2021-06-16 Steering Committee Meeting Page - Special Topics

Meeting Schedule

- To Be Held - June 16, 2021 12:00 PM Pacific Time / 3:00 PM EST
  (PAGE STILL IN PROCESS OF BEING UPDATED)

Attendees

- Jessica Townsend (Accenture)
- Steve McCown(Anonyome Labs)
- Eva Chan (Certizen)
- Darrell O'Donnell(Continuum Loop)
- Andre Kudra(esatus)
- Michael Nettles (ETS)
- Drummond Reed(Evernym)
- Wenjing Chu(Futurewei Technologies)
- Mike Vesey (IdRamp)
- Karl Kneis(IdRamp)
- RJ Reiser(Liquid Avatar)
- Jim St.Clair(Lumedic)
- Bryn Robinson-Morgan (Master Card)
- Daniel Hardman(SICPA)

Guest

- Marie Wallace(IBM - Steering Committee member, to be approved at next Plenary)
- Judith Fleenor(ToIP - Meeting Convener)
- Sumiran Garg (Guess Speaker)

Agenda TBD

Time	Item	Lead	Notes
2 min	Welcome & Antitrust Policy Notice & Agenda Review	Judith Fleenor	
10 min	Business and Revenue Analysis Review	Sumiran Garg	
15 min	Discussion and Q&A - Business Analysis Next Steps	Judith Fleenor	
10 min 2 min	Discussion - Criteria for brining New Projects into ToIP and Retiring Task Forces - Interoperability for GHP What's Next	Judith Fleenor	
5 min	Communications Committee Update	Judith Fleenor	
3 min	Next Plenary Meeting - What's on Deck	Judith Fleenor	
	Open Discussion	J Fleenor & All	

Presentation/Documents

06162021 Steeri...pic Meeting.pdf

ToIP - Business and Revenue Analysis - Observations.pdf - based on Sumiran's interviews with Steering Committee members.

Recording

- ***Link***

Notes

Welcome & Antitrust Policy Notice & Agenda Review

Darrell O'Donnell commented that based on the recent urgent PR release request, do we need to look we might want to look at the communications committee protocols?

Judith Fleenor said that will be discuss as a part of the commination's committee updates.

Business and Revenue Analysis Review

See attached document above.

Sumiran gives a snapshot demo of a New Member to ToIPs experience trying to find where to engage.

The main points:

- For a new member, the wiki does not tell you what to do.
- A one pager orientation on how to engage would be useful.
  If you are interested in X, WG Y would be good for you? If you have X skills, your contributions would be helpful in Y Task Force? Etc.
- Many of the working group pages are out of date or missing information.

Sumiran's recommendation from the document above:

SC members to meet and discuss the following:

1. What does ToIP stand for and what is the vision which can be understood by people outside this community?
2. Create three well defined achievable objectives for 2021 with deliverables associated with them and maintaining the confluence wiki at par with the on-going work.
3. Which WG will be working on those objectives and what deliverable will they produce?
4. Marketing & education on both the vision/objectives and how people/ companies can contribute towards making it happen.

Make this entire exercise as only 2 week sprint with additional one week of consensus gathering.

At that point membership benefits and revenue generation can be revisited as the basics would be clearly articulated.

Discussion and Q&A - Business Analysis Next Steps

Jim St.Clair This is excellent and in alignment with some of the concerns I've had. I think as an independent observer your analysis gives us a lot to work with.

Drummond Reed It's painful, but it true. It's help to have a fresh prospective with fresh eye saying "Hey pay attention to this." Our steady grow with people coming it has anesthetized us to the fact that it is not so easy to figure these things out. I appreciate the information, even though it's a little like and "ice bath" it's needed.

Mike Vesey: I agree with a Drummond and I think we're way too close to the fire, all of us and so, having outside someone like Sumiran come in and and look from an outside perspective is the most valuable thing to us right now right. If new people are coming and looking to join the Foundation and they can't make sense of the message they're reading, then you know we're drawing dead, so I think it's a great analysis and I look forward to learning from it and trying to build a better process because ToIP is such a fundamental building block of all of our businesses. As you know it's drawing a lot of new interest into our Community and so it's it's imperative that we get this right, so i'm very happy that this exercise is going on.

Karl Kneis Yeah well we're certainly good at getting people to join it's getting them to do anything once they get here that's the problem. So to me what's fascinating is you have what 200 companies and maybe a less than 1% participation rate that's a failure and we keep saying we're doing such a great job, but we're not. And it's really refreshing to see this perspective, and I think encouraging to collaborate on these problems and I think we also have some dangerous nooks and crannies like. There's at least one task force I'm aware of that position itself is focusing on open source deliverables, that's not. And I don't have any elegant compliance requirements to regulate that with.

Karl Kneis Also, even the mechanics of this group needs to be I think reviewed right because i've seen any number of decisions appear a fait accompli. You know, without much socialization in discussion. My final point is all things that we're doing should be somehow anchored to the voice of the larger community in every step. We had that survey of the Community, but we never had the data come back on that we never socialized that data, but we should be serving surveying the Community, a lot more because whatever the Community came here for, they're not getting, because they're not participating.

Wenjing Chu Thanks Sumiran. It seem to be highlighting thing that were offered directly and now is manifesting as true. I would like to maybe call more attention to the first point, which is our mission and who we are. I think if I got that question, I'd know what the correct answer outta to be, but I'm not sure that answer is reflecting what we actually spending time on. Day to day it doesn't seem like what we are working on relates directly to the mission, and maybe that's part of the issue. Therefore, it would be good for us to just go back to that mission statement and a lot of the others issues or relate to our discipline.   To be committed to the goals and track progress. A lot of initiative, we seem to start but we don't follow through. Some are really well thought out and planned right.

It could it be because we lack of results, it could it be many reasons, but I think if we commit to that methodology, we will figure out where those reasons are and maybe you know which some kind of consensus of what to do with it. So that we don't feel too overwhelmed.

So I would suggest we start with the mission statement "what do we want to be" and go from there, and put some discipline and structure together perfect.

Judith Fleenor suggested a plan for creating small regional group meetings to discuss and come to concusses.

Drummond Reed Time zone based meetings that could happen over the next week, I mean I like the idea of the two week sprint. And we do have a you know, a Plenary meeting in two weeks, so it would seem like it should be reasonable to have you know those five times on meetings sometime next week, if they can be timezone specific. And then the focus the questions, already been proposed and I like to making sure the focus is on the mission I mean what one very specific thing. I think one of our big four deliverables is a second version of the of our founding White Paper, which I had to revisit that recently and there's some pretty strong stake in the ground about what we are about and what we are producing. So it would be, in my opinion, very efficient to have folks look and reread that White Papers, not that long and and come to those meetings prepared to go. What is right, what is wrong, what needs to change? It's not like we're out there wandering in the desert. We have a very strong stake in the ground about what the Trust or IP stack is designed to do and how we're going to grow it. We just have a much larger Community now and it is time to revisit that vision and clarify it.

Bryn Robinson-Morgan I think we need to we're start with number four, so what, what are the questions that we want to address and then figure out how we're going to address them. One thing that I would say, I think that there's great stuff that's in the vision paper and the mission paper. The thing that I don't think that we're addressing that I think that we really need to address it. What what's the elevator pitch for the members of the steering committee when they go to their respective organizations and say it's time to renew our membership when it comes down to the cold hard cash what what's the message that I go to. My budget holders with my executive to say, this is why we should renew being a steering committee member of trust over IP for the next year and I think if we don't address that then the rest of it becomes kind of irrelevant.

Judith Fleenor Presented that a Google Shared document with suggested questions to discuss will be set out tomorrow and if you have input on the questions that small regional groups will be focusing on, to note them in that document. So all the small groups will be working from the same set of questions for concusses when they gather.

Karl Kneis Discussed that beyond this two week sprint with should have a continues improvement process that we're engaged in as stewards of the Community. Karl again pointed to what happened to the community survey data adding. I want to know what the majority thanks I don't really want to know what the minority thinks anymore i'm frankly exhausted with it.

Karl Kneis I also agree with Bryn Robinson-Morgan point we darn well need an elevator pitch that we're all going to at least agree to in the short term, and maybe that's a good, you know goal for that sprint approach.

Sumiran Garg: I completely agree that this should be an ongoing process for me the two week sprint means at least achieving one milestone, instead having another task force, with the long duration.

Karl Kneis Ideally i'd like us to be doing this quarterly soul searching repositioning reacting responding to the industry and measuring how we deliver value to the Community in the industry.

Drummond Reed Karl Kneis and Marie Wallace agreed to help facilitate the regional small groups. Judith Fleenor will touch base with each of them and set-up the time and Zoom for such calls.

Discussion
 - Criteria for brining New Projects into ToIP and Retiring Task Forces
 - Interoperability for GHP What's Next

See slides for main points Judith Fleenorintroduced.

Jim St.Clair Yes, I would just think we've skirted around this before, which is whether we commit to going down the route of being a standards development organization or not, there are still processes and ISO processes that we can consider, inculcating that would address these things like when a task force is formed, when it's retired. I think in having that discussion, we've also gone back and forth on the fact that that does naturally incur a new level of bureaucracy. But it also again comes back to what we want to be when we grow up and and whether or not we want to choose to try and voluntarily inculcate some of those processes now, with an eye towards the future.

Karl Kneis   I don't want to be ISO when I grow up, please.

Darrell O'DonnellOne of the things that's come out of the good health past trust vertices work is in really needed a very simple API which we've now put under the tech stack working group, as the trust registry task force with a goal of writing a specification and documenting the API for the open source community so we've taken that one little piece of homework out.

Drummond Reed Addressing a comment in chat about the possibility of the KERI WG moving to ToIP from DIF.
So I just quickly say the answer the question about why the KERI working group that's currently a DIF would like to come to trust or repeat is very complex. But at a very high level it's very easy to say, they believe that they have a higher level of alignment and synergy with trust over IP. than they do with DIF, but they're also small bunch of important members differences in our membership policies and so it's it's just not an easy or short answer it would take us the whole rest of this quality get through it, so I just wanted to say that much. If you have further questions, talk direclty to Sam, who is the chair of the working group, or reach out to Judith Fleenor.

Karl Kneis The point of KERI is brilliant. but I don't see how it would be a working group within ToIP being a technology agnostic community, at least as of today, focused on you know again an agnostic architecture certainly could be an important part of the Community. Ideally i'd like to see things like this voted on before they happen and socialize before they're discussed, you know with the with with the Community, in this case it's already been discussed with with members of this group and not been socialized.

JudithOne of my suggestions on that area was that any group that wants to join ToIP, would always start as a Task Force and and then when we know them, if required then can promoted as from task force to working group, but presenting their case to the SC.

Karl Kneis I think that's a great logical idea, but you just hit the read the problem is that then groups want to become working groups because of a promotional element to it.   Often there's no tactical benefit to it at all other than actually more bureaucracy for the Community that we all fund so. This leads into the original question about what is our why, why are we here what what is our objective, what is our our goal for next year, you know what is the function of a working group needs to be part of that I always understood it to be core elements of the stack and as the stack evolve, that would change it wouldn't change, according to the ecosystem of the day, or the new technology that day. So when I look at my enterprise customers, so I work with every day, and I say lookTrust over IP is great here's the here's all the architectural tools, you can use to help build self sovereign into your or decentralized identity into your tool set and then i'll come something like carry as a working group, where. It's completely confusing for them and sets the sets the adoption curve back five years carries a brand new technology it's not battle tested brilliant genius I know it'll be something, but we have to be a little bit more. I think careful about it again or i'm just wrong in my my observations and actually. We just build working groups to do promotional exercises for the Community.

Jim St.ClairI personally subscribe entirely to what you're saying Karl Kneis I mean nobody's asked me about KERI. I think it'd be great if it came over, but I see it as part of the Utility Foundry working group, not a working group. That's just my opinion.

Wenjing Chu I would like to add two cents here. I'd like our Community to be welcoming in one sense, so if there's a new thing we don't know about it, but you know there's good potential it seems like a no reason to reject it because you know it's now proven. However, I think if KERI is another solution that may have good potential for the Utility Layer then that seems like it should be in the Utility working group. And if a staff on as a task force, if we can help that the sub Community grow I think that's a good thing. It does not have to to be successful, all of them. We just want to think that the diversity and be accommodating. Welcoming it's a good thing to have four ToIP as well.

Karl Or does it deliver Trust. With KERI you say, well, it doesn't matter that it's not tested, what if it actually fails miserably it hurts the brand of Trust over IP.

WenjingTo cast a conclusion on something we don't you know, I personally don't quite know, and if there are people who advocate for it and it's an alternative. We're not stopping other activity right. I do not see unless we can prove this not good idea or is contradictory to our dual stack architecture, then say yes, we should exclude because it's outside of our mission. Presumably, our mission is to build the right stack, and so, if it's a component that can potentially or you know somebody proposed a new algorithm, of course any new hours and unproven. I do think we should be welcome in this case, but they have a task force and the Task Force will have deliverables, eventually they need to convince us that is why and that's part of the process.

Judith Fleenor pointed out that these are the types of discussion that we what to have in small groups, so that people have time to be heard from all points of view. But we need to move on to the next agenda item. But first noted that discussion have started with regards to What' Next for the Interoperability Working Group for Good Health Pass, and if you want to be involved in those conversations reach out to the Working Group Chairs Kaliya Youngor Rebecca Distler

Drummond ReedI know we want to move on, but I do want to just a handful of things I want to correct okay. First, No one's made a decision as to KERI coming in here Second, Judith will confirm that we have had discussions about the process that would need to be followed, so i'm not happy that anyone suggesting that some decisions already been made. Third ,I know of six companies because we've gone around and counted them that would like to sponsor a carry moving into.

Judith Fleenorstressed that we need to move on in the agenda.

Communications Committee Update

Judith FleenorUpdated the Steering committee on activities going on in the Communications Sub-Committee. For details see slides.

Next Plenary Meeting - What's on Deck

Judith FleenorBrought up that at the next plenary meeting there will be a call for consensus for the GHP Blueprint, pointing out that this is a SLOT B Plenary meeting in the APAC timezone friendly time slot which means 12am EST or 9pm PT. If in the unlikely event consensus would not be reached there will be a need for a vote. In the event there is not quorum at that meeting because of the time slot, we need to have a process to take that vote. It was decided that we will keep the meeting at the time slot as scheduled. If a vote is required a tally of the votes of those in attendance will be taken and within that day, either via a second EU/US meeting to tally the rest of the vote required, or this will be done by email. Judith Fleenorto check with Seth form LF -JDF to validate procedure is acceptable.

Action items

- [ ]
- [ ]