

Technical Steering Committee - 2025/07/30 08:25 CDT - Transcript

Attendees

Adam Dean, Alexander Moser, Benjamin Hart, Christian Taylor, Duncan Coutts, Jonathan Kelly, Kevin Hammond, Lorenzo Bruno, Markus Gufler, Neil Davies, Terence McCutcheon

Transcript

Neil Davies: It's not just the temperature. Yes.

Benjamin Hart: Vegas or...

Benjamin Hart: Dubai for that matter.

Adam Dean: where I live,...

Adam Dean: not where I live, but right next door, where my wife works is in Lake Havasu, which is actually hotter than Las Vegas. So, yeah, we're used to being here in the armpit, but yeah, the everythingness of Las Vegas is what it is.

Benjamin Hart: I believe we got Kora.

Adam Dean: Yeah, not just the boiling outside temperature,...

Adam Dean: but morning guys. All right, so we are six.

Neil Davies: One, two,...

Adam Dean: So that should be correct to chair the meeting in Kevin's absence today.

Neil Davies: three, four, five, six. No, we've only got six. yeah. We've got six and 10. That's good. Yeah. So, Go on, Mr. Dean.

Adam Dean: Text, do you know if we had anything on the agenda or carryover items from last week that did not get addressed?

Terence McCutcheon: Unaware explicitly, but I'm just to check. I think there is still work going on the remittant, but I think that's kind of been just like a consistent one. yeah, there was an email

Adam Dean: What did he be?

Terence McCutcheon: let's see, an email from the consensus team, something about a VRF tiebreaker.

Neil Davies: ...

Neil Davies: I think that needs to be Let's construct the agenda for next week. Let's put that on the agenda for next week. Right. Because that

Jonathan Kelly: Just for context, the VRF tiebreaker was back in the past smaller delegated SPOS would be favored in a height battle and...

Jonathan Kelly: they would get a reward versus the larger delegated body that was recognized as being skewed and not truly 50/50 or equal chances...

Duncan Coutts: Yeah, it was a very interesting subtle bug.

Jonathan Kelly: if there's more than two. so it was corrected to be actually fair,...

Duncan Coutts: It was Yes.

Jonathan Kelly: quote unquote. and then the community pushed back against that at some point and said that's not fair because we want to boost the ...

Duncan Coutts: Or rather we want it to be unfair.

Jonathan Kelly: we want it to be unfair to be more politically correct, we want it to be supportive of smaller pools was the way they put it. But of course there's potential security concerns about that and ways people can manipulate that.

Neil Davies: Yeah. So can I suggest a phrasing here which is designer fairness...

Neil Davies: which I have used in the past where the notion of boni fairness and human beings concept of fairness differs. yeah. So they need a designed fairness. No. So yes.

Duncan Coutts: The thing I've always thought about this debate is that ...

Duncan Coutts: if you want to make it deliberately unfair in a deliberate way. Not there was this bug which happened to in a very small corner case slightly advantage someone...

Jonathan Kelly: Yes, it was a passively

Duncan Coutts: which we fix and...

Neil Davies: So to have this discussion and...

Duncan Coutts: then

Neil Davies: I think one of tech when we put this up.

Neil Davies: So we went over there and one of the pieces of input I would like to see please is how unfair how difference is it from boni from mathematically fair let's call it mathematically fair how much difference is it introduced has somebody quantified that please right...

Neil Davies: because it's not a hard battle.

Adam Dean: Okay. ...

Adam Dean: but yeah, so I'm putting a note for next week's agenda.

Adam Dean: That's the VRF hype battle unfairness and/or unfairness, depending on how you look at it.

Duncan Coutts: fun. Good.

Duncan Coutts: All right. Yeah.

Neil Davies: It's just a VF tie breaking.

Adam Dean: VRF tiebreakers. That's okay.

Neil Davies: Yes. Yes.

Adam Dean: I mean, I know functionally how it works, but yeah, I wasn't sure exactly what we were calling it. So, we'll add that to the agenda next week. we did get Oraboros failins proposed at least in the CIP directory

Adam Dean: which it looks like to address anti-g grinding and one of the other grinding attacks so that could be something for

Neil Davies: How do we want to deal with this?

Neil Davies: Do we want to deal with this by somebody present us having to go and read the papers which is one possibility? should somebody present it to us?

Neil Davies: Should we delegate somebody a couple of our body to go and read it and present it to how do we want to because the idea of all of us going reading the paper and getting up to date doesn't sound like a good use of time.

Duncan Coutts: And...

Duncan Coutts: and which one is it? is this from the researchers? And is this the thing about having a verifiable delay function to reduce the ability to grind?

Adam Dean: I think so. Yeah. From Nicholas Henen proposed.

Neil Davies: okay.

00:05:00

Adam Dean: And so it's Yeah,...

Duncan Coutts: Okay. ...

Adam Dean: it's Paras. It looks like settlement time and anti-g grinding rolled into one batch of upgrades to Oraorus by the looks of it.

Duncan Coutts: including parat.

Adam Dean: I mean it says that it solves CPS 17 which is settlement speed and CPS 21...

Duncan Coutts: Okay. ...

Adam Dean: which is oracles randomness manipulation. So yeah it could be an alternative implementation

Duncan Coutts: but then it's an alternative to Paris, which is what my understanding of it was. Yeah. it's not a one for one alternative to Paris. It solves a slightly different set of problems, but it would reduce settlement time substantially by eliminating the grinding component of the long Settlement times are long in part because an attacker in principle can grind stuff. and if you eliminate their ability to grind, then that dramatically reduces the number of blocks you have to wait. And so in some sense, for some use cases, that might be an alternative to Paras.

Duncan Coutts: It doesn't give you settlement times that are as short as Paras, but it gives you settlement times that are more guaranteed rather than opportunistic. Whereas Paras says, " hooray. It turned out that your transaction actually is final now or...

Adam Dean: Okay, close. Okay.

Duncan Coutts: with a high degree of probability, but it doesn't let you predict it in advance." Whereas the anti- grinding is in the guaranteed category. So I was always very favorable to it because it's much simpler the anti- grinding stuff than Paras and it doesn't have nearly the same costs and it has a benefit for everyone. so if it can mean that the use cases of Paris are covered for enough users brilliant. it's a much simpler solution. I've never been very fond of Paris which I think most people know.

Duncan Coutts: Anyone who pays attention to what I think knows that I don't like paras. Not that anyone should particularly pay attention. There's a 30-cond summary if you like.

Adam Dean: appreciate that. I have to review Oops.

Duncan Coutts: I think it's genuinely interesting and it could present us with a dilemma of do you want to do this instead of Paris as well whatever.

Neil Davies: So it sounds to me the way we should do this is a go and...

Neil Davies: read it, we understand it, how does this affect strategic activity, that's the question that we're being asked right and then we can say then is it something we wish to make a statement the TSC thinks this or is it something to which we say because if it really does form that if we can somehow state it in such a way that people can say you can have this or...

Neil Davies: almost nothing to do this costs all this effort do you want to do it and...

Duncan Coutts: and ongoing maintenance.

Duncan Coutts: Ongoing work Yeah,...

Neil Davies: ongoing maintenance

Neil Davies: back. then we make that statement and then we have to get the comm we may end up in the situation if the thing that may then happen is that actually the community has decided that it doesn't want to continue doing Paris and then we got this problem of what do we do next? Okay. But I think this is

Adam Dean: All right.

Adam Dean: But yeah.

Duncan Coutts: because we've already committed to pay for doing Paras.

Duncan Coutts: But that doesn't mean that you have to do it.

Jonathan Kelly: But I was going to say there's already existing proposals and...

Jonathan Kelly: you have involve

Duncan Coutts: And remember that it comes as a trade-off, right? It costs something. It's not just like code complexity.

Duncan Coutts: It's actual increases network traffic. And to the extent that it does is documented in the report for Paris.

Neil Davies: Whereas the anti- grinding shouldn't increase.

Neil Davies: It doesn't increase communication. Yeah.

Duncan Coutts: The complexity is fairly local,...

Duncan Coutts: you have to compute a not a verifiable delay function in the header, I think, or maybe the block body. I'm not quite sure. It depends how it's been done. that has to be computed, but it's fairly local to the protocol.

Duncan Coutts: It doesn't and it doesn't incur lots of computational cost on it it doesn't add any extra size partic right...

Neil Davies: Yes, but...

Neil Davies: but verifiable delay functions can consume a large amount of CPU.

Duncan Coutts: but it's how big do you need to tune it and...

Neil Davies: But yes,...

Duncan Coutts: the intuition is that the attacker who has to grind millions of alternatives if the verifiable delay function is like a millisecond...

Neil Davies: yes, that's enough. Can only do it.

Duncan Coutts:

Duncan Coutts: then the block producers only have to compute a millisecond. The people who verify the blocks, it's much less than that. And the people that who have to grind a million alternatives, it's, a million milliseconds or...

Neil Davies: Can only do it at a thousand a second.

Duncan Coutts: whatever. Exactly.

Neil Davies: They can only do it at a thousand a second. Yes. Yeah.

Duncan Coutts: Per CPU that they have. And of course, they can. So anyway, the point is you can tune the size of the verifiable delay function, but there's a massive factor difference between the attacker that has to grind stuff...

Neil Davies: Oops. Yeah.

Duncan Coutts: because they have to compute millions of possibilities versus the honest people only have to compute one. And that's the asymmetry which it leverages. So it's quite a clever idea.

00:10:00

Adam Dean: So what I was trying to say is I have to review this anyway in my role as a CIP editor. so I'm going to be doing that, which is more of a grammar check and a formatting check in terms of the CIP and not necessarily a technical assessment. And then I will ask the author or authors if they're willing to, essentially present the TLDDR to the technical steering committee at a future meeting. So, I'm going to take that as a takeaway from this meeting and we'll see if we can add that to the agenda for next week okay yeah thank you Johnny all right so yeah trucking along here John Terrence did bring

Jonathan Kelly: Yeah. Yeah. You also have a soul for the DREP involvement because I checked the historical icons on gov.tools and the vision and road map was verified with anti-grinding as a part of it. Soft at the wanking.

Adam Dean: text. we had the Plutous team kind of go rogue a little bit this past week not this past week, but it's been happening and it's something to address internal to Intersect in that they are just kind of spinning up their own new private repos. thinking of maybe not taking them public at some point, but then they already exist under the Intersect MBO organization within GitHub and...

Neil Davies: Could we go more?

Adam Dean: then have come along with all the kind of fringe benefits and/or drawbacks that may or may not come.

Neil Davies: Could we go more concrete? Why did they feel the need?

Neil Davies: Could we go more concrete? Tech, could you tell us what really happened and why the concern?

Terence McCutcheon: So basically they discussed in their team as I understand it they discussed in their team and...

Terence McCutcheon: decided that a particular build that they were doing did not need to be convoluted within the Plutous Rico itself. and my understanding is I don't know how or specifically because I haven't gone to find the recordings quite yet. I don't know if I've been given a link. but they must have made a decision that said, "Hey, let's do this in a different" individual contributors right now and I'm still in the process of researching this are able to create repos under the intersect organization when they are logged in and...

Neil Davies: What?

Terence McCutcheon: registered or whatever but they are only eligible to create private repos. So there's a good step here where it comes to me because I have to see it before I can make it public. But I still do have a concern where repos in general are being created when it hasn't gone through any process of intersect agreeing to manage another repo. so I'm working on or planning on putting a process together for that...

Terence McCutcheon: but I don't want to do that in a shell. U and I think it'd be really important to have insight from you all. even...

Neil Davies: So the point is I don't think do we wish to stop individuals creating private repos at all inside intersect organization that would be the first question right I don't see...

Terence McCutcheon: if it were a baseline list that says yes we want to create a repo. No we don't. That's the larger issue.

Neil Davies: why but that would be the first question and the second question is what's the mechanism by which a new public repo can be proposed because actually it sounds Yeah. Yeah. But the first issue is so they have decided they want this and...

Neil Davies: Do they want it to be public? they do want it to be public. Okay. Sorry.

Terence McCutcheon: They're just not able to make it public themselves.

Adam Dean: So now they're going, "Hey, we think this is ready to be public and that's what kind of Yeah.

Neil Davies: Why? So,...

Terence McCutcheon: An individual contributor can create it,...

Adam Dean: And how did Inters get this repo?" Yeah.

Terence McCutcheon: but they can't work on it with anybody else.

Neil Davies: so the point is most organizations like this people have remits and...

Neil Davies: in order to do some what do you call it? you have your remit at the top. how Yeah.

Terence McCutcheon: decision flow chart. Yeah.

Neil Davies: It's not really a decision. It's sort of your governance rules, your remits, what areas you're allowed to do. Yeah.

Adam Dean: your ACL's essentially.

Adam Dean: Yeah. Right.

Neil Davies: Yeah. Yes, effectively this is but that's the sort of technical side for the creative repo.

Adam Dean: Yeah. The technical of what you're talking about what is your job and should you be creating repos?

Adam Dean: Should you have access to create repos?

Neil Davies: ...

Neil Davies: what we need to do this is if they needed this it sounds like that the procedure we might likely to have to have in the future is one...

Neil Davies: where we say it's not that you can't have a new repo created for you but actually you have to justify it please a priori as opposed to postprian

00:15:00

Duncan Coutts: I think you need to have some degrees of process ...

Duncan Coutts: because you need some things to be relatively lightweight and then some things to need acknowledgement sign off or whatever. So let me just give a couple examples towards the end of my project that I've been working on I think it makes sense to split out this library into a separate repository. It's like the stuff's already all there. It's just reorganizing it like there's nothing fundamentally new.

Duncan Coutts: It's just and so you just need someone to say yep I see that's what you're doing. That's fine And so you want something that's lightweight for doing things like that. And maybe that's what the picious guys are doing at the moment. I don't know, if they're just reorganizing their repos, but they're not like, increasing their scope or doing something new and...

Neil Davies: That's the word I've scope.

Duncan Coutts: exciting, right?

Neil Davies: Yes. Is this an increase in scope? Yeah.

Duncan Coutts: And without having to escalate to a committee, you want someone to just go, " yeah, I can see that's what you're doing." That's fine, And so, in which case, a process where perhaps it's not a crazy thing to do. we'll do this. will sort of get it all ready as some private repos and then go and ask someone with just a technical remmit to go to text and say can you make these public because we're just reorganizing these repos and text can look at it and go yeah I can see that that's fine right without having to escalate to a committee and then you've got kind of the next level it's like we're creating this new repo because we have the funding for this project and it's been signed off and we've got the budget for it and we're starting

Duncan Coutts: to work on it now. Please can we, make this report public? And again, that needs to be relatively lightweight, the decision has already been made. so you just need to be able to check it against the list of the things that we're expecting to see. And then the last one is something completely new.

Duncan Coutts: And then you got to say, okay, are we adopting some new thing here? Did we agree to that? And that's where you need the process.

Neil Davies: Do we know...

Duncan Coutts: So I would suggest...

Neil Davies: which one does this fall into? Correct.

Terence McCutcheon: I

Duncan Coutts: if people are coming to text ought to be the first person to look at it and then text can make the decision. Does he need to escalate to get approval from a committee or does it clearly fall into a bucket of like this or that which is totally fine?

Terence McCutcheon: I guess my question though is I would still see it as a risk and maybe this coming from the open source side of things. If somebody can essentially create a repo whether it's public or private and I don't have any knowledge of it until I stumble across it in whatever means that is. So my question is there a need where people should have the ability to create a repo again regardless of whether it's public or private or should any repo creation automatically come to me or to open source office and we have to create that repo.

Terence McCutcheon: We can start it with the template and they can go in there and remove and fix and whatever, but we have to be that first line of defense, if you will, that says or any new repos that comes through here.

Benjamin Hart: I have no problem with Interact having private repos,...

Duncan Coutts: That sounds completely reasonable if you want to have that policy tax of them come to you even...

Benjamin Hart: right? Yeah.

Duncan Coutts:

Duncan Coutts: if it's a private repo. I would say that sounds completely reasonable that's still a relatively lightweight process that they just have to come to you for that initial thing and then as you say maybe the bar is higher if it's public but go on I was interrupting other people then Ben I think you were

Benjamin Hart: I have no problem with Intersect having infinite private repos does not matter at the end of the day.

Benjamin Hart: at some point there is an administrative overhead but I think per private repo a lot of that administrative overhead is temporary and fairly small so I don't mind essentially people being able to create private repos not all private repos are going to have a destiny of becoming public and I don't think it's worthwhile to necessarily treat it like they will.

Benjamin Hart: But go ahead, Adam.

Adam Dean: Yeah. ...

Adam Dean: what I would like to say to that point is this is a cultural problem. I have no problem with input output HK or PN soul or well typed having infinite private repos within their repositories. These are not intersect employees that are creating new private repositories under the intersect organization. So the problem is actually our access control lists and who actually is of a certain stature within intersect as of an organization that should have that capability. Right now we have obviously far too permissive rules with the organization and too many people probably in positions that they shouldn't actually have.

Adam Dean: they don't actually need organization admin privileges to be a contributor on a specific organization So I think that's the larger scope issue is Johnny just going out and name squatting private repos all over the Intersect organization on GitHub with no actual intent of doing anything with it. But it's no big deal. it's not our problem because they're private or whatever. is a little bit too reductive of a stance to take in my opinion. and particularly again because it is a little bit of a vampire attack, I mean this committee has talked about should we adopt in the KES agent that was developed by well typed and make it part of Intersect and there where it was actually being developed properly.

00:20:00

Adam Dean: the open source committee had a chance to vet and decide on is this something that we want to take responsibility for whereas what we have is these contractors who are primarily with IoG at all who have this permission and oops now there's just a new repo can we just flip the switch and make it public that to me is a little bit of a vampire attack to be like look no it belongs to intersect now because we can't just shunt it and throw it to somewhere else just because we maybe disagree with it. So I would prefer to see that it gets developed exterior and then proposed to the open source committee or the technical steering committee to adopt it as part of intersect. if we have no remitt whatsoever in the world aside from that one, I think that's probably a good remmit for the committees themselves. But go ahead Christian, you got your hand up.

Christian Taylor: Yeah, the other thing to consider is any repository under intersect I have to manage do data analysis given a maturity grade and actively ensure that it stays within a life cycle. I already currently had to do it for 66 repositories out of seven public repos. So I do think if it's going to be public it needs some review process and consensus. if it's private I'm not even worrying about life cycle management for that. But as the owner of the org too there is a cost for every repository and team member added. So, it's a thing to think about. because I think we're already currently at 200 bucks a month just for members.

Adam Dean: Go ahead, Johnny.

Jonathan Kelly: Yeah, just to follow on from something Tech said in chat here, I suppose I will put forward a motion to see if we can pull access to people automatically being able to set up private repos without oversight and have Tex work up a policy by the end of the week for how the access permission would be given or just not even the access permission but the allowance of a new repo.

Adam Dean: Go ahead, Neil. But you're muted.

Neil Davies: Yeah. Could I suggest the motion is that in the interim we remove the p just temporarily we remove the private we remove the ability for individuals to create new repos right we're not making this as a permanent decision at this point and we look to tech to give us a text to give us a policy that we can...

Duncan Coutts: Yeah. Heat.

Adam Dean: Oops. Okay.

Neil Davies: then vote on.

Jonathan Kelly: That sounds to me like you're seconding the motion in a sense

Neil Davies: I'm seconding the motion, but I just wanted to make it clear for the recording and the motion that the removal of the creation of private repos is we see this just as a temporary control measure until the policy We're not making a policy statement about that.

Jonathan Kelly: Yeah. Yeah.

Neil Davies: It's just an operational statement.

Jonathan Kelly: Perhaps we should add age verification or AI assessment to see if people can come in to I'm just local politics.

Neil Davies: No, no, no, no, no. Don't be

Adam Dean: So it sounds like what we have, if Johnny's okay with it, is a motion to temporarily revoke all permissions to create private or...

Adam Dean: public repo repositories to non-intersect staff. and text will present a policy for repository creation by the next open source committee meeting. Does that sound reasonable?

Duncan Coutts: And...

Neil Davies: And aren't we just asking can I request that the open source committee gets to make the decision...

Adam Dean: All right.

Jonathan Kelly: Yeah.

Adam Dean: So, in that case,

Duncan Coutts: and we suggest to text that policy should balance keeping things lightweight when they can be lightweight and escalating to proper decision-making bodies when that's appropriate. That's kind of the balance you're trying to get.

Neil Davies: but we are consulted about that decision that's all right open source get to make this decision right because I don't think it's a TSC decision to how the repositories are managed it shouldn't be but we would like to be consulted please so that we know what's happening that's

Jonathan Kelly: Yeah, informed of mic.

Alexander Moser: Yeah, I would also suggest racy matrix wise.

Neil Davies: consulted. Yeah.

Alexander Moser: I think informed is enough.

00:25:00

Neil Davies: Yeah. Yeah. That's what I'm saying is they're consulted because we not enough.

Duncan Coutts: It may be one of these category things it may simply be informed when there's boring stuff happening like reorganizing a library that needs splitting repositories...

Duncan Coutts: but consulted when there's something interesting happening so that you want those different levels of escalation.

Neil Davies: Yeah. Yep,...

Adam Dean: ...

Adam Dean: I've added the language of the motion to the chat if everybody could take a look if there's no changes to that.

Neil Davies: that's fine.

Adam Dean: We can do a formal vote. let's just do thumbs in the chat and...

Neil Davies: How do you want to do that?

Alexander Moser: Hold on one second.

Adam Dean: we'll do yays, naysay, and abstains. But go ahead, Alex. ...

Alexander Moser: What does temporarily mean?

Adam Dean: until the policy is drafted, everybody except for Intersect staff will remove the ability to create public or private repos under the Intersect organization. So, Tech Tech will have an activity today to start working on revoking fixing the GitHub permission so that nobody that's not part of an Intersect staff group will be able to create any repositories under Intersect. and then his second takeaway will be to develop a draft of this policy for a presentation to the TSSE and OSC during their next meeting. Whether that happens next week or not with all the travels of everybody, we'll see. So,

Alexander Moser: No, if we could adjust the motion then to define what temporarily means so that temporary solutions don't become permanent...

Neil Davies: Yeah.

Alexander Moser: then I would vote yes.

Neil Davies: I think the point I was trying to make is we want to act quickly to stop lots of these things being created, but we're not setting the precedent that necessarily is the final decision. That's what temporary means here is we're making a quick and that I don't think that we're not making a permanent decision. That was the whole point we're calling it temporary.

Neil Davies: Right. What's your choice?

Alexander Moser: I agree. But as we all engineers know in here,...

Neil Davies: Yeah. Yeah,...

Alexander Moser: there is nothing more permanent than a temporary solution.

Neil Davies: I understand that. how do you want to change that wording?

Jonathan Kelly: re rewrite it as you see fit in the chat there,

Neil Davies: This is always the way of getting, how do you capture that? I'm sorry, Alex. How do you capture that? Yeah, that seems reasonable. until a new policy is adopted. Are you happy with that,...

Alexander Moser: Thank you, Adam.

Neil Davies: Alex? Okay.

Neil Davies: So, do we want to raise our hands and then we can count them and catch you do a screenshot? Somebody can form a queue and that will get you the numbers.

Christian Taylor: I just had one thing to add before the vote.

Adam Dean: Okay, go ahead,...

Adam Dean: Christian, real quick and then we'll do the voting.

Christian Taylor: Yeah, there's specifically five people I left with admin rights due to their function and they clarified it to me. So I just wanted them to have to be part excluded from the temporary thing in case of emergency.

Christian Taylor: It's Moritz Angererman with the API LI. two people on the Plutous team for the repository and then Kevin and Sam. Those are the only people.

Adam Dean: Why do they need...

Adam Dean: why do they need admin access to intersect as an organization us specific admin access to repositories that they're manag yeah.

Christian Taylor: No, it's admin to SP their specific repositories. That's it.

Adam Dean: No, that's fine. what we're concerned with is the administration of Intersect MBO,...

Christian Taylor: Okay. ...

Adam Dean: the organization here.

Christian Taylor: yeah. ...

Jonathan Kelly: Yeah, this is about me preventing

Christian Taylor: so I've restricted everything only to specific repos. there's nothing on wide.

Neil Davies: There's nothing here that says people can't be administrators on specific repos. It's the construction of new ones. That's the only thing we're talking about.

Christian Taylor: Okay. I know.

Neil Davies: Let's be very clear that is to revoke permissions to create the magic word is create new repositories. Okay.

Christian Taylor:

Christian Taylor: I just wanted to specifically clarify. Thank you.

Neil Davies: Okay. Hands.

Adam Dean: Yeah. those in favor of the motion, please raise your hand.

Markus Gufler: Sorry, just a second. I'm here now.

Neil Davies: F7 and all and that's everybody. That's all.

Adam Dean: Seven raised hands and that's all present. so the motion passes,...

Neil Davies: Yes. Right.

Jonathan Kelly: Is it?

Adam Dean: so that's good to go. Tex, you can go ahead and execute as you see fit on that one.

Neil Davies: Decision made. Next.

Terence McCutcheon: As it stands,...

Terence McCutcheon: currently only admins of the Intersect organization can create repos.

Jonathan Kelly: That's a quick turn around.

Adam Dean: that's efficiency for you. That's what we like to see. didn't even cost us a million ATUS, but all right. So, moving on. While we have a little bit of time left, Lorenzo has joined us. I think there is an update on the product committee and their vision 2030 long-term five-year roadmap. So, Lorenzo, do you want to take it away?

00:30:00

Lorenzo Bruno: Yeah thank you I joined for that as well. So let me share the links. So there is a public first draft version here some link vision. So the main thing is that the documented version you guys have seen now been divided in two parts. So there is a vision section which let me share my screen has a purpose mission vision and then just a connection to the strategy and then there's a longer part which is the strategy. so that's a little bit longer here. the request is still as before. So I don't know how many of you will join Rivo but we're going to book also remote workshop if you can.

Lorenzo Bruno: this is the repo where all this stuff is held and I think at least to this committee I can ask you to comment directly on GitHub. that's visible. so yeah just do these two documents here. So just go through it and leave comments and questions and we'll do for the workshop we'll incorporate everything afterwards. I don't know if any of you already had a chance to read this updated version or the previous version. Do you have any feedback or any comments or any suggestions? if so, I'm happy to collect them and bring them back to product committee what whatever you guys have in mind.

Adam Dean: F first and foremost, just for the record, because I did review the previous document during the Quebec workshop with Sam, u having a very much shorter and concise document here from what I

can see is definitely going to be advantageous. we got to get away from 20 to 30 pages more of fluff and filler and really get focused on what we're trying to do and accomplish. ...

Adam Dean: because you lost me three paragraphs or three you call them chapters in to that last document and I didn't know what we were talking about anymore. So I'm glad to see this kind of streamlining of the document so that it is much more palatable and digestible by kind of the everyday people.

Terence McCutcheon: Come on.

Terence McCutcheon: Come on.

Adam Dean: Thank you for the progress, but I haven't had a chance to review these documents and I will try to get there. If not, I'll see you guys at Rare Evo.

Lorenzo Bruno: Yeah, perfect.

Lorenzo Bruno: Alo, we'll send over perhaps let me do now. I don't know who else will join. This is the link to the event and I will put up also the link to the I mean you guys with TSC have an easier way to connect. also that the product committee would like to book some time just with TSC. So maybe we'll sort it out next week. So this is the link to the loom event if any of you is coming next week. yeah, outside of this also as you know with text we are kind of covering up for DA. So we're doing a switch.

Lorenzo Bruno: So perhaps Adam I also wanted to check if you guys had a chance to look at the proposed remmit that we checked with cabin if you had any comments.

Terence McCutcheon: That's

Lorenzo Bruno: If not perhaps we need to make a timeline since the committee election will start in eight weeks something like that. that was the second thing that I wanted to double check.

Adam Dean: I haven't personally had a chance to review the proposed remmit, but I'm also not planning on running for reelection after this cycle because I want to get back to actual development work instead of endless meetings. so I don't know if anybody else that's here has had a chance to review that and have any feedback or comments that they'd like to put on record.

Markus Gufler: from my side the same. So I also very likely will not run for a reelection but I looked at the proposed remmit. I also came up with some comment not yet in your version. I shared it with some colleagues here at the foundation first and then also with the currently elected committee members. so I assume or what I expect is that we don't give individual comments but comment as a elected committee how we see or how we could accept such a proposed remedy and this is currently at best as I know still a work in progress. So yeah, I have my own opinion.

00:35:00

Markus Gufler: I can also share it already...

Markus Gufler: but I would prefer to come up with a elected committee members comment instead of all individual feedbacks.

Lorenzo Bruno: Okay.

Lorenzo Bruno: Yeah, I like This is a document for you guys. It wasn't so this was drafted orig from what you have worked on with that racist spreadsheet with Duncan and then we worked on it with Ken. So this is your internet. this is not shared with anyone else. So this is for you to work on and be happy so you can adjust it and edit it and suggest this or do whatever it is it is needed. this is not shared outside Marcus. So just feel free to work on it with the committee as you see fit and then yes once you guys have reached an element where you reach a point where you have enough comments to a state where you're happy with then you can make a decision as a committee.

Lorenzo Bruno: So with a vote I assume you guys are happy with this and then you can bring it up to ISC and to the board. but anyways I think just my only request have a look at it if you feel you can add comments other than there if you think you don't want to add it to the document you get your own chat I think on Slack so that's fine too. I think we just need to keep talking about this so that when we start to talk about the elections people know what they are applying for right as simple as that. Okay, that was it. Thank you.

Adam Dean: All Thank you, Lorenzo. So, I think that brings us to all of our impromptu created agenda items for the day. So, does anybody else have any other business that they think we could address in our 20 minutes left of the public meeting here?

Lorenzo Bruno: I might have another. Sorry.

Terence McCutcheon: .

Adam Dean: Text started first. So tech, Morenza.

Terence McCutcheon: Sorry, I dalled up an agenda here quickly while we were chatting in the beginning, so I don't know if we covered all of those. but yeah, I think we're good, but just making sure in case anyone had a question of what's there or if I need to add or change anything for this week.

Jonathan Kelly: I guess you add the remind to that agenda I suppose but it was only very briefly discussed but it was in the meeting. But Lorenzo, what was your other

Lorenzo Bruno: So there is very happening next week. so this year the interested booth is going to be slightly bigger. So we want to u some committees are making some presentation and they're be making themself available maybe 30 minutes at the booth so that anyone that wants to ask them questions they're there. we're actually making little pins so that you can be recognized as a committee member. So that would make things easier and nice. So, I just wanted to check if I think we asked this last time, but I didn't take a note of it. If any of you I know a lot of you are coming to Rebo, but anyone else is coming to Rebo. So, I just want to make sure we have at least one person. Duncan is coming to Good. Is there anyone else so that we know more or less how many people we'll have around?

Markus Gufler: I will also give more. Yep.

Adam Dean: Unless his plans have changed,...

Adam Dean: Marcus should also be there.

Lorenzo Bruno: So, we have at least three people. So, we're making an agenda to what will happen at the intercept booth. and if you guys want to so you can either just hang around but if you also want to make a quick presentation about what TSC has been doing and why it's important then we can set a slot there and we can advertise it so you got people coming there and might be also useful to recruit for the next round of elections. So yeah, for you three coming just keep that in mind and maybe someone like me or text will come following you giving you your little pin and then we'll let you know when that happens. that. Thank you.

Adam Dean: Very good. if nobody else has Nope. Johnny, go ahead.

Jonathan Kelly: I'll just quickly check if there's sentiment on this. Now, there's an ongoing budget line item from open source committee for maintainer retainer program and I attended the release meeting yesterday to speak to the Cardano node folk and different aspects of that team to start arranging like a consultancy session with them to discuss this program because there's going to be maintainers brought on. Is there overlap to the TSC in your opinion as the chair?

Adam Dean: The acting chair will say I don't know that there's necessarily a need for the TSC to oversee a maintainer retainer program.

00:40:00

Jonathan Kelly: No, no,...

Adam Dean: The Okay.

Jonathan Kelly: no, no. Just about the reaching out to the different aspects and teams and working groups because there's working groups under the TSC will be a part of the reached out to people. So, I just wanted to see if any input was wanted by any members

Adam Dean: Is everybody familiar with the maintainer retainer program that's being developed by the open- source committee? That might be a good place to start.

Neil Davies: Please. I'm not familiar.

Jonathan Kelly: I can explain. So, one of the line items on the OC budget is 50 individuals.

Neil Davies: Yeah, actually Johnny what I really need to know is what is the intention of given it's successful and...

Jonathan Kelly: The intention is to diversify the amount of maintainers that exist on both core repositories or start providing some payment to people who are doing community repositories.

Neil Davies: and this is intended for people who are doing core development perhaps or...

Neil Davies: what or for doing is this related to the TSC's unit of core or is it related for and...

Jonathan Kelly: It's both core and...

Jonathan Kelly: community because there's going to be core projects that have maintainers brought in from outside through this program.

Jonathan Kelly: So yeah,...

Neil Davies: and how is it I mean I'm just trying to get some which cases if it's going to be core and is it going to interact with the committees that report to this committee Is there in No,...

Jonathan Kelly: it's interesting because overseeing the line item is the open source committee. So, they would ...

Neil Davies: no, no. Is there intention that they want to interact with that? Okay.

Jonathan Kelly: Adam has a raised

Adam Dean: So I mean I started drafting this idea and doing the mental exercises on it with Christian and text last year in Vienna during the open source summit there. the intent has always been that these stipened and I would not call them paid but stipended maintainer retainers because we're only talking \$1,500 US per month is our napkin math right now is more to have an independent body that is not the core doing contracted development on the repo.

Adam Dean: So they're there to triage issues, identify good first issues for furthering and...

Adam Dean: enhancing community contribution to the open source ecosystem. and then to be there to be a guy that can approve pull requests and merges. So they do need to be technical to a degree to understand the code, but not necessarily a cracked core dev top of their game person.

Neil Davies: ...

Neil Davies: okay.

Adam Dean: What's up?

Neil Davies: So they are a technically competent right person who has technical knowledge of the core the repositories on which they have this power. So they have to have domain knowledge on the repositories that you're considering them to be used for and you are paying them a retainer basically as you say a stipend retainer to act and they are acting entirely in their professional capacity with an eye to the community not to their employer.

Neil Davies:

Adam Dean: Yes. Yeah.

Adam Dean: And

Neil Davies: So that sounds like the criterion I think. I would imagine if you're going to appoint them how the only thing the TSC might be interested having an opinion on is vetting them as they come on in some way or having an opinion how they appointed. Yes.

Jonathan Kelly: Mhm. as it stands at the moment, I'm working on an application form for people to show their current experience to meet that technical competency. and I'm going to ask people to consult on assessment criteria,...

Jonathan Kelly: what kind of people they're looking for, that kind of thing, on the different core repositories. So, I'm getting a list together of the repositories that will have people come in. TSSE members are welcome to come to that meeting when it's set up. so that's what I wanted to see if people were interested or wanted to get involved.

Neil Davies: So yeah,...

Neil Davies: are you looking for the TSC to be consulted, or...

Neil Davies: be part of the decision you're making? Right. Right.

Jonathan Kelly: This becomes a question of TSC remitt

Neil Davies: But what are you looking for as the open as the people running this? What certainty do you want? Okay.

Adam Dean: And so real quick, Tech, before you jump in here, what I would say to that point is there probably would be some criteria that these stipended or retained individuals would attend the working groups for whatever thing that they are maintaining and could then become the liaison. that's not necessarily distracting from the core development teams doing the coming and presenting, hey, what is going on with Plutus and why is there this new repository?

00:45:00

Adam Dean: They could be that person that makes that presentation back to the TSC, for example, and...

Jonathan Kelly: Yes. which could...

Jonathan Kelly: which could...

Adam Dean: gets our rubber stamp for creating a new repository or something.

Jonathan Kelly: which could itself help address Marcus' previous concerns about not having an eyes on what's happening in different decision-m processes and...

Jonathan Kelly: but yes text okay exactly...

Neil Davies: It sounds like the TSC should be consulted on the process at least,... right? That's right. I'm not trying to con I just think if you're not consulting the process then we don't know what's going to happen but I think yes I would suggest it's consultative right

Neil Davies:

Jonathan Kelly: which why I've brought it to this meeting to see what level of involvement or overlap there is. thank you for that.

Terence McCutcheon: Yeah, I would agree.

Terence McCutcheon: the ask here is consultation. at the end of the day, how do we make this an accessible position, but how do we also protect the security of the development? Right? we don't want to just throw someone in there just

Neil Davies: Could you define what you mean by accessible in this context?

Jonathan Kelly: as enabled to be accessed by community members applying outside ease of access to application I

Neil Davies: You use the word an accessible position. Yes. so...

Adam Dean: not requiring 20 years of experience developing on Cardano or...

Neil Davies: but No, no, no. I totally agree this...

Adam Dean:

Terence McCutcheon: Yes.

Neil Davies: but you are placing a level of trust in them as individuals and in their technical competency.

Neil Davies: So yeah I get that.

Jonathan Kelly: Mhm. Which is...

Jonathan Kelly: why I want to reach out to the existing project managers maintainers because I want to get what levels of and also their input on who and what on the application side so that there'll be u collaboration there. It's

Neil Davies: So that perhaps we have running out of time now, but as we part of this process, I can make some suggestions as how I have seen this handled in my past. what were the criterion by which somebody had to do that in order for them to be eligible for this post and that's more than we could talk about now. But I think we can make more than a subjective we can make it an objective criteria is...

Jonathan Kelly: Mhm.

Neil Davies: what I was trying to say, right?

Terence McCutcheon: So the accessibility comes down to a part of this.

Terence McCutcheon: If we have somebody who has a lot of experience as a maintainer across a number of different repositories, projects, whatever, and their experience with Cardano is in the one to three years or they've dabbled, whichever one it is that they've spent the most time with that they have an open source maintainer. In this instance, there should be a small level of ability for us to accept the risk of having a current project maintainer mentor that maintainer as we go along.

Neil Davies: Yeah. Yeah. So tech I'm not trying to create a huge barrier to entry here. What I am trying to do is to create a fact that there is a rubicon there something they got across this we have to find because we don't know who these people necessarily are personally. This is the big problem with this thing is not that the technical stuff is one thing, but the fact is there's A huge matter of trust if you're going to Yeah.

Jonathan Kelly: Yeah, which again is...

Neil Davies: And that's the

Jonathan Kelly: why I'm looking to define that what's the level? Christian I know has spoken previously to existing contractors about this and mentorship is part of something they're willing to give to people that come on board this. He was telling me recently. So that might help as well. Christian, where were we

Christian Taylor: Yeah, I can speak to this because I helped architect all of it, but essentially we're keeping risk mitigation as a big piece in this security. what this is supposed to do is help the core teams just focus on their contracted work and their remits.

Neil Davies: Okay.

Christian Taylor: This takes on the community management, helps with the adoption rate and provides an opportunity to expand the talent pool over time. So that's a main thing but when we're talking core repositories there's higher standards to be met versus other projects. So we will select that we'll build a list of maintainers their skill sets. Intersect will provide some form of KYC just because of whoever we get in contract with we need to have some background. and we already pilot piloted this too with Cardano addresses last year with Adam.

Christian Taylor: he volunteered to help work with the Cardano found or...

Christian Taylor: how team at Cardano foundation to work on the typescript. They own the Haskell and there's a joint partnership there. So similar things

Neil Davies: Yeah, I'm...

Neil Davies: what I'm trying to say here is if we have clear procedures that we accept them, that's fine. But it's just that, we have to be seen to have reasonably decent procedures that we follow. That's all I'm asking because actually the integrity and...

00:50:00

Jonathan Kelly: Yeah. Mhm.

Neil Davies: the veracity of the codebase is something that external people wanting to use kodana look at. Does that make sense?

Christian Taylor: Yep.

Neil Davies: I mean It's about being not just doing the thing but being seen to do it properly is what I'm trying to get over here. I mean it sounds a bit fuddy duddy and I do realize it sounds but actually it's the sort of thing you've got to do to get past due diligence in the future.

Christian Taylor: Don't worry,...

Jonathan Kelly: But it

Christian Taylor: I'll be the first maintainer to help you on network. Just I was just cracking a joke that I'll be the maintainer to assist you on or network.

Neil Davies: Sorry. Sorry. Christian

Adam Dean: All right.

Adam Dean: Duncan, you have your hand up, though. Let's go to you.

Duncan Coutts: So I've got a great big fat conflict of interest here...

Duncan Coutts: because I am one of those people who is not currently working on Kadano and possibly might be able to apply for this program either personally my colleagues many people...

Jonathan Kelly: Yes.

Duncan Coutts: who do not work for me that I know who used to work on Kadano who are extremely good and who are not currently working on Kadano because IOG internal politics is it obviously Yeah.

Jonathan Kelly: This could be a path to get those people back as you say, but there's a conflict with you being on the TSC.

Duncan Coutts: So if I were to recommend to other people who don't work for me for example where I don't have such a conflict is this a program for individuals or is it okay if they work for organizations? Okay.

Adam Dean: The intent was never to be a full-time paid position. So I mean I would hope that either those individuals are working for somebody or are gainfully and pleasantly retired in other facets of their life.

Duncan Coutts: These are part-time positions,...

Adam Dean: Yeah. Yeah.

Duncan Coutts: but it doesn't...

Adam Dean: Not a full-time or...

Duncan Coutts: but it's right.

Adam Dean: not trying to pay you a full-time salary, but give you something to kind of keep you in the ecosystem and involved. And so it is hopefully a good way to at least retain access to some of that tribal knowledge that may otherwise be lost as people move on into other careers or...

Duncan Coutts: Yeah. and...

Adam Dean: facets of their life. depending on regardless of circumstances,...

Duncan Coutts: it doesn't and it doesn't matter if that goes through their current employer or them as an individual,...

Adam Dean: I imagine that would just be a matter of signing the actual contract once you get to that point.

Duncan Coutts: right? No named individual kind of thing.

Adam Dean: And it probably would not be, I would imagine, a swappable role necessarily, types can't swap a Duncan for a Bob's your uncle.

Duncan Coutts: Yeah. No, that's totally fair enough.

Adam Dean: But yeah,...

Duncan Coutts: Yeah. Yeah.

Adam Dean: you probably could, I would imagine, handle the payment through whatever company you handle to work or happen to work for. I wouldn't imagine that being a conflict. I've had to do that with various contracts for different purposes in my lifetime and it's never been a problem. that's usually a matter of your tax accounting. So, yeah,...

Duncan Coutts: Okay, that's Thank you very much.

Neil Davies: A little bit funky.

Adam Dean: that is a good point. So, Johnny and I can then take that back to the OSC as feedback on the retainer program just to keep in mind when we're scaffolding it out.

Adam Dean: And then once the OCE is ready to consult the TSSE, we'll put another meeting or at least a bullet in the agenda somewhere.

Kevin Hammond: Yeah, I've joined this lab. My understanding is that Johnny was going to progress this by talking to the developers. The

Jonathan Kelly: Yeah, I'm getting together a list of the core repositories that are going to have new people brought on potentially asking to set up a consultancy meeting with the people who are already maintaining those projects so that they can give me some criterion that they're looking for and also consult on the actual applications when they come through so that there's buyin and also the TSC will be part of consultation now after asking in

Kevin Hammond: And know as we said as we discussed with some of the developers yesterday, potentially this is great because it brings in new blood. we just have to be careful to make sure that we respect things like security that we follow the right procedures.

Neil Davies: Okay.

Kevin Hammond: We don't bring in people who aren't experienced in

Jonathan Kelly: And to that end, I have written a series of initial questions that may go into the application that asks people to prove their exact experience. So if people want to see that document, let me know. I'll send the blink.

Kevin Hammond: Okay.

Adam Dean: Yeah.

Adam Dean: And how those projects manage their internal life cycles and sprints and development processes or whatever. Yeah. the retainers would be expected to kind of mesh in with the existing project rather than come in and pee on the fire hydrant. a new chief of the project. we're appointing a community member who should be seen as hopefully if we can get it there. And we all realize it's going to be a bit of a culture shift away from the way things have been done, especially on a lot of the core repositories.

Adam Dean: So, baby steps and as long as we're making progress and seeing something good come out of it, I think it's worth trying at least. So,

Kevin Hammond: Yeah. Yeah.

00:55:00

Kevin Hammond: One of the difficult things is going to be integration into the team, Adam. So obviously we've got relatively small close-knit developer teams are communicating via internal Slack and other systems and anyone who's being brought in is going to have to basically be embedded within the team somehow. So they'll have to either have to fit with the existing working methods or new working methods will have to be devised.

Adam Dean: Yeah, we did get buyin from both input output and twe on for their various repositories that they are primary contractors on to support this idea of kind of mentorship and integrating a community or shall we say independent maintainer into their repository flow.

Jonathan Kelly: Yeah.

Adam Dean: So that's their commitment. We'll see how things actually work in practice once we get the program started.

Christian Taylor: And it's a hammer. We don't want to force down from an exec position because that never meshes well with anything in engineering.

Adam Dean: so we've got good clear takeaways on that. we are at the hour mark. So if there's no other business, we can go ahead and adjourn this meeting. I don't believe we have need for what do we call it in camera or off

Neil Davies: In camera,...

Adam Dean: and camera meeting this week...

Neil Davies: that's the Just good.

Adam Dean: because we don't really have any contentious stuff to discuss that maybe is not ready for public circulation. so if you guys are all game for it, enjoy your extra 30 minutes of your day. and I'm going to call it at least motion to adjurnn at this point.

Benjamin Hart: Have a good week.

Kevin Hammond: Okay, thanks everyone and...

Kevin Hammond: apologies for not being here.

Adam Dean: Thank you everybody. Cheers.

Meeting ended after 00:57:13 🙌

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

