



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

1. Call to Order / Roll Call

1.1. In Attendance

- 1.1.1. Dave Thaler (Microsoft) (Chair) *
- 1.1.2. Aeva van der Veen (Microsoft)
- 1.1.3. Stephen Walli (Microsoft)
- 1.1.4. Pushkar Chitnis (Microsoft)
- 1.1.5. Liam Coffey (AMD)
- 1.1.6. Naveen Cherukuri (NVIDIA)
- 1.1.7. Anne Bertucio (Google)
- 1.1.8. Brandon Baker (Google)*
- 1.1.9. Dimitrios Pendaraskis (IBM, sitting in for Mike, Red Hat)*
- 1.1.10. John Haxby (Oracle)*
- 1.1.11. David Dunn (VMware)
- 1.1.12. Grant Likely (Arm)*
- 1.1.13. Michael Lu (Arm)
- 1.1.14. Simon Johnson (Intel)*
- 1.1.15. Dan Middleton (Intel)
- 1.1.16. Simon Leet (Microsoft)
- 1.1.17. Seth Knox (Outreach chair)
- 1.1.18. Morgan Akers (JPMC)
- 1.1.19. Gorav Arora (Thales Group)
- 1.1.20. Didier Hugot (Thales Group)
- 1.1.21. Richard Searle (Fortanix)
- 1.1.22. David Kohlbrenner (UC Berkeley)
- 1.1.23. Stephano Cetola (Linux Foundation)

1.2. Not in attendance

- 1.2.1. Xiaoning Li – (Alibaba)*
- 1.2.2. Howard Huang – (Huawei)*
- 1.2.3. Mike Bursell (Red Hat)*
- 1.2.4. Jinsong Yu (Facebook)*

*voting member

2. Move to approve minutes

- 2.1. The committee approved the minutes for the April 2 meeting with 1 abstention.

3. Gartner Analyst Meeting Debrief (Outreach)

- 3.1. Brian Lowans, Tony Harvery, and Ramon Krikken were on the call.
- 3.2. Brian – What is your arrangement of service offering? Licensing?
- 3.3. Ramon – What is your definition of TEE?
 - 3.3.1. Dave working on updating that definition and Seth will send updated presentation.
- 3.4. Brian – Is post quantum included in this?
- 3.5. Ramon – Who is the audience for this?

DRAFT

- 3.6. Ramon will read through the slide deck. What is the probability of AWS joining the CCC?
- 3.7. Document Review: He is happy to take a look at the final draft of May 15th doc.
- 3.8. Follow-ups:
 - 3.8.1. Update scoping.md with latest IETF definition of TEE and notify Seth when that's done
 - 3.8.2. Resend Presentation
 - 3.8.3. Setup Document Review for Whitepaper

4. Whitepaper (Outreach)

- 4.1. [Please review whitepaper](#)
- 4.2. The goal is to give the reader a frame of reference to put a system they are exploring into context so that they can make informed decisions. We want them to have a frame of reference as they explore confidential computing in general, and to send them down a path that follows our definition and messaging.
- 4.3. We want this document to promote confidential computing and not promote our group in particular.
- 4.4. We're looking to have a draft with broad agreement by April 30. This date can be pushed out if needed, but we would like to strive for that date. We will be meeting on that date to discuss any final notes.

5. How we coordinate with Projects? (Outreach)

- 5.1. A project does not need to be associated with any specific member (e.g. Graphene), and as such we may not have Outreach reps (mentors) for each project. Each project has a point of contact for TAC, but not Outreach.

6. How do we continue to work with the website (Outreach)

- 6.1. Currently we are working with Stephano and reviewing the GitHub issues as well.
- 6.2. Stephano will continue to coordinate such that both TAC and Outreach issues are created in GitHub and synced with any tickets that are opened for the LF creative team (for larger design lifts).

7. GitHub Pull Requests and Issues

- 7.1. [PR #44](#) – Updated Quote from IETF to match latest document
 - 7.1.1. IETF took our feedback, accepted it, made the change, and agreed with it.
- 7.2. We may want to add a “Time Bomb” label for issues that have time constraints.
- 7.3. [PR #41](#) - Adds project goals to proposal template
 - 7.3.1. Question 5 needs to be added back in as it was removed by mistake.
 - 7.3.2. Projects are only given 1 questionnaire, so this will have items that are not specific to the TAC. There are questions that get answered that the Outreach committee, for example, may use after the project is accepted.
 - 7.3.3. While questions may not be technical, many of these questions might cover topics that would help us make a decision on stewarding these projects and expectations these projects might have in terms of benefits.
 - 7.3.4. There is a separate issue that the TAC is the only group that currently reviews potential projects and we may want to consider reviews from other groups as well (Outreach as an example).
 - 7.3.5. We want to probe for funding questions early for things like CI/CD.
 - 7.3.6. We should split this document into sections such that we know who is responsible for each section (e.g. TAC, Budget, Outreach).
- 7.4. [Issue #16](#) - Progression Template: Projects should address security response
 - 7.4.1. We will defer this conversation as Mike is not on the call. However, for those involved in projects (CCC members or not) please think about how your security process works and what kinds of questions we might want to ask.

DRAFT

- 7.4.2. Official MITRE documentation, definitions, CVE Identifiers are public online, and we should consider having a liaison for that process inside the CCC.
- 7.5. [Issue #17](#) - Recommendations around mapping of "project" to GitHub terminology
 - 7.5.1. Projects may contain multiple repos, so how do we treat sub-repos or sub-projects of a project we want to accept.
 - 7.5.2. The TAC should do an "annual review" of projects. One of the things we should do is to check if there are any deltas from the original accepted project.
 - 7.5.3. Projects should proactively notify the TAC when they make substantial changes to their project.
 - 7.5.4. If we keep a project review lightweight, it would allow us to have "minimum viable governance", where this review could grow organically with our projects / the Consortium.
 - 7.5.5. We will begin to work on what the text for this will be as there is no pull request today.
- 7.6. [Issue #19](#) – Project "charter"
 - 7.6.1. We are reaching out to Scott (Linux Foundation) to find the history of the Project Charter Document which was originally provided to the CCC.
 - 7.6.2. We need to document a flow diagram for onboarding a project and we want to know where the technical charter fits into that.
 - 7.6.3. This issue is assigned to Stephen Walli and he will follow up with the TAC if this is not a purely legal / governing board issue.

8. Action Items

- 8.1. [Voting Members] Please send Dave or Stephano your GitHub ID so that we can add reviewers to our GitHub issues / pull requests.

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 am PDT on April 16, 2020. The next conference call will be scheduled for Thursday April 30.

Respectfully submitted by Stephano Cetola, Acting Secretary, on April 20, 2020.