Confidential Computing Consortium

Minutes of the Meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee

31 October 2019

Members of the Technical Advisory Committee Participating in the Meeting:

- Gilad Golan (Google)
- Mike Bursell (Red Hat)
- Charles Garcia-Tobin (Arm)
- Dave Thaler (Microsoft)
- Simon Johnson (Intel)
- John Haxby (Oracle) – via Zoom
- Zhipeng 'Howard' Huang (Huawei) – via Zoom

Not in attendance:
- Xiaoning Li (Alibaba)

Linux Foundation:
- Scott Nicolas

Guests and Observers:
- Yongzheng Wu (Huawei)
- Richard Searle (Fortanix)
- Stefan Deml (deCentriq)
- Jesse Schrater (Intel)
- Philippe Robin (Arm)
- Ben Fischer (Red Hat) Outreach
- Stephen Walli (Microsoft) Acting Chair for this meeting
- Sergio Leunissen (Oracle)
- Axel Simon (Red Hat)
- Haiwu He (iExec Blockchain Tech)
- Lei Zhang (iExec Blockchain Tech)
- Andras Slemmer (deCentriq)
- Simon Johnson (Intel) TAC
- Dave Thaler (Microsoft) TAC
- Nelly Porter (Google)
- Xuejun Yang (Microsoft)
- Mike Brasher (Microsoft)
- Harold Hoyer (Red Hat)
- Nathaniel McCullum (Red Hat)

Meeting Chair: It was agreed that this meeting would be chaired by the Governing Board chair until the TAC elects its chair, as this week is the first real face-to-face time the group has spent together.

Roll Call and Introductions: There was a roll call attendance, and introductions around the table as there were new attendees that had not participated in the Open Source Summit activities through the week.

Anti-trust Review: As this was a first face-to-face meeting and there were guests and general members present, we took a moment to review the anti-trust slide.

Previous Minutes: We briefly reviewed the previous meeting minutes and accepted them.

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the October 17, 2019 meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee meeting of the Confidential Computing Consortium as distributed to the members of the TAC in advance of this meeting are hereby adopted and approved.
Moved by Red Hat, Seconded by Google. **Passed** 7, 0, 0. [Yes, No, Abstain]

TAC Chair Election: As most folks were present for the Governing Board meeting earlier in the day, we briefly discussed a preference for anonymous Condorcet voting in the TAC for positions as well. With a similar modification the TAC resolved to modify the voting process. As well the TAC discussed and agreed that the TAC representative to the Board should be a non-voting position.

Text of the slide we discussed (modifications in yellow):
Stephano will open a voting period following the nomination period and call for votes to be returned, using an anonymous, ranked, Condorcet vote by Tuesday, November 12, after which point the results of the election will be announced.
[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Condorcet_method]

RESOLVED: That the election procedures for the election of a Chair of the TAC for a term of one year is hereby approved;
Moved by Red Hat, Seconded by Arm. **Passed** 6, 0, 1 [Yes, No, Abstain]

RESOLVED: That the Chair will not have vote on the Governing Board of the Consortium by decision of the TAC.
Moved by Microsoft, Seconded by Google. **Passed** 6, 0, 1. [Yes, No, Abstain]

Project Progression Document: The TAC continues to work with the Project Progression Document as was most recently amended and distributed on 30 October. Scott Nicolas presented the latest draft. The discussion focused on agreeing to enough of the document to test it against the three proposed projects on the meeting agenda.
- There is a desire for a standard template for projects to use to present to the TAC.
- There is confusion on what criteria would be used for a status review for Sandbox stage projects.

It was agreed by a simple unanimous vote that the TAC felt they had enough consensus to proceed to test the procedures against the three projects on the agenda.
[Chair – It was not discussed but I am adding an action on me to get the document up on the website in an editable form for the TAC to continue to evolve and publish the procedures.]

Project Presentations:
It was jointly agreed that any legal process that a project owner needs to enact with the Linux Foundation is not relevant to the TAC discussions judging a project's acceptability as a Consortium project, and that the TAC could concurrently review a project assuming the presenters were acting in good faith with respect to the legal requirements.

enarx: Presented by Nathaniel McCullum (Red Hat).
- The TAC placed an action item on the chair requesting the governing board present a clear strategic scope for the Consortium for the TAC to use when judging projects.
- There was a discussion about whether or not a project's existing Code of Conduct needs to change to an 'approved' Linux Foundation CoC or not, whether there is acceptable criteria for judging a CoC, and how quickly such a CoC needs to be in place. It was agreed that this should not be held against today's submissions with an assumption of good faith behavior for 'Sandbox' stage projects.
- There was discussion on how folks should best be capturing a project's external dependencies. This is work the TAC will need to add to the submission template.
- It is noted that the TAC needs to appoint mentors to new projects. An action was captured on the TAC chair to ensure there are mentors appointed to newly approved projects.

The TAC was asked if they felt they had enough information to vote.
A simple vote was held, and enarx was accepted into the Consortium as a Sandbox project.

SGX SDK: Presented by Simon Johnson (Intel)
- As Simon presented, it quickly became apparent that a template is needed for future presentations as each presenter was making a best guess at what was required.
- The TAC briefly discussed if and how external hardware dependencies might be captured for projects.
- Codes of Conduct again became a discussion briefly exposing the need for more information/pointers to be presented in the guidelines.
- The presentation was focused on simply accepting the SGX SDK as a Sandbox stage project, with the understanding that it probably would quickly qualify as an Incubation stage project.

The TAC was asked if they felt they had enough information to vote.
A simple vote was held, and the SGX SDK was accepted into the Consortium as a Sandbox project.

Open Enclave SDK: Presented by Mike Brasher (Microsoft)
- The discussion was simpler for the OE SDK as the TAC was more comfortable with the questions and procedures.

- As the project was presenting itself as an Incubation stage project, the TAC drilled more deeply into questions of production use and external use. The TAC chose to break the question into two pieces.

The TAC was asked if they felt they had enough information to vote.

A simple vote was held, and the Open Enclave SDK was accepted into the Consortium.

A 2nd simple vote was held, and the Open Enclave SDK was accepted as an Incubation project.

Action Items:
1. [Stephen Walli] Request the governing board present a clear strategic scope for the Consortium for the TAC to use when judging projects
2. [Stephen Walli] Work with the CCC Program Manager to publish the Project Progression procedures appropriately on-line for the TAC to be able to edit and publish themselves.
3. [TAC Chair] Appoint mentors to the newly approved projects.
4. [Staphano] Run the TAC Chair vote.

Additional Agenda Topics:
There is an ongoing list of topics the TAC wants to tackle. This list in the minutes is a simple way to keep the list active for now. These items will be pulled forward as appropriate into future meeting agendas.

1. TAC mailing list status
   a. "Currently the list is free to join for anyone, but any new user's first post will be moderated (by Stephano or Scott)"
2. Budget discussion: License scanning? Test infrastructure? General infrastructure? other?
3. When should the TAC meet next?
4. Continuation of voting rules discussion: can we formalize the consensus?
5. How do we share and review documents with each other? Wiki? File share? Github? Other?
   a. How do we track action items / open issues? (wiki? Github issues? etc)
6. What LF resources should we recommend the board provide to projects in a given stage?
7. How should we best coordinate with the Outreach Committee
8. Does the Outreach Committee maintain the website with technical information? Or do we? Or does LF?
9. How should the TAC coordinate/communicate with other related industry groups: IETF, TCG, GlobalPlatform, IEC, etc.?
10. TAC chair selection
11. What clarifications/refinements to the Project Progression Policy document we make based on experience with the initial set of project reviews?
12. Upper-stack submissions (Graphene, LKL, etc)
13. List of terms/definitions
14. TAC recommendations for technical scope of the CCC (kick-off discussion) - related to previous?

<u>APPROVED</u>

15. How do we assign "sponsor" TAC members to projects, as mentioned in the Project Progression Policy draft? Should it be someone already associated with the project, or someone not already associated with the project?