Date and Time
- Thursdays 6am PT
  - Screenshare and dial-in: https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/857787301
  - See UMA calendar for additional details: http://kantarainitiative.org/confluence/display/uma/Calendar

Agenda
- Roll call
- Approve minutes of UMA telecon 2019-01-17
- UMA business model (we will have "quorum" for it in first half-hour)
- IETF contribution plans
  - Review and approve new UMA2 Internet-Drafts intended for contribution (Thomas to produce prior to call)
  - Plan topics and presenters for a OAuth WG presentation:
    - Sender-constrained RPTs?
    - Comments on oauth-distributed draft?
  - High assurance of the RO to the RqP (discuss if Peter is available)
- AOB

Minutes
Roll call
Quorum was reached.

Approve minutes
- Approve minutes of UMA telecon 2019-01-17
Deferred.

UMA business model
If we link from a technical artifact, such as the PAT, to a "machine-readable device" such as a license, one big question is whether there is a "MUST understand" semantic required around the thing at the end of the link. Maybe insisting on machine readability is going too far because most implementers may not be ready for that. On the other hand, having that kind of language prepared could be an accelerator. To conclude for today: We can't ask report readers/implementers to be REQUIRED to understand what's at the end of the link without first writing that machine-readable stuff – but we might want to do that work and still not REQUIRE it to be interpreted. Also, if we do this work, it would probably be considered a spec vs. a simple report. So we need clarity on which thing we're building/documenting. For example, we can use the PAT as the first key artifact that would carry a link to a relevant device; would that device be machine-readable? Adrian notes that Justin R. has recently joined the W3C VC group.

AI: David: Follow up with Eve (and Colin?) on the PIPC progress.

IETF contribution plans
- Review and approve new UMA2 Internet-Drafts intended for contribution (Thomas to produce prior to call)
  - Plan topics and presenters for a OAuth WG presentation:
    - Sender-constrained RPTs?
    - Comments on oauth-distributed draft?

Eve spoke to Hannes a couple of weeks back, and has since exchanged email with Hannes and Rifaat. She has asked for 30 minutes of presentation time for a start; we'll work out exactly how much time as they get more requests in. Peter is looking at attending Prague in person. Eve may be able to attend. We'll figure out who may be in a position to present based on in-person vs. remote attendance. Eve is going to start a rough-draft presentation we can collaboratively work on.

In the umagrant I-D, Figure 1 has broken line ends. We could rewrite it so that the diagram isn't so long, and just number the steps. In addition, we could at least expand the text lines to stretch to the full 80 characters where possible, to shorten the length of the diagram. Or even maximally, we could refactor how the same information is presented, in diagram or even diagram-plus-new-text form. For starters, let's at least fix the glitch. The umafederation I-D doesn't seem to be affected.

MOTION: Cigdem moves, Sal seconds: Approve contributing the umagrant and umafederation I-Ds, with the umagrant Figure 1 lines fixed, to the IETF. AP PROVED by unanimous consent.

High assurance of the RO to the RqP
Deferred.

Attendees
As of 18 Oct 2018, quorum is 5 of 8. (Domenico, Peter, Sal, Andi, Maciej, Eve, Mike, Cigdem)

1. Domenico
2. Peter
3. Sal
4. Eve
5. Cigdem

Non-voting participants:

- Nancy
- Prabath
- Thomas
- Scott
- George
- Adrian
- David
- Bjorn
- Colin

Guests:

- VP Herisse (colleague of Nancy)

Regrets:

- Andi
- Mike