



TRUST
Over **IP**
FOUNDATION

Steering Committee Monthly Meeting

08 24/25 2021

21:00-22:00 PT / 5:00-6:00 UTC

 **THE LINUX** FOUNDATION

Antitrust Policy & Member Participation

- › Attendees are reminded to adhere to the meeting agenda and not participate in activities prohibited under antitrust and competition laws.*
- › Only members of Trust over IP who have signed the necessary agreements and charters are permitted to participate in this activity beyond an observer role.

* 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>.

Agenda

- › Agenda Review and Approval of minutes (2min)
- › Membership approval process no longer needed- Membership review (2 min)
- › Governance Stack Working Group approved deliverables (5min)
- › BLOG post writing Guidelines (2 min)
- › Working Group Chair expresses a Developing Topic that needs to be addressed at ToIP (10 min)
- › Steering Committee Member's Suggestions for improved member experience (10 min)
- › Creation of Criteria for Steering Committee Membership (5 min)
- › Creation of a Process for Code of Conduct Violations (2min)
- › Upcoming meetings and Special Topics (4 min)
- › Linux Foundation Member Summit (2 min)
- › Open Discussion (as time permits)

Roll Call

<u>Company Name</u>	<u>Representative Name</u>	<u>Email Contact</u>
Accenture	Christine Leong	christine.c.leong@accenture.com
Anonyome Labs	Steve McCown	smccown@anonyome.com
Cloudocracy	Will Groah	will@cloudocracy.io
Continuum Loop	Darrell O'Donnell	darrell.odonnell@continuumloop.com
Dhiway Networks	Sankarshan Mukhopadhyay	sankarshan@dhiway.com
esatus	Andre Kudra	a.kudra@esatus.com
ETS	Michael Nettles	mnettl@ets.org
Evernym	Drummond Reed	drummond.reed@evernym.com
Futurewei Technologies	Wenjing Chu	wenjing.chu@futurewei.com
IBM	Marie Wallace	marie.wallace@ie.ibm.com
IdRamp	Mike Vesey	mvesey@idramp.com
LG CNS	Hwajeong Hwang and Junghwa Lee	hjhwang@lgcns.com / leejhwa@lgcns.com
Lumedic	Christian Ingrao	chris@lumedic.io
MasterCard	Charles Walton	charles.walton@mastercard.com
MITRE	Chris Buchanan	cjb@mitre.org
Province of British Columbia	John Jordan	john.jordan@gov.bc.ca
SICPA	Kalin Nicolov	kalin.nicolov@sicpa.com

Approval of Minutes

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the June 30, 2021 and July 26, 2021 meeting of the Steering Committee, in the form attached hereto as Exhibit A and Exhibit B, are hereby confirmed, approved, and adopted.

Membership Review and Approval (Totals: 260 Orgs, 92 Individuals)

Contributors (Individuals)

- › Mitchell Wever
- › Phil Wolff
- › Sam Smith

Contributors (Organizations)

- › Bonifii
- › Trust Elevate
- › ProofMarket
- › Privatiyze
- › Pulse Connect
- › Imageware
- › SITA ATS Ltd.
- › Positive + Impakt
- › Zamna Technologies

Contributor (Organizations)

- › Reputationaire
- › Kokomo Solutions Inc.
KOKOM024/7
- › Lab309 Ltd
- › BlockchainBird
- › Drave Developpement
- › Briartech Consulting Inc

Governance Stack Working Group approved deliverables

- Scott Perry, the Lead for the Governance Stack Working Group previously submit two deliverable for the 7 Day Review Period.
 - **ToIP Risk Assessment Worksheet Template**
 - **ToIP Risk Assessment Companion Guide**
- Both deliverable were approved by the GSWG on June 17, 2021 and sent to the SC earlier for the 7 day review period. During the review period some suggestions were made by a SC member. Working Group Lead replied to those suggestions. A document with those suggestions and reply was sent with meeting notice.
- Deliverables are being put forward for approval again.

Governance Stack Working Group approved deliverables

Comments from Andre Kudra - July 20th, 2021

- Chapter 2.3
Risk tolerance definition is quite generic. There seems to be no general consensus for this term in the risk mgmt. community. An own definition may be problematic. Couldn't this be referenced to ISO 73, or an appropriate NIST standard as for other items in the doc?
- Chapter 3.3.1 and 3.3.2
In the step “Analyze and Determine Risk Severity” the exact same factors are listed as for determining the Risk Likelihood. Does this make sense? The factors mainly aim at probability of entry, not potential damages (hence the wording is “vulnerabilities/predisposing condition”, “Susceptibility”). Protection goals and relevance of impacted assets for processes supported are not taken into account, which seems essential.

In the step “Analyze and Determine Risk Likelihood” the “likelihood that threat events of concern result in adverse impacts” is determined, i.e. explicitly the probability that a damage results of a threat is targeted, not the pure occurrence of the threat. The same chapter says “the risk score should be qualitatively assessed under the assumption of no countermeasures in place”. As countermeasures have an impact on the probability of a damage occurrence in case of a threat, the methodology seems inconsistent.

Governance Stack Working Group approved deliverables

RESOLVED: That the “ToIP Risk Assessment Worksheet Template” and “ToIP Risk Assessment Companion Guide” Working Group Approved Deliverable submitted by the Governance Stack Working Group be hereby approved by the Steering Committee as a Trust Over IP (ToIP) Approved Deliverable.

BLOG Post Writing Guidelines

- The Communications Committee is suggesting that with each deliverable that is sent to the Steering Committee for approval, a BLOG Post should be sent to the Communications Committee for wordsmithing, approval, and posting.
- A guide to writing BLOG posts has been created by members of the Communication Committee and place on our Wiki.

<https://wiki.trustoverip.org/display/HOME/Guidance+for+Blog+Posts+about+ToIP+Deliverables>

- For previously approved deliverables that haven't yet had a BLOG posted yet, please encourage the authors or others in the Working Group to submit a BLOG post draft to the Communications Committee.

Developing Topic from Working Group Lead for discussion

- While parties are bringing governance framework development needs to our attention, there lacks a fundamental strategy to operationalize and sustain it when it is built.
- There is a mis-expectation of parties seeking assistance from ToIP that they can sit back and we will build their governance framework (and now run their governing authority) for free.
- One email that generated this concern was sent out to SC members to give context.
- Scott Perry, GSWG Lead to open discussion...

Steering Committee Members suggestions for Members Experience

- Getting an account on the Wiki
- Zoom Recordings Automatically post to the Slack Channel
- Using Mailing List or GitHub issue for more conversations for longer retention
- Checking in with New Members at 60 day anniversary
- Globalization of the contents
 - We can select a few from a criteria (say, membership cluster at this current moment in time) and determine where this investment would make most sense.
- Quarterly newsletter
- More Twitter
 - Encourage members to tweet @ ?
- Volunteers for wiki gardening

Creation of Criteria for Steering Committee Membership

- The Steering Committee should consider creating “criteria” for becoming a SC member.

Sample Criteria

The Steering Committee therefore seeks participants who can demonstrate:

- The organization has materially impacted the technical and advocacy goals of the C2PA, as demonstrated by their prior technical contributions and/or public advocacy (public presentations, talks, and statements).
- The organization has a historical track record of material contributions that were accepted into open source software or standards development organizations.
- The organization has a commitment to support the mission, Guiding Principles, and Charter of the C2PA.
- The organization has a commitment to devote expert resources to addressing the problems in C2PA’s guiding documents and advance those directives, as demonstrated by identified contributors with requisite prior experience.

Creation of a Process for Code of Conduct Violations

JDF 5.0 Documents, page 3, item 15

Code of Conduct. The Project has adopted the terms of the **Community Covenant 1.0**, available at <https://community-covenant.net/version/1/0/>.

To report an issue or concern under this Code of Conduct, **contact the Project Chairperson** or the Joint Development Foundation General Manager.

- Therefore, we should have a policy ready for what we do, if someone “Contacts the Project Chairperson”

Special Topic Meetings

Special Topic - September 7th/8th (Slot B) 9pm PT & October 6th (Slot A)

- Beyond Credential Exchange
- Ontario's Digital Identity technology roadmap
Senior Advisor at Infrastructure Ontario supporting Ontario Digital Service (part of Ministry of Finance) on the Digital Identity (DI) program. They are undergoing a round of market consultations with priority vendors, companies, and organizations in the digital identity space. They would like to give a presentation on the Province's initial technology roadmap for digital identity and answer any questions the broader marketplace might have.
- OIX new Guide to Trust Frameworks
- Other topics?

ALL Members Meetings as currently scheduled

Sept 15th, WG Updates?

Oct. 13th Special Topic, which is during IIW?

Linux Foundation Member Summit

- Linux Foundation Member Summit Nov. 2-4, 2021
Silverado Resort, Napa Valley, CA
- Event is by invite only, as Steering Committee members, we can get you a code if you'd like one and haven't already received one.
- Is anyone already planning on going?
Do you want a ToIP event (meeting/meal) together planned?
<https://events.linuxfoundation.org/lf-member-summit/>

Open Discussion

Legal Notices

The Linux Foundation, The Linux Foundation logos, and other marks that may be used herein are owned by The Linux Foundation or its affiliated entities, and are subject to The Linux Foundation's Trademark Usage Policy at <https://www.linuxfoundation.org/trademark-usage>, as may be modified from time to time.

Linux is a registered trademark of Linus Torvalds. Please see the Linux Mark Institute's trademark usage page at <https://lmi.linuxfoundation.org> for details regarding use of this trademark.

Some marks that may be used herein are owned by projects operating as separately incorporated entities managed by The Linux Foundation, and have their own trademarks, policies and usage guidelines.

TWITTER, TWEET, RETWEET and the Twitter logo are trademarks of Twitter, Inc. or its affiliates.

Facebook and the "f" logo are trademarks of Facebook or its affiliates.

LinkedIn, the LinkedIn logo, the IN logo and InMail are registered trademarks or trademarks of LinkedIn Corporation and its affiliates in the United States and/or other countries.

YouTube and the YouTube icon are trademarks of YouTube or its affiliates.

All other trademarks are the property of their respective owners. Use of such marks herein does not represent affiliation with or authorization, sponsorship or approval by such owners unless otherwise expressly specified.

The Linux Foundation is subject to other policies, including without limitation its Privacy Policy at <https://www.linuxfoundation.org/privacy> and its Antitrust Policy at <https://www.linuxfoundation.org/antitrust-policy>, each as may be modified from time to time. More information about The Linux Foundation's policies is available at <https://www.linuxfoundation.org>.

Please email legal@linuxfoundation.org with any questions about The Linux Foundation's policies or the notices set forth on this slide.