FDTF DLT WG Notes

*23 Oct 2018*

# Attendees

* Ann McDonough
* Char Wales
* Bobbin Teegarden
* Rob Nehmer
* Nick Stavros
* Mike Bennett
* Georgii Pysenets

Note: We were unable to establish who Georgii Pysenets was or what organization he is affiliated to. He did not speak.

# AGENDA

* Possible creation of a Blockchain PSIG
* Event planning for December
* Joint activities / next steps etc.
* RFC versus RFP conversation

# Session Notes

## Possible Creation of a PSIG for Blockchain / Distributed Ledger

PSIG: Can call it Distributed Ledger Technology (Blockchain) PSIG.

Some discussion on whether to simply call it ‘Blockchain’ based on differing perceptions of what the word ‘Blockchain’ is considered to represent.

MB: Blockchain seems to imply the non-graph architectures like BitCoin and Ethereum. BT disagrees.

MB: Also we should be clear that a ‘Distributed Ledger’ is also not a ledger in the usually understood sense, it is any kind of data storage.

Does IOTA use the term Blockchain? They do not call themselves a Blockchain - they have a tangle not a chain.

BT: All have in common that they start with a sequence of blocks (ledgers so called).

NS: We struggled with using the term Blockchain which is why we came up with the name DIDO. People had trouble visualizing a 'distributed ledger'.

NS: In Apple, all their files are journalled. DIDO gave up on the argument on whether it was specifically a Block, Blockchain etc., so that is why we used the term DIDO, which is intended to be able to be replaced with the words Blockchain or DLT.

All have either a chain or a graph of these 'Blocks'.

Each thread in the Tangle can be considered as a chain of sorts.

All agree that.

CW: we need a hook in there that people recognize i.e. 'Blockchain' even if this is not seen as the most universally recognized name for all of the architectures in that ecosystem. Need to educate people that that is not the all-encompassing term that people think of. There are many things in the same space.

BT: Everyone who uses DIDOs does use the term 'Blockchain'. Agree we need to educate people in what it is.

### Name of PSIG

Need to resolve on the name of the PSIG we propose to charter? Going round the table:

* BT: Try Blockchain and see. Not use Ledger as it implies finance
* CW: Distributed Ledger / Blockchain
* NS: Have to have Blockchain in the name somewhere. 'THe Blockchain PSIG' making clear that this represents the etire ecosystem of things
* RN: Agree with NS. Semantics of any given token (word) not releant to the naming

The name can be changed later.

### Investopedia

"What is Blockchain and Distributed Ledger Technology?” article clearly states that that the 'ledger' is a data record. This is underpinned by” Blockchain".

### Confirm Why we Need a PSIG

What problem are we setting out to solve with the proposal for a new PSIG?

The charter can be more encompassing.

PSIG because it is horizontal.

So we all want to charter this thing and deprecate this WG.

Any negatives?

CW: Possible to not gain buy-in if this is just sprung on people. Generally use a meeting cycle before hand before it is chartered. Would be voted on, not by this WG but by the PTC.

Talk about it the meeting before. PTC would not react well to having this just pop out of nowhere.

How to socialize this?

 - announce it

 - have a charter and post this, go around to the various groups about the initiative to charter the PSIG.

 - Don't spring it on the PTC.

OR

During the Seattle meeting, try to get this on various people's agendas e.g. MARS. Other Platform TFs as well, explain what we are intending to do, so people have heard about during the week.

Also get some inputs into what the Charter would be. Otherwise would we have a charter ready to even ready.

### Rationale for this PSIG:

BT: Seeing some of the activity around OMG, it is clear this is a horizontal not a vertical. For example we have a speaker at the event for Retail Blockchain, Also healthcare and government.

NS this was also why we did the DIDO paper. Covered all different areas of OMG.

BT: Also MARS, as the next CORBA in terms of integrating applications.

BT: retail, healthcare, and insurance are also all doing something with blockchain, and gov.

BT: Since we are the first with blockchain standards, we want to make OMG the venue of choice to move standards around blockchain.

CW: Also with our Blockchain event on the Tuesday, that could be the forum in which we introduce the Blockchain PSIG.

CW: An alternative would be to turn it into a WG (as we have now). That would not require a Charter. Would be a free floating WG as distinct from one associated with a specific TF. The argument against the WG idea is that it is so informal, has no stature. See also Data Governance discussions on whether to form a SIG. Needed to see if it had the staying power first.

NS: Also determine who would be the major participants e.g. need a driving force like IBM or IOTA. Otherwise can detract from the whole effort.

CW: SIGs are the incubators for RFCs and RFPs. So MARS has DDS PSIG. They work on draft RFPs and bring these to MARS and elsewhere. Can take these either to Domain or Platform.

### Plans for PSIG Chartering

Q: Would the half day be enough socialization or should we charter in March?

CW: it could be. So put this on the PTC agenda for the Friday, make a final decision after Tuesday if it is not ready.

## Seattle Event Planning

### Agenda

BT working on the agenda - got a good keynote, possible new speaker.

* Agenda starts with kick-off by Richard Soley.
* Chris Jones as keynote speaker. On board of 3 different Blockchain startups, including DragonChain.
	+ 1 hour
* Then US Government (Claude B if available - MB to follow up on that)
	+ 1 hour
* Then a break
* Then MB on OMG as a venue for Blockchain standards, with examples of OMG work (DIDO, the FDTF DLT PoC). Also mention the PSIG idea
	+ 15 min
* Then Nick on DIDO and the next steps on the PoC (the impementation)
* Then IOTA (Alex Renz, Paul Handy confirmed), talk about the IOTA Tangle architecture and their IOTA standardization activity
* MB close and OMG as the place for emerging Blockchain standards

Chris Jones - also wants us to have the CTO of Dragonchain speak - to be confirmed. Blockchain start-up community in Seattle.

Add this as a talk? Probably not, maybe too short notice.

Also can help DragonChain bring some of their tech though OMG as well.

### Timings

Start at 08:30 - BT has the outline program.

## Wednesday Lunch

Wednesday lunch keynote: can we put forward one of the above e.g. Chris Jones to be that speaker.

**Action:** Who organizes this?

A McD writing to Mike N about this.

Next action once we hear from MN:

Also who do we propose?

**Action:** BT to identify the potential Wednesday Lunch speaker.

(also ties in with the academic group)

BT: there is also a guy from Uni of Washington who could speak.

Also broadcast this to the entire OMG group. Mention the PSIG in the introduction to the Keynote.

### Leaflets

NS can do a leaflet that pulls out the OMG related standards from the DIDO paper. Need not go over in detail.

Do this as a poster for Tuesday. And handout.

**Action** on NS. Working with Ann on this.

Also can we get this put into the OMG folder?

One page double sided.

AM will run this by MN, hopefully not a problem.

Also include Retail - they have an active Blockchain activity. Reached out to BT. Have them in place of Government speaker if needed. Or divide the Gov / Retail. Retail person is Bart. via Karen Shrunk.

## New item: Blockchain Info Day in March

In Reston we should consider a Blockchain Info Day.

This would be a good place for people like Retail Oil and Gas, etc. Also government. Not the developers but the end users.

## RFC v RFP

AB strongly questioning the use and over-use of RFCs so we can only do an RFC if this is very very clear. Unless (e.g. in the case of IOTA) there are no competitors in the marketplace it is an RFC, else it is an RFP.

MB: IOTA folks in the middle of these discussions. Once we have a clear statement of the intended scope of the proposed standard, we will clearly be able to know if it should be an RFC or an RFP. Until then no-one is assuming anything either way.

CW: also against use in RFC as a development process, which is wrong. All agree.