Technical Steering Committee - 2025/08/27 08:27 CDT - Transcript

Attendees

Alexander Moser, Benjamin Hart, Christian Taylor, Duncan Coutts, Jonathan Kelly, Ken-Erik Ølmheim, Kevin Hammond, Neil Davies, Nicolas Biri, Terence McCutcheon

Transcript

Nicolas Biri: No.

Kevin Hammond: anything. Just wait a few minutes for people to join us.

Jonathan Kelly: Amar.

Kevin Hammond: Is there anything you want to add to the agenda? Either Robie Hi. Hi, I know just saying Neil Alex asking if there are any other items to add to the agenda.

Neil Davies: Not that I could Yeah,…

Neil Davies: we already started discussing some of them. in the chat.

Kevin Hammond: Okay, good.

Benjamin Hart: I see we're in the same office today, I'm surprised I haven't seen you yet.

Kevin Hammond: Hi. This is the Google office spin.

Benjamin Hart: I'm Extra blurry today apparently. We go. I just picture it as more of a surreal maze of fake wood paneling.

Kevin Hammond: Entire building decked out in fake wood paneling. Tax, are you acting as secretary today?

Jonathan Kelly: Check the chat.

Kevin Hammond: Second tax.

Terence McCutcheon: All right, Kevin, what was that?

Kevin Hammond: I was just asking whether you were acting as secretary today. Tax. Right.

Terence McCutcheon: Yeah, I would say I'm the standing secretary for the time being. When Lorenzo's here, you can help with, product connections, but I'm putting up the minutes and attending as the secretary in that backend capacity here. So,

Kevin Hammond:

Kevin Hammond: But I'd suggest we start the call that there may be people joining later. So this is the technical steering committee meeting of the 27th of August 2025. thank you everyone for joining. the meeting is for it. We have seven voting members by my count present and we require six. and next will be taking the minutes. So, the last item I had on the agenda was minutes and actions from the last meeting. I'm not sure we have those tags. I didn't see them. let's deal with them out of band.

Kevin Hammond: So Neil, we had discussed the VRF tiebreaker last time and you didn't want to put forward a motion last time. You wanted us to think about the situation.

00:05:00

Kevin Hammond: Do you want to pick up on the discussion from that?

Neil Davies: I think yes,…

Neil Davies: I think having thought more about what does this mean to us, I think there are a couple of points here. it's a matter of process. I mean this is a change that will change economics and potentially change has potential security implications outside has such things right and it's already been submitted as a PR so I think one of the things I would like us to discuss is which ra and that raises the thing about the standard problem with open source which is actually

Neil Davies: supply chain attacks. Okay, I'm not saying this is an attack. I'm just saying it's an example of something has been spotted which people want to talk about and so they want to basically how do we manage it? So I think I'd like to discuss what advice do we give to people and how would we like to manage that aspect of things that need deeper consideration before they put into the code because I'm desperately trying to make sure we don't end up with them stopping people progressing but I do want to if this has been started that's number one okay the second point is the issue of okay I think and I think that's actually the major point right we can it obviously has other features etc.

Neil Davies: but I think the key thing that as was pointed out in the chat somebody said all someone has to do is accept this and it's in the codebase and a change has occurred without how does the community get to invol how does the due diligence get done over it okay I think that's the main point that I come up with and we don't compress we can discuss what it actually means in terms of a bit more technical nuance

Kevin Hammond: So, let's do that. Johnny, you've raised your hand.

Jonathan Kelly: Yeah, I've dropped three links in the chat. One is directly to that pull request to your articles around it. And then I've got a quote. I said at the end of last meeting I would go around the people who are suggesting this and ask them about writing a SIP. and the response I got from one of them was…

Jonathan Kelly: then we can write the SIP. Laughy face. It's things like this that upset the community. They make the change without telling us. No zip, no nothing. And then we asked to switch it back and we're forced to jump three hoops just to represent the other

Neil Davies: Okay. Yeah,…

Neil Davies: I do that. And I think that also brings up the fact that this is the law was code question, This was never I mean I don't know if I want to have that debate because that's before we took any responsibility for this stuff.

Jonathan Kelly: No, the technical steering committee was not in effect at the time that the change It was made by the core teams directly as a result of hearing about the issue of there being bias towards smaller pools which had been in effect for over a year and a video had been made about by Andrew Westber, but none of the core team working on it were aware until it was brought up in an SPO call. and then once they heard about it, they fixed the issue and made it 50/50 properly fair.

Jonathan Kelly: But there was no SIP for that process. It was just corrected as a bug.

Neil Davies: I think he was seen as a bug at the time.

Neil Davies: That's the point though. There is a difference. Do you So, what about this issue of dealing with changes like this? I mean, my feeling is that, as we've discussed, none of us want to stop the process, but we do want to make sure that potentially contentious things get discussed before accepted. how do we think we could manage that as a process? What would our best suggestion be?

Neil Davies: Am I making sense? I mean, I'm just looking for someone to right…

Kevin Hammond: Yeah, I understand…

Kevin Hammond: what you're saying. in this case, the developer team has referred it to us because they're uncomfortable with taking a decision. Okay.

Neil Davies: which is I think. So, that's good. So, basically I think we should and I think we should somehow thank them for that. Number one.

Neil Davies: secondly I would like this to somehow be marked as awaiting a decision from right and therefore shouldn't get merged without that decision occurring right I'm just trying to say I think it's very much in the remit of the developer teams to basically say I'm uncomfortable with this and punt it up to the technical people right I think that's what we have to trust them to do, and I'm very pleased with that. Now, we got to work out how we're going to deal with it. But that's a second question. As a I think what it sounds like they got conf they were worried. They've punted it up. That's good. And I'm glad they punted it up because it has an effect on other things.

00:10:00

Neil Davies: And I think we would like to thank them for that for a start and say could they make this more formal in the sense that they should mark this as one not to be merged until it's until these issues have been resolved. somebody can't just do it by themselves. That would be my first question. Yep. that's the next question.

Nicolas Biri: Neil, when you're saying until this is resolved, what will being resolved mean here actually? Yeah. Okay.

Nicolas Biri: Okay.

Neil Davies: …

Neil Davies: and the reason why I say this is the first point is this shows the community has taken responsibility for people noticing changes that might change this stuff, that the engineering part of the community is taking care not to suboptically change the behavior of the system without due consideration. Right? I think that's important. we have to work out how to resolve it. But I'm just saying until it is resolved, it just can't be merged. That's all I'm saying.

Duncan Coutts: I was just having a quick look at the GitHub labels and there isn't obviously a label that would be appropriate for this change the specification. There's one that talks about formal specs but there isn't time for it this is a protocol change.

Neil Davies: I mean, are we going to ask them to suggest a label that they should put on it that That's the technical thing is to suggest what a label that would be clear that require that it's being on hold in some way. Okay. Thank you. Johnny

Jonathan Kelly: Yeah. Yeah. So, you're talking about getting to a resolution. last week it was loaded that there needs to be a SIP for this before it can be properly considered in a formal process. And then I said I would go and find out if that SIP existed. I found out there was a pull request with no SIP. And then you've got the response that I've already quoted, but they did say that they would write a SIP. So I think the thing to do now is to go back to the people who have put in this pull request and explicitly say that they need to go through a formal process and…

Jonathan Kelly: write a sip for

Neil Davies: Or…

Neil Davies: or perhaps a SIP is I'd like to try yet last week we were talking about this SIP seems we didn't make a decision right SIP feels like possibly a bit heavy but I've no idea at least some discussion has to be had right it purely was a suggestion for conversation I'm not trying to create process on the side here.

Jonathan Kelly: The sip suggestion I believe was yours.

Neil Davies: We were having a conversation. I'm trying to make sure we got time to think about it. Duncan

Duncan Coutts: Sorry if my audio is bad. mic issues. so Alex Esgan has done a little bit of analysis on this. he posted it on the ticket on the PR for the actual change. and going by his numbers, if I've understood what he has written correctly, then in the best case, there's a 6% expected improvement in revenue for some of the smaller pools.

Neil Davies: So I read that and was trying to work out what that bias was, right? I mean Yes.

Duncan Coutts: I've not done I mean I was expecting it to be lower than that and I've not double checked anything he's written, but Alex is usually right on these sorts of things. so it's a good ballpark figure. but I think that it still kind of corresponds to I think my general prejudice on this, which is that this is an ad hoc change. You would never design it like this in the first place, which okay, John Jonathan is why we, fixed it. I mean, I was part of the team that said, this is a bug. Let's fix it. it's not what the specs said we were supposed to be doing.

Duncan Coutts: but if you wanted and I think the way I would advise people to go is to say if you want a deliberate bias introduce a deliberate bias and make that something that's tunable right whereas this proposal is reintroduce a bug that has some change that is not controllable and is we don't know really

the full implic We haven't really analyzed the full implications of it. if you want to do it, do it deliberately. Don't do it in a strange ad hoc way that corresponds to a misinterpretation of the spec. So, I mean, what would it look like? You would introduce something deliberately through the incentives mechanism. It would have a tunable parameter.

00:15:00

Duncan Coutts: It could be set to zero or set to something nonzero that you could adjust to say how much bias do you want between big and small pools and let people argue it out as to what that ought to be but don't do it as this one random little thing that makes actually quite a small difference I mean okay 2.6 Six is not nothing, but it's not very much.

Duncan Coutts: It's a, if you wanted to do something deliberately, you'd probably want something that would let you t turn it up to something bigger than that. I think that's my view.

Nicolas Biri: and that could lead actually to the CPS versus S discussion…

Nicolas Biri: because in that case it's probably the case that you want CPS to say we want to have a different re revenue distribution between small pool and large pool and you can start having this problem statement and basically try to iterate on this and…

Nicolas Biri: there are several approach to tackle this issue and we can do this and really yeah yeah yeah that's yeah yeah yeah I totally agree yeah yeah I also agree yeah and…

Duncan Coutts: you have to actually agree that it's a problem in the first place.

Duncan Coutts: Which it's not at all obvious that it is. Some people think it's a problem that it

Nicolas Biri: to answer also the feedback that John had about the fact that we ask for a CIP while there wasn't a CIP in the first place. It's just that at some point it would be nice to have a more maturing for CIP while there wasn't any CIP in the past is actually a way to have a more matured properly in the first place that we don't need to move to more proper documentation of all decisions.

Duncan Coutts: Yeah, we're supposed to have decentralized governance now. we did not have it at the time.

Nicolas Biri: Johnny, you're on mute.

Nicolas Biri: Johnny, if you Yeah.

Jonathan Kelly: And I would just like to formally acknowledge as I said at the beginning that it was treated as a reported bug and fixed as such. So it wouldn't require CIP anyway in that scenario. But I think their concern was that it was treated as such. And from their perspective, at least in giving feedback to me, it wasn't communicated until it was fixed that they were going to fix it. So it felt like it had come up out of the blue. It was known about for over a year. It was in the community as standard knowledge and then it got fixed without people knowing it was being fixed. I think that's the perspective they're coming from, just to represent it, not to agree with

Nicolas Biri: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. and…

Duncan Coutts: That's a reasonable complaint.

Nicolas Biri: I do understand there's a problem again. Yeah. Yeah. And that's also why we need to have a more mature process and asking for CIP is part of this more mature process. I agree that it can be disappointing when you are thinking that in the first place it should have already been a seed earlier. The thing is that at some point we need to start somewhere.

Jonathan Kelly: Yes, indeed. And I will say that they did start by laughably laughing a little bit and saying then we will write the SIP. So I think they're open to the process as long as they're formally requested to go down that route.

Jonathan Kelly: So, I would suggest possibly engaging and suggesting that route starting with a problem statement.

Kevin Hammond: Yeah, I think part of the reason why the team didn't write a step, Nicola, was precisely because it was seen as a bug fix and…

Nicolas Biri: Yeah. Yeah.

Nicolas Biri: True. I mean, yeah. But even…

Kevin Hammond: the Yeah,…

Nicolas Biri: if it's a bug fix, we didn't have a seat to begin with to describe the intended behavior. So, it's basically a chicken hack problem. But I mean we need to start somewhere at some level.

Jonathan Kelly: It was part of the formal spec I think …

Nicolas Biri: Yeah. Yeah.

Jonathan Kelly: how it was going to be worked out and it was always decided that it was going to be a straight 50/50 for a slot battle and it didn't end up that way in implementation and that's where it got confused but Yeah.

Kevin Hammond: I suspect it is that the mechanism wasn't defined precisely in the formal specs. It was defined in the paper. the formal spec wouldn't have given any specifics about the tiebreaker and there would then have been an implementation that was consistent with the formal spec. Neil Neil

Neil Davies: I think it was from recollection there was a couple of paragraphs in the spec, right, which basically said, then this as tiebreaking, right? a lot of effort was put into trying to ensure that people if they were slow but not too slow and things like that. this issue of the exact mechanics of how B slot battles are won was given a lot of thought at the time and also as part of the general refinement process.

00:20:00

Neil Davies: There was a point at which the delay we penalized thing that arrive things were there was also the fact that the blocks were being produced way too late right and being inserted and causing issues which is also resolved. All of this was part of the shakedown of what was done in the first year or two from memory.

Duncan Coutts: and none of it is in the original papers because the original papers do not have any tiebreers.

Kevin Hammond: So this was something that was discovered in the implementation that needed to be defined and

Duncan Coutts: Chains of equal length are equally good in the original papers.

Neil Davies: What? it was known that a set of definitions were research analysis was done of the effect of these decisions. because actually we had to make decisions to move forward in time.

Neil Davies: And this remains a small niggle in

Duncan Coutts: We did check that the researchers agreed that adding additional things to the chain ordering did not have security implications…

Duncan Coutts: but we did not check about incentives. and the basic reason why it doesn't make any difference for incentives. It doesn't make any difference for security is because the paper says that for chains of equal length, you can choose arbitrarily,…

Neil Davies: for pray Security.

Duncan Coutts: not randomly, arbitrarily. And the analysis works for any such choice, which means any additional ordering you put after chain length doesn't actually make any difference for security for braille security. But we did not ask for any analysis of incentives which is I guess worthy and as Neil said the spec simply said order by this and this and it didn't give a precise implementation of what that meant. So yeah, we incorrectly, used the same the RF hash for the ordering as well as have you made it over the threshold without realizing the implication of using it for both.

Neil Davies: the implication. Go

Duncan Coutts: Which is then why we considered it to be a bug once we understood it. And yeah, the fact that SPOS's know about something turns out isn't the same as the developers knowing about something. So I mean I completely agree with reasonable complaint, lack of communication, blah blah blah, etc. totally fair critique. Yeah.

Neil Davies: So next steps I think we've recorded the fact that we're going to thank the developers we're going to suggest the developers construct a tag which stops these things from being merged without the issue being solved. that we see this as an incentive problem and it needs a problem statement followed up by appropriate conversation and things like that. we don't see it as a chaos security problem.

Neil Davies: though I must admit anything that's slightly even this level of slight bias worries me from other aspects. What?

Duncan Coutts: More specifically, I think second Nicholas's suggestion that they start with a Kadano problem statement because I think getting agreement that there is actually a problem is important and then my encouragement to the people who are interested in this would be to say think about it don't think about it as reverting a change think about it as a deliberate introduction of the future that you want and think about how that should be done. What degree of bias do you want? And you need to have something

where you can control that degree of bias presumably with a critical parameter. Do it as a deliberate feature, not an accidental,…

00:25:00

Neil Davies: I think that covers off this agenda item.

Duncan Coutts: not an accidental thing,…

Duncan Coutts: which is what it was.

Kevin Hammond: So, we're going to recommend a CPS rather than a SE Duncan.

Kevin Hammond: Is that correct?

Duncan Coutts: Yeah, try to gain consensus that there's a problem and…

Duncan Coutts: then search around for solutions that actually address the problem in a coherent way.

Kevin Hammond: Okay. …

Kevin Hammond: so does everyone agree with the course of action that Neil and Duncan have outlined? Does anyone disagree with that?

Jonathan Kelly: No objection.

Kevin Hammond: Sorry D,…

Jonathan Kelly: I have no objection.

Kevin Hammond:

Kevin Hammond: you agree?

Jonathan Kelly: I have no objection.

Kevin Hammond: No question. Okay. Yeah. any objections from any one please raise them now. So, we've got a call to action. I've made some notes on te tax if you can turn that into minutes. That's great. And Neil Neil and Dark may need you just to check that and to add to it. It sounds as if we've got an act. So one of the things we probably want to do is just to raise the major issue so that the people writing the CPS can address them. So what do we think the major concern would be and the major concern would be how to deal with bi what the degree of bias would be what an exceptional degree of bias would be.

Kevin Hammond: Tell me.

Jonathan Kelly: Since there's no objections, I'll feed that back to the person I was talking to previously, just so that there's direct communication as quickly as possible on this.

Kevin Hammond: And We'll also communicate back to the team that raised the issue with next item that I had on the agenda, was the halfhawk working group reactivation. we discussed this in principle. we need

to make a decision to start to reactivate it. So, I don't think we were core it when we were discussing it before.

Kevin Hammond: so the proposal would be to reactivate the hardworking group and initially the goal will be to collect to determine the scope for the next hard fork and to agree that with the developer teams so start small and what we're expecting is for a hard fork to happen in roughly the November time scale. So now is about the right time to start thinking about it, kicking things off again. Does anyone object to that? Do we need to take a formal vote on that? if not, I'll work with tax and the other intersect members of the insect team to get this organized.

Kevin Hammond: So we'll need to just start to reinstate the eating. who from the street would like to be involved in that in the half working group determining the scope?

Jonathan Kelly: Sorry, I was in what? Sorry. no. I'm okay for that one. I'm going to be in the fire drill thing later. That's what I thought you were saying.

Kevin Hammond: No, no, we'll come to five on a second. Any volunteers? Okay, then I'll take it forward and we'll call people in as appropriate. item for you, Alex. deposits for parameter updates. Would you like to leave that

Alexander Moser: The story to this is that somebody raised in the parameter committee. the question whether Intersect would be open to being the sponsor to the 100,000 ADA that are needed to create governance actions when somebody would like to propose a change but can't afford it. The parameter committee then decided that this should be a question to the TSC which would ask formal question to the executives or the board or whatever the process then is.

00:30:00

Alexander Moser: maybe additional context to this as I and everybody else that I talked to thought that it would be very nice idea to do this together in terms of Intersect and Katana Foundation sponsoring more or less. However, I was told that while it's a great idea, everybody hasn't offened their plate that it's currently not in scope as it will likely be anyway an edge case solution if at all.

Alexander Moser: and we can't justify that thing right now which wouldn't mean that intersect can't do it but I think valuable for this conversation to know that foundation can't right now do this and…

Benjamin Hart: Cardono Foundation intersect can't. You said both in the last.

Alexander Moser: foundation and…

Benjamin Hart: Okay. Thank you.

Alexander Moser: Maybe also to note obviously this would only be true until there's some type of crowdfunding mechanism that would work in that gard. But statement or point stance Tony

Jonathan Kelly: Yeah, at the end of the last meeting I said I'd find out what I could about crowdsourcing contracts apps. There's two that I got reported back on. One that PI was working on and another that the mesh folk are working on and…

Alexander Moser:

Jonathan Kelly: there is a GitHub repository but they're not to the point of actually deploying.

Jonathan Kelly: So I'll share the link to the GitHub repository for mesh crowd sourcing but there's nothing actually product sized or available yet.

Benjamin Hart: I would definitely be in favor of establishing a budget for this going forward…

Benjamin Hart: if one does not exist. certainly we're asking for the ADA that we need for the next budget round or I think the 100k does get refunded if you pass the proposal, So we should have something like that as a fund for at least a fixed number of protocol updates per year, whatever is reasonable.

Benjamin Hart: three maybe.

Kevin Hammond: Yes, we pro probably it's only 100k recycled. Ben depends on the parameter that's being updated.

Benjamin Hart: Yeah, there is some risk but it's I think relatively low. That's a protocol updates are 50% of the DRAPs, right? Okay.

Kevin Hammond: But there's no risk. The deposit is always returned…

Kevin Hammond: then regardless. It's always if

Benjamin Hart: It's always returned.

Benjamin Hart: Okay. okay. Then that gives me even less reason to not want to do this,…

Neil Davies: the amount is basically how many you can have outstanding at any one time. that's the budget.

Benjamin Hart: which today is we have zero outstanding at the moment, right?

Neil Davies: And from recollection intersect when putting together it thought for the budget it's currently doing you marked a number up to five concurrently for the whole of intersect. Yeah.

Kevin Hammond: So this is really just saying can we use some of the funds that have been earmarked for governance act action deposits to source community members…

Kevin Hammond: who can't otherwise raise the deposit. Yeah. Okay.

Benjamin Hart: I mean I think subject to the approval of the protocol working group this is fine.

Kevin Hammond: So, what I'd propose so any objections to…

Benjamin Hart: Sorry parameter working group. Do we need to take this to the budget committee as well?

Kevin Hammond: what Alex is describing? No. What I Yeah.

00:35:00

Benjamin Hart: They control the purse strings. No.

Kevin Hammond: What I proposed to do would be to me to make a note of this. do you want a formal vote on this tax? Do we need a formal vote?

Alexander Moser: Kneel your muses.

Terence McCutcheon: I apologize.

Terence McCutcheon: Can I get a quick 30 second recap?

Kevin Hammond: So we're discussing deposits for third-party parameter update proposals and what we are proposing is that Intersect should be prepared to lend the deposit for community proposals where these are sensible ones.

Kevin Hammond: We need to determine what is ible. Nearly you raising your hand or just raising your pen.

Neil Davies: I was raising my hand…

Neil Davies: because I think we're mixing the difference between imagine there is a pot of money that is available to do this right without such a pot of money nothing can happen anyway so therefore intersect can't

Neil Davies: So intersect has to have a number of these. imagine we do get what we're asking I think the principle asking for is given that intersect is doing this and…

Kevin Hammond: Good night.

Neil Davies: we'll need to do it for parameter changes supported by its committees. could we use this for other community proposals? But as the moment you say else it has for suitable ones then you got a decision process who's going to make that decision? Yeah.

Neil Davies: are we saying in general the principle here is if somebody proposes a decent parameter ch. The point is if the parameter committee has accepted and taken on the parameter change right then basically that falls under the parameter committee to intersect acting on it. These are only for ones. If the parliamentary committee hasn't done that, why would they not do it if it was a good one? I'm just trying to work out under what circumstances this could ever get triggered. and it being a good one, who's the gatekeeper of it being a good one?

Kevin Hammond: Alice, do you want to respond to that?

Kevin Hammond: I see tax has got his hand.

Alexander Moser: Yes the same problems have been identified as well in this case being the foundation site that there needs to be some quality control happening at some point somewhere…

Alexander Moser: because otherwise anybody can send an email with an unsigned or co-signed transaction. Please give me a signature so that I can do this. You said that you would und my proposal, but obviously Intersect wouldn't want to do that either, just rubber stamping governance actions.

Alexander Moser: So Neil asks the right question. How is the process for quality control? And in extension, who does it for parameter changes?

Kevin Hammond: the obvious group is the premise committee Alex right are you proposing this for other community governance actions as Okay.

Alexander Moser: Yes, the question was I think raised in general for all governance actions including info ones. I honestly don't remember who raised that request but the question came up and I thought it was interesting enough to talk about it.

Kevin Hammond: Okay. …

Alexander Moser: But let's assume it would only be for parameter changes then indeed it would be the parameter

Kevin Hammond: So we need to define the scope out because if we're proposing this for all kinds of governance action then it's quite a different thing from just being restricted to parameter changes Nice.

Alexander Moser: Would the parameter committee then be okay to play quality police? I think we can ask that question back to the perimeter committee.

Kevin Hammond: But I would assume so we can play out various scenarios, Alex, but essentially obviously if you've got something coming through the regular parameter change process and the private committee supports that and raises the request, then Intersect would be expected to pay for the deposit.

00:40:00

Kevin Hammond: the member if it wasn't intersect raising the proposal but it had gone through the PCV process but a community member then raised the proposal on chain that's one scenario where you could ask will intersect pay the deposit is maybe an edge case or alternatively perhaps a community member is proposing a change it's not gone through the PCP process but the parameter committee is willing to endorse the change following discussion. So those are different scenarios I could see and in all those cases it might be reasonable for insect to pay for the deposit if you're extending it to other governance actions as well.

Kevin Hammond: then it becomes a little more complex I would say.

Kevin Hammond: So for a hard fork you would have to be endorsed by the hard fork working group and normally I'd expect intersect to raise the action.

Benjamin Hart: Yeah. I think we can limit the scope to simple protocol updates.

Kevin Hammond: And obviously for info actions the problem then is that an info action can be anything.

Benjamin Hart: …

Kevin Hammond: So I think yeah.

Benjamin Hart: protocol updates at the discretion of the protocol working group. I think that's fine. I feel like a lot of those things that we would want to filter would be filtered with that discretion.

Benjamin Hart: And since ultimately things that the protocol working group approve bubble up through the authority of this group, if that filter fails, we can act as that filter.

Kevin Hammond: Text. we've discussing this with whilst ignoring your raised hand. Did you have anything to add to that?

Terence McCutcheon: I did and…

Terence McCutcheon: I don't want to sound too overarching here, but I'm not really sure the basis of the question because we haven't talked about where explicitly this funding is supposed to come from. i.e. any request of this nature for this funding is not something that was part of intersect proposal. there's not a parameter committee or technical steering committee treasury withdrawal that would fund this.

Terence McCutcheon: So I'm trying to understand the expectation because even if we said the TSC has the ability to recommend this and then that's accepted further up the chain and…

Terence McCutcheon: so on and so forth, what we're essentially doing is gamifying funds that Intersect has to a point to where it's

Neil Davies: No, no tech.

Neil Davies: The point is if everything went the way it was supposed I understood don't forget these are just underwriting deposits. The deposits come back. So that the total cost a is not an ader right the right and secondly intersect was when last this was discussed Novemberish intersect was going to put aside enough funds to have five of these running concurrently across the whole of intersect.

Terence McCutcheon: Peace.

Neil Davies: So all we're talking about accessing a resource that intersector has already got the budget associated with this is a tenth of an ader…

Neil Davies: because that's how much the transaction costs you yeah the monetary cost is that the opportunity cost is you use up one of their five slots

Kevin Hammond: …

Kevin Hammond: it's the opportunity cost of tying up and text. Just to be clear, so we have raised parameter changes in the past. So, a parameter has been raised in the past. insect should have budget set aside for that purpose. the way the budget has worked out this time is not ideal, but that there should be some provision within the insect budget for essential activities such as this. There still is the budget because a number of treasury withdrawals have been raised.

Benjamin Hart: I'd even go further and say that the fact that Intersect has acted to provide this deposit for projects that it intends to be the administrator with a protocol update, there's no administration necessary.

00:45:00

Benjamin Hart: I would say this sets a precedent. Thank you.

Neil Davies: Yeah, I would agree.

Neil Davies: I mean, they've already supported third party activity by supplying the budget. Yes. And all we're saying is the parameter committee and the TSC would act as quality control for such It was to cover the deposit.

Terence McCutcheon: …

Terence McCutcheon: I'll understand this from a different perspective and…

Terence McCutcheon: I apologize for missing so much of the meeting here. They may have misunderstood what the original ask was. I mean they'd still have to essentially submit that for their parameter committee to submit as their own suggested by the third party or…

Kevin Hammond: So for actions raised by third parties…

Kevin Hammond: which were supported by the parameter committee.

Kevin Hammond: Yeah.

Terence McCutcheon: the community or whatever.

Terence McCutcheon: So I guess misunderstanding that because the way it initially came across was that there could have been a gamification effort in that opportunity cost whether it's five slots or an innumerable amount of slots. what I'm hearing now is that there's the protection of the parameter committee and then b the technical steering committee. So you all between S2U would not allow for let's say more than two and absolutely not up to five…

Kevin Hammond: I do it on a case by case basis…

Terence McCutcheon: if that is the theoretical number here. that's a different conversation. I'm not really sure why that would be up for a vote, but

Benjamin Hart: I think we can say at most one at a time is probably fair play.

Alexander Moser: Yeah.

Benjamin Hart: Is that a reasonable limit? Yeah, sure.

Kevin Hammond: and by negotiation with the Intersect executive. So rather than saying, " we're only going to raise one…

Kevin Hammond: if there were two proposals that were equal merit." and in sector was living to find the deposit for both then why not right?

Benjamin Hart: I think I'm just trying to limit the potential conflict…

Benjamin Hart: if for whatever reason we have two credible protocol updates, they should be rolled into one thing, I think.

Kevin Hammond: No no not necessarily Ben.

Benjamin Hart: Yeah,…

Kevin Hammond: If they're dealing with completely different parameters then rolling them together is simply confusing.

Benjamin Hart: it limits the risk for Intersect, particularly if they suddenly need to raise other actions. I think that's about it. But it's okay. I'm hearing some resistance to that adjustment and that's fine. We like it can be case by case.

Neil Davies: I think it's got and…

Neil Davies: in the past basically This was an the committee via the secretariat asked requested from the operational staff to raise them. That's what happened in the past. it's not that we ever had the money is what I'm trying to say, all we had was the ability to ask which could not be What's the word? Unreasonably refused. because right that was the point.

Neil Davies: they always said yes because actually they were always reasonable. Okay.

Kevin Hammond: as so it's just slightly extending the opportunity for third parties to or…

Kevin Hammond: to participate in this process.

Terence McCutcheon: As long as this is being voted on as a suggestion or recommendation, that's fine. But again, the way that I initially heard this was the technical steering committee trying to call for a vote and…

Kevin Hammond: Right. Wait.

Terence McCutcheon: saying that Intersect should willingly use these funds for some purpose.

Neil Davies: No, that was never said.

Terence McCutcheon: And the committee, although cannot enforce for Intersect to utilize funds for a specific purpose. that's my overarching concern here.

Alexander Moser: That was not the question either.

Benjamin Hart: Yeah, maybe I think there is a motion on the table.

Benjamin Hart: I'm not sure if we've actually articulated it,…

Benjamin Hart: but in the process of articulating it, I think the motion is to recommend this on to the budget committee.

Kevin Hammond: Yeah. …

Kevin Hammond: what I propose doing then is to raise it with the ISC. Okay. …

Kevin Hammond: now I'm going to miss the next meeting, but it could raise it at the meeting after that and it could also be raised directly with the budget committee.

Benjamin Hart: Does Adam attend CE when you're in absentia?

Kevin Hammond: Adam, I would have asked Adam to attend but he's not here.

Benjamin Hart: Okay.

Kevin Hammond: So I'm happy for any other TSC member to volunteer to attend.

Benjamin Hart: Okay.

Kevin Hammond: I'll put out a call via Slack channel.

Benjamin Hart: Perhaps that person could read it.

Kevin Hammond: So it could be Adam or could be No,…

Benjamin Hart: It's fine. Even if it waits another meeting, they're twice a month, right? …

Kevin Hammond: they're every week then on Mondays at 1400 UTC.

Benjamin Hart: they're every week.

Kevin Hammond: So I'll pass that on and…

Kevin Hammond: let people decide whether they would like to attend that meeting. if not then I'll just pick it up the following week.

Terence McCutcheon: The following week may be better…

Terence McCutcheon: because this week was the committee updates and next week would be intersect business versus the committee updates. Again, just a reminder.

Kevin Hammond: Yeah. So then it can wait another week. Okay. Johnny

Jonathan Kelly: Yeah, I'm just going back to the VRF point. I've spoken to the person while the meetings happened, so I'll just report on the same call. they've expressed some personal frustration with the feedback.

Terence McCutcheon: Is this s***?

Jonathan Kelly: However, they're having a working group meeting and they're not going to make any formal statements until the working group meeting tomorrow. but it has been fed back that problem statement is being requested and a formal method of choosing the bias etc. And I've let them know the recording of the meeting will go up so they can see the full context of this discussion. But they did have some choice words, but said that they only represented their personal opinion and not the opinion of the formal working group.

Kevin Hammond: Yeah if you want to pass it on Johnny say the concern would be related to the impact the un unintended consequences of changing the bias in in terms of potential security issues that would be a fair thing to say.

Jonathan Kelly: Yeah.

Kevin Hammond: It's not that we would reject this out of hand. we understand exactly why people are frustrated by this. but the change was done in good faith I believe with a view to eliminating this kind of bias and our analysis suggests that it is in the best security interest to have an unbiased VRF tbate breaker

Duncan Coutts: And if it would be useful, I'm happy to attend this is the incentives working group, right? But I'd be happy to join for a longer time. Okay.

Jonathan Kelly: I will double check.

Jonathan Kelly: One second. Even if it isn't, I'll let them know that you're happy to join a meeting and ask them to provide you a link. And if you DM me an email address for the invite, then I'll get that across to them.

Kevin Hammond: Johnny. so the only other item of on the agenda was an update on the fire drill that we're proposing to hold. If I think everyone's familiar with this, but just in case people aren't, what we're proposing to do is to bring together a group of SPOS's and other actors to test out the procedures that we outlined in SIP 135 about a year ago. SI 135 is the disaster recovery process.

Kevin Hammond: So we described some procedures that we would need to enact in the event there was a disaster on mainet. what we were proposing to do was to do a dry run of these procedures so that we were prepared in the event of an actual disaster. Not that we're anticipating any disaster on mainet but just to make sure that the procedures do work as intended. there are no issues that we weren't aware of are that we've tested out all of the details and the proposal was to do this on Sancho net. we're not proposing to disrupt any of the live networks mainet preview or prepro but to do this on social net.

Kevin Hammond: So we've spoken to Mike Horn who is administering Sanchonet. he's on board. We've raised this with state pool operators and we've convened a group via the security council to do this. we've put together a document that people are willing very welcome to comment on. I've identified in that I've indicated a couple of scenarios that we would like to test and how we would go about engineering the disaster on Sancheonet and then how we would go about recovering from that. So please feel free to comment on that proposal or to make changes. I can give people edit rights if they would like to do that.

00:55:00

Kevin Hammond: So I think that's a summary of where we are. Do anyone have on Any questions about that?

Jonathan Kelly: No, just confirmation that I'll be part of that. I'm an SPO on Saturn at the moment and I'll be part of any formal coordination with Mike as well.

Kevin Hammond: And in terms of timing, the security council is appointing they're advertising for an incident manager as part of the security council. So the timing ideally would be such that this person could do the coordination we think. So we might want to wait a month or two before setting this up.

Kevin Hammond: One of the major concerns is obviously not to get any negative publicity from this. So we're going to need to go through the comm's teams. one of the concerns that was raised with us was why does Cardano need to have a fire drill? is it expecting a disaster? And the answer is no. we're not expecting a disaster. We've never had one. That's why we've never tested the procedures. So unlike

certain other chains, these things are extremely rare eventualities and that was why we feel the need to test things just as a precaution. But we'll work on messaging appropriately. Great. So you've got a link to the document there. It's pasted into the Slack chat for you.

Kevin Hammond: And so I said, please feel free to comment to request edit rights if you want to change something. I think it's going to be fun. who doesn't like the idea of deliberately destroying something in order to bring it back exactly as it was?

Jonathan Kelly: Yes, a whole lot of work always goes into making things look like nothing

Kevin Hammond: Yeah, this is definitely going to be like that Johnny and especially where we're recovering from situation where no blocks are produced for an extended time period.

Neil Davies: But it's for reasons like this aircraft travel is so safe.

Jonathan Kelly: Tell that to Boeing.

Neil Davies: Actually, no, but pilot nor any flight crew is allowed to do that without having go through training for what to do in an emergency, are they?

Jonathan Kelly: Tree.

Neil Davies: The point. that's a better analogy. the Boeing one is having a single vendor manage all of your changes, do a reverse takeover, and destroy the quality of your product. analogy. Okay.

Kevin Hammond: The other thing we want to test,…

Kevin Hammond: Johnny, is do the communication mechanisms work properly. so we want to know are we using the right means to contact people?

Jonathan Kelly: Mhm. Yeah.

Kevin Hammond: Are there any issues that need to be ironed out there? do we need any structure of procedures to bring to call people in also we'll need to determine who we would need to call in the event of a real emergency.

Jonathan Kelly: Yeah. Yeah.

Jonathan Kelly: You need a proper response team especially since it's distributed and needs actual SPOS's on it, So they're formalizing who that team would be a good thing to

Kevin Hammond: Thanks. Yeah.

Kevin Hammond: And I either having them participate in the fire drill alternatively having people involved in the fire drill who can coordinate u the necessary response is going to be very positive. So fire marshals if you as well one of the things that we'll also need to test is whether we can bring up a subset of the network in a suitable suitably isolated way.

01:00:00

Kevin Hammond: So one of the things that we want to test is to do precisely with the situation where we've not made blocks. what we'll need to do is to bring that up very carefully over a period of time. So it'll be interesting to test one of the sick authors if I recall correctly. If you're interested in being involved,…

Kevin Hammond: just let me know and likewise any if anyone else is interested in being involved, let us know. we can open this up to observers as well as active participants.

Alexander Moser: Yes, we said yes.

Alexander Moser: Yeah, please involve Stephen me.

Kevin Hammond: Great. Thank you.

Alexander Moser: He likely also leave you, but just text us.

Kevin Hammond: Yeah. will do. Are there any other items for this week's agenda? So, Adam will chair this meeting next week. In my absence, I'm going to be staying with friends in France next week, so unlikely to be able to join. Adam will also be attending the meeting on Friday for the 2030 vision discussion. So again, I can't attend that, but Adam will do that and I'll see you all again in two weeks time. Thank you very much everyone. this is the end of this meeting. Thank you very much. Bye.

Meeting ended after 01:02:28 👋

This editable transcript was computer generated and might contain errors. People can also change the text after it was created.