ALLSEEN ALLIANCE

Technical Steering Meeting

November 16, 2015

Antitrust Compliance Notice

- AllSeen Alliance meetings involve participation by industry competitors, and it is the intention of AllSeen Alliance 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 AllSeen Alliance meetings and in connection with AllSeen Alliance activities are described in the AllSeen Alliance Antitrust Policy. If you have questions about these matters, please contact your company counsel, or if you are a member of AllSeen Alliance, feel free to contact Lee Gesmer or Andrew Updegrove, of the firm of Gesmer Updegrove LLP, which provides legal counsel to AllSeen Alliance.

Reminder:

This call is being recorded

Agenda

1. Approve minutes from previous meeting
2. Contributed Applications project proposal
3. Security Sub-Committee (SSC)
4. IRB Update
5. Testing crisis

Contributed Applications

Project Proposal

Rationale

- Need somewhere for code contributions that don’t fit the normal model
  - Prototypes
  - Demo code
  - Proofs-of-concept
  - Hackathon assets
  - Non-commercial applications
- Current project proposals require identified maintainer and committers
  - Contributor may not be able/willing to allocate resources
  - May be a one-off
- Allows contributions to be made under Alliance’s contribution agreement
  - Ensure consistency in licensing and clarity of ownership

Motion

- Request TSC approve the creation of a top-level ContributedApplication project under which subprojects can be created to house contributed applications
- Project name will be “contributed_applications”
- All it takes to create and contribute to a subproject is an email request to the AllSeen Alliance staff.

Security Sub-Committee (SSC)

Brian Witten

Brief History

- SSC Concept Proposed: 2014/11/10
- Charter & Members Approved: 2015/03/31
  - **First SSC Call: 2015/03/23**
- Vulnerability Handling Process Finalized: 2015/07/08
- Security Reviews as Part of the IRB Process
  - **Plan approved: 2015/07/02**
  - **Individuals approved: 2015/08/19**
- Best Practices: Led by Art with Greg Z helping
- Updates 2015/06/15, 2015/10/20

Remaining To-Do

- Code Review for HAE: Need Volunteer!
- Define a security testing process
  - **Work with Certification & Compliance WG to incorporate "security" (testing) required for Certification.**
- Automated code review
  - **Find ^propose for TSC approval, low-cost/effort solutions for detecting security issues and inclusion of 3rd party code**
- Engage other open-source groups to learn their approach. Set expectations for best-practices.
- Track security risks across all projects
- Update Wiki

Current Members

Voting

- **Core: Marcello Liou**
  - **(Previously delegated to Greg Zaverucha)**
- **Common: Greg Burns**
- **Gateway: Art Lancaster**
- **Smart Spaces: John Cameron**
- **Compliance & Certification: Ram Jeyaraman**
- **Developer Support Mathew Martineau**
- **SSC: Brian Witten**

Non-Voting

- **byungjin.kim@lge.com**
- **dino.natucci@microsoft.com**
- **dominique.chanet@technicolor**
- **fabrizio.dolce@electrolux.it**
- **johan.svener@sonymobile.com**
- **lishaozhang@tp-link.com.cn**
- **mmichael@qce.qualcomm.com**
- **ogawa.tomoki@jp.panasonic.com**
- **qce_cameronm@qce.qualcomm**
- **tolly.smith@latticesemi.com**
- **ueda.toru@sharp.co.jp**
- **yuga.shin-ichi@canon.co.jp**
- **zhangjun@haierubic.com**

Current Interface Review Board (IRB) Security Reviewers

- Gerrit Ruelens (Qeo/Technicolor)
- Dan Shumow (Microsoft)
- Greg Zaverucha (Microsoft)
- Brian Witten (Symantec)
- Cameron McDonald (Qualcomm)

IRB Update

Interface Design Guidelines v1.1 are ready

- Incorporates lessons learnt from 8 months of reviewing submissions
- No radical changes in direction, but many refinements versus v1.0
- https://wiki.allseenalliance.org/irb/interface_design_guidelines_draft_1.1
- Request ratification of the new guidelines

Testing crisis

Testing status

- Setup of AJATS and the knowledge transfer to the OSU hosting and system test teams is under way and going very well.
- This work has highlighted the important role that the current Alliance test team has been playing in both the day/day AllJoyn testing as well as in and after the System Release test cycles.
- In order for the OSU efforts in support of the AllSeen Alliance to be successful (and cost effective) OSU will need resources on the Alliance side that can take on the activities that the test team had been handling which are outside the scope of the current agreements.

Key areas of need/exposure need to be addressed

- AllJoyn Testing Liaison (the “Point of Contact” documented in the RFP’s) – an Alliance representative who can speak for the Alliance, provide priorities and direction when needed, act as an escalation point and who can find the appropriate AllJoyn contributor / forum for the various technical issues that will undoubtedly arise.
- AJATS monitoring and defect investigation/documentation. The Alliance test team has been monitoring the automated test logs for any test failures on a daily basis. When a failure occurs they work to identify the source of the problem from the logs, as well as the associated commit, and then document that issue in Jira. Without this ongoing effort the value to the Alliance of having the AJATS hosted by OSU will be greatly diminished.
- AJATS maintenance / administration. OSU is very close to having the AJATS environment configured and set up. It’s accessible to the Alliance test team and they have been porting their scripts/test tools to the new AJATS. However, AJATS will require ongoing maintenance to stay in sync with AllJoyn source code changes, to fix broken test applications as well as adding coverage for new features or platforms, and deprecating unneeded functionality. A good example is the current efforts by the Alliance test team to upgrade the AllJoyn tests / scripts to function with iOS 9. The current Alliance Test team is most likely not going to be able to complete this before they are gone. So until other AllJoyn members take this on, AJATS won’t have a functioning iOS component.
- Test Case Maintenance. Similar to AJATS, the AllJoyn test cases in TestLink will need to be maintained. Changes to the source code will require changes to test applications and changes to documented test steps. After releases, feature tests will need to be selected and migrated to regression testing. Unneeded test cases will require deprecation. New bugs may require the addition of new test cases.

Members need to step up an take on testing responsibilities or the Alliance needs to outsource these capabilities.

Timeline is 30 days.

Thank You

Follow Us On 

- For more information on AllSeen Alliance, visit us at: allseenalliance.org & allseenalliance.org/news/blogs