

FDC3 - April 10th, 2018 Minutes

Attendees:

Victor Rodriguez, Adaptive
Mike Stevenson, Adaptive
William Shotton, Algomi
Nikhil Doshi, Barclays
Alexei Samonov, BGC
Anvar Karimson, BGC
John Valois, BlackRock
John Magdaleno, Broadway Technology
Terry Thorsen, ChartIQ
Christopher McGuire, Citadel
Zeno Lee, Cloud9
Kayton Parekh, CMG
Iuri G, CMG
Stamo Hadjiyski, CMG
Slava Kryukov, DB
Dan Riley, FactSet
Jason Dennis, FactSet
Johan Sandersson, FactSet
Dylan Praul, FinTech Studios
Mark Dennis, Fidessa
Stephen Murphy, Genesis Global
Frank Tarsillo, IHS Markit
Bart Vanpraag, IHS Markit
Jonathan Teper, JPM
Ben Lis, LEI Smart
Michael Sacks, OpenDoor LLC
Nick Kolba, OpenFin
Espen Overbye, OpenFin
Chuck Danielsson, OpenFin
Oris Forcade, RBC
Ryan Laszlo, Savanet
Eric Linder, Savanet
Katherine Jones, Thomson Reuters
Saori Fotenos, Thomson Reuters
Joseph Ahearn, Trading Screen
Thomas Sugden, UBS
Ed Broach, Wellington
Eamonn Fanning, Wellington
Cesar Morgadinho, Westpac

Karan Jain, Westpac

App Directory Working Groups Summary

The App Directory Breakout Working Group has finalized and approved their charter, available at <https://github.com/FDC3/App-Directory>. The primary purpose of the group is to provide strong application identity and human readable names for application metadata.

FDC3 Member Jorge Santos from Thomson Reuters contributed feedback to the App Directory WG proposal with their thoughts. TR asks that you check out the proposal https://github.com/FDC3/App-Directory/blob/master/fdc3_thomsonreuters.md and provide feedback.

Main Points of Consensus:

- Directories would federate via Name Services
- Agents combine the concept of an interop Broker & App Launcher, addressable via a protocol specific URL
- Standards around Application Manifests is out of scope for the App Directory

Frank Tarsillo -> Just to clarify: on the Name Services piece, we're looking specifically @ SRV records

For an initial diagram of the app directory workflow, please see the meeting slides.

Intents WG Summary

The main focus has been the scope of the group - to what extent should standards define RPC mechanics? In the initial proposal, RPC is explicitly out of scope.

Is RPC in scope for the Intents WG? Does it belong in a separate WG?

Kat from TR -> Our requirement is not to support full RPC, what we really need is to provide continuous interoperability during a single session. We want to be able to launch an application & then interact with that application.

Slava (DB) -> We're not as interested in the mechanics of RPC, but more things like discovery by the definition of objects.

Nick (OpenFin) -> To me, this may just have to do with how we're defining & slicing working groups. It's possible that there isn't that much work around intents themselves, but just protocols that define how apps connect. The 2 main pieces that are important to me are app discovery &

app identity. A key blocker to just having plug & play rich interaction is being able to not just discover, but verify the identity of an app that wants to connect to another.

Espen (OpenFin) -> I think the next focus for the intents group would be to figure out if RPC is a separate group.

Nick (OpenFin) -> I'm hearing that the interest is not around RPC itself but enabling the mechanics that would allow discovery & RPC. I think the right place to define this would be the API working group. It makes sense to keep Context Data & Intents purely context driven. API & App Directory working groups more about the operation of these systems.

We will hold an initial group on the APIs.

Demo

A Demo of the Context Data Specification, Application Intents, & fdc3.open API was presented to the group, using GreenKey voice commands.

Savanet Contribution Proposal

Savanet is interested in contributing their financial data taxonomy to the FDC3. To be addressed today:

Does this make sense as a standard?

Does it promote interoperability?

Is this maintainable/sustainable within the FDC3?

Eric Linder from Savanet

Designed a universal taxonomy such that any other taxonomy can be mapped through it. The idea being that you can map any other taxonomy through theirs.

This was done with regard to investment bank research schemas, historical data services, buy-side model DBs, FASB/IASB principles, etc.

The taxonomy is multi level, 5 levels of detail. There is also metadata for all of the fields names & has been in use for over a decade.

For mapping through ->

Savanet Element -> Mapping Formula -> Through to TR/Bloomberg/Morningstar Data

Enables side by side comparison

Nick (OpenFin) -> One use case would be enabling applications to request data from another endpoint on the desktop without advanced knowledge of the proprietary format, just referring to a standard

Saori (TR) -> In the original charter, we had explicitly talked about financial objects being out of scope. Do you consider this a financial object?

Nick (OpenFin) -> Short answer: yes. This represents in some way an expansion of scope.

Saori (TR) -> How do we think this relates to the symphony foundation?

Eric (Savanet) -> I spoke with Symphony about this, but in all honesty I don't see them being well managed. I just didn't think the foundation was going anywhere.

Johann (FactSet) -> Even though I'm the chairman, I do agree with your statement. However, the foundation is changing and it will all come together. In that sense - I would like to see this as a part of financial objects.

Eric (Savanet) -> Nothing would preclude this from being used by any group. It doesn't seem to me to matter which group shepherds it along.

Johann (FactSet) -> From my standpoint, the Symphony specific working group will be merged into a program within FinOS that will just look @ standardization among any participants in FinOS.

Nick (OpenFin) -> And if the focus there is interoperability I think it makes sense to be part of the FDC3.

Johann (FactSet) -> Then what items of FinOS is not FDC3?

Nick (OpenFin) -> There are a number of different programs that are going to be within FinOS that cover things that aren't specifically within interoperability.

Tom S (UBS) -> The taxonomies are definitely relevant to what we do here withing UBS Neo.

ACTION ITEMS:

- Review the Sava Net proposal
- Review TR Feedback
- Breakout Group Meetings