Blockchain PSIG Notes

*20 Feb 2020*

# Attendees

* Robert Stavros
* Rencher, Robert J
* Michael Bennett
* Lars Toomre
* Bobbin Teegarden
* Robert Nehmer
* Ian Stavros

# Agenda

(none posted prior to the meeting)

* Review Reston agenda
* Review membership status (notes from last week’s call)
* Reston agenda preparation
* Cloud WG potential overlap discussion
* Updates
* AoB

# Meeting Notes

## Reston Agenda Review

Reference v 0.1 of the Supplementary Agenda, posted to OMG, along with the Google Calendar agenda.

Note that for the Monday afternoon sessions we do not have a detailed breakdown of timings from MARS as yet. Agenda will be updated when we do.

### Main sessions (Wednesday afternoon)

MB: Does the running order look OK? This accounts for all the sessions we agreed last week, with their durations. The only alternative is to switch the before-coffee and after-coffee pairs of sessions, if we wanted to.

Consensus: The Wednesday afternoon agenda is OK as published. No changes sought.

### Cloud WG session

Cloud WG meets Wednesday morning.

It has been suggested via email that we consider doing a joint session with the Cloud WG. At this point the idea would be simply to explore any possible areas of overlap and future joint activities. A specific time has not been Note that this session would be at the same time as the SBRM Education Session.

Q: Is there some idea of what the potential overlap is?

The sub-headings below explore various potential areas of commonality with the Cloud WG.

#### Permanodes

NS: With Permanode (IOTA) there is definitely a need for Cloud within the Blockchain world.

Ethereum has its own equivalent of a Permanode. As the chains get big, it’s not processing that would be on the Cloud but the long term storage. See email from Nick.

BT: Why?

NS: Size of the Blockchains (ledgers)

BT: If you do correct garbage collection this can be shunted off to offside storage.

This is what happens in the IOTA Permanode, where they keep all that information.

Likely Hyperledger / IBM have their own way of doing it as well.

MB: surely garbage collection and the records management requirement for discoverable legal and economic documents, are 2 different things.

BT: The use of ‘garbage collection’ is my own term for this. The idea is to reduce the amount of stuff needed. Can mark things as ‘finished’.

MB: Suggest we don’t call this garbage collection.

IOTA has a thing called a Permanode, for this purpose.

#### Supply Chain

The other Cloud overlap is when we start getting involved with Supply Chain, and also brokering.

In supply chain, as you roll up the ingredients of something, you must know where it originated (for discoverability), but from that point on it would likely be stored in cloud storage not DLs.

May also have implications for IoT.

#### Brokerage

There is also a place for Cloud for brokerage related records.

Also expand this to Internet of Things (IoT).

#### Libra

This is not a DL or crypto currency, but it is a currency to be stored in Facebook servers.

Is it a DIDO? No because it is not distributed. It is ledger technology.

MB: Is this within the purview of this Blockchain PSIG? Should we cover all manner of virtual currencies, over and above DIDO?

NS: should discuss in terms of scope. Also the wallets are ‘distributed’.

MB: Really?

IS: Isn’t’ this similar to the Hyperledger model?

NS: Hyperledger can be distributed.

IS: More centralized than distributed.

Q: Does this relate to our joint work with the Cloud WG?

A: Yes – the Cloud WG can help us determine if the Facebook Libra comes under Cloud or under Blockchain PSIG.

#### Outcome

Q: Presentation or just an open discussion?

Probably just an open discussion. It may help to produce slides summarizing the things we discussed about. Present as ‘thoughts’ rather than any detailed assertions.

**Action:** NS to do around 4 slides to cover the basic scoping of the topics covered above.

#### Any preferences as to time?

Propose this be the last session of Wednesday morning. If it gets too long it can spill over into lunch.

**Action:** MB to respond to Claude’s email to confirm this.

## Membership

We discussed and agreed last week how we anticipate membership of this PSIG to work. In summary, the group would be open at present, but would become closed as soon as there is some formal RFC or RFP in process via MARS or elsewhere, that we are working on.

There have been subsequent emails send to assorted parties, asserting that this group is already closed (the sender having not read the minutes from last week).

MB presented the minutes from last week on this to ensure that everyone who was present at last week’s meeting agrees that these notes characterize the discussion correctly.

All agree this is what was agreed at that meeting.

Superseded by the below where applicable.

### Membership Further Comments

BT: It seems unfortunate not to be open to the public as we would like to attract further involvement.

BT proposes we do a monthly update to the general public. Also have events around that.

Similar to finance where there is a ‘financefriends’ group which is probably for that (MB to check).

MB also how can you be an incubator if you are closed?

NS: Think the issue is: if you look at other standards groups they base things off the access to the documents whereas the OMG asks for membership. The concern is with people using a cc list as a means to participate at high levels without needing to buy memberships, which is unfair to those who have.

BT: This may prevent us getting good work done.

IS: Also we lack outreach towards younger folk, in OMG. For example reaching out to universities.

RN: They have announced a new Poster Session for students at each of the technical meetings.

MB Is the main consideration IP or cost? Or both?

W3C has an ‘open’ thing and the RFC submissions are the only things that are closed, which is a submission group?

### Membership Outcomes:

* Check with OMG staff if it really is the case that a SIG can’t remain open once a RFC/RFP is in flight
* Also why have this restriction for an RFP when it is only RFP responses, that have IP
  + i.e. is the cost thing that drives this, or the IP thing?
* If the above is a No, Can we create a second public OMG email list for public facing

In general we should define our requirements and push these up to the Board in terms of determining what we want to do.

*[Subsequent notes from MB:*

* *Recall that for RFCs, as for RFP responses, any meeting relating to the development of the RFC or the RFP response is characterized as a separate meeting e.g. ‘FIBO Submitters Meeting’ and is not part of the Task Force (in that case, Finance DTF) at all*
* *Looking back, it seems that we asked at the OMG about the open-ness or otherwise of this group when it was first formed, and were told it was open to members only; during that correspondence we lost the participation of at least one interested party (Claudio Lima of IEEE) who had participated in the prior FDTF Blockchain Working Group; his firm was about to become a member but had not yet. MB has subsequently re-engaged with Lima but via the IOTA / IEEE relationship, not as an OMG relationship. This illustrates the above points*

*]*

## Updates

### Lars Update

Has met a person now elected as CDO of the Government Blockchain Association. We be joining that organization which is in the process of joining the OMG.

That person has 2 hats:

* Modernizing re reporting
* Standards for BC Assoc I both DLTs and some financial stuff, and derivative voting records. Using DLTs to modernize delivery of government services.

That person is coming to the Government blockchain session on Tuesday on Tue pm in Reston

Also suggest we do a special event in September (Burlingame) on DLTs governance issues. This will be run by FERM and Gov DTF, with Blockchain PSIG taking the lead. Suggest to also do a Blockchain focused event in September for Silicon Valley attendees. They (a law firm) will pay for half the cost of such an event.

In Orlando they will cover RegTech (BC-PSIG folks may want to tune in to that). Not limited to financial regulation.

#### Jackrabbit

Char Wales is confirmed as part of Jackrabbit Consulting.

## AoB

No.

## Next meeting

MB not available 27 Feb.

NS available but agenda unclear.

Any agenda items for next week?

LT would like a brief conversation on DIDO

**Conclusion:** Agenda for 27 Feb is DIDO, NS runs the meeting.

MB will send NS the login.