DRAFT

TAC Conference Call – 7:00am PST
Thursday 19 March 2020

1. **Call to Order / Roll Call**
   a. Members of the Technical Advisory Council
      i. Dave Thaler (Microsoft) (Chair) *****
      ii. Aeva van der Veen (Microsoft)
      iii. Stephen Walli (Microsoft)
      iv. Mike Bursell (Red Hat)*
      v. John Haxby (Oracle)*
      vi. Grant Likely (Arm)*
      vii. Michael Lu (Arm)
      viii. Simon Johnson (Intel)*
      ix. Simon Leet (Microsoft)
      x. Seth Knox (Outreach chair)
      xi. David Dunn (VMware)
      xii. Morgan Akers (JPMC)
      xiii. Jethro Beekman (Fortanix)
      xiv. Naveen Cherukuri (Nvidia)
      xv. Gorav Arora (Thales Group)
      xvi. Didier Hugot (Thales Group)
      xvii. Richard Searle (Fortanix)
      xviii. Stephano Cetola (Linux Foundation)
   b. Not in attendance
      i. Xiaoning Li – (Alibaba)*
      ii. Howard Huang – (Huawei)*
      iii. Brandon Baker (Google)*
      iv. Jinsong Yu (Facebook)*   *voting member

2. **Move to approve minutes**
   a. The committee approved the minutes for the February 27th F2F joint meeting (TAC), for the February 27th F2F TAC only meeting, and the March 5, 2019 meeting as amended before the meeting (with 1 abstention for the March 5th vote).

3. **Action Item Review**
   a. [Simon] Propose a list of project categories for discussion. [In Progress, moving to GitHub issue]

4. **Analyst Briefing Report Out**
   a. Overall, went well, analyst appreciated our efforts.
   b. We will be getting responses back to Steve, specifically with a preface of our stance in regard to CSPs, as well as comments directly from those CSPs.
   c. Seth will send an email out to TAC and Outreach for CSP and chip vendor responses with a specific word limit.
   d. Morgan and Steve Reilly will be meeting as part of this briefing.

5. **Project Infrastructure Costs**

a. In our efforts to encourage projects to join the CCC and be housed in a neutral arena we would like to support things like website costs, domain name, email addresses, and general web-maintenance.
b. The Linux Foundation can provide IT infrastructure and will work with us on pricing that makes sense for the number of projects we hope to support and the services those projects require.
c. Dave will make a proposal on the list for the TAC to vote on and that proposal will then be recommended to the governing board.
    i. Proposal: Items listed under Small & Medium tiers on slide 12 would be appropriate for Sandbox (and above) stage projects if they so request. (e.g. domain name, email, website)
    ii. Intent is that this vote is specific to the current list and does not imply any agreement on items on a different list if LF changes the items under tiers. Intent is to provide a set of "basic services" which are listed on the current slide (slide 12 of agenda).

6. **Chat for CCC Projects**
    a. Many of the free chat services (Slack, Matrix, Gitter, Zulip, Rocket) do not offer a free tier that is acceptable.
    b. Features we want
        i. Logging
        ii. anonymous chat
        iii. web interface
        iv. non-per-user cost
        v. CoC enforcement
        vi. end to end encryption
        vii. domain integration like chat.theproject.org
    c. We also want to look at possibly using the same service for all projects in an attempt to get better services / pricings.
    d. Rocket does provide many of these features however it does not have a free tier.
    e. Mike can invite folks to try the Enarx Rocket chat group. Contact him directly for access.
    f. We would like to have a 2-dimensional matrix to compare the options out there and which features they provide.

7. **GitHub Issues**
    a. Please go through the issues and approve or add comments.
    b. Note to the GitHub Process: If there are no comments in 1 week, we will mark these as approved.

8. **Projects and Security Responses**
    a. We request that projects have a security response policy.
    b. Details on an OE CGC group conversation are available here:
        i. https://github.com/confidential-computing/governance/issues/16
    c. There was some consensus around projects having their own security process and roll up issues to the CCC TAC as needed.
    d. More conversation is required around 1. Should we have a security committee and 2. Should we have a security rep or advisor for projects and should that person be a member or simply a security consultant. More discussion is also required around embargos and embargo email lists (who gets the notice of the embargo / vulnerability).

Action Items

DRAFT

1) [Stephano] Create a repo for the website and begin tracking issues. [**DONE**]
2) [Stephano] Create a text file with all the links to the past recordings and store that in the TAC files area (viewable to TAC members only).
3) [Stephano] See issue #27 and issue #9.
4) [Dave] Send the infrastructure costs proposal to the mailing list.
5) [Mike/Aeva] Create the matrix for chat programs and send that to the list.
6) [Simon (Johnson / Mike] We'd be interested in Red Hat and Intel's experiences in terms of security committees, responsible disclosure, embargos, etc.

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 am PDT on March 19, 2020. The next conference call will be scheduled for Thursday April 2nd.

Respectfully submitted by Stephano Cetola, Acting Secretary, on March 24, 2020.