TAC Meeting

March 19, 2020



CONFIDENTIAL COMPUTING CONSORTIUM

Antitrust Policy Notice

- Linux Foundation meetings involve participation by industry competitors, and it is the intention of the Linux Foundation to conduct all of its activities in accordance with applicable antitrust and competition laws. It is therefore extremely important that attendees adhere to meeting agendas, and be aware of, and not participate in, any activities that are prohibited under applicable US state, federal or foreign antitrust and competition laws.
- Examples of types of actions that are prohibited at Linux Foundation meetings and in connection with Linux Foundation activities are described in the Linux Foundation Antitrust Policy available at http://www.linuxfoundation.org/antitrust-policy. If you have questions about these matters, please contact your company counsel, or if you are a member of the Linux Foundation, feel free to contact Andrew Updegrove of the firm of Gesmer Updegrove LLP, which provides legal counsel to the Linux Foundation.



Agenda

- 1. Roll call
- 2. Approval of minutes
- 3. Action item review
- 4. Report out from first Analyst Briefing meeting
- 5. Budget items
- 6. Review github issues & pull requests
- 7. Any other business



Roll Call of TAC Voting Representatives

Quorum requires 5 or more voting reps:

<u>Member</u>	Representative	Email
Alibaba	Xiaoning Li	xiaoning.li@alibaba-inc.com
ARM	Grant Likely	grant.likely@arm.com
Facebook	Jinsong Yu	jinsongyu@fb.com
Google	Brandon Baker	bsb@google.com
Huawei	Zhipeng (Howard) Huang	huangzhipeng@huawei.com
Intel	Simon Johnson	simon.p.johnson@intel.com
Microsoft	Dave Thaler(*)	dthaler@microsoft.com
Oracle	John Haxby	john.haxby@oracle.com
Red Hat	Mike Bursell	mbursell@redhat.com



^{*}TAC chair

Approval of TAC/Outreach Joint Meeting Minutes

https://lists.confidentialcomputing.io/g/main/files/F2F/2020%20-%20RSA/CCC%20Outreach%20Minutes%202020-02-27.docx

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the February 27, 2020 **joint** meeting of the Technical Advisory Council and Outreach Committee of the Confidential Computing Consortium as distributed to the members of the TAC in advance of this meeting are hereby adopted and approved.



Approval of TAC Minutes from F2F

https://lists.confidentialcomputing.io/g/main/files/F2F/2020%20-%20RSA/CCC%20TAC%20Minutes%202020-02-27.docx

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the February 27, 2020 meeting of the Technical Advisory Council meeting of the Confidential Computing Consortium as distributed to the members of the TAC in advance of this meeting are hereby adopted and approved.



Approval of TAC Minutes from March 5 telechat

https://lists.confidentialcomputing.io/g/main/files/TAC/Meetings/2020/CCC%20TAC%20Minutes%202020-03-05.pdf

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the March 5, 2020 meeting of the Technical Advisory Council meeting of the Confidential Computing Consortium as distributed to the members of the TAC in advance of this meeting are hereby adopted and approved.



Action Item Review

- [Stephano] Eventually provide a better way (wiki list, perhaps GitHub issues) to track website content requests and their progress
- [Stephano] Make meeting recordings be discoverable in Groups.io in the TAC group only
- [Stephano] Create a document around GitHub process and propose at the next conference call
 [ISSUE #27]
- [Stephano] Find the mission statement and submit a pull request for adding it to our GitHub repo
 [ISSUE #9]
- [Simon] Propose a list of project categories for discussion
- [Mike Bursell] Work with the LF (and possibly RH) to see how we should, as a group, work cross-project on things like SRT bugs, disclosures, embargos, etc. [Related to ISSUE #16, on agenda later]

Proposal: track non-trivial (and non-periodic) action items using github issues



Analyst Briefing Report Out

- Steve Riley asked: "Do the CSPs actually want to focus on software-based TEEs so as not to be tied to a particular chip vendor?
 - Open Enclave and Enarx projects already support multiple chip vendors
 - Various TAC discussions along lines of 'there is no trust without a <u>hardware</u>-based root of trust.'
- Seth collecting responses to get back to Steve



Budget requests



Project website charges

- Projects often have project-specific websites (e.g., GitHub pages)
- Would like to transfer domain name, email addresses, and website maintenance cost for CCC projects
- Request from Red Hat to transfer https://enarx.io costs
- Open Enclave SDK also has http://openenclave.io where same would presumably apply
- PROPOSAL: Items listed under Small & Medium tiers on slide 12 would be appropriate for Sandbox (and above) stage projects if they so request.
 - 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.

2020 Cost – Service Areas



Small \$50/month*

- IAM services
- Domain registration and transfers (1-5)
- Email Forwarding
- Github org associations

Medium \$450/month*

- Small tier +
- Domains registration and transfers (5-10)
- Email list management w/ groups.io
- Website Hosting & Security

Large \$1500/month*

- Medium Tier +
- Productivity JIRA
- Wiki (confluence)
- CLA
- VD
- DA

Self service platform automation / platform security / cloud operations 24x7 site monitoring / Escalations / Service Desk / License and vendor management

Chat channels

- Open Enclave project asked whether slack channels would be funded if/when funding is needed
- Free tier would be sufficient for now, but answer may affect whether a project should use slack or an alternative
- Alternatives: rocket (no free tier) allows anonymous and github integration, matrix allows anonymous and no per-user cost (just per server), gitter, discord, keybase, ...
 - Red Hat wants github integration, e2e encryption, chat.<project>.io, logging, anonymous for disclosure/harassment reporting, web interface allowed
 - Intel wants non-per-user costs for CCC, CoC enforcement



GitHub Issues & Pull Requests



Pull Requests and issues

- Please review https://github.com/confidential-computing/governance/pulls
 - 3 PRs ready for review/merge
 - None appear to need meeting discussion
- Issues at https://github.com/confidential-computing/governance/issues
 - At least 3 could benefit from discussion:
 - #16: <u>Progression Template: Projects should address security response</u>
 - #17: Recommendations around mapping of "project" to github terminology
 - #19: Project "charters"?



Any other business

