offer updates/upgrades to the Android operating system on different schedules, which can complicate environments utilizing Android devices from multiple manufacturers.

1.10.2 Malicious code protection/Restriction of installed applications and application permissions
MDM or EMM software will typically allow restrictions on installed applications. One of the few effective attack vectors to compromise mobile operating systems is to manipulate the device user to install a malicious application. Even though the application may be restricted from accessing other application data, it may have some access to common data stores on the device and access to device functions (e.g. GPS, microphone, and camera) that are undesirable. Unrestricted installation of applications by the device user could pose a significant risk to the device.

Malicious code protection using traditional virus scanning software is technically infeasible on most limited function mobile operating systems that are not rooted or jailbroken. The integrated data and program separations prevent any third party installed program from accessing or ‘scanning’ within another application data container. Even if feasible, power and storage limitations would be prohibitive in the effect on device battery life and storage capacity on most mobile devices. However, the cryptographic separation between applications and effective application virtualization technologies built into common mobile operating systems partially compensate for the lack of traditional virus scanning technologies. Appropriately configured MDM software is capable of checking the installed applications on the device and reporting the software inventory to a central management console in a matter analogous to traditional virus scan detection of unauthorized software. This behavior is analogous to the software inventory performed by anti-virus products and can provide a high degree of confidence that only known software or applications are installed on the device. While it is theoretically possible to bypass the application sandboxing and data segregation protections to compromise a mobile device through the web browser, the attack methods required are significantly more advanced than those required for a traditional full featured operating system. Malicious code protections on the device web browser can be enforced through the use of a properly protected web proxy which the device is configured to use as a mandatory device policy.
The most common method of malicious code installation is enticing the user to manually install the malicious app which can be mitigated on organizational devices using an MDM or other application installation restrictions which prevent the user from installing unauthorized or unknown applications. Mitigation of this issue within BYOD environments may not be possible and will present a significantly enhanced risk to the device.

TECHNOLOGY NOTE: In the particular area of application installation there is a significant difference between the behavior of Apple iOS and Android platforms. Apple cryptographically restricts the way applications will execute on the device and assigns mandatory application permissions when the application code is signed prior to release on the Apple App store for distribution. Apps on the Apple platform must conform to Apple’s policy on App behavior and cannot exceed their design permissions on access to common device functions once the App has been signed and distributed. However, the Apple method does not typically advertise the precise internal permissions granted to the App to the user prior to installation. At runtime, the App is required to request user permission to access certain device functions, and the user may agree or not agree, which may introduce risk if they are unaware of what they are agreeing to allow. Unsigned or un-trusted Apps are cryptographically prevented from executing on non-jailbroken iOS devices. Apple provides a mechanism for organizations to distribute custom apps within an organization with equivalent protections but all receiving devices must have a special certificate installed that will only allow official App store and the organization custom Apps to execute.

Conversely, the Android platform, while also requiring app code signing, allows for self-signed code which can be distributed be means other than an official app store and execute on any Android device. Application permissions are presented to the user once at app installation but ramifications of agreement to certain app permissions may not be obvious to a non-technical user. Permissions in the Android model require user acceptance of all app requested permissions or the app is denied installation, which can result in unwise user acceptance of excessive permissions in order to gain functionality provided by the app.

On either platform user installation of applications can significantly change the security state of the device. Applications may be able to transmit and receive data or share device common data with other devices over the network or local WiFi or Bluetooth connection. On either platform it is highly desirable to limit allowable applications to a pre-approved pool of apps via MDM or organizational App store structures and device policy. However, the risks associated with uncontrolled app installation is several orders of magnitude greater on Android based devices.

WARNING: Rooted or jailbroken devices are modified in such a manner that the built in protections against malicious code are effectively disabled. A rooted or jailbroken device would require significant and costly compensating controls to achieve compliance.

1.10.3 Firewall/IDS capability
Traditional device or “personal” firewalls as identified in CJIS Security Policy section 5.10.4.4 may not be practical on limited function mobile device operating systems but significant compensating controls are available. By default, mobile device operating systems have a limited number of system services installed and carefully controlled network access. To a certain extent the mobile operating system performs similar effective functions as a personal firewall would perform on a general purpose operating system. Potential compensating controls for the five (5) personal firewall requirements specified in section 5.10.4.4 are listed below:

1.10.3.1 Network services
1.10.3.2 Intrusion detection
1.10.3.3 Intrusion prevention
1.10.3.4 Traffic control
1.10.3.5 Network access control
1. Manage Program Access to the Internet: On agency controlled devices with an MDM, limiting the apps installed on the device will effectively perform the same function. Since no software or apps can be installed without MDM approval a robust approval process can effectively ensure internet access is only granted to approved apps. Built-in apps and functions can also be limited on network access by the MDM.

2. Block unsolicited requests to connect to the user device: Default configurations for mobile operating system platforms typically block incoming requests. It is possible to install an app that may ‘listen’ on the network and accept connections, but the same compensating control identified in item 1 will mitigate the likelihood of that occurring.

3. Filter incoming traffic by IP address or protocol: Protocol filtering effectively occurs due to the limited function of the operating sys long as no installed application opens network access ports. The mitigations in 1 effectively compensate for this control as well.

4. Filter incoming traffic by destination ports: Same as 3.

5. Maintain an IP traffic log: This may not be technically feasible on most mobile operating system platforms as maintaining this log would require access to lower level operating system functions that are not accessible unless the device is rooted or jailbroken. However, individual Apps that communicate over the network or accept connections from the network may permit logs of IP traffic associated to that application to be stored.

1.10.4 SPAM Protection
SPAM guards installed on corporate or organizational email systems may effectively accomplish the SPAM protection requirements for the CJIS Security Policy on mobile devices if properly configured to block SPAM before delivery to the device. If no upstream SPAM guard is installed on the mail server the mobile devices accesses, the device may not have adequate SPAM protection. Additionally access to internet based email (web mail) would need to be restricted to web mail with appropriate SPAM and/or antivirus protections to ensure compliance.

1.10.5 Periodic system integrity checks
One method to compensate for the technical infeasibility of traditional anti-virus and malicious code protection is to install an MDM that performs periodic system integrity checks that validate device configuration and status against an approved baseline. Deviations may provide indicators of potential device compromise or mis-configuration.