

WPTF 2021-02-18 Meeting

Meeting Schedule

- Thursday February 18th, 2021 10:00 to 11:00 am EST / 3:00 to 4:00 pm UTC / 7:00 to 8:00 am PST

Location

Join Zoom Meeting <https://zoom.us/j/99527911892?pwd=MEExZT2x1d0Nlb24zclBUMU56b2NPQT09>

Meeting Attendees

- Karen Hand
- sankarshan
- Eric Drury
- Drummond Reed
- Victor Golubkov
- Karl Kneis
- Jim St.Clair
- David Luchuk
- Annegret Henninger
- Carly Huitema

Agenda Items

Time	Item
1 min	Welcome & Antitrust Policy
2 min	Introduction of new members
1 min	Agenda Review
5 min	Opportunities of Decentralized Resource Identifiers in the Research Landscape – Dr. Carly Huitema
10 min	Drafting – “Introduction to Trust over IP” white paper (V2) <ul style="list-style-type: none">Drafting – “Digital Trust Marketplace FAQ”
5 min	Coordination/integration of the new ToIP graphic
5 min	Concepts and Terminology WG – Definition of white paper
5 min	Update – Meeting with Communications Committee – Feb 5, 2021
10 min	Update – Meeting with David Luchuk - IP
15 min	Update – Meeting with WG Chairs and Co-Chairs – Feb 10, 2021
1 min	Next Steps

Recording

- [Meeting Recording](#)

Agenda & Discussion Notes

- 10 members joined the call
- Update on the [Opportunities of Decentralized Resource Identifiers in the Research Landscape](#) white paper - Carly Huitema
 - Updates include change in language concerning build vs design
 - Table entry at top of document to capture metadata and document control
 - Provided abstract summary
 - Next steps – final deliverable approval by EFWG
 - ToIP community provided opportunity to work with experts to produce this white paper – would not have happened without this support
- Update on [ToIP WP0010: Introduction to ToIP White Paper](#) - David Luchuk
 - Ideas presented in WP need to be revised to reflect current activities and experiences and to reference deliverables that will be finalized over the next month, (e.g., TSSs, interop specifications and design principles)
 - Priority need for community to contribute to this deliverable and framed as important opportunity for all to engage – tied across all WGs and requires time and effort by all members

- c. [Drummond Reed](#) – origins of white paper based on single document, [Aries Hyperledger RFC](#) as there was need to publish definition of the ToIP stack, need for reference and basis of ToIP charter, given legal requirement to define scope of work as a Linux Foundation, Joint Development Foundation (JDF)
- d. Current misconception - ToIP tied to Hyperledger Aries. Although Charter includes definition of the technology stack, the Charter also includes recognition of technology stack succession (e.g., ToIP - native definition), at which point the original publication ([Aries Hyperledger RFC](#)) will be superseded by four documents (e.g., to include specifications/overall architecture of the two sides of the stack), specifically:
 - i. [ToIP WP0010: Introduction to ToIP White Paper](#)
 - ii. Design Principles for the Trust Over IP Stack –refer to [ToIP Stack Design Principles Task Force](#)
- e. There is a need for the community to contribute and provide point of view concerning communication about the stack, descriptions, examples...as it is this white paper will be the most widely read and first introduction to Trust Over IP
- f. Discussion
 - i. [Karen Hand](#) - will there be access to Intro WP outside GitHub?
 - ii. [Drummond Reed](#)- yes with a preference for Google docs, ask WPTF to set up and host
 - iii. [Karl Kneis](#) - will be important to have Foundation wide consensus (all WG's) concerning design principles
 - iv. [David Luchuk](#) – need for Foundation wide approval for WP
 - v. [Karl Kneis](#) – would like to see more clarity and alignment to ensure collective understanding of ToIP – concerned there might be disconnect between wider community members and WGs. Need one clear vision to take to market and industry
 - vi. [Drummond Reed](#) – Yes, the Design Principles white paper will require extra wide review as it is a Foundation wide paper
 - vii. [David Luchuk](#) – I am current lead to set up and provide engagement/collaboration, paper still requires a framework (e.g., annotated tables of contents) - work will be open, transparent and accessible
- 4. Coordination/integration of new ToIP graphic – @Drummond
 - a. Communication Committee working with graphic artist to updated technology stack graphic, and now have ability to serve as an interactive teaching tool
 - b. Complimentary to logo/look and feel we have now
- 5. Concepts and Terminology WG – [Definition of white paper](#) - [Karen Hand](#)
 - a. Was submitted to CTWG - change to definition to be more broadly and not specific to ToIP
 - b. Request was made for WPTF member to liaise with CTWG as they are developing a rendering tool (to enable pop up definitions of any terms from ToIP corpus on web version of white papers – hover and click resource)
 - c. [Drummond Reed](#) – role of liaison does not require technological expertise, importance for functionality and usage. Tooling will be a markdown process of the final pdf versions of white papers.
- 6. Update – Meeting with Communications Committee – Feb 5, 2021 – [Karen Hand](#)
 - a. First conversation with Communication Committee regarding WP needs from CC and WPTF
 - b. Will be future discussions
- 7. Update – Ecosystem IP and AntiTrust Policy - [David Luchuk](#)
 - a. Refer to presentation made to [EFWG meeting on February 11, 2021](#)
 - b. Contributions to ToIP fall under Creative Commons 4.0
 - c. Understand there is liability protection for any member(s) who contribute deliverables to ToIP
 - d. [David Luchuk](#) –a number of important follow up questions have been identified and will be shared with legal department and Linux Foundation to ensure clarity (e.g., liability, external presentations to WGs, sharing of ideas and not deliverables)
 - e. [Karen Hand](#) – Recognition of concerns from smaller initiatives and subsequent discussions within EFWG and WPTF around sharing of ideas and hesitation to engage with EFWG. Was point made by Karl, how to reframe as a positive action.
 - f. [Karl Kneis](#) – initially seen as a legal issue, however there is the bigger issue of how contributing to OS can help support larger objectives especially for a smaller provider. There is a need to understand how to forward commercial objectives of smaller providers while still contributing to OS community. There is an opportunity here.
 - g. [David Luchuk](#) – small vendor making a presentation within a WG or TF with no intention of making a contribution is a question for follow up with Linux Foundation and will be brought back to EFWG
- 8. Update – Meeting with WG Chairs and Co-Chairs – Feb 10, 2021 – [Karen](#)
 - a. Review of key deliverables and process as well as WPTF as collaboration hub
 - b. Was wider discussion on use of Gates and GitHub Deliverables Portal
 - c. Close to having consensus on WP deliverables process, more discussion is needed
 - d. [David Luchuk](#) – Concerning Deliverables Portal and WP Portal – we are close to alignment
 - e. Comments
 - i. [Annegret Henninger](#) - would like to see more discussion on publications of white papers and what white papers need to be written
 - ii. [Karen Hand](#) – are standards and best practices for WPs. There is also a need to ensure WP deliverables align with current ToIP approval process. Moving forward, need to focus on delivering WPs for publication
 - iii. [Karl Kneis](#) – it is clear there is a gap in understanding across community concerning the WPs in proposal. Next meeting need to address entering WPs into Deliverables Portal. Need transparency for all good activity being done on WPs.
 - 1. Need to bring to resolution CCI Governance Framework was issued for review, needs to come to resolution (WPTF or not?), is core deliverable for EFWG. As well, WP authored by [Rieks Joosten](#) for was opened for public review, needs to be resolved along with the [ToIP WP0020: Digital Trust Market Place FAQ](#). These deliverables need to be brought home.

Decisions & Action Items

- ☐ Review of [Opportunities of Decentralized Resource Identifiers in the Research Landscape](#) in preparation for EFWG final approval
- ☐ WPTF to provide and host access to [ToIP WP0010: Introduction to ToIP White Paper](#) - call for all members to contribute
- ☐ WPTF to provide and host access to [ToIP WP0020: Digital Trust Market Place FAQ](#) currently residing in GitHub WP Portal
- ☐ Appoint liaison to CTWG to provide functionality/usability input for Rendering Tool
- ☐ Opportunity - Provide clarity and greater understanding how to consider commercial objectives of smaller providers while still providing contributions to OS community
- ☐ Alignment of WP deliverables process and Deliverables Portal
- ☐ Need to update Deliverables Portal with current proposed WPs

□ Bring to resolution CCI Governance Framework review, [ToIP WP0020: Digital Trust Market Place FAQ](#) and proposed WP by [Rieks Joosten](#)