Blockchain PSIG Call Notes

*29 Aug 2019*

# Attendees

* Allen Brown
* Jeff Gaus
* Ketan
* Nelson
* Nick Stavros
* Rob Nehmer
* Robert Rencher
* Lars Toomre
* Bobbin Teegarden
* Mike Bennett

# Introductions

* AB: Deixis: Contracts and strong semantic of contracts. Oregon
* JG: Blockchain Venture Studio – Oregon CofE and Provenance Chain Network
* K: Multi industry provenance. Oregon
* N: IOTA Foundation Technologist and evangelist; IoT
* NS: San Diego, CA. DARPA grant for DIDO Test Environments (VMs); son in Portland OR
* RN: Oakland Uni, Rochester MI. Research on DLT mainly in Assurance space. Co-chair of FDTF
* RR: Boeing Enterprise IT. Focus on IT for new products and services. Security etc. aspects; emerging tech value propositions, including DLT. Also standards etc. committees in aviation
* LT: Co-lead of OMG SBRM WG. RFP issues in Amsterdam. Responses Dec, Finalize March; Co-lead of FERM WG. Independent of FDTF as relates to a range of risks, for US Gov agencies; Working with US Congress on FTA 2019. Needs standard business reports (machine and human readable). For FSOC (to and from them). Also Co-lead of dormant AI PSIG (now Platform Task Force
* BT: System Architect, Co-chair of BC-PSIG FDTF; of AI TF. Blockchain and AI evangelist

## Introductions Comments

Some Portland OR introductions to be made. Maybe a Meetup? Meeting with Ian Stavros on the DIDO Test thing.

NS in Oregon Sept 16 through to OMG meeting on 23rd. Meeting in Portland that week.

The beer is on Jeff and Ketan.

MB: Circulate everyone on this list so they can organize that. JG will find a room.

## Who will be at Nashville?

* MB
* NS
* JG – to be decided

## Nomenclature

### DIDO v DLT

DIDO covers distributed computing more generally, e.g. IPFS, DDS and DLT (with immutable objects). Does not imply Blockchain technology i.e. implementation agnostic.

DLT seems to imply a ‘Ledger’ to some listeners. IPFS and others do not imply a ledger.

DLT itself implies something broader than the accounting sense of ledger i.e. any data structure storage.

The DIDO 2.0 paper aims to define these things.

IOTA as an example is not very ledger-like in its applications. That is, not always currency.

DARPA felt a need beyond accounting.

## Test

e.g. IOTA has a TestNet. What does DIDO do differently.

DIDO Test Env introduces hostile agents and things, and does not let these out of the lab.

For Digital contracts, need to carry out destructive tests. Need to remain virtual.

Reacting to lack of testing in some Smart Contracts in history.

Customer is potential end user e.g. R&D at Fortune 500 companies, rather than the originator.

Pedigree and Provenance.

### Q: Will this be open to startups and newer companies?

And what is the revenue model?

See below

### Q: Is this bringing in different DLT environments into the standard test environment?

A: Funded by DARPA so open to anyone being able to use it. Not up and running yet.

Concepts: Community, Sponsor etc. Details another time.

So far: Ethereum, IOTA and 4 or 5 others.

Resulting material is all open source. Open to smaller companies but must find their own budget to do so.

# This Blockchain PSIG Group

Works independently of the DTFs and PTFs (see below). We then liaise with the most appropriate Task Force (TF) e.g. MARS for middleware standards.

## RFP v RFC and RFIs

* RFP: Identify an industry need for a standard; the TF creates and issues the RFP
* RFC: Existing de facto standard, to be blessed by the OMG as an OMG standard.
* RFI: Request for Information. Often precedes an RFP, so as to gather the information needed to draft one.

## Domain v Platform

e.g. data models and ontologies tend to be for the domain. Also domain-specific messaging e.g. FHIR messages in healthcare.

## Specific Streams of Activity in Blockchain PSIG

* ID for Crypto Assets
* DIDO-RA
* DLT Interoperability RFI and later RFP
* IOTA Standards submissions

# DLT Ecosystem Interoperability RFI

This is to lead to a later RFP (Dec). At the MARS PTF.

## Modes of Interoperability

*See slides*

* Data versus Operations.
* Semantics
  + E.g. Deixis, REA (Contracts)
* System / Router analogs
  + BlockNet
  + Overledger
* Smart Contracts
* oracles
* Messaging
  + MAM
* Low-level
  + EEE
  + Protobuf etc.
* What else?

## SBRM – can we use this as a basis for how ontology is used

SBRM: Reporting focus, says how to refer to an ontology.

Changed in Amsterdam. Refers to values of cells as ‘Facts’ in the XBRL sense. E.g. a cell on a spreadsheet, goes into a place in a report.

Each cell mapped back to an ontology. OMG Architecture Board (AB) suggested it did not need to be an ontology, it could be a Taxonomy of a Data Dictionary. Some AB and / or Board members resist that weakening. Currently suggests but does not require use of an ontology to describe what the cells mean. Are required to use ontology to describe the contents of a report.

e.g. Section 1 is requirement for Balance Sheet, 2 = global funds and so on. Ontology per section and possibly multiple ontologies within a section.

Core concept: attach a tree of knowledge to the report, e.g. what I know about Net Incomes.

# Appendix: Chat Log

**Nelson (to Everyone)**: 1:59 PM: Nick - I will be in San Diego on October 9 for Infragard Earthquake Symposium, could I stop by and see your testbed?

**Nelson (to Everyone)**: 1:59 PM: I'm located in Los Angeles.

**Nick (to Everyone)**: 1:59 PM: yes... i think I’ll be there

**Nick (to Everyone)**: 2:00 PM: nick [@] drstavros.com