



**TAC Conference Call – 7:00am PST  
Thursday 14 January 2021**

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

**1.1. In Attendance**

- 1.1.1. Dave Thaler (Microsoft, TAC Chair) \*
- 1.1.2. Aeva Black (Microsoft)
- 1.1.3. Brandon Baker (Google)\*
- 1.1.4. Dan Middleton (Intel)
- 1.1.5. Dmitry Frenkel (Google)
- 1.1.6. Eoin Carroll (McAfee)
- 1.1.7. FX Marseille (Thales)
- 1.1.8. Giuseppe Giordano (Accenture)\*
- 1.1.9. Grant Likely (Arm)\*
- 1.1.10. Jethro Beekman (Fortanix)
- 1.1.11. Mark Shanahan (Intel)
- 1.1.12. Michael Klein (Accenture)
- 1.1.13. Mike Bursell (Red Hat)\*
- 1.1.14. Nathaniel McCallum (Red Hat)
- 1.1.15. Naveen Cherukuri (NVIDIA)
- 1.1.16. Richard Searle (Fortanix)
- 1.1.17. Roy Hopkins (R3)
- 1.1.18. Scott Schweitzer (Xilinx)
- 1.1.19. Seth Knox (Outreach Chair)
- 1.1.20. Shiri Band (Cysec)
- 1.1.21. Simon Johnson (Intel) \*
- 1.1.22. Simon Leet (Microsoft)
- 1.1.23. Stephen Walli (Microsoft)
- 1.1.24. Thomas Fossati (Arm)
- 1.1.25. Xinxin Fan (IoTex)
- 1.1.26. Steve Winslow (Linux Foundation)
- 1.1.27. Stephano Cetola (Linux Foundation)

1.2. \*voting member

**2. Move to approve minutes**

- 2.1. The Technical Advisory Council approves the minutes from the December 3 meeting with no abstentions and no objections.

**3. Action Item Review**

- 3.1. [Mike] Ensure that a TAC budget line item for 1 Zoom account for OE SDK 3.2
- 3.2. [Stephen] Please reach out to Cat Allman regarding any details we can get on LISA21
- 3.3. [Stephano] ~~Find the costs of the chat options over the course of a year and reach out to project contacts with details on our options to get their feedback~~
- 3.4. [Stephano] ~~Bring reasonable chat options to our projects to see if they have preferences as to the chat applications we might choose from~~
  - 3.4.1. LF has chosen a multi-platform chat solution and will be offering that to projects all orgs in the coming weeks.

## **DRAFT**

- ~~3.5. [Stephano] Send the TAC the questions from the Webinar and discuss creation/extension of a FAQ~~
- 3.6. [Dave] Check with the possibility of adding a doi to a future version of the whitepaper to encourage academic papers to reference our whitepapers
- 3.7. [Stephano] Check with LF to see if doi whitepapers is something that has been done in the past
  - 3.7.1. This has been done in the past. Still working on getting information as to if this is still possible today.
- 3.8. [Stephano] Make the updates to the TAC whitepaper (and ensure that the links from the TAC whitepaper point to the latest version of the outreach whitepaper) and send to LF Creative. (in process with LF creative)

## **4. License Scanning**

- 4.1. The goal is to provide transparency to the projects such that if licenses are found and there are possible problems there, we can work with the projects and the CCC to walk through the results and help guide through any fixes.
- 4.2. Process (Fossology Application):
  - 4.2.1. Run scans of the projects' codebase
  - 4.2.2. Manually review the output and recommend any changes.
  - 4.2.3. Produces reports and SPDX documents, catalog licenses found, identifies any issues.
  - 4.2.4. Provide guidance around best practices.
  - 4.2.5. Analyze any dependencies (code not in the repo).
  - 4.2.6. Prepare summary slide deck.
  - 4.2.7. This process could be done for each project, but it does come with a cost.
- 4.3. Technical charters define the outbound licensing. Some projects may be interested in license issues withing its dependencies, but that is up to the project.
- 4.4. As an example, in the Linux kernel community these types of checks were not in place initially and did cause some issues. Even when developers are being careful the nuances of license compliance can be tricky, even in less dependency-indiscriminate languages.
- 4.5. As another example, Rust has crates available for adding license scanning, and Enarx uses one such tool to ensure compliant license usage.
- 4.6. Aside from dependency scanning, the tools also scan the files themselves. So, if the file contains any notices of proprietary or confidential information, if it is subject to a EULA, if the files indicate the use of binary blobs, as well as if the files themselves contain any conflicting license usage.
- 4.7. LF Projects LLC (the series LLC to which the CCC projects belong) provide this as a paid service for projects. We will estimate what the costs would be accepted projects and will report back to this group.

## **5. Enarx Project Review**

- 5.1. <https://lists.confidentialcomputing.io/g/main/files/TAC/Project%20Reviews/Enarx>
- 5.2. Enarx has a full end-to-end demo which will be presented at the webinar on January 28 at 9am. Links to that webinar will be going out this week.
- 5.3. Enarx is moving towards their first release. Currently supporting both Intel SGX and AMD SEV.
- 5.4. We moved our website from enarx.io to enarx.dev to [avoid the "io" domain](#).
- 5.5. We are currently using [Twitter](#), [LinkedIn](#), [YouTube](#), and [RocketChat](#). RocketChat has been donating an instance to the project. We use this product every day. Overall, we have had a very positive experience over the past 6-9 months.

## **DRAFT**

- 5.6. Project is licensed with Apache 2.0 with a required DCO. That DCO and license are validated to be compatible, and the DCO must be present before code pull requests are merged.
- 5.7. Currently working on simplifying the deployment and use of attestation services (see: [aesmd.service](#), also the [attestation ML](#)).
- 5.8. See the [Enarx review document](#) for a full list of updates to their TCB. Enarx keeps the TCB light and aims for auditability. Currently the TCB is just under 10 MB and efforts to get that even smaller are under way.
- 5.9. Red Hat was the initial sponsor of the project but will stop providing engineering resources on Feb 01, 2021. Other options are being explored. Equinix provide CI/CD hardware. Please reach out to the Enarx team if you have any questions or can work to provide future resourcing.
- 6. Outreach Update – IDC TAM report**
  - 6.1. We had a follow-up meeting. The approach they took in their proposal was a TAM based on hardware (chip) capable of Confidential Computing.
  - 6.2. We are looking for something that is more along the lines of the forecast of potential users and growth of CC over the next 5 years.
  - 6.3. We are awaiting a new proposal that covers these ideas. It would be more of a survey process, much like they did for SSDs back when those were not yet popular in products but had many potential benefits.
  - 6.4. For webinars, we'd like to alternate between a project presentation and a in depth technical topic for our monthly webinars. Attestation would be a good next topic. OE SDK / Graphene / Keystone / Veracruz may be a great project to highlight after the technical topic. Action items logged for those respective project reps to see if those projects would be interested in presenting.
- 7. CCC SIG Proposal: Authentication, Authorization, Attestation**
  - 7.1. [https://docs.google.com/document/d/1a6Swoki2Vb3MAFhC\\_msyRdZq1JMFk\\_t9ecvQd\\_ZB-r-4/edit?ts=5ff60e0b](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1a6Swoki2Vb3MAFhC_msyRdZq1JMFk_t9ecvQd_ZB-r-4/edit?ts=5ff60e0b)
  - 7.2. The group will focus on discussions, requirements, and specific implementations of libraries and web frameworks that allow applications writers to use attestation primitives without worrying about the specific implementation of the hardware TEE.
  - 7.3. There are many attestation methods out there. Lack of interoperability between them and their innate complexity makes them difficult to use.
  - 7.4. See the above linked document for deliverables, governance, and roadmap.
  - 7.5. It should be noted that this type of work is extremely complex and difficult work. We can accelerate this type of work to great benefit, but the work must be stable such that issues with backwards compatibility can be minimized.
  - 7.6. We should also tap into academic work going on in this area.
  - 7.7. It should be noted that documentation is easily stored in the CCC GitHub repo however having code committed to that repo would make it difficult for developers with corporate restrictions to collaborate. We should discuss if a CCC project would need to be spun up to enable code contributions.
  - 7.8. Please discuss this SIG over the next couple weeks on the mailing list. We will talk about crafting the charter next week after offline discussion with a vote planned for 1 month from now.
- 8. TAC Internal Talks**
  - 8.1. Proposal to allow internal or external presentations to help the TAC do its job in a more informed and effective way.
  - 8.2. See [the slides](#) for details. We can continue discussion of this on the list and will discuss it again in the next meeting.

## **DRAFT**

### **Action Items**

1. [Stephano] Report back with costs for license scanning for the existing CCC projects as well as the estimated cost for each project that joins.

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