DECENTRALIZED IDENTITY FOUNDATION

OPERATING ADDENDUM APR 2021 (GRANTS)

1. Grants Programs

   1.1. Purpose and overview: DIF wants to administer small grants to allow transparent and public incentivization of open-source work benefiting the whole community. The following process outlines the procedure for administering these.

      1.1.1. **Funding constraints**: Funding must be made available for DIF to define and run the challenge. Only DIF member organizations and/or the Steering Committee are allowed to create a challenge.

      1.1.2. **Submission constraints**: all work submitted for a challenge (whether accepted or not) must be donated to DIF and have no contributors or dependencies disallowed by the challenge terms. Donation targets/standards tracks other than DIF may be specified by a challenge as appropriate (i.e. CCG, HyperLedger, IETF, etc), although the work contract should first be donated to DIF, even if DIF will continue the work to another organization afterwards.

   1.2. Process:

      1.2.1. **Funding Commitment.** A funding source, which can be the Steering Committee in its budgeting capacity and/or any DIF member organization and hereafter referred to as "DONOR", can **propose** a scope for a DIF challenge. This challenge within that scope can be written and executed by the Steering Committee, the Technical Steering Committee or any standing IPR-protected working group of the organization, hereafter the challenge "OWNER".

      1.2.2. **Pre-Challenge.** A donor should select an owner and set for them a one-paragraph description of the goals or scope within which they should define a challenge (see in particular section "Work" below). This scope should not be overly specific, prescriptive, or substantially favor the business agenda of any one DIF member (including the donor) over others. They should also set a timeline upfront that includes deadlines for all the following steps. This timeline can be quite hard to alter once set into motion.

1.2.3. **Challenge**. An OWNER has a set period of time to return to the DONOR an acceptable challenge definition, a written document (see appendix, 2. Challenge Template). An owner may require a review of the challenge by the Steering Committee or Technical Steering Committee before accepting it, if they allocate an appropriate amount of time.

1.2.4. **Approval.** One to three weeks should be allotted to negotiate or fine-tune the challenge if the Donor (or Steering Committee or Technical Steering Committee) require changes to the challenge. Once approved, Donor should initiate a contract with DIF, that describes the method of payment and timelines.

1.2.5. **Publication/Grantee Selection**. Two to eight weeks should be allotted to publicize the approved challenge and gather participants. If "mini-grant" or "work item" mode was selected rather than "open participation" mode by the challenge owners and donor, this period should also include the identification and pre-approval of one or more GRANTEEs to deliver the work within the time allotted. Grantees may include independent contributors or organizations.

1.2.6. **Work.** Depending on the terms set by the challenge, the GRANTEE(s) can either work privately until donation ("mini-grant" mode) or work in the open through meetings of an official work item of the working group in question ("work item" mode). If any other DIF members are participating in the work other than the GRANTEE, it is required that these meetings be not only hosted by DIF but also recorded and published for the sake of maximum transparency.

1.2.7. **Submission**. Once one or more grantees have a set of deliverables they feel meets all the mandatory requirements of the challenge, they submit these to the Technical Steering Committee. Depending on the original timeline, they have somewhere from two to six weeks to confirm satisfactory completion of the grant and request any changes. If the original challenge grants them any discretionary power for distributing the funds between multiple grantees, they may do so with or without input from the steering committee. *Note: High-level minutes about grant deliberations should be recorded in the minutes of the technical steering committee in the interest of transparency.*

2. Challenge Template*:*

2.1.   Donor(s): _____

2.2.   Challenge Owner(s): _____

    2.2.1.   If a working group, current chairs: _____

2.3.   Work can be contributed to by:
___ [pre-approved] grantee(s) only (**mini-grant** mode)
___ [pre-approved] grantee(s) with help from DIF membership (**work item** mode)
___ any eligible member* (**open bounty** mode)

2.4.   Payment options (select only one):

    2.4.1.   ___ Winner takes it all

    2.4.2.   ___ At discretion of submission judges

    2.4.3.   ___ Itemized in Success Criteria and/or Additional Details section

2.5.   Scope:

(Define a problem space, set of problems, or stakeholders whose needs are unlikely to be met otherwise, without defining one specific technical or business problem)

2.6.   Rationale for Community Benefit

(Define how this challenge benefits the whole DIF community, even if short-term benefits are unevenly distributed)

2.7.   Success Criteria:

(aka Definition of "done", test vectors, description of needed test fixtures, etc.)

2.8.   Dependency Limitations:

(are there requirements or limitations on the dependencies of submissions, or their licensing? Can a submission depend on closed-source, or copyleft-licensed libraries? Be explicit about cryptographic maturity or regulatory approval if application.)

2.9.   Additional Details Section:

*(Mention here any relevant specifications, bibliography, external criteria of success such as criteria for consideration in a registry or standards process, etc. **Please mention it here if the work contracted is expected to be reviewed or acceptable anywhere except DIF, such as standards bodies or open-source organizations**)*