

# 2022-12-01 TRTF Meeting Notes

**IMPORTANT:** This is a second set of meeting notes due to problems with saving the original meeting notes to the Confluence server. The original meeting notes were for a joint meeting of the Technology Architecture TF and Trust Registry TF. That wiki page lives [here](#). However there were problems saving that wiki page due to multiple editors being active at the same time. Since it became clear in the meeting that we only had time to cover the Trust Registry TF agenda items, another copy of the meeting notes has been saved here under the title "2022-12-01 TRTF Meeting Notes".

## Meeting Date & Time

- 10 Nov 2022 This Task Force holds TWO meetings weekly every Thursday at the following times (to cover global time zones - see the [Calendar of ToIP Meetings](#)):
  - NA/EU 07:00-8:00 PT / 14:00-15:00 UTC
  - APAC 18:00-19:00 PT / 02:00-03:00 UTC

## Zoom Meeting Recordings

- NA/EU Meeting: <TBD>
- APAC Meeting: <TBD>

## Attendees

### NA/EU Meeting

- [Darrell O'Donnell](#)
- [Drummond Reed](#)
- [Christine Martin](#)
- [Andor Kesselman](#)
- [Neil Thomson](#)
- [Antti Kettunen](#)
- [Daniel Bachenheimer](#)
- [Mattia Zago](#)
- [Jacques Latour](#)
- [Matteo Midena](#)
- [Allan Thomson](#)
- [sankarshan](#)
- [Tim Bouma](#)
- [Wenjing Chu](#)
- [Allan Thomson](#)
- [Andor Kesselman](#)

### APAC Meeting

- [Darrell O'Donnell](#)
- [Drummond Reed](#)

## Main Goals of this Meeting

- 1) Establish new policy RE moving general announcements to the plenary TSWG meetings
- 2) Technology Architecture TF work review
- 3) Trust Registry TF work review
- 4) Group work on highest priority items

## Agenda Items and Notes (including all relevant links)

Time	Agenda Item	Lead	Notes
------	-------------	------	-------

2 m in	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Start recording</li> <li>• Welcome &amp; antitrust notice</li> <li>• Introduction of new members</li> <li>• Agenda review</li> </ul>	Chairs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Antitrust Policy Notice:</b> <i>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.</i></li> <li>• New Members: none</li> </ul>
1 m in	Announcements	All	<p><i>We will no longer be doing general announcements at Task Force meetings — those will be reserved for the plenary TSWG bi-weekly meeting. This will give us more time to do the work of the TF.</i></p> <p><b>DECISION:</b> At Task Force meetings, we will skip doing general announcements at the start of the meeting and instead encourage them to be shared either: 1) at the bi-weekly Technology Stack Working Group meeting, OR 2) at the end of the meeting <i>if there is time</i>.</p>
2 m in	Review of previous action items	Chairs	<p><input type="checkbox"/> ACTION: <a href="#">Drummond Reed</a> will close <a href="#">issue #44</a> by checking with LF counsel Scott Nicholas as to what license should be stated in the LICENSE.MD file.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Scott is preparing an answer for Drummond.</li> </ul> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ACTION: Drummond Reed to begin a draft of a blog post announcing release of the Public Review Draft of the TAS.</p>
1 0 m ins	Tech Architecture Task Force Work Review	<a href="#">Drummond Reed</a> and/or <a href="#">Wenjing Chu</a>	<p>Review work items on the ToIP Technology Architecture V1.0 Specification (TAS) that require group participation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• open items</li> <li>• close items as feasible</li> <li>• new work?</li> </ul> <p>NA/EU Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allan asked about what is our track to interoperability. Should we look at the list of component specs that actually need interoperability?</li> <li>• Darrell explained that we were proposing to share this time slot simply because there is intense interest in trust registry work and we started it here at ToIP.</li> <li>• <a href="#">Michael Palage</a> shared that he joined the group because he feels that trust registry work is critical to interoperability work.</li> <li>• <a href="#">Neil Thomson</a> felt that the biggest issue is lack of alignment by non-tech (governance) players on committing to interop, which causes a problem tech can't solve.</li> <li>• <a href="#">Drummond Reed</a> noted that there is also the question of whether ToIP is going to start a separate Interoperability WG.</li> <li>• <a href="#">Wenjing Chu</a> wondered if having separate meetings or alternating meetings might be more effective.</li> <li>• Secondly, Wenjing thinks the question of whether the use of a trust registry is necessary or the best way to handle the question.</li> <li>• <a href="#">Tim Bouma</a> said, "Mission accomplished on the issuer/holder/verifier model with digital credentials. The piece that is missing is the trust registry component. We need to equip policy makers to understand this new piece."</li> <li>• <a href="#">Antti Kettunen</a> agreed with Tim. The trust registry piece — and governance in general — needs attention.</li> </ul>

10m	Trust Registry Task Force Work Review	Darrell O'Donnell and/or Antti Kettunen	<p>Review work items that require group participation</p> <p>First, we had a call for volunteers to join <a href="#">Darrell O'Donnell</a> in leading the Trust Registry TF. <a href="#">Antti Kettunen</a> had already volunteered in a previous meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Andor Kesselman</a> volunteered to be a third lead.</li> </ul> <p>DECISION: The leads of the Trust Registry TF will be <a href="#">Darrell O'Donnell</a>, <a href="#">Antti Kettunen</a>, and <a href="#">Andor Kesselman</a>.</p> <p>We then went into a discussion about starting up the work of the Trust Registry Task Force.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Jacques Latour</a> I could do a brief presentation at next meeting on our progress so far on Trust Registry terminology definition with DIACC, I'm leading the TR WG and we kind of agreed on top down on the scope of a TR and TR ecosystem (need DIACC approval) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* what registration and scope <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Requirement: Global interoperability &amp; unique identifiers</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• <a href="#">Andor Kesselman</a> spin up a repo and start a discussion : "the definition of trust"</li> <li>• <a href="#">Allan Thomson</a> said that we needed to start out by reaching agreement on high level requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ how are requirements manifested</li> <li>◦ Trust Registry: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ major security considerations</li> <li>▪ identity mindset, not security mindset</li> <li>▪ how will you use the technology in a secure ecosystem.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• <a href="#">Antti Kettunen</a> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Terminology is critical (RE: Jacques point above)</li> <li>2. How trust registries are the Interfaces at layer 4. Determining where and when we are interfacing with trust registries is critical. So we need to understand where our boundaries might be.</li> <li>3. Trust registries are the actual glue between Tech &amp; Governance stack &amp; different ecosystems, like industry-ecosystems, eIDAS, etc. I personally believes this is going to be a bigger topic than just "let's have trust registries". TR's are the glue also to policy.</li> </ol> </li> <li>• <a href="#">Darrell O'Donnell</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Requirements to TAS: A new lens for Trust Registries</li> <li>◦ What are interactions between members between trust networks.</li> <li>◦ Trust registries / Chains of trust</li> <li>◦ Credential registries : generalization of trust registries   BC 4 years ago</li> <li>◦ <a href="https://docs.google.com/document/d/1TU1jXzwCG4B0dA0f8KxIW0aJSYKc8tlYaMYh9dljnsng/edit#heading=h.yh6b52esd20m">https://docs.google.com/document/d/1TU1jXzwCG4B0dA0f8KxIW0aJSYKc8tlYaMYh9dljnsng/edit#heading=h.yh6b52esd20m</a></li> </ul> </li> <li>• <a href="#">Tim Bouma</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ First principles <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Prefers to use Public Registrar instead of TR</li> <li>▪ Currently this is Tim's main concern</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• <a href="#">Drummond Reed</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ +1 to Allan's point about taking a security mindset as much as an identity mindset</li> <li>◦ We need to look at trust registry topics now through the lens of the TAS. It will make it much clearer where trust registries sit and what interfaces they need to expose to whom, both within and across digital trust ecosystems.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <a href="#">Allan Thomson</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ We must recognize that our solutions MUST integrate with the security models already in place today</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <a href="#">Andor Kesselman</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Trust is a very maleable concept. It is not necessarily binary. He is interested in dynamic trust decisionmaking, that takes into account multiple inputs.</li> <li>◦ Use case: rural village with a local trust network. and no internet.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <a href="#">Antti Kettunen</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Trust can also be a community concept, where digital trust ecosystems function as communities where you can get multiple trust inputs. However that mechanism is hard to recognize in many policies today, except for cases like voting. So we need to figure out if community-trust is a use case within Credential ecosystem, or a TR function.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <a href="#">Andor Kesselman</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ "FWIW: DIF has been working on the semantics and technicals <a href="https://identity.foundation/trust-establishment/">https://identity.foundation/trust-establishment/</a> for those that want to learn more about it".</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <a href="#">Judith Fleenor</a> about the collaboration with DIF: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ LICENSE is the same</li> <li>◦ MOU is in process now but should be done within a week.</li> <li>◦ We need to work out how we want to work together.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <a href="#">Darrell O'Donnell</a> had concerns about DIF viewpoint on being narrower as compared with ToIP TR.</li> </ul>
25m	Decisions regarding the two TFs going forward	All	<p><b>DECISION: We will establish separate meetings — either at different times, or alternating bi-weekly meetings — for the Technology Architecture TF and the Trust Registry TF.</b></p> <p>ACTION: <a href="#">Darrell O'Donnell</a> to send out a Doodle poll for ad hoc working sessions for the Trust Registry TF (at both NA/EU and APAC-friendly times) for the next couple weeks.</p> <p>ACTION: <a href="#">Andor Kesselman</a> to coordinate with DIF and TOIP to figure out the process to collaborate and send some proposals.</p> <p>ACTION: <a href="#">Drummond Reed</a> sets up a Slack DM with the the leads of both the Technology Architecture TF and the Trust Registry TF to figure out how the TRTF time slot is chosen &amp; other things.</p>
5m	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review decisions /action items</li> <li>• Planning for next meeting</li> </ul>	Chairs	

## Decisions

- **DECISION:** We will establish separate meetings — either at different times, or alternating bi-weekly meetings — for the Technology Architecture TF and the Trust Registry TF.

## Action Items

- ☐ ACTION: [Darrell O'Donnell](#) to send out a Doodle poll for ad hoc working sessions for the Trust Registry TF (at both NA/EU and APAC-friendly times) for the next couple weeks.
- ☐ ACTION: [Andor Kesselman](#) to coordinate with DIF and TOIP to figure out the process to collaborate and send some proposals.
- ☐ ACTION: [Drummond Reed](#) sets up a Slack DM with the the leads of both the Technology Architecture TF and the Trust Registry TF to figure out how the TRTF time slot is chosen & other things.