

Jerry Dussault • 14 days ago

The main website for the CoE can be found at: <https://www.sel4-us.org/>
We'll soon be posting more information on joining the CoE and accessing the code repository. In the meantime, don't hesitate to contact via email for information.

-
- •

• Share ›

• **Jerry Dussault** • 16 days ago

Thanks for joining this presentation on the seL4 Center of Excellence (CoE). If you would like to know a little more about the Griffiss Institute or Innovare Advancement Center, I'll provide hyperlinks below.

<https://www.griffissinstitu...>

<https://www.innovare.org/>

-
- •
- Reply
- •
- Share ›

○

-
-
-



Jeremy • 14 days ago

I am not seeing video for this presentation--will this be posted after the presentation?

-
- •
- Reply
- •
- Share ›

○

-
-
-



Regan Robertson Mod • 14 days ago

Hi Jeremy, you are a bit early. This presentation will start at 2pm.

-

- •
- Reply
- •
- Share ›

○

-
-



Jerry Dussault Jeremy • 14 days ago

If that issue persists, you might try reloading the webpage.

-
- •
- Reply
- •
- Share ›

•

-
-



Regan Robertson Mod • 14 days ago

The video will start on this page at 14:00, and you may have to hit play or unmute. As a reminder this site works best in a Chrome Browser. You can write in comments through this feature to continue the conversation or ask questions. Please login or sign up for a Disqus account to participate in the discussion boards.

-
- •
- Reply
- •
- Share ›

○

•

-
-



Jerry Dussault • 14 days ago Featured by seL4 Summit

The main website for the CoE can be found at: <https://www.sel4-us.org/>

We'll soon be posting more information on joining the CoE and accessing the code repository. In the meantime, don't hesitate to contact via email for information.

-
- •
- Reply
- •
- Share ›



-
-
-



Paul Pazandak • 14 days ago

Hi Jerry, will the COE fund, support and/or manage any DO178C cert evidence?

-
- •
- Reply
- •
- Share ›



-
-
-



Jerry Dussault Paul Pazandak • 14 days ago

Great question. We've not ruled anything out yet, and helping the community build and share evidence towards certification, or building levels of trust is something we could take on. In addition to code bases, our repository could (should) be a place to collect and share that kind of information.

-
- •
- Reply

-
-
- Share >



Paul Pazandak Jerry Dussault • 14 days ago

I would anticipate that the COE would need to pay for the cert, or consider asking any gov't customer to ensure that if they pay for cert, that the evidence gets contributed back to the COE. We want to avoid having the gov't pay for the same cert more than once. This would also mean limiting/managing code evolution for those modules, as any mods would require recertification. Ideally, the code within the COE (at least the main branch) could be managed more like a commercial software product than active research (unless we can build a streamlined certification process).

-
-
-
- Reply
-
- Share >



Jerry Dussault Paul Pazandak • 14 days ago

That's the idea. Pay for it only once and re-use it. Yes - Code distributions managed more like a software product line than a research project.

-
-
-
- Reply
-
- Share >

-
-
-



Nathaniel Husted • 14 days ago

For associate membership, have you all thought on how you'd want to handle multiple membership from the same government entities? For example, say there would be multiple individuals from a DoD branch due to the somewhat dispersed nature of capability and sometimes silo'd nature of that government area?

-
- •
- Reply
- •
- Share ›



Jerry Dussault Nathaniel Husted • 14 days ago

Given it thought, but don't know that there's a single best answer. For now we'll be flexible and accept membership at the level(s) that make sense for each organization. I'd welcome suggestions on this.

-
- •
- Reply
- •
- Share ›



Nathaniel Husted Jerry Dussault • 14 days ago

Honestly, I think you have the right idea. I think the two major branches contributing thus far seem rather well organized with who's-who-in-the-zoo. The

other major branch -- playing it by ear makes sense. Happy to reach out via email with some thoughts there.

-
-
- [Reply](#)
-
- [Share >](#)

-
-
-



Jerry Dussault Nathaniel Husted • 14 days ago

Thanks! The more help we can get working through these details, the better!

-
-
- [Reply](#)
-
- [Share >](#)

-
-
-



Aleksey Nogin • 14 days ago

Are there restrictions for accessing the repository (beyond the one implied by DoD-only and ITAR)?
E.g., would it be only open to members?

- 1
-
- [Reply](#)
-
- [Share >](#)

-
-
-

○



Renato Levy Aleksey Nogin • 14 days ago • edited

members only. The foundation has resources which are not member tied, but the CoE because of the DoD objective, must have strict access control

-
-
- ·
- Reply
- ·
- Share ›



Carl Nerup Renato Levy • 14 days ago

So, if you use any code you might want to use subject to ITAR restrictions, I would not put it in the COE - correct?

-
- ·
- Reply
- ·
- Share ›



Jerry Dussault Carl Nerup • 14 days ago

We anticipate hosting code in the CoE that is ITAR restricted. So if you're a US Company, member of the CoE, you could re-use that code if you're prepared to live with the consequences of the ITAR restrictions.

-
- ·
- Reply
- ·
- Share ›



Olin Sibert • 14 days ago

Will the code repository provide tools or other support for ensuring that the materials in the repository have appropriate markings to reflect their distribution status (e.g., ITAR, CUI)? Similar question about tools for ensuring that license markings on the content are consistent with high-level intents?

- 1
- •
- Reply
- •
- Share ›



Jerry Dussault Olin Sibert • 14 days ago

We don't currently have tools for that. Distribution marking is important, but initially we may have to limit our Private Repo to instances that share a common distribution limitations. If you're aware of tools we could employ, please let us know.

- 1
- •
- Reply
- •
- Share ›



Jerry Dussault Olin Sibert • 14 days ago

As to license marking, I anticipate the initial code contributions will be from U.S. DoD developers, and code with Gov't Purpose Rights. So we can share freely among developers for Gov't Purposes. Beyond that, would like to move as much as we can toward open source, but if firms wish to retain their commercial rights, we'll have to work with them to ensure code is properly marked. We don't currently have tools for that.

- - -
 - Reply
 - -
 - Share ›



Jerry Dussault • 14 days ago

FYI: as of this morning we're still working on the authentication piece of the private code repository. Had hoped this would be ready today, but my team is telling me it may be a few more days.

- - -
 - Reply
 - -
 - Share ›



June Andronick • 14 days ago

Thanks for this update Jerry!

- 1
- -
- Reply
- -
- Share ›



Regan Robertson Mod • 14 days ago

We will be taking a 30-minute break as we look forward to the next presentation at 3PM.

-
- •
- Reply
- •
- Share ›



Renato Levy • 14 days ago • edited

One important small correction. The individual and Auditor members gets a discount on the Summit registration, but not its full cost. Summit registration is around \$900, this year notwithstanding, so it makes no sense that you get it free by paying \$150.

-
- •
- Reply
- •
- Share ›



Nathaniel Husted Renato Levy • 14 days ago • edited

I think that's fair. From the government side, we ended up in a strange boat with my command. They complained they didn't have enough lead time to do a conference package (takes us about 2 8-hour days to do the paper work, then send it off to other people), but then said it wasn't expensive enough to be considered training. Oddly enough \$900 makes it easier.

(unclear what associate membership may look like w.r.t the full discount)

-
-
- [Reply](#)
-
- [Share >](#)

○

-
-



Jerry Dussault Renato Levy • 14 days ago

Please carefully review the membership agreement for current fees and benefits at each membership level. We can't afford to give members \$900 in value for a \$150 membership fee, as Renato has correctly stated.

-
-
- [Reply](#)
-
- [Share >](#)

-
-
-



Carl Nerup • 14 days ago

As this is jointly backed by the USG, has seL4 been announced the winner for government wide deployments?

-
-
- [Reply](#)
-
- [Share >](#)

-
-
-



Jerry Dussault Carl Nerup • 14 days ago

Not sure what you're inferring here, but I can say we have NOT been officially endorsed by DoD or US Gov't.

-
- •
- Reply
- •
- Share ›

-
-
-



Carl Nerup Jerry Dussault • 14 days ago

What is interesting is that in most customer use cases, there is a lot of latitude left to the Integrator as to which hypervisor we may use. Not to say that they do not always have an opinion - but it is still a bit woolly out there.

-
- •
- Reply
- •
- Share ›

-
-
-



Paul Pazandak • 14 days ago

I'm eager to see an seL4 distribution roadmap, but I'm guessing that it's too early to expect this. Has this been discussed yet?

-
- •
- Reply
- •
- Share ›



Jerry Dussault Paul Pazandak • 14 days ago

We've discussed the need, and how we'd coordinate with seL4 Foundation, but there is no Roadmap yet.

-
-
- •
- Reply
- •
- Share ›



Aleksey Nugin • 14 days ago

Do you plan to allow "upgrading" a membership (e.g. joining as an individual, and later upgrading to Auditor, while only paying the difference)?

-
- •
- Reply
- •
- Share ›



Jerry Dussault Aleksey Nugin • 14 days ago

You're the first one to raise that question. We might be able to do that, but I'll need to take the suggestion to our Leadership Committee for their blessing.