7:49 AM PDT 2023-07-26

**Call to Order:** 0802

**Meeting Lead:** Joshua BRICKMAN

**Attendees:** 21

**Member Count:** 72

**Next Meeting:** Wednesday August 2nd, 2023

**Highlights:**

~

**Old Business:**

* Previous meeting remarks presented by Garrett N.
  + Reviewed newly created issue #100 *“Guidance Doc Status and Ownership if Applicable”* which identifies work units that have been completed, and those that remain open and need work. Each work unit is tagged with applicable GitHub issues and owners.
    - Discussed the *“Cloud Sub-Processes”* work unit (GitHub Issue #74). Justin F shared that the MDM PP working group has drafted an analysis document that is currently in formal review prior to release to CCitC membership.
  + Discussed ICCC and GitHub Issue #94 “Meet face to face at ICCC”. CCUF is unable to provide space for CCitC meetings, so Josh B is looking into conference room space at Oracles office which is a 10 minute walk from the ICCC host hotel.
  + Discussed GitHub issue #101 “Trusted Platform Details”. A new top-level section to be created in the guidance doc to describe in detail what a trusted platform is and is not.
  + Josh B to follow up with NIAP liaisons on the work being conducted by the MDM PP working group.

**New Business:**

* Josh B discussed the work being done by the NIAP Working Group on MDM PP analysis.
  + All work being conducted with respect to the CCitC working group is and is meant to be public, however it has been noted that the work being done by the NIAP Working Group has been conducted in a closed manner.
  + Jade S made the clarification that previously, CCitC has referred to this NIAP Working Group as a “Sub-Group”. This is misleading as it is not a sub-group of the broader CCitC working group. Jade S explained that Justin F has been asked by NIAP to participate with the NIAP Working Group which includes other stakeholders and NSA SME’s and has been created to work on specific topics of interest to NIAP.
  + Justin F reiterated that no documentation or reporting produced by the NIAP Working Group will contain proprietary information, however during the course of the analysis on MDM PP and through internal discussions with vendors, input may have been requested or presented to the NIAP Working Group which may be proprietary in nature in order to help contextualize issues and describe technology implementations. This information will be distilled into more generic language that apply to general functionality vs proprietary technologies. A due diligence review is currently underway by other members of the NIAP Working Group to ensure that no proprietary information is included in the analysis prior to its release to CCitC members.
* Discussion on Common Criteria’s definition of “Assumptions”.
  + Josh B described the role of assumptions in Common Criteria evaluations and that they are generally unevaluated/not tested claims.
  + Justin F clarified that schemes can and do have the authority to require evidence above and beyond simply claiming an assumption is satisfied by a particular OE. For example, A.PLATFORM in the App PP. This is a NIAP PP so more flexibility is provided in mandating an additional level of rigor in evidence to support some assumptions.
  + Tyrone S presented some analysis on assumptions in the NDcPP
    - In some cases, certain assumptions are tagged with *“applies to vND’s only*”.
    - Assumptions should have a matching security objective, to satisfy them.
    - A proposal was made to include a set of assumptions and related organizational policies and objectives for PP authors to include in their PP’s. Additional guidance on how they are satisfied by existing frameworks like FedRAMP could also be added.
    - Josh raised a point on whether some assumptions may be covered by the vendor vs the CSP, and how the requirements of something like FedRAMP could possibly be leveraged as rationale for assumptions in CC being met.
* Josh announced that a conference room supporting approximately 22 people has been booked at Oracle’s office during the time of CCUF.

**Questions/Follow-ups:**

* Reminder for CCitC members to comment their attendance status for CCUF/ICCC in GitHub Discussion #94.

***End of Meeting – Adjourned 0901 PDT***