

# **FACTOM COMMUNITY**

## **MEETING MINUTES**

**Factom Guides**

**Meeting #32**

**2018-12-10**

<b>Date and time of meeting</b>	2018-12-10, 20:00 UTC
<b>Date minutes drafted</b>	2018-12-10
<b>Date minutes approved</b>	
<b>Organization/Team</b>	Factom Guides
<b>Attendees</b>	Factom inc (Brian Deery), Canonical ledgers (Sam), DBGrow Inc (Julian), The 42ND Factoid LTD (Tor)
<b>Members not in attendance</b>	Centis BV (Niels Klomp)
<b>Other attendees</b>	
<b>Meeting Leader</b>	Canonical Ledgers (Sam Vanderwaal)
<b>Meeting Secretary</b>	The 42ND Factoid LTD

<b>Subject 0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Roll Call</li> <li>- Approval of minutes from previous meeting on 2018-12-03</li> </ul>
<b>Discussion</b>	
<b>Conclusion</b>	All guides present, Minus Niels. Minutes from last meeting passed.
<b>Follow up</b>	

<b>Subject 1</b>	
<b>Discussion</b>	
<b>Conclusion</b>	
<b>Follow up</b>	

<b>Subject 2</b>	Document ratification (Sam)
------------------	-----------------------------

<b>Discussion</b>	<p>Two documents up for ratification right now. Currently in guide-vote phase. If they pass with the guides they will be voted on by the ANOs.</p> <p>Documents will not please everyone. They have been discussed for 3 weeks now, and some parts are mutually exclusive. Our governance is however not static, so these can be amended at a later stage if necessary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* ANO Removal Ratification</li> <li>* ANO Expectations Ratification</li> </ul> <p>In addition there is a discussion regarding the creation of a non-profit, as well as a discussion about guide/ANO-insurance.</p> <p><b>Brian:</b> Is there a way to continue the discussion at this time about the documents? There were still some parts of the documents we didn't have full consensus about?</p> <p><b>Tor:</b> There was an 8 day discussion, and then a motion to extend the discussion was passed (3 additional days). Another extension was not done, so the documents moved to ratification. If the documents does not pass we can initiate a new discussion/ratification-period, or if they passes they can be amended after.</p>
<b>Conclusion</b>	
<b>Follow up</b>	

<b>Subject 3</b>	<b>Onboarding ANOs Status (Brian)</b>
<b>Discussion</b>	<p><b>Brian:</b> It is going, but going slowly. In the process of onboarding Multicoins it was discovered that their efficiency was set incorrectly. They campaigned at 40% but on the blockchain it was set at 30%. Looks like a clerical error inside in Multicoins, and we are basically waiting for that to be cleared up and resolved. The record remains unbroken of any ANOs fully getting passed the audit without any errors. The audit has caught something from every ANO so far. It is moving on.</p>
<b>Conclusion</b>	
<b>Follow up</b>	

<b>Subject 4</b>	<b>Upcoming releases (Brian)</b>
------------------	----------------------------------

Discussion	<p><b>Brian:</b> Towards the end of last week Paul discovered another bug... We have been chasing a handful of bugs. There was one talking about not enough factoids, which was kind of a bug where the state of which addresses had which balances, so the system would panic whenever balances would go negative (which is an appropriate response). So that was tied in with the savestate which accelerates rebooting of the network. In addition to those, which have largely been discovered, Paul found another one by the end of last week... Paul are you on the call? Would you like to talk about that one?</p> <p><b>Paul:</b> This bug was just that under some circumstances we could get into a place where we could not boot the network. Largely related to a timing issue. Some of that protection code implemented with the Great Stall could turn around and bite us. It was really rather complex to test and verify and validate... I only had one state that would reliably cause the problem. Clay had an additional route to the problem, so we knew we had something we needed to fix. I worked on it during the weekend, and with some extensive testing it seems like we have found and fixed it. After verifying we can start deploying to the testnet.</p> <p><b>Brian:</b> I maybe naturally less optimistic, but I am very pleased that we have come this far. Clay are still massaging the code, and there are some bits to clear up before we have a stable codebase here.</p>
Conclusion	
Follow up	

Subject 5	Follow up: tasks from last meeting / upcoming tasks
Discussion	<p>///// <b>START:</b> Text from previous guide meeting minutes (follow up items in orange color) /////</p> <p><b>Sam:</b>  <b>Last week:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finished ANO discussions and documents</li> <li>• Uploaded community documents to the forum DMS</li> </ul> <b>This week:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Next Grant round</li> <li>• Next ANO Application round</li> <li>• Finish uploading documents to forum DMS</li> </ul> </p> <p><b>(Text from previous meeting begins)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft up/finish changes to Guide process document</li> <li>• Finish ANO discussions and documents</li> <li>• Upload community documents</li> </ul> </p>

(Text from previous meeting ends)

**Tor:**

(Text from previous meeting begins)

I am happy with the progress on the documents up for ratification, and will work with Sam (I hope) to finalize the documents over the next few days prior to the ratification vote beings.

I have also had some positive interactions with Shuang (“legal”) in reference to the document structure, and will implement the new system as soon as the “timed discussion” is finalized (in two days).

(Text from previous meeting ends)

- (Update from Tor):
- Worked on preparing the two documents up for ratification together with Sam.
- Reworked the Community Drive structure based on input from legal. Updated all links in all documents and reworked the table listing all our documents in [Doc 200 - Factom Community Documents](#).
  - Current status:
    - 2 Governance documents (1 new being ratified)
    - 0 Process documents (1 new being ratified)
    - 12 Informational and Records.
  - Future identified document (with placeholders)
    - 5 additional processes identified
    - 4 additional informational/records documents identified
- Next week: Focus on the next grant round and ANO application round.

**Niels:**

(Text from previous meeting begins)

As my connection is so bad over here I will start typing my activities and todos. First as I mentioned on the Factomize forum, next few weeks I am quite busy with my new house, so my time is more limited. Will have time again in January. I have put the Factom Improvement Protocol in a repo and will push that this week so people can review and we can adjust where needed. I have also created a draft doc for the bug bounty and selective disclosure program. Will need a bit more work and should certainly be able to find time for that this week so we can push this forward as well.

(Text from previous meeting ends)

**Julian:**

(Text from previous meeting begins)

- Reviewed Doc 001 (governance document); curated long list of notes and issues with the document
- Worked with legal to prepare trademark and foundation discussions and will release those in the next day or so

(Text from previous meeting ends)

**BRIAN:**

(Text from previous meeting begins)

	<p><b>Continue on 6.1.1</b>  <b>Continue on Wallet updates with identity and encryption</b>  <b>Contribute to 6x timed discussions</b>  <b>(Text from previous meeting ends)</b></p> <p><b>Done:</b>  Released updated binaries 6.1.1</p> <p><b>Continuing:</b>  Continue on 6.1.2  Continue on Wallet updates with identity and encryption  Continue with community docs</p> <p>(Discussion about measuring TPS to get a metric of how the network is being improved over time. Is described as part of Factom inc development grant.)</p> <p>Paul: The whole point is to have a reproducible result you need to have a hash of a branch so you know what you ran on what code. It has been hard over the past few months due to a lot of patching after The Great Stall... After the next mainnet release this will be sorted out, and easier to implement. As we have worked on this, some of the fixes we have put in have had very negative effects on performance, so we have had to turn around and beat on them... It has been a very frustrating period, and working on the performance issues have not been a priority, as the stability comes first and these are not parallel processes but linear; first stability and then performance.</p> <p>///// END: Text from previous guide meeting minutes /////</p>
<b>Conclusion</b>	
<b>Follow up (until next meeting)</b>	

<b>Subject 6</b>	Open floor
<b>Discussion</b>	N/A
<b>Conclusion</b>	
<b>Follow up</b>	

**Meeting adjourned at 20:27 UTC.**

**V. 1.3 - Please verify [here](#) before use that this is the latest version of the document.**