00:00

The handshake phase, wrapping up clarity contracts for 0.1, starting for 0.2. For the SDK core, there's two SDKs called out, the core and the signer. So we're going to be wrapping up stacks types and moving into SPTC transactions for the signer, getting into the P to P protocol and the roast signing.

00:25

In with the signer.

00:29

There's the signer UI, which has already received some attention, but I guess going to be kicking off more intentionally. The Docs team moving from a high level work into the protocol and releases component. Nakamoto Jude's going to be working to wrap up stacker DB V One and starting on the VDF V One and the blockchain rollout for V One clarity.

00:58

VM, wrapping up support for non state.

01:03

Clarity operations and starting with the state related clarity operations and cross contract calls, testing and hardening and quality of life. A whole bunch of efforts going on regarding SBTC testing, clarity testing, and then getting into the blockchain survey action item. So going through that, developing those issues and prioritizing them. And then I saw some other ODS and ends being added to the project board. So we'll jump to the project board here in a second. I wanted to get everyone's wheels turning about the Sprint sync. So we have the hackathon coming up next.

01:50

A good number of people will be.

01:53

In New York participating, others will be participating remotely. The goal of the hackathon is to.

02:00

Scan up the stacker signer, Sbtt signer.

02:05

And so Jacinta added a really great deep dive into the planner and coordinator onto the discussion board yesterday. So the call on Thursday would like to take some time to kind of go through that. I've created some discussion topics around that.

02:24

To make sure that conversation gets.

02:27

The attention that it needs. Also coming back to the SBTC user stories that were defined, there was a discussion topic that Muni broached in a call last week about the signer. So thinking about peer to peer networks and trying to get a better sense if people feel like I might be mischaracterizing this, but leveraging existing libraries versus building our own protocol. And then Joey commented something I believe is related to that yesterday about an unaccounted for need for a back channel communication system for the web based deposits. So we'll jump from here and then go into the detailed project board. I'd like to just kind of hear from the contributors. I don't know if Frager's on the call or not. Set Zeus, I see you here if there's anything that you want to speak to regarding all of the clarity work that's going to be going on.

03:36

It looks like you have items called out for SBTC 0.1 and 0.2.

03:46

Mainly just for 0.1 right now, which is, again, essentially all the happy paths. Latest update on our end is we're feeling very confident and I guess the we there is mainly me and Frigger on the stacking pool. Are feeling confident about the individual logic and the unit test. Right now the problem we're running into, which has been definitely more and more common, is we're running into blocks in how we can actually test flow scenarios. So going through transaction, someone starting a deposit and then having that be a Bitcoin transaction, then verifying on stacks, et cetera. So testing between Bitcoin and Stacks and making sure both of those are happening is what we're struggling with in our group. But I would say that outside of that, most of the things are kind of clear. So flow tests I would assume are going to be the priority, are going to be our main priority for these remaining weeks and of course making sure that we're integrated with the signers by the end of the week.

04:48

By the end of the month.

04:49

Sorry.

04:51

Okay, great.

04:52

Yeah, and I know Jose is going to be in New York kind of representing, know, able to answer some of those questions and hopefully help liaise between you and Friger remotely and what's going on in the room.

05:13

Yeah, I heard about the hackathon kind of last minute as well. I definitely would have been down to fly out to New York, but yeah, I'm around remotely for whoever needs me from whenever.

05:25

Okay.

05:29

Yes. Quick observation, if we go to the.

05:32

Previous print view for the mini, there.

05:37

Was a new task around the end to end testing scenario for mini. I see the four seven two pulled into the new one, I think, but can we also look at the previous sprint and what needs to trickle back into the current sprint? And while we're doing that, I see really well scoped work for the current sprint. But as we're going through the list, there's two things I want to focus on. We want to focus one, what is the deliverable milestone we want to achieve across individual working groups for each sprint? Let's also highlight that. Think about a working code or a demo you want to showcase at the end of the sprint and work your way backwards. And two, we have a lot of work planned for each sprint, but what are we basing the scope of the sprint on? Is that sizing? Is that priority?

06:33

If we can also assign some kind and agree on something that we all can communicate in the same language, that'll be brilliant. Because otherwise we will lose track of whether we are going to or we are in a good shape to achieve the milestone set for the Sprint for the SBTC Mini in the long term or not that we need to get that picture. And I'll add a third one. Also add a priority if possible. As new people are starting to contribute across individual working streams, it'll be easier for them to pick up tasks based on priority. If anyone has bandwidth. Yeah, those are my suggestions. Happy to hear from everyone.

07:19

Yeah, I'm happy to just talk a little bit back on the Clarity group and address what's happening there. Yeah, I would say sprint wise.

07:30

This.

07:30

Has been sort of a problem within our individual group is we've been switching management a lot and Marvin's been leading a lot of the architect and design and the management itself has been falling to the wayside. And so I'm going to start taking over a lot of what you're talking about.

07:49

Sir Allah.

07:50

So I would say most of our issues are still on the other rebuild. And so my first task is kind of clearing both of these up, making sure what is in the current sprint is actually accurate of what we're going on. But I would say in terms of the overall, I would say Martin's Gantt chart is probably like what we're following and the 3.0 roadmap that is tied to that. Right? So right there.

08:21

Yeah.

08:21

So that's all reflected here on this tab, the roadmap.

08:27

Yeah.

08:28

In general though, our group is behind in terms of adopting this versus the old rebuild.

08:34

Yeah.

08:35

And what I said kind of is for all the working groups as well. So as we're going through it, let's focus on those three for the current sprint.

08:43

Thank you.

08:47

I also pasted a link to that roadmap that we've been working on which again is reflected in this.

09:01

So that's a great set of points. Sarala, I don't know if anyone else has. It looks like there are some items.

09:12

That didn't get pulled over from the previous Sprint board.

09:20

They're still noted as new and on the Sprint.

09:24

So this was a request that I.

09:27

Had asked a couple of times.

09:31

If.

09:31

Everyone could make sure that they go through there's boards that are by IC so you can find your individual.

09:40

Tasks.

09:41

That are in the project board that are assigned to you. These are issues that were either created by you or have been identified as you being the lead. Make sure that you are getting that assigned the correct status and to the correct sprint. So that we're still in a process of all trying to get fullest around this one ritual of having this board and maintaining this board.

10:09

So getting off on the right foot.

10:11

And making sure that we know that we're working from a source of truth will help a lot in that regard.

10:19

Yeah, and I also see some stale issues way back from 2.1 that need cleaning up.

10:24

I think at the tail end we can move on.

10:29

Okay.

10:32

All right, so it looked like you had talked about everything regarding SBTC Mini.

10:40

The Clarity workstream for 0.1 and 0.2. Anything else you wanted to add there?

10:52

Okay.

10:57

Will, can I jump in with a quick question about the last request? So a bunch of those items are issues that got pulled in from the stacks blockchain board and I think there's a lot of issues that don't necessarily fit into kind of like our core focus for this Sprint planning. So what do you want us to do with those types of issues?

11:26

Let's see here. So they would be pulled into here.

11:32

If you just note them.

11:33

So are these issues that are done or not done? They're just on the backlog and they're just not related to the Nakamoto upgrade.

11:44

Yeah.

11:45

Okay.

11:48

I don't know if you would.

11:49

Do you feel like those should be? They could either be *tagged as being
part of the quality of life or.*

11:57

We could create a standalone work stream.

12:01

That would just relate to other.

12:07

We.

12:07

Could either put them *as a tet as the quality of life* or they could just go to
I don't know.

12:13

If there's other work streams that those would sort of fall into or if.

12:20

There'S just like a miscellaneous bucket that we could create. But essentially as soon as things are tagged and it's easy to just filter them out. So the reason why I brought them in here is because when you go and you add an item, it's going to show you a list of everything that's not added to the project board. And so it's easier for management to be able to for everyone to manage this to go in and just grab the new things. So even if you're adding an old item and then archiving it or marking it as done and so you're not seeing it doesn't show up. In having to hunt and peck through this long list of all of the issues, only the items that aren't on the board or haven't been added to.

13:06

The board will show up, if that makes sense.

13:09

Yeah, that makes sense.

13:11

Yeah. So if part of the grooming process, I can certainly just create some miscellaneous.

13:18

Buckets so that if it's out of.

13:21

Scope with the bitcoin summer efforts, they can get tagged into that other kind of miscellaneous area.

13:31

Yeah, I think Saral is right. Most of them probably could fit into quality of life.

13:36

Okay.

13:37

But then as far assigning a Sprint number to them, that might be very tricky to do at the moment.

13:47

Sure.

13:49

Yeah, that's fine. If it's unassigned, then it will also be filtered out because it won't be tagged with the current spread.

14:00

Okay.

14:09

Cool, thanks. Yeah.

14:12

Stepan, do you want to talk a.

14:14

Bit about efforts that you have planned for Sprint Three regarding the core SGK?

14:21

Yes.

14:24

This time I'm planning to write or add all of the types we need to support the signer code base. I think we'll need to deal with the transactions, some clarity values. I'm not yet sure. We've also had a sync today. We should probably end up writing even more tickets about how designers should order SPDC operations and stuff like that. And yeah, this week I'll basically focus on trying to lay down the foundation for that work to proceed, especially during the hackathon in New York. So, yeah, I'll continually kind of sync with Justinta Martin and Sayak on that and that's generally.

15:17

And then I don't.

15:19

Okay, so with regards to the signer dashboard, jacinta, I don't know how active.

15:32

Is that actually going to be during the sprint?

15:34

Yeah, I thought I had updated these, but evidently I haven't. The signer dashboard is definitely not the focus of the Sprint, and I'll try and update my tickets ASAP, but the focus is more on getting some pseudocode scaffolding in place for the signer, especially for the hackathon coming up. So, yes, as Stefan mentioned, we had a bit of a sink, so I've created some tickets and a new discussion related to that and I'll make sure to update them. But the focus is, yes, scaffolding and internal the state machine for the signer is probably what the main focus of.

16:13

This Sprint will be.

16:15

Okay.

16:20

All right, Martin, do you want to.

16:23

Kind of yeah, you might have noticed an issue popping up on the designer here because it wasn't work stream designed. We're all getting used to this board.

16:31

Okay.

16:33

But yes, it also has some more beauties waiting and yeah, on the doc side, it might seem like we have a lot of scope planned for this sprint, but since we have the hackathon coming up, we actually are a bit more focused on the docs, on fewer pieces. So you see a lot of stuff that's already in progress and almost done, but the new things that we are focusing on, you can see the backlog items on the top is well, okay. Pox contracts is also in progress by Jesus, but he has a lot on his plate, as you've heard during the Clarity update. But main focus is getting signer documentation ready so that we have the high level architecture. We have some central ideas of the state machine and the internal state that the signers need to have and the interactions between the signers and stacker, DB and signers and the blockchains outlined as quickly as possible because without that in place, we're not in a position to deliver during the hackathon.

17:40

So that's part of like we have the SDK preparations, we also have the documentation preparations. We had a really good call today outlining many of these things. So that's the focus on the documentation side. Aside from that, we're still, like the Clark Working Group is contributing a lot with the SPC mini documentation. There are some new things popping up there like Bootstrapping Spcdr. I'm very happy to see that in progress, but that's a relatively new issue that's popped up as well. So full steam ahead here, but a lot of focus on finishing up the things needed for designer.

18:20

What does Dr.

18:21

Stand for?

18:23

Developer Release.

18:24

Developer Release.

18:25

Okay.

18:26

Yeah, I think the Clarity Working Group coined the abbreviation. So you will see Dr a lot, probably.

18:32

Thanks.

18:36

And then, Andre, I've seen a couple of items of yours happy to go through.

18:42

You've got some things talking about explainer.

18:46

Deck, the launch plan for developer release.

18:51

Yeah.

18:55

On the topic of documentation, this is, I think, something that's really helpful, especially for communicating with our partners and with the ecosystem. So I think Martin is working on, I think, a general sort of explainer of the signer documentation. I think it's also important that we have those docs and tutorials kind of made for partners specifically so that they can begin to integrate that into their systems. I think additionally, for all of the updated technical docs, we're going to need to go through and ultimately update a lot of our marketing materials and some of the explainers that are kind of out online. There's a lot of conferences and events coming up next month. So I think my general plan for this is to basically make sure that all of the updated design decisions that are reflected in this documentation effort are also reflected in the marketing materials that we have.

19:59

So sure be working closely with Martin to finalize that as well as with Kenny as well. In addition to that, I'd say general top priority for me is on the release planning. So making sure that we basically have clear timelines, clearing any critical path items that we need to have a release and we're being clear about sort of who is the target audience for this developer release and how they will likely be using the product. We had like a kickoff meeting right before this to kind of start exploring some of these questions. So I think that's going to be a large part of this Sprint, just making sure that we have everything sort of aligned and the goals for the release are sort of just clear to everyone here. Let's see, I think those are the main things that I have here. Let me just double check.

21:00

We're planning a release at the end of the Sprint.

21:03

Is that what I heard, Andre?

21:07

So I think it's a good question, Sarala. I think specifically when I say release, it's really for the testnet release that has been planned for September. There are some open questions around do we launch on testnet versus mainnet? Are we going to have whitelisted groups of signers? How do we kind of move forward with this release in a way that's meeting the needs of the builders and developers that are in the ecosystem? So just trying to make sure that all those things are aligned. And to your point, Sorella, I think working backwards from that and making sure that the releases that we can plan for the end of this Sprint are sort of feeding into the broader goals.

21:58

That we have there for clarifying.

22:07

Great.

22:08

Jude, do you want to kick off.

22:11

Some of the conversations around Makamoto?

22:16

I mean, kind of the same what people have been saying earlier. My main thrust right now is just to get everything ready for the hackathon. So getting Stacker DB live, or at least usable to the point where we can start fiddling with it next week as well as do some preliminary homework on trying to figure out how the code will be factored with two separate block processing rules in effect the pre Nakamoto and post Nakamoto.

22:44

Great.

22:47

Bryce?

22:50

Yes. Let's see. Kind of finishing up the pieces from the first Sprint is that issue number 26 in the list there, supporting the basic subset. So essentially the framework is there from the previous sprint and then it's just a matter of filling in more details. Mostly. I talked to some of the Bitcoin L two labs folks this morning and they're going to help out with that. So I kind of went through a bit of what that code looks like and what is next, and I think we should have a good collaboration there. Then my current first focus is this piece. So this is mapping the sequential types, anything other than the basic types onto the stack model of the WebAssembly VM. I was hoping to have that done last week, but didn't quite get there. So that's my first priority. And then combining that with that first item and then the state related Clarity operations.

23:58

The goal that I'm planning to show by the end of the hackathon next week is to have things actually executing inside of Clarinet. So basically building the WebAssembly and integrating that runtime in with Clarinet's version of the Clarity runtime. I think that'll be a very cool demo to get completed by the end of next week.

24:20

That's great.

24:21

I don't actually have an issue for that specific Clarinet integration. I'll create that one after this meeting.

24:27

Great.

24:28

Hugo for that Clarinet related work. So he might join us virtually for.

24:32

The hackathon next week.

24:39

Jesse, do you want touch on.

24:43

The items that you have identified for.

24:45

Testing and hardening for Sprint Three? Maybe not here.

24:57

Okay, yeah, the only one that I'm just continuing on is 37 63.

25:06

Yeah, I'm not sure what the other ones are.

25:08

I'm still going through that list that was added.

25:12

I I think I reassigned.

25:16

That was an open issue that Pavitra had identified. I wasn't quite sure what to do with it, so I moved it to you.

25:27

Sorry, I should have let you know about this block full on this one.

25:32

Okay. Yeah.

25:34

I'm just continuing on with the work I have been doing the past other Sprints. I'm getting close to a draft PR. There is another issue that I need to add into this board that I followed yesterday around some extremely slow and flaky tests that I'm discussing with Aaron right now.

25:53

Okay.

25:56

Jacinta, you had something here regarding the Stacks node API.

26:02

I submitted that when I first joined. I don't know how it ended up in this Sprint, but it essentially was a comment from the fact that whenever I would query the Stacks node API, it had inconsistent return types depending on if the chain tip was behind or it failed to find that block height. It would have been a lot nicer from a developer's perspective if it just consistently returned a JSON. Struct with the error and the reason that was what that was for. But I never listed that under Testing and Hardening or under Sprint Three, so I don't know why it's there.

26:39

Okay, I'll clean up. And Ashton?

26:43

Yeah?

26:45

I've been setting up the CI for the SBTC repo, the Zack's Network, just SBTC, and I've done some investigation on task runners, but I think there was a meeting yesterday where we're trying to consolidate the way that we organize not only our CI, but our task runners for all of our Stacks network repos. So I'm putting together a document and going to drive the discussion on how we should organize our task runners between.

27:11

Our Stacks network repos. Great.

27:17

And then, Aaron, you had a couple of items scattered throughout regarding Nakamoto.

27:26

Yeah, sure. So I updated the state of this work stream a little bit, but aside from just trying to help make sure that things are in a good place for the hackathon, next week, I'm going to try to knock out two of the just sort of like simpler tasks in the Nakamoto stream, basically implementing these two burnout.

27:57

Great. I guess.

28:05

While we have everyone jacinta, if you wanted to maybe help set the stage for the brain dump that you did last week, is there anything from that? These were the open questions and concerns that I was able to pull from that. Is there anything that you're hoping for folks to take a look at within that discussion item and comment on before.

28:37

We have a more lengthy discussion on Thursday about this so that you get.

28:42

Answers to anything that's outstanding prior to the meetup in New York?

28:49

It's a good question. I think kind of the biggest. So I just recently reached out to Jude to figure out how Stacker DB kind of works. So I know that one of the big assumptions with what I wrote down there is that we can use Stacker DB for the P two P portion and figuring out what sort of format I need to make the message requests and responses to fit with Stacker DB is a big one. And if that assumption is a valid one, I think given the conversations with Jude, that's kind of the approach we're going to go with. But if people have concerns about that would be great. There's also questions. I just created another discussion that's about how we're going to map withdrawal fulfillments requests on the Stacks network to the corresponding bitcoin fulfillment because we don't want to have double processing, and it'd be good to be able to link those two transactions together and how we're going to map them is kind of important.

29:53

Another one is I wrote this originally with the idea that there was a coordinator for every reward cycle, there would just be one coordinator, but it seems a more resilient system and potentially an easier system is that per transaction. We use a VRF sort of approach. Everyone, not even actually for every transaction, anyone can sign, and we're going to just have potentially a little bit of duplicate work. So do we need a coordinator? A big question that Morten kind of put forward is, do we even need a coordinator? Can every signer just every time they.

30:36

See.

30:39

A transaction on the network and they haven't received a sign request for it, just trigger a sign request? And then if people get duplicate sign requests, each signer should keep some amount of state to know, I've already seen this, don't process it, that sort of thing. So conversations around what level of coordination is required beyond just aggregating partial signature shares are always great. So if people could have that in the forefront of their mind, I think that's really important. It's a bit hard to get into without going through the whole process, but those are kind of the biggest questions that came up through the conversations with Martin and Sayek and Stepan. So if people want to read through it, that might be the best way to kind of just get up to speed. Because I know it seems when you first say signer, it seems easy, but when you get into it's actually kind of complicated.

31:35

So to have people read through that entire brain dump, even though it is very long, would be really helpful. And then I'm sure they're going to have questions that arise and if they want to comment on that discussion board, that'd be great. I can then try and formulate it into themes so that on Thursday it's a little bit more organized.

31:52

But yeah, that's all I can really say.

31:57

I'm sorry.

31:58

No, that's fine. I guess I'm also curious, to what extent does this dovetail with some of the conversations that came up both on Friday and yesterday? I think on Friday, Moony posed the.

32:19

Question regarding P to P. Is this.

32:23

Something I believe people were talking about, like lib to P as an option, like leveraging an existing library versus building our own, which I'm guessing would be Stacker DB. And then what you posted, the second withdrawal, the fulfillment is that related to what Joey had mentioned yesterday regarding the.

32:48

Back channel communication in terms of a.

32:51

P two P discussion. So if Stacker DB is in the state jude has indicated, it is in a mostly testable state, and he's pretty I mean, I don't want to put words in your mouth, Jude, but you seem pretty confident that it'll be ready for the developer release. If we can leverage that. It should already have taken it's already using the P two P. It's handling all the P two P communication. So it should just come down to as simple as every signer needs to post or get to a specific API call, I'm assuming on the stacks node, I think anyway, yeah. So if that's the case, then the P two P discussion can be tabled. I mean, I think down the line, if Stacker DB is insufficient or needs to be rewritten on its own, it might, for example, leverage an existing library or something like that.

33:45

But I think how Jude has designed it might satisfy our requirements. It's just a matter of integrating what he has with what we need and understanding what sort of data format he expects. So I think the P two P discussion is okay, but in terms for the back channel communication system for web based deposits, I don't think I saw that comment from Joey, but I'm assuming it's related to linking stacks and Bitcoin transactions. But maybe Joey.

34:13

That's about reveal transactions. Like someone does a deposit request, right? The signers need to know a hey, here is the UTXO for a deposit request, and B here is the script that you need to sign to unlock the deposit request. And that information need to be relayed from users to designers. And I mean, that's not a hard problem, right? We know how to spin up a web server and how to connect things together itself. It's not a part of the current design. So that's something we need to specify how that information gets from point A to point B.

34:52

Is that not going to be included in the initial stacks?

34:58

I'm assuming this is for, this is a Bitcoin transaction. And no, you will not see, like, you cannot monitor the Bitcoin chain and figure out that a transaction is a commit transaction. Someone needs to tell you through some sort of back channel, like you need to know from another source of information than the Bitcoin chain that this transaction is actually committing to an SPDC operation. And here's the data embedded in that transaction.

35:26

I just had assumed that was a wire format definition, but I guess we need something in addition.

35:33

The problem with commit Reveal is allowing people to create transactions that look like normal. Like when you're creating, nothing is visible on the chain. When the signers create the Reveal transaction, then everything is visible on the chain. Then anyone running a Stack node can see the Reveal transaction and know, hey, here's data on the chain that needs to be processed by SPTC. But commits are invisible and they need to be made aware. To, again, like, this is not a technically hard problem. It's just something that isn't part of the current design. So it was pointed out as a sort of blind spot that we need to work in.

36:12

Martin, is the purpose of this for anonymity or is the purpose of this for something else? Because we could solve a lot of this problem by making it so that the commit transactions were identifiable on chain. In fact, Zack's Note itself could just pick them. Up and make them available to signers.

36:30

Is that even possible? Because there's a lot of constraints for commit transactions. Essentially the purpose of commit reveal is that custodial users can send a transaction to an address and that's all they need to do.

36:43

Right.

36:45

So you cannot embed other outputs and those are just practical constraints of the design. But if there's a way to make them visible on chain, then.

36:58

Sorry, I.

36:58

Think I talked over you.

37:00

Yes.

37:00

May I ask a question?

37:01

Please?

37:04

There's no world in which these transactions have off returns in them, is what I understand.

37:09

Not the commit transaction, but the real transaction. The real transaction has an op return. It has the magic bytes, it's visible, it's very easy to find. There's no world in which you can add an op return to the commit transaction. Unfortunately, you will sort of violate the whole purpose of commit reveal.

37:25

Okay, thank you.

37:26

That's all I need to know.

37:27

Yeah. All right, and then is there anything.

37:41

I didn't get a chance to check back, but the items that were identified related to the user stories for SBTC, is there anything that can be done to help make sure that those get onto the project board and scope?

38:04

Martin?

38:05

I don't know if this is something.

38:07

That yeah, I think there's some work we need to do to sort of refine these and map that to the efforts that we're already doing or figure out if there's any user story that we have that isn't sort of covered by anything that's already on our radar. But I don't think we should take brain dumped user stories and put them blindly on the board because that would just bloat the shared view for everyone. And so people, I don't think that would amount to anything positive for the project.

38:38

Okay. If we tried to set aside maybe like 1 hour when we're in New.

38:44

York to have a gut check, maybe towards the end of the hackathon to.

38:54

Confirm that these are still all valid and maybe try to identify what still needs to be mapped to the project board. At that point in time, after we've.

39:05

Had a chance to get a lot of other work taken care of, If.

39:09

I set some time on the calendar.

39:11

Is that going to be helpful?

39:13

Yeah, that would be great. I think it would be good to have some sort of dialogue on how we want to work with how we want to manage maintain these user stories and what purpose we want them to serve for the project as a whole. That would be great. Okay. Essentially figuring out how to maximize the benefit we can get from them. I mean, to me, the user stories is providing a good framework to sort of scan the design and figure out if we have any blind spots, figure out unknown analysis. Essentially they're providing a framework for that, but there might be other benefits to it. I don't know exactly what your intention of getting value out of them are, so I think it's good if we do sync that.

39:53

Yeah, I guess all of this goes back to some of Sorella's initial comments. I think that we're making a great progress in going from zero to one.

40:08

Like, hey, we're all in a room.

40:11

Together, we're all participating in these sprints together, we're all starting to speak a common language. But now that we've identified this roadmap, we need to be able to track progress against these milestones, to know how complete each one is and when they are complete, and also being more judicious and knowing what it is. That we're going to be demoing at the conclusion of every sprint, so that.

40:42

We'Re getting a clear indication of how.

40:47

Close we're getting to our goals. So, yeah, I suppose that taking those user stories and I'm reading it as, hey, this is a core behavior that needs to be accounted for. It's been broken down into six tests. These are six tests that they've been.

41:09

Laid out, but.

41:13

They haven't been assigned to someone. They haven't been more concretely scoped and added to the project board.

41:20

So essentially, it just seems like, hey.

41:23

Here'S a great opportunity to identify or.

41:26

To get to a trackable.

41:33

Means of understanding how close we're getting to a milestone. I just want to make sure that.

41:37

We don't forget about it and lose track of it.

41:41

It does seem like a smart thing.

41:44

For us to be using as a measuring space.

41:49

I agree with that. I think it's like tracking these user stories is really helpful to make sure that we have a really clear scope. And so an example just came up, Martin, in the call that were just in, where one example of a user story that I think wasn't accounted for is, as an application builder, I need a way to upgrade. The contracts or the asset contracts from Mini to Nakamoto, because without that, it creates several inefficiencies that make it really difficult for a builder to want to integrate Mini. And so one solution that was proposed was adding a trait definition. Okay, so we know that we may need to add a trait definition to the Mini contract and for future SBDC contracts in general in order to be able to do that. What is the body of work that needs to go into that and how does that change the scope?

42:43

So, just wanted to point that out as an example of something we're having, like, user stories of what we're actually optimizing the protocol for at this stage can help us make sure that we're shipping things that users actually need and they're requesting, and we can actually measure and see where the scope is changing. And just for that.

43:01

I have a suggestion for the hackathon or off site next week. And I know, Jude, you'll probably hate me for this, but if you're spending an hour of time planning for SBTC. I suggest whoever's required to be there, Martin, Andre, Will, and probably others on this call get together in a room. We have a lot of whiteboards there posted this out sequence prioritize size those user stories so we have a clear view of from now until when Mini is going to launch backtrack it and which of these user stories need to be done in what?

43:38

Sprint.

43:39

And make sure that everyone in that room understands the scope of it. And also brainstorm if you're missing any user stories for that matter. Maybe spend an hour or two time box it and you won't get this chance again to be in person to plan this out planning in an async session versus in person on a whiteboard. Stark difference. So make the best of that time.

44:06

Yep, great idea.

44:12

I'll set it up.

44:13

Jude.

44:17

I will work to sort of tee up a little scheduling exercise and then pull you in for an hour of time when we're in New York just to make sure that we've identified what the user stories are. We've broken it up into individual tasks and we've reverse engineered from essentially what the ship date is going to be to now and make sure that we're assigning all that work to people. Okay, is there anything else.

45:01

That we.

45:02

Wanted touch on? I wanted to just make sure that people saw there was a post.

45:08

In.

45:09

The Discord server from Maxine and the UX UI about some designs he's been working on for the SBTC dashboard. I'm guessing, Andre, you've seen that. Just wanted to let others know that's there.

45:25

And then also a note in the.

45:28

Sprints channel from Rohit about the progress.

45:32

On the Stacks Python Library, if anyone.

45:38

Is interested in learning about the status of that. But that is all I have right now.

45:54

I will absolutely make sure I go.

45:57

Through and Bryce, I'll work with you. Make sure that we get all of the items that are sort of out of scope for this off the board. And then also make sure that we're working to get everything carried over from the previous Sprint to the new Sprint. Anything that is relevant within scope and was uncompleted.

46:35

All right.

46:40

This is it, right?

46:42

This is the start of sprint three. Oh, Maxine, I see you here. Is there anything that you're hoping to.

46:53

Get feedback on with the dashboard, or.

46:57

Is there anyone that you haven't connected.

46:59

With that you need to connect with?

47:04

Sorry, yeah, nothing is really set in stone. It would be great if we could have some feedback on this from any point of view.

47:23

Okay, is it just the one static comp now, or do you have a prototype that you could share or additional screens?

47:35

So far, that's it, but yeah, I'm open to design more pages if necessary.

47:44

Okay, yeah, I will touch base with.

47:48

Andre and make sure that we get.

47:50

You the feedback that you need.

47:52

Yeah.

47:53

So I've been working with Maxime on this. I think we're at the stage now where it's really just, like, getting final sign off from any other stakeholders to actually go out and build those out a little bit further. So I think that's why Maxime shared it with the broader group. So if there's anyone else here that wants to take a look at the dashboard, sort of understand the user flow there, now's the time to provide feedback before we start building those out.

48:21

Excellent. Yeah. Something that we may have missed or, like, something that's really important that we missed somehow. Just should.

48:36

You might consider posting the.

48:40

Comp.

48:42

Maybe with a link to a figma file so that people can go and click on the figma file and do that in a GitHub discussion board and sort of spell out what areas you're really hoping to get feedback on. And then if people are able to just point and click on there, say, hey, this is unclear, or, we need this button here that will lower the bar for people.

49:10

Okay. Makes sense. Okay, thanks. You got it. All right, take care. Good morning.

49:22

Stay safe out there.

49:27

There were.