

Thursday 21 March 2019

Attending

- Markus Sabadello
- Jonathan Holt
- Drummond Reed
- Joe Andrieu
- David Longley
- Ken Ebert
- Stephen Curren
- Dmitri Zagidulin
- Dan Burnett
- Nader Helmy
- Amy Guy
- Adrian Gropper
- Chris Boscolo
- Yancy Ribbens
- Manu Sporny

Agenda

1. Attendance and Introductions
2. How we want to operate as a subgroup of the CCG
 - a. Short-term group
 - b. Goal: a completed Community Final Draft by the end of April
 - c. Community governance: Issue resolution and closure policies; did-spec issue remediation
 - d. Weekly calls, but also use the CCG list and github issue for progress
 - e. Notes from each call sent to the CCG list
3. Discussion of priorities and agenda topics
 - a. Presentation of the above README: did-url-spec - Decentralized Identifier URL (did-url) Specification as well as the spreadsheet:
<https://github.com/mwherman2000/did-url-spec/tree/master/src> (latest numbered version)
 - b. Relationship of DID Spec and DID Resolution Spec (5 mins)
 - c. Status report from Amy/Dmitri/Manu on editorial (5 mins)
 - d. Logging new features (instead of adding them to the spec) (5 minutes)
 - e. JSON-LD context(s) (10 mins?)
 - f. ABNF Plan of Action (20 mins)

Meeting Notes

Drummond: The main focus of this group is the DID spec. Other issues should be submitted to the CCG as a new work items. We need to have direct discussions regarding issues and move items forward with a goal of closure by the end of April. Amy and Dmitri have done a tremendous amount of editorial work.

Topic #1: Agenda

Drummond: Normally we will agree on the agenda items. (see above). Any additional items for the agenda? I'll add status report to the agenda.

Jonny: What is the status of the DID working group?

Drummond: The CCG is responsible. We want to be able to hand off the DID spec when the working group is formed.

... Any additional topics? I'll set time guidelines for topics.

... Prioritization of topics (see agenda above).

Topic #2: Presentation of the README deferred to second call

Topic #3: Relationship of the DID Spec and the DID Resolution Spec

Markus: The DID Spec covers DID identifier syntax, the abstract data model of DID Documents, and concrete syntaxes (e.g. JSON-LD).

The DID Resolution deals with how to go from a DID using the method to arrive at the DID document.

Drummond: DNS is an example of a specification that combines the URI and the resolution.

... The DID Resolution Spec arose out of the need to have a separate specification to address the details of how to achieve this.

Dan: I know Markus understands the difference between the idea that resolution does not always result in a document. Dereferencing has multiple actions associated with it. The key is that resolution is about getting the rules, policies, etc. for dereferencing a resource, while dereferencing is about taking an action on a resource. The default action may be to return something, but we should be careful not to always assume that dereferencing means to return a document. In particular, the "resource" here is not necessarily defined (yet) to be a DID document.

Manu: here's [the link for the DID Working Group](#) Charter.

Drummond: The DID resolution group has already had several calls. Slides are available to distinguish between resolution / dereferencing.

Manu: It's basically use cases and syntax. When we feel like the DID Resolution has at least 2 implementations and we are ready to work on it, we can start on a standardization effort.

Drummond: More discussion?

Jonny: Where do we draw the line between the format and the serializations? We need common ground that we are going to transform into JSON / JSON+LD.

Manu: Ted always says "It's a data model. Not protocol." The protocol is out of scope for the VCWG; it is in scope for CCG.

Jonny: I think if we state it clearly that we are formulating it in JSON/JSON+LD

Joe: There are protocolish things who will be using the data models that can be captured in the use cases.

Drummond: Data model/serializations: DID Spec is a data model and one serialization.

Jonny: I can work with that.

Drummond: I think that is sufficient for our current work.

Dan: Protocol work can happen in W3C, but we are chartered to not address this so that we can reach easier consensus. Protocol work can happen in other groups or later, perhaps, in this group.

Topic #4: Status Report on Editorial

Amy: We still have a large list of items to resolve. At rebooting we closed 23 issues at RWoT. Some issues have followup on Michael's issues.

Drummond: Are there areas where you would like feedback?

Amy: Not right now. The Intro and abstract sections will be overhauled. Some content will be moved to other documents. A PR is coming.

Drummond: As someone responsible for early content, I give you license to pare the spec down to more proper content.

Amy: I will edit with greater confidence. ;)

Drummond: Our goal is to have the explanatory document, with Ken and Dan, by IIW.

Topic #5: Logging New Features Instead of Adding Them to the Spec

Manu: We will have a few calls to clean up the spec on its path to the WG. During the meetings of the DID WG will also be a time to request new features. Please log the issue in the issue tracker for current CCG work or for the DID WG to discuss. We want to focus on editorial cleanup on the current spec. The issue, if critical, can also be added to the spec now for future consideration. If we follow these guidelines it will make the editors' job easier.

Manu, please add link here to the issue tracker:

Drummond: I know that some obvious future features could be added to the list.

Topic #6: JSON-LD Contexts

Drummond: There are questions regarding JSON-LD contexts in the VCWG. Do all of the issues surrounding contexts applicable here?

Manu: Yes, we have the same set of conversations as the VCWG. If we make the same decisions, all of the concerns could be addressed in the same manner. Such as "What is the final URL for the VC Credential context?" We can decide that the string is the identifier without the deep concerns for centralized control. Regarding immutability, it is OK to hard code or locally cache the files or build them into the application. Content-based addressing or hash-links are also possible solutions. As long as we use the same methods for resolving these issues as the VCWG, we should be ok.

Yancy: Re: contexts not being centralized, in the VCWG is the context is mandatory?

Manu: The string is mandatory, but you don't have to retrieve the context from the network, you can cache it or build it into the application because it is not supposed to change. In the event of something catastrophic happening, the community can resolve to use a standard definition instead.

Jonny: If there is an issue of trusting that URL, why not just define its contents?

Manu: It helps the generic JSON-LD processors continue to function. It is less disruptive to the rest of the web. It allows those who want it at a URL and those who want it immutable, to both be happy.

Jonny: I can live with that.

Topic #7: Closed Github Issues

Micheal: Can items that were closed in editing without resolution be re-opened?

Amy: There were a few that closed. Github needs to be adjusted to allow the person who entered the issue to re-open it if they feel it was not properly handled. My apologies, I thought

the issues had been addressed. I'll re-open those that need to be.

Michael: We need full discussion.

Drummond: What is "full discussion"?

Michael: Consensus is different than majority rule. Most issues were handled well. A few with specific unaddressed comments should be reopened.

Action Items

AMY: Re-open issues that have been closed so they can be fully discussed.