

## Minutes Inaugural Meeting Project Governing Board DAD-CDM Project

July 10<sup>th</sup>, 2023, 12:00 pm EDT over Zoom

In attendance:

Rafi Mendelsohn (Cyabra)  
Viktoras Daukšas (debunk)  
Jon Brewer (DISARM Foundation)  
Stephen Campbell (DISARM Foundation)  
Georgianna Shea (FDD)  
Rachele Gilman (Global Disinformation Index)  
Emily Brown (JHU APL)  
Daniel Meidenbauer (JHU APL)  
Rob Schaul (Limbik)  
Polly Lambert (Logically)  
Anil Bandhakavi (Logically)  
Adriana Klima (Logically)  
Jean-Philippe Salles (OpenCTI)  
Kelly Cullinane (OASIS)  
Chet Ensign (OASIS)  
Jamie Clark (OASIS)  
Duncan Sparrell (sFractal)

Kelly welcomed everyone, thanked everyone who has worked on getting the project to this stage, and asked if we wanted to do introductions. Stephen suggested a quick round: name and affiliation only.

Kelly confirmed that those who had signed an eCLA could vote and listed all those who were eligible to vote. Viktor asked what role the Co-Chairs play. Kelly said they set the direction for the project and drive it forward, much like a CEO does. Duncan said that this analogy was not quite accurate since Co-Chairs do not have executive authority in the same way a CEO does but rather that they are more like facilitators responsible for consensus building. Other projects have tripped up on this point.

Kelly then listed the names of the nominees for Co-Chair, Georgianna Shea and Jean-Philippe Salles, and asked if there were any objections to electing these nominees. There were no objections, so George and Jean-Philippe were voted unanimously as Co-Chairs and congratulated by all.

Kelly shared a few slides explaining how Open Projects are managed and the support that OASIS provides. At a minimum the PGB will need to set up a Technical Steering Committee and there will need to be at least one Repo, but it is up to the PGB to create other committees and up to the TSC to create other Repos, as required. Stephen posted a link in the chat to a page which provides an introduction to Open Projects:

<https://github.com/oasis-open-projects/documentation/blob/main/guides/getting-started-guide.md>.

It is up to the PGB to decide what to approve and advance through the standards process, which can ultimately result in new OASIS standards which can be submitted to other standards bodies such as the ISO or the ITU. This can be a multi-month or multi-year process involving working drafts becoming draft specs and then approved specs that become candidates for an OASIS standard. The process for Open

Projects is roughly similar to that of Technical Committees. Stephen added that in the case of DAD-CDM it may be that the process will differ slightly in that the intention is to leverage the existing STIX standard rather than creating a new standard and that this might involve crafting STIX Enhancement Proposals for review by the CTI-TC (Cyber Threat Intelligence – Technical Committee). He suggested that Duncan may be able to advise on this process which is documented here:

<https://github.com/oasis-open/cti-stix-common-objects/tree/main>.

Duncan pointed out that this may be putting the cart before the horse and that technically this would be up to the PGB to decide. There are other approaches that might be taken such as that taken by Collaborative Automated Course of Action Operations (CACAO) or the Indicator of Behaviors sub-project of the Open Cyber Alliance. Jamie pointed out in the chat that rather than actively promoting an extension of STIX through the CTI-TC and thereby ceding control to the CTI-TC, a project might decide to go its own route and let the CTI-TC decide on whether to comment or embrace the new spec as an extension to STIX. Duncan pointed out that anything proposed to the CTI-TC would be subject to the CTI-TC's governance process and that the CTI-TC is a large group with its own priorities and its own community. And contributions would also need to exist before they could be proposed to the CTI-TC.

Stephen agreed that the PGB would need to make the decision on this but also suggested that there was some existing work that could be leveraged. He suggested that the intention as laid out in the project charter was to leverage some of the work that had already been done by OpenCTI in collaboration with the European External Action Service in extending the STIX model with disinformation objects such as Channel and Narrative rather than reinventing the wheel. One option is for DAD-CDM to turn these into contributions and propose them as STIX Enhancements.

Kelly explained the importance of non-standards track work, especially Project Notes and Whitepapers which communicate broadly to the community what the project is doing and its objectives. It is especially important at the beginning to ensure this transparency, so that everyone understands clearly the objectives and direction of the project. And it is important that the process be as open and transparent as possible. This means using the mailing list on the Open Project portal (a web page built using groups.io) as much as possible, rather than emailing individuals separately. To ensure you do not miss any meetings or events be sure to go to the DAD-CDM calendar at <https://lists.oasis-open-projects.org/g/dad-cdm/calendar> and click on "Subscribe to Calendar" at the bottom to copy the URL which you can then paste into your own calendar app. The balloting system is vital.

Kelly explained that a Google Drive could be set up for sharing files but that we would need to be careful that important documents are shared via the portal and mailing list. Slack is another option and Kelly pointed out that some members of OASIS are already communicating via the DISARM Foundation Slack but that any potential issues on using such a solution going forward would need to be identified and ironed out. Several members indicated their liking in the chat for sharing files via Google Drive, including Rafi and Viktoras. Duncan responded in the chat that he disagrees with using GDrive since it lacks configuration management features, and that GitHub would be preferable, especially for contributions and formal documents. Stephen asked in chat if this preference was due to the auditing or logging features of GitHub and Duncan replied yes.

Kelly explained the difference between Individual and Entity Contributor License Agreements, which is also explained here:

<https://github.com/oasis-open-projects/documentation/blob/main/guides/getting-started-guide.md>.

She said that a common misunderstanding is that signing a CLA means relinquishing rights. This is not at all the case. Signing a CLA just grants non-exclusive rights to OASIS to use and republish the work. The full rights remain with the contributor. Kelly also explained that anyone can attend meetings but only PGB members can vote (or those on the TSC roster in the case of the TSC).

Kelly opened up the floor for questions and suggested that the most important remaining order of business was to arrange a date for the next meeting. Stephen asked the new Co-Chairs if they had any questions. Jean-Philippe said it's a lot to take in and that he had no questions right now. George said she felt like a new-born giraffe just trying to stand! She asked what the cadence should be. Kelly suggested biweekly meetings might be appropriate. Chet said that there is a lot of work up-front as the PGB puts in place its own governance rules and suggested that every other week for a month or two may be appropriate at the start until the basic logistics are in place and the TSC is set up. Thereafter the PGB could meet monthly or even quarterly.

Duncan posted in the chat that monthly is preferable, quarterly is too infrequent, at least until we get going with working meetings between PGB meetings. There is also the issue of time zones and whether you split or rotate meeting times to deal with those. Stephen said that in terms of the big picture the Incident SDO Extension is a good example – it has taken the technical committee just over a year to spec out the Incident SDO Extension: it is quite possible that a similar timeframe may be needed once the TSC is set up, to propose STIX Extensions for disinformation, if we go that route.

Jon raised the issue that ease of access to sharing documents is important and that everyone knows how to use Google Drive. Stephen asked Duncan if there was any other reason for not using Google Drive other than the possible lack of auditing or change logging. Duncan and others had already had to drop off the meeting. It was agreed to discuss this at the next meeting.

Stephen suggested a follow up meeting in short order since August is largely a vacation month in Europe. George said that she is actually available in August but is pretty busy with travel in September. She suggested next week - same day same time. Jean-Philippe agreed this was doable. Everyone agreed and so the next meeting was set for Monday July 17<sup>th</sup> at 12:00 pm EDT. Kelly said she would add it to the project calendar and asked if someone had a Zoom account that could be used. Stephen said we could use his and would send her the details. Kelly said she will help us with some of those initial logistics Chet referred to. The meeting was adjourned at 13:05.