7:41 AM PDT 2023-08-02

**Call to Order:** 0800

**Meeting Lead:** Joshua BRICKMAN

**Attendees:** 22

**Member Count:** 72

**Next Meeting:** Wednesday August 9th, 2023

**Highlights:**

* A new announcement has been pinned by Josh B in GitHub for new members.
  + Under ‘Discussions’ > ‘Announcements’ there is a pinned announcement called “Read Me First”. This post contains all the information necessary for new members to get up to speed on current documents, progress, and relevant CCitC information.

**Old Business:**

* Previous meeting remarks presented by Garrett N.
  + Discussed the work being conducted by the NIAP Working Group on the analysis of MDM PP.
    - Concerns were raised on work being done in a closed manner.
    - Jade S explained that this group consists of other stakeholders, and NSA SME’s to work on special interest topics.
    - Justin F confirmed that documentation or reports produced by the NIAP Working Group will **NOT** contain proprietary information, however some conversations with vendors may include proprietary information in order to convey challenges or specific technology implementations, therefore a level of discretion has been required during this process.
    - A due diligence review is underway by members of the NIAP Working Group to ensure that no proprietary information is present in the report prior to its release to the CCitC working group.
  + Discussed Common Criteria’s definition of “assumptions” and the role they play in an evaluation and how they may apply to cloud evaluations.
    - Schemes can and do have the authority to levy additional evidence requirements in order to satisfy an assumption.
    - Tyrone S presented some analysis on assumptions in the NDcPP, showing examples of where certain assumptions apply to specific TOE types (vND’s etc.)
    - A proposal was made to amend the guidance doc to include a set of assumptions and related organizational policies and objectives for PP authors to include in their PP’s.
    - Some assumptions might be covered by the vendor or the CSP, further analysis into whether something like FedRAMP validation would satisfy some assumptions.
  + Josh B confirmed that a conference room has been booked at Oracle’s offices during CCUF.

**New Business:**

* Josh B. discussed the in-person workshop to occur during CCUF in the fall
  + Agenda is TBD for now, however a conference space for approximately 22 persons has been booked at Oracles offices since official CCUF space was not able to be provided.
  + This group/meeting will adjourn for members to attend other meetings at CCUF, such as the joint session.
  + These in-person meetings may continue in the future and coincide with other conferences.
* Matt provided a brief update from NIAP.
  + CCUF Joint session to occur in the afternoon of first day (October 26th)
  + NIAP has onboarded five new people and may result in some new faces in various activities including this group, as projects are assigned.
* Tyrone S presented some new analysis in the document “TrustedPlatformSPD.adoc” on GitHub.
  + In cases where a TOE is hosted on a Trusted Platform, platform related Assumptions and associated Security Objectives for the Operating Environment should be addressed by the Trusted Platform in use.
  + Several assumptions have been derived from the those in the NDcPP, however may need to be adapted to cloud specific uses.
  + Discussion around assumptions related to platform isolation and how this would be satisfied by the platform. Particular deployments (SaaS, PaaS, Iaas) may need special considerations depending on the model.
  + Included in this document is a table mapping these assumptions and environmental objectives, to the ‘Cloud Authorization Scheme Controls – Cisco CCF v2.0’ spreadsheet. Thibaut M to follow up internally in Cisco to find out who the document owner is.
* Continued work on the Guidance Document.
  + Discussion on the previous topic of audit data generation and whether some SFR required audit messages can be provided by the platform instead of the TOE. In cases where exact conformance is a factor, SFR’s must be exactly met. However PP-modules may refine an SFR in the base PP, but only in a way that strengthens the requirements or more narrowly scopes a subsets of selections. It cannot loosen the requirement or remove elements of the requirement in any way.

**Questions/Follow-ups:**

* Thibaut M to follow up internally to find out who the document owner of the ‘Cloud Authorization Scheme Controls – Cisco CCF v2.0’ spreadsheet is.

***End of Meeting – Adjourned 0859 PDT***