FEDERATION

FACTOM COMMUNITY

MEETING MINUTES

Factom Guides

MEETING #12

2018-07-07

V. 1.2

FEDERATION

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.

FEDERATION

Date and time of meeting	2018-07-07 21:00 UTC
Date minutes drafted	2018-07-07
Date minutes approved	
Organization/Team	Factom Guides
Attendees	Factom inc (Brian Deery), Centis BV (Niels Klomp), DBGrow Inc (Julian), Canonical ledgers (Sam), The 42ND Factoid LTD (Tor)
Members not in attendance	N/A
Other attendees	Paul Snow / Flying Viking (from the floor)
Meeting Leader	Factom inc.
Meeting Secretary	The 42nd Factoid LTD.

Subject 0	- **Roll Call** - **Approval of minutes from previous meeting on (2018-06-30).**
Discussion	
Conclusion	Meeting minutes approved.
Follow up	

Subject 1	Tor Paulsen - update regarding recusal from first application round (Tor)
Discussion	Tor: After the first application round, the guides described the reasoning behind why they recused themselves from grading some of the ANOs. I have an update in this respect. For the sake of transparency, I want to disclose that I have taken an equity position in the ANO Cryptovikings in lieu of receiving payment as an advisor. This was done for tax-reasons, specifically that as we are both from the same country I would have to pay 25% VAT and be registered in the vat-registry which is a real pain. My role and involvement with them has not changed in any way since my last disclosure, and I act solely as an advisor to them. I do not participate in their daily operations. My position is in excess of 10%, but is not a controlling position, and I do not hold any official functions in their organization.

V. 1.2

Conclusion	
Follow up	

Subject 2	Update on initial grant implementation (Brian)
Discussion	Brian: New release of the factomd software coming up next week (week of 9th of July). We have been trying to include some performance updates, they have turned out to be trickier to have stable in all circumstances than we would like. The testnet deployment of that has slipped; we have basically been pairing down and removing various things over the past week that we thought we were going to be able to put on the testnet, and minimizing the amount of upgrades to find a stable release. So we are several days behind on the testnet release which was supposed to be this past week. That in conjunction with a simplified version of the initial grants are scheduled to go out for next week. My guess it that is will be a bit later in the week, seeing as we still need some testnet time on this. The grants are going to be hardcoded into the code, so it's a relative low risk operation and its relatively straight forward. Part of that is receiving the addresses from the grantees, which we have gotten some of so far. Then there will be other software that can be run before those actually trigger to make it such that in the future that more logic is applied.. And when the grant recipients get credit there is a digital identity associated with those so the grant recipients get a say in how the governance and protocol is run. This is going to be determined later on, and we are just doing the groundwork for that now. Sam: What do you mean about a simplified version of the grants being run on the testnet? Brian: So there are two things that are going forward with this release. Part of it is backwards compatible; thats some of the stuff we have been pairing down over the past week or so, and that can be updated or not updated and all the nodes should act in unison. But the grants themselves are not reverse compatible, at least from the ANOs perspective, the majority of the ANOs have to upgrade before that or they will not be able to build the blocks. Due to the time constraints and a lot of the success we have had with the ANO payouts, we feel comfortable skipping the testnet phase and just using internal testing on the internal testnets to accelerate the grant distribution process. And so reverse compatible parts can go on the testnet, and there is no activation time there. (...) This is an evolving situation. Paul: The main problem is that the testnet is at a different block height from the mainnet, so we cannot deploy the grant as they are on the testnet, but something

similar to it. Also it has a week delay before they pay out, so we cannot do a 1:1 test. I'm not sure if we even designed the tests yet.

Brian: We need a genesis block for the coinbase transactions.

Paul: We don't want to wait for that week, so we'll tweak the parameters so it pays out quickly. We don't really want to change the code for tests, but we will tweak it slightly; and it should

Niels: Is there a specific reason why we cannot just wait another week for this?

Paul: I do not think there is a rush. We are going to hold the tokens anyway at Factom inc, so it does not matter for us. Other people might not be in that situation, but we just need to make sure it's right.

Brian: We have been trying to keep this two week cadence. If it makes sense to slip on that a little bit, then maybe…

Paul: If we are going to hold to the cadence the slip would be two weeks, and we don't know if that is ok with everyone. Or we do an extra deployment in a week, or… There is a lot of options here.

Sam: Without a slip, what is the implementation on the mainnet?

Brian: There is a whole stack of timelines here. There is the one week delay from the coinbase commit to when it actually shows up in the coinbase. That's part of the protocol. You need to have a week of lead time to have a various ANO to actually update their software, so the activation time needs to be out a week. So that's two weeks from when it deploys. And then you back up from there to having the code ready and tested, and available. I'm not sure which timeframe you were talking about?

Sam: The timeframe for writing and testing the code for the testnet.

Brian: We are trying to do it this coming week. So that is kind of the plan at this point.

Julian: Sam, check out the factomize forum, and there it is a thread that has the timeline laid out.

Brian: We apologize that there are uncertainties about this. There is a lot of stuff going on at the same time.

Sam: Totally understand.

Tor: Do we have a conclusion?

Brian: We collect the addresses and the balances needed for the various grant payouts, and have those hardcoded into the code. Then we do some testing internally,

V. 1.2

	then have it deployed.
	Brian: Earlier we were talking about deploying directly to the mainnet seeing that this requires everyone on the testnet to upgrade, so the lead time on the testnet would push back the entire deployment of the grants. How urgent is the grants in relation to the risk tolerance of the grantees.
	Niels: So basically it is 2 weeks versus 4 weeks?
	Sam: Pauls initial date was July 16th for the coinbase transactions. Are we roughly on that timeline?
	Paul: The only thing that has slipped is collecting the addresses, because we were suggested to have the addresses last week. We should have some identities created in relation to the grants, but doing this a week later does not really matter. Holding us back right now is having the complete list of addresses needed to put it into the code. We are scheduling two payments per grant. The code is relatively simple, so if we can handle the social aspect then we can have it
	Paul: We just need to know for certain that we need to have all addresses that is going to be used for all grants. Prior to us activating the code, which is going to be out there a bit, all the digital identities should be created for future accounting purposes, so we can be able to look at this in the future so we can see that the digital identities existed prior the coinbase transactions being effected.
	The hard part is the social part.
	Sam: We can tag people in the forum thread to get this going. We will figure it out.
	Paul: The addresses are in the grants, but the digital identities are not (or some of them are).... If we go to that forum and each representative just says "this is it", then we can look at it and confirm it back to you guys. It is not hard.
	From the floor (#Governance-chat): *"Unless the only change to the code is coinbase payouts for grants I would still advocate to run it on Testnet first."*
Conclusion	Collect grant identities and payment addresses.
Follow up	Collect grant identities and payment addresses.

Subject 3	**Emergency Alert System Update (Sam)**
Discussion	Sam: We are going to use the TFA-bot for this. I had some difficulties getting it to work with SIP, but he (Stuart) kindly added Twilio support which works great.

V. 1.2

	AlexSupersloth and I tested that, and it works. There is some smaller changes to build into the bot for it to work for the Guides as well, and he will work on that
	Big thank you to TFA and Stuart especially for building this bot. It will be great tool for node operators to monitor their bots, and also for the Guides to initiate alerts.
Conclusion	
Follow up	

Subject 4	**Poloniex Update**
Discussion	Brian: No real forward progress on getting that up and running, however they have asked for an update to the API-wallet. It is not a blocker for anything they are doing, but it seems like a nice thing to do for them to move the process forward to show responsiveness and to make their lives easier in the future. And that is something that is on the roadmap, and they seem appreciative of that. While it won't help with the current holdup, by factom being more responsive the hope is that the responsiveness would be reciprocated. Tor: Timeline for the API-calls to the wallet? Brian: Not really, will go into our regular updates. They seem blocked on something specific that we can not help with at this point. Niels: Can you disclose the change they requested? Brian: Yes, they want the wallet to do a summation of all the balances into a single number, rather than having them need to sum all of them in multiple API-calls. So if they have 10 000 addresses, that is 10k API-calls and not one - and it's a time issue for them. Niels: it should not be too hard would it? Brian: No - not really. Niels: Thanks for the update.
Conclusion	
Follow up	

FEDERATION

Subject 5	ANO-selection
Discussion	Guides posted a timeline in #guide-announcements, and the documentation and forms is now ready. Guides will spend the next days looking it over to verify that everything is ok prior to the next ANO selection round..
Conclusion	
Follow up	

Meeting adjourned at time 21:41 UTC.

V. 1.2