BGIN Inaugural Meeting

9 March 2020, 13:00 - 15:00 pm UTC

Summary and Action Points

1.	Welcome remarks
Summary	**[Manifest and ToR]** After **Member A** introduced draft Manifest and ToR, **Member B** stated that the Manifesto should contain more specific examples of who we are asking to participate so that relevant stakeholders can actually take action. **Member C** argued that careful wording and explanations are required not to exclude stakeholders, not in the list. **Member D** emphasized the importance of identifying specific areas of interest (e.g. privacy) and making mention of stakeholder groups in such issues, rather than being overly prescriptive. **[Name of the group]** **Member E** expressed a concern about the word "Governance" as certain people of cryptocurrency community, especially Bitcoin community, might reject the self-proclaimed governance group. **Member F** stated that making clear that it is not about governing others but about self-governance, while **Member G** added that the term governance is important, and is at the heart of what this initiative to be about. **Member H** pointed out the name should be catchy and easy to pronounce. After exploring possible options (e.g. BGN suggested by **Member I**, BEGIN by **Member J**), it was agreed to use **"BGIN (Blockchain Governance Initiative Network)"**, proposed by **Member K** on Slack, as a tentative name for the press release. It aims to convey the message that it is an initiative and does not have any intention to become a governance body. **[Role and labeling of founding members]** The point of the discussion was how to choose a name that will be acceptable to both founding members and those who join later, especially high-profile people. Among others such as "Initial members" or "Research fellows", a name **"Initial contributors"** was chosen to label the current members. **[Positioning and contribution of BGIN relative to other similar activities]** **Member L** pointed out that properly explaining the initiative is important to show it's value to people (e.g., a journalist) so that they would understand what BGIN may offer them. **Member M** argued that BGIN would be something like a repository or marketplace where all of the different ideas and thoughts can be brought to the table to discuss. **Member N** said that BGIN is different from other initiatives (e.g. OECD, EC, GDF) in that its approach is more bottom-up, open and inclusive. **Member**

	O mentioned the engagement of engineers as a differentiating factor to create meaningful documents.
Action Points	- To work with **BGIN members** to polish the Manifest and ToR on Google Docs by the end of this March - To finalize the name of the group through continued discussions with **BGIN members** and interaction with **interested parties** such as open source-style engineers - To find an appropriate domain name for BG2N and ask for comments from **BGIN members** promptly - **Governance Working Group Members** to continue discussions on how to differentiate from and liaise with other initiatives (mailing list / Slack) and propose a draft plan at the next meeting
2.	**Selection of Acting Chair**
Summary	**Member A** stated that two different tasks, administrative and substantive, need to be recognized and acting chairs should be a person who is an active listener and can bring out the best in everyone. **Member B** added that having public sector or official capacity (e.g. JFSA) in the charing role would provide a great credibility gain. **Member C** suggested a council consisted of multiple members rather than a single chair, which **Member D** agreed on. **Member E** proposed to have multiple co-chairs who span different time zones. **Member F** recommended **Member G, H and I** as acting chairs and **Shin'ichiro Matsuo** and **Mai Santamaria** agreed to take the position. **Member K** proposed to have another chair from Southern sphere (e.g., Chile, Argentina Australia) and other members such as **Member L** and **M** agreed on the idea.
Action Points	- To find the right person from Chile (or Pacific Alliance countries) and give its feedback at the next meeting
3.	**Organizational and governance matters**
Summary	*[Governance Working Group]* **Member A** kicked off the discussion by pointing out some key points as follows. o What are the areas of focus and what will be the outcomes?: Maybe the first question we should address. o What should be the legal structure? o What should be the voting procedures? o How shall the organization fundraise? In terms of the governance of BGIN, **Member B** proposed to have some working groups to discuss particular issues like above and recommended **Aaron Wright** and **Shigeya Suzuki**, an expert on Internet governance, as leading members of the working group. The proposal was approved by them and other members. *[Online vs F2F meeting]*

	Given the evolving situation of Coronavirus issues, **Member C** argued that remote meeting may become a new normal and BGIN should take this opportunity to develop a meeting design for remote participation by utilizing rapidly developing technologies such as AR/VR. While members agreed on the necessity of online conference, **Member D** and **Member E** pointed out the F2F has benefits in that participants can easily exchange views and reconcile delicate issues that require some chemistry. **Members** agreed to seek for hybrid approach and discuss the meeting design at Governance Working Group.
Action Points	- To develop a draft ToR of Governance Working Group and call for participation and present the draft at the next meeting.
4.	**Call for mock-up discussion**
Summary	**Member A** stressed the importance of having a solid and narrowly focused scope for the first [non-governance] study(working) group. He said it will take around half a year to create a concrete and tangible ToR scope of the working group, during which people could solidify the processes while working in conjunction with the Governance Working Group. **Member B** proposed **Key management / Identity / Privacy** Issues as a good candidate for the first items. **Member C** supported his idea and added that these issues can be overly broad and therefore an area that is sufficiently new with space for progress should be chosen (e.g., automated key management through machine algorithm). **Member D** also suggested a policy description language, that is a balance between having policy goals and running code, as another area of focus that might be evolving. Recommended by **Member E** and **Member F** respectively, **Nat Sakimura** and **Katharina Pistor** accepted to be one of the co-conveners of the study group.
Action Points	- To develop a draft ToR of the study group and call for participation and present the draft at the next meeting
5.	**Public communication**

Summary	**Member A** gave a brief presentation on what to consider for public relations and rights management of BGIN documents, referring to IETF's case as examples.
	
	[IPR Management]
	Members unanimously agreed the importance of IPR management and the discussion points include:
	- How to legally own our documentation and allow use by the public (**Member B**)
	- Call for a legal entity and experts to sort out complicated IPR issues (**Member C, D, E, F, and G**)
	    ● Have a call for contributors after we identify key issues
	    ● Some members (**Member H, I, J**, etc.) have specific names of experts to invite
	    ● Holding non-aggression exploratory round-table with contributors (e.g. IP lawyer in Ireland) might be a good idea

	- The idea to create a blockchain patent pool (**Member K and L**)
	    ● Rights in contribution like IETF may not be enough as many blockchain patents have been filed and issued
	    ● A repository that could hold legal rights to protect all parties
	- Should we deal with IP in a separate working group or as part of the Governance working group? (**Member M**)
	    ● Two layers: IP protection mechanism for BGIN itself and IPR issues in decentralized financial systems
	    ● **Member N** suggested having the discussion on the first layer in a part of the Governance working group
	
	[Tomorrow's press release]
	Member O proposed to add a sentence to describe the legitimacy of Japan (e.g. G20, hacking incidents).

Action Points	- To start an online discussion to develop the BGIN IPR protection mechanism as a part of the tasks of the Governance working group and propose a draft plan at the next meeting. - To finalize the press release before the press briefing on March 10
6.	**Next steps**
Summary	**Member A** explained about tomorrow's BG2C online panel session in which Member A will announce the establishment of BGIN. He also told that most of BG2C session was postponed to April. **Member B** talked about her plan to host the "Block #1" meeting in Dublin in this Autumn.
Action Points	- To start discussions on the "Block #1" meeting design and create a draft by the next meeting. - To decide the next meeting date and share it with BGIN members through mailing-lists and Slack
7.	**Any other businesses**
Summary	- Introduction an acting assistant
Action Points	(None)