

# **FACTOM COMMUNITY**

## **MEETING MINUTES**

**[Factom Guides]**

**[MEETING #5]**

**[2018-05-17]**

VERSION	DATE	CHANGED BY	CHANGES
0.1	2018-04-07	Matt Osborne	First draft for guide review.

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

<b>Date and time of meeting</b>	2018-05-17 21:15UTC
<b>Date minutes drafted</b>	2018-05-17
<b>Date minutes approved</b>	
<b>Organization/Team</b>	Factom Guides
<b>Attendees</b>	Brian Dreery, Niels Klomp, Matt Osborne, Tor Hogne Paulsen
<b>Members not in attendance</b>	
<b>Other attendees</b>	Please see “Attendee-Snapshots” folder
<b>Meeting Leader</b>	Brian Deery
<b>Meeting Secretary</b>	Tor Hogne Paulsen

<b>Subject 0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Roll Call</li> <li>- Approval of minutes from previous meeting on (INSERT DATE).</li> </ul>
<b>Discussion</b>	Everyone approved the previous meeting minutes.
<b>Conclusion</b>	Minutes approved.
<b>Follow up</b>	Brian factomizes the minutes.

<b>Subject 1</b>	<b>Update on Guide Nomination + Election</b>
<b>Discussion</b>	<p><b>Matt:</b> Waiting for governance review. Two phone calls scheduled with insurance. Has to be customized insurance. We have to get new Guide election announced soon. Suggest deadline next monday or tuesday for nominating new guides.</p> <p><b>Brian:</b> I don’t think we will find clarity, even with the legal review, in the current environment.</p> <p><b>Brian:</b> Suggest to open nominations at tuesday.</p> <p><b>Matt:</b> How will we handle voting this time around.</p>

	<p><b>Brian:</b> Previously it was ascension by the parties, but this one we will have more than two people filling David Chapman's seat. In the governance doc we had different seats being filled by seats being filled by technical people, testnet community and the general community, and we didn't get good clarity about which people got filled by which people. So the technical people... So we had two testnet seats, maybe hashing out which seats are the ones being filled out by which people</p> <p><b>Tor:</b> Only two people applying.</p> <p><b>Brian:</b> But there could be more, nomination is not open.</p> <p><b>Brian:</b> How do we want to do the election process this time.</p> <p><b>Brian:</b> This is basically person voting between one person or another, or..? It's unclear what the mechanics are going to be for this. Do we make a channel like we did before, and get upvotes for either one person or the other?</p> <p><b>Niels:</b> We will need to have small introduction from the nominees, and then have to vote. The introductions have to be way before the vote itself is being held.</p> <p><b>Brian:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Matt:</b> Should we close Nominations close friday, then open election Monday, which gives the candidates the weekend to post an introduction about themselves.</p> <p><b>Matt:</b> This upcoming tuesday we open for nominations, nominations close on friday, and then open the vote on monday. How many hours do we have to have the vote open for? 48? 72?</p> <p><b>Matt, Niels, Brian and Tor agree on 48 hours for the vote. Vote closes on Wednesday.</b></p> <p><b>Brian:</b> (Makes a motion for the above). Vote may 28 which stays open for 48 hours. Matt and Niels agrees.</p>
<b>Conclusion</b>	Motion passes.
<b>Follow up</b>	Set up the vote.

<b>Subject 2</b>	<b>Onboarding Update</b>
<b>Discussion</b>	<p><b>Brian:</b> Onboarding is moving forward, its not as robust or as fast as we had anticipated. There were hiccups in the rollout after the first authority was added, and that caused some desire to redesign how the system communicates. As of today we have 3 outside parties running two servers. DBGrow is in the process of being</p>

	<p>onboarded, and they are currently running one authority server, and very shortly, hopefully today, we will bring on the team LUCIAP, and after that we will start seeing who else is ready on the top of the list of onboarding and bring them on.</p> <p>Any questions about that from the floor?</p> <p>(Sanfranshawk asks if there is only one guide position available at this time, which brian confirms).</p>
<b>Conclusion</b>	
<b>Follow up</b>	

<b>Subject 3</b>	<b>Discussion of what triggers &gt;100% efficiency</b>
<b>Discussion</b>	<p><b>Brian:</b> There was a bit of confusion last week, and currently, about when we as a community are going to give the go ahead to the authority sets to lower their efficiencies below 100%. There are two schools of thought, the first is when no single controls the majority of the network, the second school of thought is that we have our first eleven authority sets, and it would be more socially desirable to have all 11 of them running before factoids are created. We have had more information over the past week, where the onboarding process has not been as easy as we had anticipated both for the network and for the people setting up their servers, and I would like to hear thoughts from the guides what school of thought makes sense.</p> <p><b>Niels:</b> Last time we discussed that for it to be even we had to be 9 parties, and that since 9 is so close to 11, that we should wait until we are 11. I think this is a discussion the authority node operators themselves has to have, and make a decision to about.</p> <p><b>Brian:</b> New information, it is safe for Factom inc to lower the amount of authority servers to lower the amount of authority server its running before we get to that number. It's more a matter of risk during faulting, and keeping the network up and running VS having different parties control it, but the point is that others can be in control of this before we get to that 9 number, that might factor in to that 9 vs 11 we were thinking last week.</p> <p><b>Brian:</b> So with 4 other people on board, its technically possible to reduce the majority factom inc has to have a full distributed system this week.</p> <p><b>Tor:</b> How many servers in the authority set?</p> <p><b>Brian:</b> 10.</p> <p><b>Tor:</b> Dont you need an odd number?.</p> <p><b>Brian:</b> Yes, Inc could run 3 servers and still not have a majority.</p>

	<p>At this point it is more about risk management and spreading control. So, that brings forward the control, the first school of thought, and the second school of thought might take longer than anticipated.</p> <p><b>Tor:</b> When could we get 11 servers up and running?</p> <p><b>Brian:</b> We got two parties currently at authority sets, two that will be up shortly, and then three from Factom that would be 11. That would be four factom Inc. parties.</p> <p><b>Matt:</b> When do we anticipate all 11 being able to be up?</p> <p><b>Niels:</b> Are you able to onboard all the operators within a week?</p> <p><b>Brian:</b> It's all contingent on how the network is running, but if it does yes.</p> <p><b>Matt:</b> If we onboard 5, start inflation, then network has problems, the non-onboarded entities may not be happy about this.</p> <p><b>Brian:</b> Matt is taking about if we are not able to bring on more authorities in a timely fashion, then it looks bad for the people who came on earlier.</p> <p><b>Niels:</b> Agreed. Also another point, if we leave it up to the authority set itself, more than half of the operators will be on board and they have a majority, then probably 5 or 6 operators are already on board and they will of course waiting for having their factoids. If it then takes two or three weeks to get to 11... I don't think that's a fair vote. I think we need to leave it up to the authority set, last time we agreed to wait until we are up to 11.</p> <p><b>Matt:</b> I think it's up to the authority set as well.</p> <p><b>Brian:</b> It also gives an incentive for the operators to help out the rest of the operators that are not on board yet.</p> <p><b>Tor:</b> When can we be at 11 operators Brian? A guess?</p> <p><b>Brian:</b> I would guess 2 weeks, maybe faster... but I envision that there will be a few stragglers.</p> <p><b>Matt:</b> If there are stragglers, we would still have to go at some point and leave them behind.</p> <p><b>Niels:</b> Could we start out with 11, but even if we are not at 11 we would start inflation on "X" date.</p> <p><b>Suggestion:</b> We start inflation when 11 operators are in the Auth Set or in 2 weeks if we are at 9 operators or more. Whichever comes first. Everyone</p>
--	--

	supports this. Tor will spearhead this with the community to get support since it is ultimately the operators' decision.
<b>Conclusion</b>	
<b>Follow up</b>	

<b>Subject 4</b>	<b>Grant Solution Proposal, Governance Legal review, Foundation Setup Update</b>
<b>Discussion</b>	<p><b>Matt:</b> There are some solutions proposed in the forum. We are waiting for quotes from two law firms about timeline and costs so the community can have some more information. Julian is also talking to a third law firm. SL is doing a ton of work on looking at a foundation set up, Digital Impact contributed a ton of knowledge as well, and once we have the data we will move this forward and tie this up.</p> <p><b>Brian:</b> OK. Excellent. Thank you.</p> <p><b>Matt:</b> The guides don't want to pick the final solution at all, it has to be decided upon by the community. It should not be a Guide decision. Niels and Tor supports this.</p> <p><b>Julian (on Discord):</b> Is expecting a response from his law firm soon.</p> <p><b>Brian:</b> Is there any further discussion on the grant- and legal review we should have here in this meeting?</p> <p><b>Matt:</b> Prefer to do it in forums to involve everyone and have a written record so we don't need to rehash the same conversation continuously.</p>
<b>Conclusion</b>	
<b>Follow up</b>	

<b>Subject 5</b>	<b>New business?</b>
<b>Discussion</b>	<p><b>Brian:</b> Is there any new business from the floor?</p> <p><b>Brian:</b> Hearing no input, I make a motion to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Tor.</p>
<b>Conclusion</b>	
<b>Follow up</b>	

<b>Subject 6</b>	
<b>Discussion</b>	
<b>Conclusion</b>	
<b>Follow up</b>	

<b>Subject 7</b>	
<b>Discussion</b>	
<b>Conclusion</b>	
<b>Follow up</b>	

<b>Subject 8</b>	
<b>Discussion</b>	
<b>Conclusion</b>	
<b>Follow up</b>	

<b>Subject 9</b>	
<b>Discussion</b>	
<b>Conclusion</b>	
<b>Follow up</b>	

<b>Subject 10</b>	
<b>Discussion</b>	
<b>Conclusion</b>	
<b>Follow up</b>	



