

# TAC Conference Call – 7:00am PST Thursday 3 September 2020

### 1. Call to Order / Roll Call

### 1.1. In Attendance

- 1.1.1. Dave Thaler (Microsoft, TAC Chair) \*
- 1.1.2. Aeva Black (Microsoft)
- 1.1.3. Axel Simon (Red Hat)
- 1.1.4. Brandon Baker (Google)\*
- 1.1.5. Florian Wiedmann (CYSEC)
- 1.1.6. FX Marseille (Thales)
- 1.1.7. Giuseppe Giordano (Accenture)\*
- 1.1.8. Grant Likely (Arm) \*
- 1.1.9. Guzongmin (Ant Financial) \*
- 1.1.10. Hongliang Tian (Ant Financial)
- 1.1.11. Jethro Beekman (Fortanix)
- 1.1.12. Liam Coffey (AMD)
- 1.1.13. Mike Bursell (Red Hat) \*
- 1.1.14. Morgan Akers (JPMC)
- 1.1.15. Naveen Cherukuri (Nvidia)
- 1.1.16. Richard Searle (Fortanix) \*
- 1.1.17. Scott Schweitzer (Xilinx)
- 1.1.18. Seth Knox (Outreach Chair)
- 1.1.19. Shankaran G (Facebook)
- 1.1.20. Simon Leet (Microsoft)
- 1.1.21. Stephen Walli (Microsoft)
- 1.1.22. Xinxin Fan (IoTex)
- 1.1.23. Simon Leet (Microsoft)
- 1.1.24. Stephano Cetola (Linux Foundation)
- 1.2. \*voting member

### 2. Move to approve minutes

2.1. The Technical Advisory Council approves the minutes from the August 20 meeting.

#### 3. Action Item Review

- 3.1. [Mike] Ensure that a TAC budget line item for 1 Zoom account for OE SDK [In Progress]
- 3.2. [Xiaoning] Send Dave or Stephano your GitHub ID so that we can add reviewers to our GitHub issues / pull requests
- 3.3. [David Kohlbrenner] Please provide a list of the licenses used for crypto implementations, specifically to ensure that they are all OSI approved. [In Progress]
- 3.4. [Stephano] Work with Axel on getting a better, cheaper solution to their mailing list request. [In Progress]
- 3.5. [Stephano] Work with the Occlum folks to get a list of the dependencies listed which are part of the TCB and add that to the submission document for posterity. [In Progress]
- 3.6. [Stephano] Update the survey questions with the notes from these minutes. [DONE]

### 4. Technical Charters

- 4.1. The CCC Chair, TAC Chair, and Scott (LF) met this past Monday to discuss this topic.
- 4.2. Submissions to LF Projects is completely separate from submission to the CCC. A project can decide to join LF Projects and then possibly join an umbrella project (like CCC) or not.
- 4.3. Likewise, the CCC can require their projects to be a "Series LF Project" or not.
- 4.4. Submission to LF Projects includes both the Technical Charter and Project Contributor Agreement.
- 4.5. The Technical Charter is not strictly required to conform to the template but may take longer to review. The intent is not to dictate project governance structure. Key items are the license and voting rules within the charter.
- 4.6. Charter template states that a "CONTRIBUTING" file in project report has 3 categories of info: a "TSC" voting members list and how they are selected, definitions of any roles used by the project (maintainers/committers/contributors/etc.), and policies and processes for contributing.
- 4.7. Any changes to the technical charters of these projects are not legally required to be reviewed by the CCC.
- 4.8. These project charter changes should be part of the annual review process of projects by the TAC.

## 5. Member / Project Survey

- 5.1. <a href="https://docs.google.com/document/d/16lmYYnEnW65ucdZHSqJogQ1i6riq\_rPlgKTJK55">https://docs.google.com/document/d/16lmYYnEnW65ucdZHSqJogQ1i6riq\_rPlgKTJK55</a> 102l/edit?usp=sharing
- 5.2. Please have a look at these questions and send any feedback to Stephano or comment directly here. This will be brought to both the Outreach Committee and the Governing Board before it goes out to projects and members.

## 6. Outreach Whitepaper (Utilization Paradigms)

- 6.1. <a href="https://docs.google.com/document/d/1JxOIHB2MsUTJzsiLSH04a-QMhHZfLzeaiVRNX9kD6ng/edit?pli=1">https://docs.google.com/document/d/1JxOIHB2MsUTJzsiLSH04a-QMhHZfLzeaiVRNX9kD6ng/edit?pli=1</a> (See red section entitled "Blockchain")
- 6.2. Conversations were had and issues resolved around the two *approaches* (#1 & #2) in this section (and we feel that term could be improved).
- 6.3. Seth suggested that we cross link the TAC whitepaper when it is finished, so that the Outreach paper might, for example, say "For more examples of approaches, go here" and send folks to the TAC whitepaper.
- 6.4. Please have a final review this section before we send this back to the Outreach committee.

# 7. Confidential VM/container/process/etc terminology

- 7.1. <a href="https://docs.google.com/document/d/1xZ6IX0w0jaWDbLMFNAybTF3FpLnQ5TJ98nzIWbsbFnY/edit#">https://docs.google.com/document/d/1xZ6IX0w0jaWDbLMFNAybTF3FpLnQ5TJ98nzIWbsbFnY/edit#</a>
- 7.2. There are different instantiations of the straw-persons mentioned in this paper which are evident in everything from whitepapers to other open source communities. As a group whose goal is to guide these definitions, we should at least be sure that communities use the same terms to mean the same things to avoid fragmentation of language.
- 7.3. (Per the proposal) We feel that the developments discussed here are core to the TAC's mission and belong in this group, not in another working group.
- 7.4. We would like to take on the task of coming up with some additional terms and definitions for use in whitepapers as well. Outreach has already begun this effort and would like to add a glossary of terms to the website or whitepapers.

## 8. Project Progression Policy

8.1. <a href="https://github.com/confidential-computing/governance/blob/master/project-progression-policy.md">https://github.com/confidential-computing/governance/blob/master/project-progression-policy.md</a>

### **DRAFT**

- 8.2. When we first adopted this policy in Lyon, we had to accept something so that we could begin accepting projects. We only debated items up to the incubation stage, as our only projects that were joining were at that stage. For the other stages, we held off on discussions until a future date until necessary. We also accepted at the time that this text was not perfect, but rather acceptable at the time it was needed.
- 8.3. We may want to note in this policy that everything after the Graduation stage is still a straw-person and has not been finalized or approved.
- 8.4. The board will be discussing (next week) the need for Graduated projects no longer having a voting representative on the TAC.
- 9. TAC Whitepaper Threat Model (esp. Sec. 6.3, Side-Channels)
  - 9.1. <a href="https://docs.google.com/document/d/17PhrIXvFJsAIJryYjpezmfdSI1BSB1x1tE2FTbriHy">https://docs.google.com/document/d/17PhrIXvFJsAIJryYjpezmfdSI1BSB1x1tE2FTbriHy</a> c/edit?ts=5ec71ac7
  - 9.2. Generally speaking, we feel that this section is very well done. Sarah (R3) had a great suggestion and Mike added some text to address that issue.
  - 9.3. Important to note that there are many types of side-channel attacks and so using the term broadly should be done with care.

### **Action Items**

- 1. [Scott (LF)/Dave] Scott to provide the Project Contribution Agreement document to Dave for the TAC.
- 2. [Aeva/Mike] Create straw-person for terminology proposal.
- **3.** [All] Please do a final review of the Outreach whitepaper before we send it back to them (they have a meeting next week, Wednesday).

Meeting adjourned at 9:02 am PT on September 3, 2020. The next conference call will be scheduled for Thursday September 17.

Respectfully submitted by Stephano Cetola, Acting Secretary, on September 3, 2020.