

# **FACTOM COMMUNITY**

## **MEETING MINUTES**

**Factom Guides**

**Meeting #22**

**2018-09-17**

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>	2018-09-17
<b>Date minutes drafted</b>	2018-09-17
<b>Date minutes approved</b>	
<b>Organization/Team</b>	Factom Guides
<b>Attendees</b>	Factom inc (Brian Deery), , DBGrow Inc (Julian), Canonical ledgers (Sam), Centis BV (Niels Klomp)
<b>Members not in attendance</b>	Tor.
<b>Other attendees</b>	
<b>Meeting Leader</b>	Factom Inc (Brian)
<b>Meeting Secretary</b>	Canonical Ledgers (Sam)

<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 2018-09-10.</b></li> </ul>
<b>Discussion</b>	<b>All Guides except Tor from 42nd Factoid present. Minutes from previous meeting approved.</b>
<b>Conclusion</b>	
<b>Follow up</b>	

<b>Subject 1</b>	<b>Grant Round #2</b>
<b>Discussion</b>	<p>Brian: The Current grant has run out of time all the grants have been issued and we're in the process of trying to figure out how the next grants are going to be issued. I'm not sure if there are any specific items that we want to talk about.</p> <p>Niles: I would like to give an update on what I've been working on. Doc 152 is for the new Grant round creating the one off process where we mention dates, timeline and the process for the next Grant round. Tor and I have been working on it and we've made some nice progress on it but probably need one or two days extra. Of course this is open for discussion. What I will do is post the link to the doc in the coming days</p>

	<p>so the wider community can discuss. But before that we have some internal discussions to finish up before opening up to the wider audience.</p> <p>Brian: Where would one look to find this document?</p> <p>Niels: It's in the Governance drive under the folder "Processes", Doc 152. That's basically all I have to say about it. I do think in a few days we can have a wider discussion about it. And I would like to make the discussion not too lengthy as we will need legal to review it and I believe we need to set a date for the next grant round soon so everyone can prepare for it. I believe we will see a lot of grant proposals this round.</p> <p>Governance drive:  <a href="https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1b7pUXr1xQ4eh_npi4AogYJFc3w9n9S9N">https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1b7pUXr1xQ4eh_npi4AogYJFc3w9n9S9N</a></p> <p>Brian: Any feedback from Community or Guides?</p> <p>Matt [Go Immutable] in Governance Chat: Any reason to limit it to 100,000 FCT?</p> <p>Niels: It's an initial number but 100k FCT roughly translates to a little less than a quarter of Grant pool funding. However, with new ANOs being onboarded this amount will drop. We need to discuss whether we want to do Grants every three months or if we want to use an exact FCT amount for Grant rounds.</p> <p>Matt: Do we need this in the Governance? Seems like we have to go through a lot of hurdles if we ever want to change this.</p> <p>Niels: This is in the one-off Grant document not in the General governance.</p> <p>Matt: <b>So if I understand, even if this document is ratified by the community, in order to change a clause like this, it would not need to be voted upon again by the community?</b></p> <p>Niels: Officially you're right because this is a process document, but like I said, we want to prepare for future grant rounds as well so we like to set up the structure meaning there will be a new ratification of a future document once we have the full voting solution, etc. One of the things we like to do is to open the discussion a period beforehand so everyone knows what to expect.</p> <p>Matt: Thanks for the clarification. Just trying to limit red tape.</p> <p>Brian: We will move this to offline channels to discuss on the forum and Discord to finish up but this was a good heads up for everyone. Thank you. If there is no more discussion here we'll move on to the next agenda item.</p>
<b>Conclusion</b>	

<b>Follow up</b>	
------------------	--

<b>Subject 2</b>	
<b>Discussion</b>	
<b>Conclusion</b>	
<b>Follow up</b>	

<b>Subject 3</b>	<b>3rd party Audit (Brian)</b>
<b>Discussion</b>	<p>Brian: This is Micahel Perklin's audit. It has been 2-3 months since we reached out to him and coordinated contact with various ANOs. This past weekend he reached out to me and baout half the ANOs had gotten back to him. He also had some concerns and questions. Michael is a very studious individual and prides himself in his reupatiation. He doesn't want o approve something he doesn't whole-heartedly believe in. So I'm going to work on clearing this up and helping him resolve questions and concerns with ANOs. It's very important to get this kind of approval on our decentralization process.</p> <p>Factoshi: <b>Brian, I replied to Michael but never heard back from him. I wasn't sure if it got caught in spam or if he received it or what?</b></p> <p><b>Matt: Same for Go Immutable. Michael could come to the ANO summit also, if that has not been considered.</b></p> <p>Niels: I got a follow up from Michael this weekend and will make it a priority(?) tonight.</p> <p>Brian: I don't know the answer to Factoshi's question but we'll figure it out. I haven't invited him to the ANO summit. He is a very busy person being part of the leadership of the Shapeshift team. He came in the past but this is more of a question for Paul.</p> <p>Paul: Michael is always welcome and there's room to present in both Factom and Bitcoin conference tracks.</p> <p>Brian: Great I'll consider inviting him. One of his concerns was that Factom is not decentralized enough. Maybe meeting a large number of ANOs will allay some of these fears</p> <p>Sam: What are his metrics for decentralization?</p> <p>Brian: It's early days for determining this still.</p>

	<p>Sam: IF he has specific recommendations we can take them into consideration.</p> <p>Niels: Is he aware of the community documents and governance in the drive folder?</p> <p>Brian: ?? Missed this response, think it was you will work with him to look through them</p>
<b>Conclusion</b>	
<b>Follow up</b>	

<b>Subject 4</b>	
<b>Discussion</b>	
<b>Conclusion</b>	
<b>Follow up</b>	

<b>Subject 5</b>	<b>Follow up: tasks from last meeting / upcoming tasks</b>
<b>Discussion</b>	<p>///// START: Text from previous guide meeting minutes /////</p> <p>Sam:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Emergency Alert System √             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Test system with handful of ANOs √                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Tests with specific ANOs was successful.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Schedule large-scale test √                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Scheduled for 28th before ANO monthly meeting</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>● Factomize New Documents √             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Done</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Finish Doc 142 Emergency Alert System X             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Will do this week</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Update Factomize Instructions document √             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Finished</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Julian:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Prioritization of processes for update.</li> <li>● Release ANO Removal Document             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The ANo removal document turned out to be a larger project than I anticipated because of the feedback process between Guides and legal firm. Went through several major revisions we had to do some pretty comprehensive rewrites, but the deadline for having that out is</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<p>Tuesday.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Moving forward will be bringing the new grant round document to legal and having them review that. That will be my focus this week in addition to prioritizing documents that should go to legal.</li> </ul> <p>Tor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Draft a process for “ratification and updates” of community governance documents.</li> </ul> <p>(notes added prior to the meeting)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Started on the “Ratification and updates” process and named it “Administration of governance- and community documents”. It Needs more work. I got help from David Chapman to create new forum on Factomize named “Governance Discussion” with sub-forum “Document Ratification”. The general idea is to use the discussion section for public discourse about creating new or amending existing documents and then doing a vote in the “Ratification”-subforum.</li> <li>○ The procedure for creating/amending a document will be typed up in the process and shared with the community in the mentioned “governance discussion” this week.</li> </ul> <p>I have started working on the document but it’s not complete yet. Will provide update in next meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Start populating the Pledges-subforum with synopsis of the individual ANO’s pledges, and reach out to the individual ANOs to get their approval of posting them.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ It turned out that having private conversations in the Factomize forum (as this requires) is not possible at this stage. David (forum owner) has come to the rescue (thanks!) and is currently developing thread-by-thread permissions which enables the guides to have private conversations with ANOs. Hopefully this will be in place by the end of this week, and I will continue my work then.</li> </ul> <p>Pledge-subforum is not ready yet. Waiting for it to be completed. David Chapman expect the required features of Factomize to be ready later this week. Summarized pledges are ready for review from the ANOs, so things should move fast when the forum is ready.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Aggregate a list of community/governance processes and suggest what order we should start tackling them in.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ I have not gotten around to aggregate the full list yet (will do together with Julian), but I would first like to have the community agree on the “administration of governance- and community documents”, and then in quick succession ratify the following documents using that process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Doc 108 - Incident-reporting &amp; -management”</li> <li>■ Doc 142 - Emergency Alert System</li> <li>■ Doc XXX - “Removal of ANO from the Authority set”</li> <li>■ Doc 152 - “Single Use Process - Grants 2018-02”</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>The docs below are the 4 initial documents I believe we should have the community ratify first. They are all governance related and extensions of the Governance document, and should be handled in the same way as a change of the governance document itself:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ANO removal process</li> <li>- Guide removal process</li> </ul>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cancellation of coinbase outputs</li> <li>- Next round of grants</li> </ul> <p>Julian:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finish list of governance processes that need creation, updating, legal clarification, etc. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ I'm not sure that I will be ever finished with this list. But we have a list of things we need to do quickly, and we have a list of processes we need to take a look at. I think me and you Tor should make a list of prioritization of documents and what order to look at those. The second item is bring processes in front of legal for review. We did that this week for the removal of ANOs and reworked it completely with legal. I'm very happy with the version I was able to create with legal, and it is far better than what we were able to create ourselves. Legal found a lot of issues and we removed a lot of those; like missing definitions of terms used which were not defined anywhere. And I believe we should do this for all documents. The ANO removal document I will put out for the wider community to see today or tomorrow, and I think it will be a quick review process before we can ratify it.</li> <li>Niels: What about the cost? Any idea?</li> <li>Julian: I will need to get back to you; legal did a lot of things at once, and I need to pull out this document from the others to see how long time it took. What I can say is that the firm we are working with is getting very involved and invested with the Factom governance and it will be invaluable going forward.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Bring first processes, such as a fully formulated ANO removal process, to legal for final review.</li> </ul> <p>Brian</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finish onboarding of batch 1 ANOs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Done and successful.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Coordinate multistage release of v5.4.3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ In progress and successful so far.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Provide feedback on ANO removal process from governance doc co-author perspective and technical feasibility, plus how it might happen with standing parties. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ I was not as productive on that as I wanted to be on that front. I'm regret that I wasn't able to provide input early in the process, but I am keenly interested in the process to remove ANOs.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Release 5.4.4-rc1 to testnet <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ - done</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Continue release of 5.4.3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ -</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Update portainer for an ANO updates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Done</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Correct some portainer degradation with some ANOs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ done</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Develop process for integrating community code contributions (green light from lawyers - need to figure out the process for integrating that. Should be</li> </ul>
--	---



	<p>fairly easy). Timeline: Aiming for the first one this week; but the release cycles on factomd is more of a branching process with lots of things rolled up into one. Keep in mind that its a process; you have the tickets which gets tracked, multiple stages of testing... QA signoff etc. It's not done until its released, which tends to maddens the project managers thats involved. This gets into Xaviers question; done is a continuum - but yes, we are moving forward.</p> <p>Sam: Any legal limitations on the type of request?</p> <p>Brian: No. There are no specific limitations. We have been pulling in documentation PR's in the past. But this is the big one. It's been irritating that we have had pull requests out there that would have solved internal problems, but we was not able to utilize them. I'm happy that this will move things along.</p> <p>Sam: Thanks for the work on this. Appreciate it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Coming along. Moving forward. Luap's CORS additoin going first</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ping Poloniex about released wallet update they requested <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ done</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>///// END: Text from previous guide meeting minutes /////</p>
<b>Conclusion</b>	<p>Tor:</p> <p>Sam:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work with other Guides on next Grant round</li> <li>• Factomize weekly document(s)</li> <li>• Finish Doc 142</li> <li>• Set up automatic backup of Google Drive</li> <li>• Pull from To-Do or backlog list</li> </ul> <p>Brian:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coordinate release of 5.4.4</li> <li>• Continue progress on Community Code</li> <li>• Restart 3rd party audit</li> </ul>
<b>Follow up (until next meeting)</b>	<p>Tor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Finish Draft of process for ratification/approval of governance/community documents</li> <li>- Populating pledges</li> </ul> <p>Julian:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Next grant document</li> </ul> <p>Brian:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Release 5.4.4-rc1 to testnet</li> <li>- Continue release of 5.4.3</li> <li>- Update portainer for an ANO updates</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Correct some portainer degradation with some ANOs</li><li>- Develop process for integrating community code contributions</li><li>- Ping Poloniex about released wallet update they requested</li></ul> <p>Niels:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Doc 152 - Grant schedules</li><li>- Next grant round on factomize</li><li>- Look into sponsor role reform</li></ul>

<b>Subject 6</b>	<b>Open floor</b>
<b>Discussion</b>	No questions.
<b>Conclusion</b>	
<b>Follow up</b>	

Meeting adjourned at : 2033 UTC.