

2021-09-09 TRTF Meeting Notes

Meeting Date

- 09 Sept 2021

Zoom Meeting Link / Recording

- <https://zoom.us/j/91888476340?pwd=VmNISG9DWENWempsdGpQeEpXND>
(This link will be replaced with a link to the recording of the meeting as soon as that is available)

Attendees

- Drummond Reed
- Darrell O'Donnell
- sankarshan
- John Walker
- Antti Kettunen
- Eric Drury
- Jim St.Clair
- Lucy Yang

Main Goal of this Meeting

Complete Working Draft 01 of the ToIP Trust Registry Protocol V1 Specification and advance it to Community Review Draft status.

Agenda Items and Notes (including all relevant links)

Time	Agenda Item	Lead	Notes
5 min	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Start recording• Welcome & antitrust notice• Introduction of new members• Agenda review	Chairs	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Antitrust Policy Notice: Attendees are reminded to adhere to the meeting agenda and not participate in activities prohibited under antitrust and competition laws. Only members of ToIP who have signed the necessary agreements are permitted to participate in this activity beyond an observer role.• New Members:
5 min	Review of previous action items	Chairs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REQUIREMENTS<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦ ACTION: sankarshan will apply his suggested reorganization of the Requirements section.<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SCOPE<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦ ACTION: Darrell O'Donnell and Drummond Reed to capture our scope decisions in this section, including that TR metadata is out of scope for this version of the specification but is planned for a future version.◦ ACTION: Jim St.Clair will draft some text for the Scope section about rules processing as a future feature.<input type="checkbox"/> DATA MODEL<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦ ACTION: Darrell O'Donnell to propose a textual description of the data model that refers to Appendix A for the normative requirements.<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PROTOCOL<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦ ACTION: Drummond Reed to draft text for this section.<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> APPENDIX A: OpenAPI Specification<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦ ACTION: Darrell O'Donnell to complete any other edits to the OpenAPI specification and then add the authoritative links to Appendix A for the Implementer's Draft.<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ACTION: John Walker to review the API and post feedback to our Slack channel. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• John did review the API and the three calls.

30 mins	Review of work on the Working Draft and closing open issues	All	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See the ToIP Trust Registry Protocol V1 Working Draft • DESIGN REQUIREMENTS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ sankarshan added a table that organized the requirements into three sections. ◦ We discussed his remaining questions, particularly whether the Information Security should be a SHOULDs or MUSTs ◦ Antti Kettunen suggested that it should point to industry best practices as a SHOULD ◦ Jim St.Clair agreed that a SHOULD statement pointing to the ◦ ACTION: Drummond Reed to add to the Design Requirements section a reference to the ToIP Governance Metamodel and its Information Trust related sections. ◦ ACTION: Drummond Reed to move any remaining non-requirements left in the Design Requirements section to another Google doc. • SCOPE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ ACTION: Drummond Reed to add a scope statement about DIDComm. • PROTOCOL <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ We discussed the service block question <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ACTION: Drummond Reed and Darrell O'Donnell to propose a ToIP-domain based URI for identifying TR endpoints ▪ ACTION: Drummond Reed edit to specify that the serviceEndpoint value MUST be a single URI. ◦ We discussed the EGF vs. TR identifiers question <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The issue is the one or two ▪ John Walker was in favor of returning both. ▪ ACTION: Darrell O'Donnell and Drummond Reed to think through a recommendation about EGF identifiers and TR identifiers, i.e., do we need both, and if so, should we return both?
5 mins	Terminology & Glossary	Drummond Reed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We need to prepare our terminology for this spec • ACTION: Drummond Reed to make a proposal for terminology for this specification based on the work of the Concepts and Terminology WG.
10 mins	Next steps in Community Review	Chairs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We did not get to this topic because we are still not quite done with the V1 spec.
5 mins	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review decisions /action items • Planning for next meeting 	Chairs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We REALLY want to be finished with the V1 spec by the next meeting.

Decisions

- None

Action Items

- ☐ ACTION: [Darrell O'Donnell](#) to propose a textual description of the data model that refers to Appendix A for the normative requirements.
- ☐ ACTION: [Drummond Reed](#) to add to the Design Requirements section a reference to the ToIP Governance Metamodel and its Information Trust related sections.
- ☐ ACTION: [Drummond Reed](#) to move any remaining non-requirements left in the Design Requirements section to another Google doc.
- ☐ ACTION: [Drummond Reed](#) and [Darrell O'Donnell](#) to propose a ToIP-domain based URI for identifying TR endpoints
- ☐ ACTION: [Drummond Reed](#) edit to specify that the serviceEndpoint value MUST be a single URI.
- ☐ ACTION: [Darrell O'Donnell](#) and [Drummond Reed](#) to think through a recommendation about EGF identifiers and TR identifiers, i.e., do we need both, and if so, should we return both?
- ☐ ACTION: [Drummond Reed](#) to make a proposal for terminology for this specification based on the work of the Concepts and Terminology WG.