

# **FACTOM COMMUNITY**

## **MEETING MINUTES**

**Factom Guides**

**Meeting #16**

**2018-08-06**

VERSION	DATE	CHANGED BY	CHANGES
0.1	2018-04-07	Tor Hogne Paulsen	First draft for guide review.
1.0	2018-04-09	Tor Hogne Paulsen	Version for general use in the Factom community.
1.1	2018-04-12	Tor Hogne Paulsen	Added more fields for metadata.
1.2	2018-04-15	David Chapman	Updated, “Chairman” and, “Secretary” fields.

Note: This version control is for the Template, not the individual meeting minutes.

<b>Date and time of meeting</b>	2018-08-06
<b>Date minutes drafted</b>	2018-08-06
<b>Date minutes approved</b>	
<b>Organization/Team</b>	Factom Guides
<b>Attendees</b>	Factom inc (Brian Deery), Centis BV (Niels Klomp), DBGrow Inc (Julian), Canonical ledgers (Sam), The 42ND Factoid LTD (Tor) (via chat).
<b>Members not in attendance</b>	
<b>Other attendees</b>	
<b>Meeting Leader</b>	Brian Deery
<b>Meeting Secretary</b>	Sam Vanderwaal

<b>Subject 0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Roll Call</b></li> <li>- <b>Approval of minutes from previous meeting on 2018-07-29.</b></li> </ul>
<b>Discussion</b>	<p><b>All Guides present.</b></p> <p><b>Brian motions to accept minutes from Guide Meeting #15. Niels seconds.</b></p> <p><b>All Guides vote to approve minutes.</b></p>
<b>Conclusion</b>	
<b>Follow up</b>	

<b>Subject 1</b>	<p><b>Recent network stalls; background and fixes (timeline) - (Brian)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Also: Release schedule for next 2-3 versions including content.</b></li> <li>- <b>Which factomd version will include API requested by Polo?</b></li> </ul>
<b>Discussion</b>	<p>Brian: Some background: several weeks ago we had some stalls in the network. Coupled with issuing of the grants. So we tried to make a release that combined critical bug fixes + grants. One of the bug fixes is suspected to be causing some kind of issue that is difficult to understand and the root cause has not be ascertained. We re-released with only the Grants (4.5.1). Grants are set to activate in ~2 hours. As part of this we removed all the critical fixes so if there are stalls such as what happened</p>

yesterday the network will not recover gracefully. And so, there are about three of these fixes. One of them is suspected to have a slightly higher likelihood of causing issues because it has more code changes. So there are two critical bug fixes we are ready to integrate and get to the testnet. The third one, the savestate, needs more inspection and testing because it involves more code. And there are a handful of other patches in there to help with debug when other problems such as this happen. And there's another network bug fix, more of an optimization, that has been on the backburner for a while. That is a fix that is slightly higher risk but may yield some positive benefits. The thought is to have two releases to testnet this week. One of the releases would involve some of this network fixes and then that gives more time for integrating the critical bug fixes that we're confident with to be deployed on the testnet later in the week. And also, the factomd API that is needed by Poloniex is close to being ready. We're anticipating that going onto the testnet Thursday as well. The poloniex fix has two aspects: walletd and factomd. What I'm referring to is just the factomd part. We got feedback from Poloniex that they were willing to do some development using pre-release software which will be the walletd. But the factomd updates need to go into the testnet because they're part of the flow through the core code. It's just an API change but more stuff needs to be added into the factom inc. code itself to account for it.

Quintilian: 1 week testing on testnet and then mainnet release @briandeery ?  
(Keeping to the 2 week cadence you talked about previously)

Brian: Yes, along those lines. If the testing we're talking about goes well this can get deployed next week. Some of the changes have to do with faulting so it may or may not be a required upgrade but we'll have to do more research on that.

Paul Snow (Governance chat): Trade offs to pushing changes out 2 weeks.  
Faulting needs to get out there, and poloneix needs updates.

Brian: These are all changes that stop the network from imploding so are all very desirable. Any questions on this?

No questions.

Brian: We have a month or a month and a half of performance updates that have not been deployed. Those would be very nice to get to mainnet as well, but I'm hesitant to include those with the critical fixes due to the potential of having problems in them.

Niels: With the recent stalls it would be wise to hold off on these performance changes. Have them better tested on the testnet.

Paul Snow: One of those (we have sat on for a month) fix the current TCP issue.  
There is danger to leaving code on the shelf  
These are performance changes.

	<p>Niels: I'm aware of it. Of course it up to you guus to determine it but we've had a large amount of stalls recently. If there's performance updates that help have a more stable network because of timing issues then I'm all for it. What I'm saying is that we need a stable network as soon as possible.</p> <p>Paul Snow: The idea is to make the network more stable, yes. We are getting a few more people doing things, and I'm not sure what the issues are. So we will also be adding logging to get more info.</p> <p>Q: What kind of logging? Deployed on individual nodes?</p> <p>Paul: Logging on elections and dbsigs...stuff around these stalls.</p> <p>Q: Ok, thanks.</p>
<b>Conclusion</b>	
<b>Follow up</b>	

<b>Subject 2</b>	<b>Alerting system update? - (Sam)</b>
<b>Discussion</b>	<p>Sam: tested emergency alert system. Worked well with some hiccups. Forgot to give new number for white list. Setting in Twilio stopping from calling Norway, which was fixed. Worked as expected.</p> <p>Over next few weeks, work with Tor to update process document. Wait until after ANOs are elected to do full emergency test. Timing is suggested right before the monthly ANO meeting. Tests are short and don't take a lot of time to run. It is also convenient b/c everyone is already available.</p>
<b>Conclusion</b>	
<b>Follow up</b>	

<b>Subject 3</b>	<b><u><a href="#">Doc 108 - Incident reporting &amp; Management</a></u> - (Niels/Tor)</b>
<b>Discussion</b>	<p>Niels: Basically the last two weeks TOR and I worked on the incident reporting and management document. Doc 108. Describes incident reporting for ANOs and others running nodes. In the future we want to have a proper incident management software but in the meantime we will use Discord and a spreadsheet. The spreadsheet has been created as well. It has the five most recent stalls. Two separate tabs: one for network stalls and the other one for single node problems; single nodes crashes. The idea is that ANOs upload their logs so we have a better overview of what happens and all the</p>

	<p>tehr nodes can see and detect problems early on including which ANOs are having problems and why. The document does bring some overhead of course, but it's not that much. We ask the node operators to upload their logs and create a small message in the Discord channel with a link to their logs and then have people from the Core and Code committee take on the incident. We will do the initial investigation and diagnostic with the people in the Discord channel but we ensure that everything gets written down in the spreadsheet. We make sure we can escalate and act on everything in a timely manner. It's a draft version so people can make remarks and suggestions. We are presenting it today to the Core and Code committee for a first look and then we'll present it to ANOs after that. I believe that the incident log is already paying off because it shows the frequency of our incidents and total duration of them. It's meaningful data we are getting from it.</p>
<b>Conclusion</b>	
<b>Follow up</b>	

<b>Subject 4</b>	<b>Legal grant update? - (Julian)</b>
<b>Discussion</b>	<p>Julian: There's not much to say on this as of now. It's pretty where it was at last week: in a olding block waiting for grant payments which is now ~14 blocks away. I would expect from now until about two weeks from now I anticipate being the ramp up period for this grant. Filling the firms' retainers and then will be going full force in about two weeks' time.</p> <p>Brian: Just FYI, activates in 14 blocks but doesn't become effective for another 1000 blocks (~one week).</p> <p>Julian: we'll be able to start as soon as it activates by fulfilling some retainers.</p> <p>Q (governance chat): Will the price dropping affect the grant?</p> <p>Julian: This is a much longer conversation but using the calculations we did for paying this grant will be about \$50-60k under the actual Grant ask and then with liquidation fees and slippage we'll be coming in ~\$80k under the actual Grant. If we are not able to do this at that amount, we'll come back to the community showing our budget and everything that happened and hopefully work out something with the community to fill out the rest of that Grant. That's it for now; be ready for a lot more in the coming weeks.</p>
<b>Conclusion</b>	
<b>Follow up</b>	

<b>Subject 5</b>	<b>Open Floor</b>
<b>Discussion</b>	No discussions or questions from community or Guides.  Brian motions to adjourn meeting and Niels seconds.
<b>Conclusion</b>	
<b>Follow up</b>	

Meeting adjourned at 19:28 UTC.