Projects

Petra Manche

Create

- ⚓ Projects
- ⚑ Milestones
- ☑ Tasks
- 🔖 Discussions
- ≡ Gantt Chart
- 🕐 Time Tracking
- 📄 Documents
- 📊 Reports
- 🔲 Project Templates
- ⚙ Settings
- ❓ Help Center
- 📢 Feedback & Support

CCUF Incorporation Working Group ⌄

Overview | Tasks | Milestones | **Discussions (18)** | Time Tracking | Documents (15) | Team (17)

Filter: ? [+ enter your query] 🔍   Sort by: Comments ⌄

Meeting notes from October 17 teleconference

Author: Brian Smithson
10/17/2014   3:34 PM

CCUF Incorporation WG meeting notes

For the teleconference held on October 17, 2014. 8:00AM PDT
Prepared by Brian Smithson / Ricoh Americas

Attendees

Joshua Brickman	Erin Conner	Douglas Gebert	Tammy Green
Mike Grimm	Ryan Hill	Petra Manche	David Martin
Simon Milford	Andy Nissen	Brian Smithson	Alicia Squires
Lachlan Turner			

(Sorry if I missed anyone – please let me know)

Agenda

1. Discuss "divide & conquer" approach
2. Action items / next steps

Notes

We discussed the division of labor by topical area, as outlined in the [agenda announcement for this meeting](). There were additional discussions about more specific issues related to those topical areas.

We decided to add an additional area, related to the expanded scope of the CCUF that would be made possible by incorporating (or otherwise having a budget to work with).

We also decided to prioritize the topics into two groups, each group to be worked on in parallel.

After the meeting, I added another topic to cover tools and telecom requirements. I put it in the first priority group because (a) the tools part is fairly well established, but little work has been done on telecom, and (b) cost estimates for these services is needed to support any plans related to budgets and membership fees.

Here is the list of topics in each group (new topics are highlighted):

First priority

Membership fees, classes, and rights. This is a big topic to look into how we can create a structure of membership classes and fees that are fair to smaller organizations, and also to organizations that might have limited interest in the CCUF (but want to participate in, for example, one iTC), and yet bring in enough revenue to support the organization.

Membership agreements and rules that apply to supported activities. I think it will be relatively easy to find examples of membership agreements that won't be a problem for legal departments, but I wonder if we need to consider any rules (particularly having to do with transparency or decision-making) or policies (particularly related to IP and patents) that could or should apply to any CCUF-supported activities like WGs and iTCs.

Engaging the CCUF membership. How and when should we inform and engage the CCUF membership in this process, and especially, how and when should we go about getting the CCUF to vote on incorporation?

Relationship to the iTCs and other CCRA-nation-driven activities. We currently support them on Teamlab, and would presumably continue to encourage iTCs to use CCUF collaboration tools. Do those relationships change if we become CCUF Inc., and if so, in what way?

Tools and telecom requirements. What are our requirements for collaboration tools, and should we try to provide telecom (e.g., webex, gotomeeting, etc.) services?

Alternatives to incorporating. For those who think incorporation is not the best approach, you could save us all a lot of work if you can propose alternatives that at least provide an equally improved set of collaboration tools without the need to incorporate to pay for them. Otherwise, it's likely that we'll end up proposing some way to incorporate!

Later priority

Intellectual property, patent, and anti-trust policies. There are many examples in other, similar organizations. What is appropriate for the CCUF?

Outsourcing choices for legal, admin, and IT (collaboration/telecom) services. I've looked into three alternatives, but each needs more investigation. And there may be better alternatives to consider than the ones I've come up with.

Expanded scope for the CCUF. Should the CCUF consider (as part of incorporating) expanding its role in other areas, such as helping or hosting the ICCC?

Action items

Old

Alicia completed an action item from last meeting, to summarize the benefits of joining the CCUF:

- Insight on where Common Criteria is going
- Access to community for questions/answers/discussions
- Participation in Workshops offering direct dialogue with CCDB and government scheme members.
- Access to international Technical Communities work spaces

- Access to Technical Working Groups
- A voice in the community
- Usage of CCUF tools/wiki

New

1. All: Look at the topics in the First Priority group and volunteer to work with others on one or more of them.
2. Topic groups: Get to work ☺

Next meeting

We'll have another meeting in about two weeks. Since some of the WG membership has changed since the last doodle, I'll launch another doodle to decide on the date/time for the next meeting.

Comments: 0   Add comment

Proposed agenda for CCUF Incorporation WG teleconference #2: Friday October 17, 8:00AM US Pacific / 11:00AM US Eastern / 4:00PM UTC

Author: Brian Smithson

10/16/2014   8:05 PM

Proposed agenda for tomorrow's CCUF Incorporation teleconference:

1. Welcome new members

2. Divide and conquer?

There are many different facets to this investigation, so I think it would be most efficient if WG members volunteered to investigate particular topics and report back to the WG as a whole. Ideally, two or three members would work together on each topic. Some possible topical areas are listed below. Please consider these topics, or suggest different topics, and also consider if you'd be willing to spend a little time on one or two of them:

- **Membership fees, classes, and rights**. This is a big topic to look into how we can create a structure of membership classes and fees that are fair to smaller organizations, and also to organizations that might have limited interest in the CCUF (but want to participate in, for example, one iTC), and yet bring in enough revenue to support the organization.
- **Membership agreements and rules that apply to supported activities**. I think it will be relatively easy to find examples of membership agreements that won't be a problem for legal departments, but I wonder if we need to consider any rules (particularly having to do with transparency or decision-making) or policies (particularly related to IP and patents) that could or should apply to any CCUF-supported activities like WGs and iTCs.
- **Intellectual property, patent, and anti-trust policies**. There are many examples in other, similar organizations. What is appropriate for the CCUF?
- **Relationship to the iTCs and other CCRA-nation-driven activities**. We currently support them on Teamlab, and would presumably continue to encourage iTCs to use CCUF collaboration tools. Do those relationships change if we become CCUF Inc., and if so, in what way?
- **Outsourcing choices for legal, admin, and IT (collaboration) services**. I've looked into three alternatives, but each needs more investigation. And there may be better alternatives to consider than the ones I've come up with.
- **Engaging the CCUF membership**. How and when should we inform and engage the CCUF membership in this process, and especially, how and when should we go about getting the CCUF to vote on incorporation?
- **Alternatives to incorporating**. For those who think incorporation is not the best approach, you could save us all a lot of work if you can propose alternatives that at least provide an equally improved set of collaboration tools without the need to incorporate to pay for them. Otherwise, it's likely that we'll end up proposing some way to incorporate!

3. Other topics of interest to WG members?

Here are the meeting details again:

You have been invited to a join.me online meeting

Friday October 17, 8:00AM US Pacific / 11:00AM US Eastern / 4:00PM UTC

Join the meeting: https://join.me/bsmithson

On a computer, use any browser with Flash. Nothing to download.
On a phone or tablet, launch the join.me app and enter meeting code: **bsmithson**

Join the audio conference:

Dial **18662013918**
Access Code **1660165#**

Start time by time zones

Comments: 0   Add comment

CCUF Incorporation WG teleconference #2: Friday October 17, 8:00AM US Pacific / 11:00AM US Eastern / 4:00PM UTC

Author: Brian Smithson

10/6/2014   8:36 PM

[Edited to correct the date in the title of the original posting]

You have been invited to a join.me online meeting

Friday October 17, 8:00AM US Pacific / 11:00AM US Eastern / 4:00PM UTC

Join the meeting: https://join.me/bsmithson

On a computer, use any browser with Flash. Nothing to download.
On a phone or tablet, launch the join.me app and enter meeting code: **bsmithson**

Join the audio conference:

Dial **18662013918**
Access Code **1660165#**

[Start time by time zones](#)

Comments: 0   Add comment

CCUF Incorporation WG meeting notes for the teleconference held on October 3, 2014. 8:00AM PDT

Author: Brian Smithson

10/3/2014   8:10 PM

CCUF Incorporation WG meeting notes

For the teleconference held on October 3, 2014. 8:00AM PDT

Attendees

Erin Conner	Douglas Gelbert
Mike Grimm	Petra Manche
Andy Nissen	Alicia Squires
Brian Smithson	Ashit Vora

Agenda

1. Open discussion about the general concept
2. Open discussion about current alternatives
3. Action items / next steps

Notes

We had a productive discussion about agenda item #1, and didn't quite get to the other items.

We discussed what the benefits of incorporation are. Primarily, the motivation to incorporate comes from a need to get collaboration tools that are designed for our purposes and are professionally supported. However, the current concept and alternatives are also designed to outsource some administrative work to a third party. Some of that administrative work is created by incorporation, but much of it (member management and such) is currently a volunteer activity performed by the Management Group. Incorporation would also make it possible for the CCUF to make its own arrangements for meeting space and hotel block reservations for the CCUF-CCDB Workshops, so as not to rely on the benevolence and ability of a CCRA member nation to provide meeting space and other services for the Workshops. Farther in the future, incorporation would make it possible for the CCUF to share some of the burden of organizing and conducting the ICCC.

One of the general concerns about incorporation is that it is a "one-shot deal" that we must do correctly because it would be difficult to change after being set up and agreed to by member organizations.

Other concerns fell largely into one of three categories:

1.Cost

Once concern was that the membership fee might be set too low at the outset, which would make it difficult to significantly increase it later.

Another concern is that some organizations who are not particularly active in CCUF WGs or the TCs that it supports might leave the CCUF if they are required to pay even a small annual fee. If such organizations find so little value in the CCUF, then perhaps they might not be missed. However, any assumptions about how many industry members would pay an annual fee should be considered carefully, because an unexpectedly large defection could violate assumptions that are used to set annual fees, making it necessary for annual fees to be increased and possibly causing a spiral of further defections.

One group that might defect from the CCUF is the smartcard community. Since they have their own processes and means of collaboration, and since the CCUF is largely focused on iTCs and cPPs, it is understandable that they could see little value in continuing their membership.

We also discussed some options for making participation in iTCs available for free or for a very small annual fee (see Barriers, below), but that raised the question of whether participants would simply opt for the easiest membership option.

2.Legal

No matter how small the annual fee might be, any membership agreement for organizations would likely need to be reviewed by a legal department and signed by someone authorized to sign for such things. This is quite different from the current model, in which individual members join without a signed agreement and represent their organization.

Many associations operate on an organizational membership basis and require a signed membership agreement. However, there are other examples:

IEEE Standards Association requires an individual membership for balloting on standards, but aside from that, individuals are able to freely participate without any membership or signed agreement (but, then, they sell those standards to fund the IEEE-SA operation). IETF allows individual participation without formal agreement, but it is funded by organizational contributions and revenue from meeting and conference fees and sponsorship. Both organizations are incorporated entities.

Interestingly, most of the concerns about cost and legal issues were expressed by two of the largest vendors who, presumably, have neither shortages of cash nor lawyers ☺.

3.Barriers to participation

A specific concern about cost or legal is that it creates a barrier to entry for iTC participants. Some participants who are not currently involved in CC activities may find it onerous to need to join the CCUF and pay a fee in order to participate in an iTC. We discussed the possibility of having a reduced- or no-fee option for participation limited to one iTC, perhaps to join the iTC but not the CCUF and therefore not requiring a signed membership agreement. This raised the question mentioned above in "Cost" about participants opting for the cheapest, easiest route.

Since the new iTC/cPP process requires some public comment facility already, this may or may not really be a problem for the CCUF to

Since the new iTC/cPP process requires some public comment facility already, this may or may not really be a problem for the CCUF to solve. The public comment mechanism might satisfy the need for a no-fee, no-agreement way to participate through the CC portal, as it is today, or through a limited public-facing capability provided by a new CCUF toolset.

In any case, as long as the CCRA doesn't require that iTCs are hosted by the CCUF, iTCs would have the freedom (as they do now) to find other means of communicating and collaborating. If they wish to use the CCUF's tools, they would need to agree to join as CCUF members.

Another concern about the barrier to participation had to do with the Workshops. Members have said that they value the opportunity to work with CC schemes during the Workshops, but a fee-paying membership requirement might be seen as preventing access to those government agencies. However, if the CCUF is paying for meeting arrangements for the Workshops, it is not unreasonable to charge admission. We could, as many other organizations do, allow non-members to join the Workshops by paying a non-member admission fee.

Much of this discussion raised the issue of "what is the value of joining the CCUF", whether or not it requires an annual fee and a membership agreement. Many CCUF members already spend a significant amount of time and travel expense to participate because:

- They invest a lot of money in certifying products, and the target market for certified products is a significant source of revenue
- It provides opportunities to coordinate with CC schemes and others in the CC community
- It is a way to learn about what's happening in the CC and to influence it

Next meeting

The next teleconference will be held on Friday, October 17, 2014, at the same time (8AM PDT). Details and agenda will be announced.

Comments: 2   Add comment

CCUF Incorporation WG kick-off teleconference: Friday October 3, 8:00AM US Pacific / 11:00AM US Eastern / 4:00PM UTC

Author: Brian Smithson

10/1/2014   4:57 PM

You have been invited to the CCUF Incorporation WG kick-off teleconference

Friday October 3, 8:00AM US Pacific / 11:00AM US Eastern / 4:00PM UTC

To join the meeting: https://join.me/bsmithson

On a computer, use any browser with Flash. Nothing to download.
On a phone or tablet, launch the join.me app and enter meeting code: **bsmithson**

Join the audio conference:

Dial **18662013918**
Access Code **1660165#**

Click here to see the meeting's start time by time zones

Comments: 1   Add comment

---

documents to review: status of alternatives, and tools requirements matrix

Author: Brian Smithson

9/30/2014   8:24 PM

I've posted two documents for your review and comments:

1. Status of alternatives provides a summary of each of the three current alternatives. The summaries are not yet complete, so don't go comparing costs just yet. However, I would certainly like your comments on what is there and also on any other items that should be added to the summary for each alternative.
2. Tools requirements matrix is as it says, a comparison of the general set of requirements that came from the TC Collaboration Tools WG with what is offered by the tool proposed by each of the three current alternatives (and also compared to what is available in Teamlab). There is a rudimentary scoring system at the end, but since there are quite a few unanswered cells, the scores don't mean very much yet. I would like comments on the requirements set and any other questions or comments you have about the spreadsheet.

Please have a look and post comments to this forum.

Comments: 0   Add comment

CCUF Inc. kick-off teleconference survey

Author: Brian Smithson

9/29/2014   7:51 PM

I'd like to schedule a kick-off teleconference for the CCUF Incorporation WG. but unfortunately I have only one day this week available and then I'm on vacation for a little while. Also, we have members from all over the world, so there is no time of day when a teleconference would be convenient for all (or even any!) of the members' time zones.

Please follow this link http://doodle.com/d8pcr76rfz9katz3 to choose which (if any) dates/times work for you.

Comments: 0   Add comment

Welcome to the CCUF Incorporation WG - background, status, and next steps

Author: Brian Smithson

9/29/2014   6:34 PM

Thank you for joining this WG. This posting provides a brief background and status of the project as well as some suggested next steps for us.

Background

Although the idea of incorporating the CCUF isn't a new idea, the most recent motivation to look into incorporation arose from a discussion

Although the idea of incorporating the CCUF isn't a new idea, the most recent motivation to look into incorporation arose from a discussion about improving the CCUF's collaboration tools. Teamlab / OnlyOffice isn't designed for the kind of collaboration that the CCUF fosters, but when David Martin, I, and others, looked at what kind of collaboration tools we might use instead, we found that we needed one of the following:

1. Money to pay for a host service, or
2. A donation (money or service) from a CCUF member company, or
3. One or more very dedicated volunteers to build, host, and maintain a service.

Money is out of the question unless the CCUF is incorporated somewhere as a legal entity. Reliance on donationed or volunteer-based services puts the CCUF at risk of discontinuity if a donor or volunteer discontinues and a replacement isn't available.

There are other benefits of incorporation:

- As a financial entity, the CCUF could engage in contracts such as to make paid arrangements for meetings, workshops, and conferences.
- Through an organization-based membership agreement, the CCUF could ensure that its own management and the working groups and technical communities that it supports operate within broad principles of fairness, transparency, and other measures of goodness.
- As a legal entity, the CCUF could hold copyrights and trademarks.

However, none of those represents an identified need. The most visible and critical need that incorporation can help solve is the CCUF's collaboration toolset. Consequently, I started looking at the costs and benefits of incorporation in more detail to see if it was even possible for the CCUF to get the kind of tools it needs for a modest and flexible membership fee schedule.

I should also point out that there is no reason why the CCUF *must* be incorporated. This WG could recommend against incorporation, and life would go on.

Status

The general concept that I've been considering is:

- The CCUF incorporates as a non-profit entity (for IRS purposes, a 501(c)6 trade assoriation),
- Membership would be based on organization, not individuals. Once an organization has joined, any number of individuals from that organization can participate.
- Funding would come from annual membership fees from member organizations. Only CC vendor, CC lab, and CC consulting organizations would pay. Others (schemes, end users, academics, etc.) could join for free. Membership fees would have at least two tiers to make it practical for very small CC industry organizations to join.
- The CCUF employs an outside service to provide administrative services to maintain the corporate records and to manage membership invoicing and finances,
- The CCUF employs a hosted collaboration tools service, likely (but not necessarily) associated with the administrative services firm.

This concept is just a concept that I've used to see if this particular way of going about it is feasible. This WG could propose a different approach.

I've been looking at three alternatives to implement the concept:

1. Use VTM Group (an association management firm) for admin services. Use VTM Group's collaboration tool ("Causeway"). Use a lawyer that has worked with VTM group to get us through the incorporation process.
2. Join IEEE-ISTO (Industry Standards and Technology Organization) as one of their programs, which automatically makes the CCUF part of a 501(c)6 without incorporating as its own entity. Use one of their collaboration tool offerings. No need for a lawyer.
3. Use Association Management Services (AMS) for admin services. Use AMS's collaboration tool ("ARO", pronounced "arrow"). Use a lawyer that has worked with AMS to get us through the incorporation process.

I will post and update the status of each of these in the "alternatives" folder in this WG's document area on Teamlab.

These are not the only possible alternatives. I have been working through the details with each of them, but this WG could identify other alternatives that should be considered.

Next steps

What is needed from WG members is to:

1. Review and discuss the concept.
2. Review and discuss the alternatives.
3. Continue to investigate the alternatives to get firm estimates of time, money, effort, etc.
4. Develop the following items. These are are generally needed for incorporation (even if the concept is changed or new alternatives are investigated);
    - Organization name (trade name clearance) and purpose (justifying non-profit status)
    - Membership class structure, fee schedule, and rights
    - Membership agreement
    - Board structure, hardwired committees (if any), and selection of initial board members and officers
    - Organizational charter
    - Policies related to intellectual property, essential patents, and anti-trust
    - Relationship to the CCRA and iTCs
    - Legal and administrative services to be employed
    - Collaboration tools and other ICT services to be engaged
    - Start-up funding plan
5. Propose one or more solutions to the CCUF Membership for approval.

I hope that all WG members can review and discuss the concept and alternatives. Beyond that, I think we can divide up the work, so please look at items 3~5 and consider if any of them are particularly interesting to you.

Separately, I'll propose that we have a kick-off teleconference.

Comments: 0   Add comment