



**TAC Conference Call – 7:00am PST  
Thursday 14 May 2020**

**1. Call to Order / Roll Call**

**1.1. In Attendance**

- 1.1.1. Dave Thaler (Microsoft) (Chair) \*
- 1.1.2. Giuseppe Giordano (Accenture) \*
- 1.1.3. Michael Klein (Accenture)
- 1.1.4. Stephen Walli (Microsoft)
- 1.1.5. Pushkar Chitnis (Microsoft)
- 1.1.6. Aeva Black (Microsoft)
- 1.1.7. Liam Coffey (AMD)
- 1.1.8. Brandon Baker (Google)\*
- 1.1.9. Mike Bursell (Red Hat)\*
- 1.1.10. John Haxby (Oracle)\*
- 1.1.11. Grant Likely (Arm)\*
- 1.1.12. Michael Lu (Arm)
- 1.1.13. Simon Johnson (Intel)\*
- 1.1.14. Dan Middleton (Intel)
- 1.1.15. Seth Knox (Outreach chair)
- 1.1.16. Roy Hopkins (R3)
- 1.1.17. Shankaran (Facebook)\*
- 1.1.18. Morgan Akers (JPMC)
- 1.1.19. Gorav Arora (Thales Group)
- 1.1.20. Didier Hugot (Thales Group)
- 1.1.21. Stephano Cetola (Linux Foundation)

**1.2. Not in attendance**

- 1.2.1. Xiaoning Li – (Alibaba)\*
- 1.2.2. Howard Huang – (Huawei)\* \*voting member

**2. Move to approve minutes**

- 2.1. The committee approved the minutes for the April 30 meeting with no objections and no abstentions.

**3. Chat: Followup**

- 3.1. The question we are trying to answer: Should the projects seek funds for 3<sup>rd</sup> party services, should they work together on a shared service, or should the CCC hosted service be provided?
- 3.2. This topic is brought up by both Enarx and OE SDK.
- 3.3. Enarx has had an offer to provide free services from Rocket.chat which they have accepted. We can ask if they would extend the same offer to other groups.
- 3.4. [https://github.com/enarx/rfcs/commit/72da1c191fbabc98093ebd4bee177a2d7d60df29?short\\_path=59d5c8e#diff-59d5c8e31d5757051b7d3361f666e454](https://github.com/enarx/rfcs/commit/72da1c191fbabc98093ebd4bee177a2d7d60df29?short_path=59d5c8e#diff-59d5c8e31d5757051b7d3361f666e454)

**4. Whitepaper updates**

- 4.1. Aeva will be driving completion of the use case examples that have been assigned to members of the Outreach committee.

## **DRAFT**

- 4.2. We expect to have a draft with that content prior to the next TAC meeting and hope to be on the agenda to move that forward.
- 4.3. Please comment on the document before the next meeting:
- 4.4. <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1JxOIHb2MsUTJzsiLSH04a-QMhHZfLzeaiVRNX9kD6ng/edit?ts=5ea23d21#>

### **5. Project Contacts - Outreach**

- 5.1. Usually the TAC is the interface between the CCC and projects, however we do not want to impede information flow between the projects and the Outreach Committee.
- 5.2. The question being raised is how we enable communication between the Outreach Committee and the projects which are accepted. Does the project designate a contact for Outreach?
- 5.3. We will leave this up to the mentor for the project to direct questions to the Outreach committee and we need a pull request to create a file that lists these mentors.

### **6. Analyst Presentation Overview**

- 6.1. We'd like to do an overview of what we have presented to analysts so that we can start forming a technical whitepaper around this material. Also, we have one more analyst briefing set up, so we want to discuss these slides for that briefing.
- 6.2. One of the aims for this whitepaper should be the spectrum of protections that are available, and that will lead into the types of attacks that would be protected against.
- 6.3. The framing of the presentation (or whitepaper) should include some note to affect the understanding of the terms (software / hardware) referring to the vector of attack, not the target of the attack.
- 6.4. We should be careful not to cover assurances which relate to products, not projects. As a reminder we are here to support projects and not products.
- 6.5. Several points were brought up around the content of the slides and their text was refined. Specifically, some bullets from the Side Channel slide were removed.
- 6.6. Do we feel that one TAC whitepaper is sufficient, or do we need 2 whitepapers? General consensus is to keep one whitepaper until we find the amount of information being covered warrants a second paper.
- 6.7. To clarify, getting a high-level Outreach whitepaper out is paramount, and conversation around the more in-depth TAC whitepaper(s) will continue.

### **7. Issue / PR Review**

- 7.1. [Issue #16](#) – Project Security Responses Process
  - 7.1.1. Previously there was consensus that each project should have a process (how does one report and how does the disclosure happen). Issues will be rolled up to the TAC as needed.
  - 7.1.2. Project level security committees are fine unless the need arises for escalation to the CCC.
  - 7.1.3. There are two important cases to consider here:
    - 7.1.3.1. Security researcher that finds a vulnerability and want to contact the project.
    - 7.1.3.2. A hardware vendor wants to contact the project to make them aware of vulnerabilities that affect the project.
  - 7.1.4. Does it make sense for us to have a markdown document that is “things to think about” around these issues. Please consider commenting on this issue with any further thoughts as we move this forward. Dave will create a placeholder for this document.
- 7.2. [PR #46](#) – Progression Policy Update
  - 7.2.1. This can use some rewording and restructuring. Previously it did not mention that there was a governing board vote, where it did mention that there was a technical

## **DRAFT**

and legal review. The board will discuss the text around what the benefits of joining the CCC (as a project).

### **8. Resolution – As part of the growth plan from sandbox to incubation, we require that a project must have a defined security process.**

8.1.1. The resolution passes with no objections and no abstentions.

### **9. Hyperledger project: Avalon**

9.1. Orchestration of secure workloads. We'd like to split that out of Hyperledger and bring it to CCC as a fully formed project. Currently in process with engineering and with the folks at Hyperledger who are supportive of this initiative. We'd like to schedule going over this in 2 weeks after the submission template is in.

## **Action Items**

1. [Stephen] Please qualify "all projects" in the culture slide.
2. [Dave] Create a pull request to create a list of mentors for each project.
3. [Brandon] Create an empty document for the TAC whitepaper and send out a link. You may want to create an outline and scope so that this is the first agreed point.
4. [Mike/Brandon/Simon] Continue to create text for an in-depth TAC whitepaper.
5. [Dave] Create a placeholder markdown document for issue #16 to continue discussion around these questions.
6. [Simon] Send a note to the TAC and GB re: Avalon.

**Meeting adjourned at 9:00 am PDT on May 14, 2020. The next conference call will be scheduled for Thursday May 28.**

**Respectfully submitted by Stephano Cetola, Acting Secretary, on May 14, 2020.**