



did:v1 Rubric Evaluation

A complete evaluation and iteration of the
DID Method Rubric

JOE ANDRIEU

MAY 6, 2021

<http://legreq.com/pres/v1.rubric.didwg.2021.05.06.pdf>

Agenda

- Context
- What we did
- What we learned

Context

- ▶ DID Method Rubric
 - ▶ RWOT Paper (published)
 - ▶ W3C Note (pending)
 - ▶ <https://w3c.github.io/did-rubric/>
- ▶ DHS SVIP funding DID and VC interoperability efforts
- ▶ Digital Bazaar developed did:v1
 - ▶ Presented “Rationale” advocating did:v1

What we did

- ▶ Reviewed current W3C draft
- ▶ Found criteria that express Digital Bazaar's rationale
- ▶ Identified **potential** new criteria to cover new elements
- ▶ Refined criteria to better address Veres One distinguishing features
- ▶ Shared with cohort
- ▶ Engaging cohort for additional feedback & insights

What we learned #1

- ▶ Rubric still in infancy
 - ▶ Some questions were just too academic
- ▶ Need structure-variable questions
 - ▶ 1.3 Separation of Power
 - ▶ 4.6 Consensus layers
- ▶ Enforcement (initial draft of real questions)

What we learned #2

- ▶ Design is itself a separable concern
 - ▶ Distinct from governance
- ▶ May need separate evaluations for
 - ▶ Implementations, esp wallets
 - ▶ Adversaries: how does the method handle particular adversaries

What we learned #3

- ▶ Still a long learning curve
 - ▶ Learning the Rubric
 - ▶ Learning each Method
- ▶ Need better tools for community engagement
 - ▶ Criteria discussion
 - ▶ Custom rubric development
 - ▶ Shared rubric evaluations

Open Discussion

- ▶ <http://legreq.com/pres/v1.rubric.didwg.2021.05.06.pdf>
- ▶ <http://legreq.com/media/rubric.v1.2021.05.06.pdf>
- ▶ joe@legreq.com