

FACTOM COMMUNITY

MEETING MINUTES

[FACTOM GUIDES]

[MEETING #6]

[2018-05-24]

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.

Date and time of meeting	May 24 18:00UTC
Date minutes drafted	May 24
Date minutes approved	
Organization/Team	Factom Guides
Attendees	Brian Dreery, Niels Klomp, Matt Osborne
Members not in attendance	Tor Hogne Paulson
Other attendees	(see snapshots in Google Drive)
Meeting Leader	Brian Deery
Meeting Secretary	Tor Hogne Paulsen

Subject 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Roll Call - Approval of minutes from previous meeting on (INSERT DATE).
Discussion	<p>*Brian calls meeting to order at 18:02 UTC</p> <p>*Brian votes to approve minutes. Matt and Niels seconded (this was done after Subject 1 and Subject 2 were discussed)</p> <p>*Brian, Niels, and Matt all present. Tor not present (this was done after Subject 1 and Subject 2 were discussed)</p>
Conclusion	
Follow up	

Subject 1	Matt Osborne Resignation
Discussion	<p>*Matt talks about his resignation (will post his Discord statement in “Follow Up”)</p> <p>*Niels and Brian say thanks</p> <p>*It is confirmed Matt will step down on Wednesday, May 30 after the election is concluded</p>
Conclusion	

Follow up	<p>Hi @everyone</p> <p>As those of you that attended the Governance Ratification Town Hall on April 7th might recall, we were short one Guide after the first four had been elected. At that point, I was nominated out of the blue. Prior to accepting the nomination, I told the community that I was not a long-term solution, but would step-up, do my best, and help out the community for the next 60 or so days. While I knew the role of Guide would be demanding, I did not envision 50+ hour weeks. I'm simply at the point where I can't put life on hold anymore to continue being a Guide. With the upcoming Guide election to fill @DChapman 's spot, I think now is as good of a time as any for me to step-down. I'll be staying on through the Guide elections in order to ensure a smooth transition. You can also count on me playing an integral part in the ANOs community (I have already committed to being a member of the Governance committee).</p> <p>As I posted in Discord recently, I think we are in a great spot. Within the next 6-8 weeks we will have the first 21 Authority Set members all on-boarded, we'll have a full legal review of the Governance document concluded, we'll have proper insight into insurance options for Guides/ANOs as well as know if a Non-Profit or Foundation structure should be created, we'll have a legally compliant, fully functional grant pool furthering the development of the protocol, and we'll have the Initial Grants not only funded but also have a few of them completed as well. We've laid a tremendous amount of groundwork in the past six weeks. We should all be proud of what we have accomplished.</p> <p>To @DChapman , @Niels , @quintilian , and @briandeery : It was an absolute pleasure working with all of you. The community is extremely fortunate to have had you as Guides. I can't say enough good things. I look forward to harassing you from my ANO position. :smile: To @PaulSnow and Factom Inc, thanks for building something with such enormous potential that I feel fortunate to be a part of. I look forward to our future discord battles :stuck_out_tongue_winking_eye: . To the non-Guides that I have been fortunate enough to develop relationships with, I look forward to working with you more closely to help galvanize the ANOs, thus helping Factom reach its full potential. And to those I have not had a chance to get to know, please don't be a stranger... It was an absolute privilege to be a part of the M3 launch. We accomplished a tremendous amount in the past six months, I can't wait to see what the next six months brings. The fun is just getting started. -Matt.(edited)</p>
------------------	--

Subject 2	Election Update
Discussion	<p>Omar Hakim (Ohakim89), Julian Fletcher-Taylor (JulianFT), Anonymous (mlegacy)</p> <p>NIELS: Would like more nominations. Please step-up (not a reflection on current people nominated)</p> <p>MATT: Guide is full-time job, eliminates a lot of people from consideration. If you have 30 or so hours a week to give, please stand-up though. Guides need all the help we can get.</p>
Conclusion	
Follow up	

Subject 3	Guides as LLC / Company vote together with guide elections?
Discussion	<p>NIELS: Governance states a “Guide” can be an “entity.” Nomination was rushed, did not have time to think or make sure we were set-up under a corporate entity.</p> <p>BRIAN: How do we do this? Do we need community?</p> <p>MATT: Niels, you are saying the community needs to elect the entity since they didn’t elect the entity originally (they elected the individual).</p> <p>NIELS: Yes</p> <p>BRIAN: I am operating under Factom Inc</p> <p>NIELS: I am operating under entity also, but was not elected that way</p> <p>NIELS: I suggest doing it during new election. New measure added that lets Guides replace name with entity.</p> <p>PAUL (from the floor): “Really we elect a digital identity....not a person or a company. This is what we should go to.</p> <p>And remove the support should it be mishandled in the opinion of the community.”</p> <p>BRIAN: I am ok with the new measure during elections</p> <p>NIELS: We were elected as people, digital identity piece is complicated, need to discuss outside of it.</p> <p>BRIAN: Make motion to “During election to make proposal to re-recognize Guides under their corporate banners.”</p> <p>NIELS AND MATT: Agree</p>
Conclusion	We need to explore digital identities and figure out how Guides can officially switch to their corporate entities during this election cycle.
Follow up	

Subject 4	GDPR process & legal
Discussion	<p>Niels: GDPR starts in 3.5 hours. Need process and scope for handling personal info. Process for deleting personal data.</p> <p>“Organization” needs to prove why the information is needed. Must comply with deletion request. When processing sensitive data we have to implement a consent form with minimum age.</p> <p>Procedures for investigating data breaches.</p> <p>*Explore having a “data protection officer” and other GDPR related issues</p> <p>*We will be fully compliant as soon as possible. High up in agenda. Myself and Quint can run point on this</p> <p>MATT: what will we try to get done before tomorrow?</p> <p>NIELS: Quint is putting together procedure. Will be as compliant as we can be.</p> <p>MATT: Example would be removing contact info from AS elections that is public?</p> <p>NIELS: Yes. Info will be deleted from forms and spreadsheets. Only Guides will have originals in central place.</p> <p>BRIAN: Hesitates to start appointing officers.</p> <p>NIELS: Not appointing, just exploring if we need to appoint an officer.</p> <p>NIELS: I have a list of first-steps. I will share.</p>

	<p>NIELS: GDPR enforcement is per country. Fines are huge. EU took things to next level. Is arguably overkill.</p> <p>MATT: Xavier has question in Governance chat - Niels?</p> <p>XAVIER (from floor): Will this process need to be applied on the ANOs side? How to hold contact information for our membership?</p> <p>NIELS: If ANO in EU, need to comply. If not in EU, probably are OK, not sure though. Niels Asks Xavier to clarify more....</p> <p>NIELS: We will need to comply with erasure requests in future.</p> <p>XAVIER (from floor): Whoever is responsible for keeping the contact information updated (committee or individuals). We need a clear idea of how we should handle the data to be compliant.</p> <p>NIELS: This will apply to committees, individuals, etc. Will apply to anyone doing business with EU members.</p> <p>NIELS: We will work out in next few weeks. Do our best now and then refine. Will get procedure in place as soon as we reasonably can (for example, 3 months)</p> <p>ADAM (from floor): How will this affect the blockchain, where retroactive data removal is impossible? Are nodes inherently in violation of gdpr since we cannot even control or know the data that has been included in the blockchain?</p> <p>NIELS: That's the huge questions. Blockchain and GDPR are at opposite ends of spectrum. Is a question for technical and legal.</p> <p>PAUL (from floor): The Factom protocol allows for removal without breaking proofs</p> <p>NIELS: We can talk about this for hours, probably best to move on</p> <p>BRIAN: Agree</p> <p>List Niels Promised during meeting: <i>Our GDPR process should include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Information/scope about GDPR - Documentation of what GDPR-information we hold - Process for deleting or providing personal data on request - Implement consent-form for users when they provide the data (including minimum age for providing information) - Procedure for detecting, reporting and investigating data breach - Decide if we have to formally designate a Data Protection officer - Decide if we have to determine lead data protection supervisory authority (cross border organization) </p>
Conclusion	Niels and Quint running point to get initial protocol. Work with legal to explore GDPR ramifications for Factom protocol and standing parties involved
Follow up	

Subject 5	Grant Solution Proposals Update
------------------	--

Discussion	<p>MATT: Tons of support for current Grant Solution Proposal (Town hall #2 approach). This buys us time for proper legal review and voting tool creation while not hindering development, as initial grants would be issued. Matt then outlines process of new procedure, which can be seen in more detail on Factomize.</p> <p>MATT: Guides cant drive this decision. Have great community support for proposal so far. No one has voted no. Want to bring up at operators meeting though before we move to “Essential Initial Grants. Assuming get approval, would open Initial grants tomorrow. Need to decide when this comment period would close so we can move onto voting/ratification at Town hall #2. Could do something like Tuesday for example? Have not thought dates through yet.</p> <p>BRIAN: What is turnaround time for closing Initial grant Comment period?</p> <p>NIELS: Next Tuesday is too close</p> <p>MATT: What sounds good?</p> <p>NIELS: 1.5 weeks from now (monday the 30th)</p> <p>BRIAN: let’s think this through more. Closing time needs more thoughts.</p> <p>MATT: What if we open up friday, then talk offline about when to close?</p> <p>BRIAN AND NIELS: Sounds good</p>
Conclusion	
Follow up	

Subject 6	Onboarding Process Update/Efficiency Drop
Discussion	<p>BRIAN: Things going well. 10 out of 11 are up. Each are running 2 servers, factom Inc is running 3 to maintain odd number of servers, the 3rd will not generate factoids at any point.</p> <p>NIELS: Thanks for clarifying</p> <p>BRIAN: Waiting on one last group - Go Immutable</p> <p>MATT: Syncing and digital identity were done before realizing had a config issue. Had to restart process. I am not running point on this, this is my understanding. I will get community update as soon as I can</p> <p>BRIAN: Last meeting we discussed two scenarios - (1) Two weeks passed then coinbase if 9 or more nodes are up (2) If all 11 are online, then Coinbase</p> <p>MATT: Let me get you an update as soon as I can. We don’t want to hold people up. People need to get paid.</p> <p>NIELS: Would suggest to start coinbase tomorrow no matter where Go Immutable is at.</p> <p>BRIAN: Offline identity creation takes time as well</p> <p>NIELS: If they are not up by coinbase, what are consequences?</p> <p>BRIAN: Every 4 hours the efficiency is registered</p> <p>PAUL: Nothing holding ANOs back from starting now</p> <p>NIELS: True, I like my suggestion though</p> <p>PAUL: when does Grant Pool start?</p> <p>BRIAN: Can talk about offline</p>

	<p>ALEXANDERSUEPRSLOTH: When set efficiency?</p> <p>BRIAN: Tomorrow seems ok, gives Matt's team a fighting chance. Do we want to set a time tomorrow when we go live?</p> <p>NIELS: We can make suggestion, but operators need to decide</p> <p>BRIAN: Operators. Meeting is tomorrow. Should we suggest time for them to start?</p> <p>NIELS: Let's continue conversation in Discord with ANOs?</p> <p>ALEXANDER: Will we start accruing payments as soon as efficiency rises?</p> <p>BRIAN: Yes</p> <p>NIELS: Yes, and they are only paid out every 7 days</p> <p>PAUL: Which channel discuss Coinbase start at?</p> <p>NIELS: Operators technical</p>
Conclusion	Operators need to decide when launch
Follow up	

Subject 7	NEW SOFTWARE UPDATE - 5.1.0
Discussion	<p>Brian: 5.1.0 has been in testing for a week. Many advantages, masks the pokemon bug (causes random panics). Bandwidth improvements. Implements coinbase cancel. Has 10-12 different line items I will detail in Operators technical channel.... This is reverse compatible, people can update at their leisure. Only non-reverse compatible aspect is if Coinbase cancel happens but have a week window to address issue... Can do update over several day period</p> <p>NIELS: What if coinbase cancellation?</p> <p>BRIAN: Followers will not understand P2P messages, would simply download next block after finish rather than build it alongside authority nodes. They would act as if downloaded from the past.... Authority Nodes need to build blocks together and know what all P2P messages mean. If one has not updated, they will be minority, so they will be voted out.... Audit servers will replace Federated servers that are not updated.</p> <p>BRIAN: Need to push new code out to Github. Need to talk about risks. In past talked about testing out software on testnet before pushing to Mainnet. We intentionally kept riskier updates out of this update.... This update is low risk and is replacing a big bug, so we are going to skip testnet. Future updates will be tested on Testnet first.</p> <p>ALEXANDER: Will we need to maintain special peers after we update?</p> <p>BRIAN: This is a deeper conversation to have in technical channel</p>
Conclusion	
Follow up	

Subject 8	MEETING ADJOURN
Discussion	BRIAN: Motion to close



	NIELS: Seconded
Conclusion	
Follow up	

Subject 9	
Discussion	
Conclusion	
Follow up	

Subject 10	
Discussion	
Conclusion	
Follow up	

Subject 11	
Discussion	
Conclusion	
Follow up	