Blockchain PSIG Call Notes

*6 August 2020*

# Attendees

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

# Agenda

* LETS RFP
	+ Sort out the DDS usage references

# Meeting Notes

## DDS Application

### DDS Terminology

In the RFP Response specification, they must use the same words to mean the same thing in DDS.

In general (e.g. in Domain stds) we encourage people to use terms in a coherent way. For the specifics of something like DDS, we should want the Specification to use (or map to) the terms in DDS.

MB assumes that the end product may use its own terms e.g. Channel but the Spec needs to use the terms - e.g. Topic in e.g. DDS. NS and LT seem to suggest otherwise.

* Not required but makes life easier

Otherwise we would need some mapping of e.g. Channel v Topic. Other formalisms have their own meanings for words like Topic as well so this needs to be clear.

We do need the to define what they mean by e.g. Topic. If doing something different don’t use the same terms.

So RFP should have a ‘Reserved Terms and Definitions’ section.

RFP response – template has a place for that.

See A.2 Glossary specific to this RFP.

Also: If NOT using the standard term for something, the RFP Response (Specification) should make clear why.

That could be a sub-clause next to the Definitions part of the Submission.

Example from SBRM: since it has to translate to XBRL, has to recognize terms from that.

Likewise for LETS and DDS – identify some potential test suites that would prove conformance to (in this case) DDS. How to prove conformance.

### Use of DDS

DDS at a logical level is what we are looking at.

Elsewhere – something may have used DDS at only the wire protocol level.

Here we are doing the opposite – looking at the logical definitions in DDS but Blockchain is its own ‘on the wire’ thing.

RTPS (Real Time Protocol Standard) defines how you pack the bits on the wire so they can be unpacked with no data loss – e.g. datatypes, endian-ness and so on. Marshaling and marshaling the data.

The different levels of acceptance – protocol level versus RTPS and so on.

Then e.g. DDS vendors could be listening to their topics using existing RTPS stuff.

In summary there are different levels of conformance to the DDS specification, as above.

### RFP Response

What we are looking for as a response to this RFP.

BT: It would be neat if the response was IOTA plus some DDS vendors working together.

### Suggestions

* Look at e.g. RPC over DDS – a layer placed over DDS to emulate (or rather, to be) remote procedure calls. Want IOTA et al to come up with their own Specification – IOTA Streams / LETS over DDS.
* Similarly for OPCUA. For industrial processes. They built own standards but then realized DDS did that and so made a gateway for existing products to go to DDS via some gateway.

The 1st of the 2 above seems like a model for what we are looking for.

## Language

LT: What is the required language for OMG submissions and can submissions be in other languages (e.g. German).

US English?

No. Spellings are all British English.

* As for ISO (per fast track)

Tech editor usually changes this from US English after something is submitted.

IOTA - using English but which one?

RFP – does this state the language in which the Response is to be worded? I don’t remember seeing it.

## IOTA

### IOTA IoT Usage

IOTA work on Autonomous vehicles – the need for information trust. This has come up recently.

There are a lot of concepts on that (air as well as ground) on how to securely manage communications.

That brings in another aspect of QoS that Nick has mentioned in earlier calls.

### DDS Presentation for IOTA Foundation

NS still needs some lead time for that. 2 – 4 days to prepare.

Can we lock in a date?

20 August.

MB will advertise that now on the IOTA Slack.

The earlier the better. E.g. 8am PDT / 11am Eastern.

NS sending the placeholder invite.