7:58 AM PDT 2023-06-14

**Call to Order:** 0800

**Meeting Lead:** Brandon HARVEY, Joshua BRICKMAN

**Attendees:** 20

**Member Count:** 70

**Next Meeting:** Wednesday June 21st, 2023

**Highlights:**

* A poll was held to identify those that will be attending CCUF/ICCC in October and to assess the level of interest in attending a CCitC workshop during this time.
  + 40% of those present at this meeting indicated they would be attending ICCC and interested in a CCitC in-person meeting as well.

**Old Business:**

~

**New Business:**

* Proceeded with amendments to the Guidance Document.
  + Comment from last week on providing guidance for consultants/vendors on drafting AGD/CC Guide.
    - Discussion on guidance for shared responsibility models in cloud platforms and how to provide guidance on scenarios where responsibility shifts based on the product. Clarification needed on expectations for shared responsibility with a cloud TOE type.
    - Discussion on how the notion of a “trusted platform” relates to this and whether in this context, infrastructure like routers and switches are included in this definition.
    - James D raised a point on the use case where a vendor may want to place a physical appliance within the overall cloud environment to be part of the overall cloud platform. This would introduce a potential special use case and may or may not need to be defined as a “Cloud deployment” since it’s still a physical appliance in a data center.
    - New sub-section “Shared Security Model” was added to section “Cloud Topology”

*“Brief explanation of Shared Security Model – Can take this from cloud SRG or other standard.*

*In most cases the shared responsibility will clearly map with the TOE and TOE platform. For example, the elements of shared responsibility for a cloud customer should be implemented by the TSFI. For elements that the cloud provider is expected to be responsible for, the Trusted Platform should provide to the TOE.”*

* + Josh commented that the majority of commits in GitHub and contributions to documents under construction have been made by very few members.
    - A brief review of the guidance document was conducted to identify sections that need additional work.
    - A general call for volunteers was made to those present to review the following sections and modify/provide feedback as needed.
      * Shared Security Model
      * CPU Equivalence
      * Roles Clarification
      * Guidance for Testing Environments
    - Issue #97 created on GitHub to track this. Interested members that wish to take on the review of a section should leave a comment in this issue indicating their intent.

**Questions/Follow-ups:**

**~**

***End of Meeting – Adjourned 0900 PDT***