FEDERATION

FACTOM COMMUNITY

MEETING MINUTES

Factom Guides

Meeting #21

2018-09-10

V. 1.2

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.

Date and time of meeting	2018-09-10
Date minutes drafted	2018-09-10
Date minutes approved	
Organization/Team	Factom Guides
Attendees	Factom inc (Brian Deery), , DBGrow Inc (Julian), Canonical ledgers (Sam), The 42ND Factoid LTD (Tor), Centis BV (Niels Klomp)
Members not in attendance	
Other attendees	
Meeting Leader	DBGrow Inc (Julian)
Meeting Secretary	The 42ND Factoid (Tor)

Subject 0	- **Roll Call** - **Approval of minutes from previous meeting on 2018-08-27.**
Discussion	
Conclusion	Everyone present. Meeting minutes from previous meeting approved.
Follow up	

Subject 1	**Guide kanban board (Niels)**
Discussion	Niels: Guides decided to create a kanban board. I created a new board, I'll share the URL in governance chat. Will be mentioned in #useful-links. Will need to go through the backlog items; stuff that are not applicable any more or not updated. It's a real simple process; we have a backlog. A list of items that needs to be done, and a current-task list. And also completed tasks. Guides will pull in their items they want to work on. We cannot have more than 10 items in the to-do list, and 8 in the in-progress list. The reason for these limits is that we are not trying to do too much at once. Reading the notes from last meeting, I saw it was discussed that time as well. Basically I think it is good to talk about what we have done and what we are going to do next week.

V. 1.2

Brian: I like that we are tracking stuff now, so we can show off the value we are doing to the community, but I do hesitate about going full kanban on this as I see this more of a tracking system as a work-directing system.

Niels: Kanban of course is pull based, so it's self organizing - so you are required to pull in the stuff you are working on. So it's not like someone directing you to do stuff. It's a rather easy system and it does not have a lot of overhead.

Brian: My points was about the limits your are setting.

Niels: What is the actual problem?

Brian: The setting of the limit that we can work on; it limits the amount of stuff we can work on.

Niels: The limits are there for us not to have 20 tasks each thats piling up "in progress"; and it forces us to focus on a few things. I suggest we try it

Sam: We had a similar process previously, it was not exactly kanban - but we ended up having a long list of items piling up that we were not working on. I like the limiting factors as it ensures us to focus on a few tasks until completion.

Niels: One of the problems with the old system was that we had multiple … This forces us to work on the important stuff, and we need to keep the backlog prioritized with the important cards on the top, so we can pull in the next important cards. We need to groom the backlog from time to time to ensure a good workflow.

Sam: Makes a lot of sense to me. How does the stuff we identify in the guide meetings play into this?

Niels: New stuff can go directly into the "in progress" if important, but one think I like is to have progress reporting on stuff that has been done; and stuff that we will work on the next week. But basically mention the stuff that has

Tor : (some stuff - agenda point 5)

Sam: It's good to have it in the end of the meeting.

Tor: Should we assign a person to move the tasks to kanban?

Sam: If we have identified guide-specifics tasks they should move them to kanban themselves, but I can check that it has been done etc. after the guide meetings.

V. 1.2

[LayerTech] Xavierwjc#3480 Today at 10:12 PM
After the tasks are completed, it is automatically archived. Are the archived list categorized in anyway?
Like export by dates. So at the end of the year it's easier pull a list of tasks completed by Guides by category, etc.

Niels: I have started on categorizing some labels etc, and it will be categorized somewhat. I will have to look into Trello and see what it supports. We are using the free Trello and there might be some restrictions in place. We could also look at the paid Team-trello

Brian: During the guide meetings things will also be logged; they are more permanent.

NEW MESSAGES

Today at 10:14 PM
Are these talks factomized or archived anywhere? -Choco

Sam: Yes. The minutes are factomized and stored on the governance drive.

Conclusion	
Follow up	

Subject 2	**When to host next Application round?**
Discussion	Julian: It doesn't seem like anyone is presenting anything, so it seems like this is an open discussion.

Brian: At this point there was some talk to wait for the Factoid price to come up. And that seemed what the consensus was. I'm not sure that any specific target came up.

Niels: I'm not sure that it was the consensus, and that some people wanted to add ANOs even at this low price for decentralization purposes. I think we need to revive the discussion, as the guides have been busy…

Sam: We are still talking about adding 5 ANOS, so we are still at 2 servers, as governance is not ready to transition people from 2 to 1 servers - especially not at this FCT price.

Julian: This seems like it's a community discussion, and we should have it in the open - not only the guides..

(MORE TEXT) |

V. 1.2

Conclusion	
Follow up	

Subject 3	**Grant round #2?**
Discussion	Brian: The elephant in the room is the Inc. development grant. It has run out at this point, and at this point we are refreshing and updating the grants in anticipation of presenting them to the community for the next three months, and as far as the timing goes that might be more of a community based thing, but we very much want to move forward on this and continue to build the factomd software. Niels: I agree. It's a discussion we need to have; about the next grant round. It will not be the final version of the grant rounds, but we will not have (the on chain voting protocol any time soon...)... It needs to be an interim solution. My feeling is that we are currently at 27 ANOs and 5 guides, and we have the vote option on the factomize forum that restricts one vote to every ANO - and I think it will be a nice stopgap solution to vote for the grant rounds in the mean-time. But first we need the discussion on the grants; when to start the ground etc. This will not only be 5 grants, but will be open to everyone and I expect a lot of grant proposals to come in. Sam: We all agree that we need a new round? Anyone disagree? (no). Sam: We initially said that we needed to wait for the on-chain solution, but it's clear that will take some time and we need an interim grant round. Hopefully grant round three will have the built-in voting protocol. Brian: With the forums we can start to emulate some of the on-chain voting processes that will come online. So the guides and the ANOs are the ones that have voting rights when there is on chain voting in place, and those can be emulated on factomize. And some of those other things like staking cannot be done on factomize, but we can make baby-steps. Julian: What do we need to get done before then? I have a few things; we should decide on the type of voting (few different proposals; instant run-off voting etc…) And this is all things that we should talk through as a community. We should discuss if the guides gets votes; and what type of vote… There are some governance processes we need to update; and ratify properly. How to set up the voting on factomize, and have conversations on better defining the roles of sponsors, and how grants and deliverables are laid out.. And a big one; we need to talk through USD- vs FCT-denominated grants… Are there any things you would like to add?

V. 1.2

	Niels: Just an operational remark. I just added some of those things in Trello and placed them on the to-do list; and let's discuss it after this meeting, so we are sure we got every card we need for this. Julian: Anything else has to add? Sam: Timeline? Julian: I don't think we have established any timelines as of yet, but I think we are all hoping this is something that takes around 4 weeks or so before it starts. Niels: The same. We probably need 2 weeks to discuss it, and 1 week to run it by legal. And then probably one week to do the finishing touches and start the process; and announce it to everyone so people can prepare. Sam: Should we make a task for us this week to set a date? Brian: Yes. Julian: Anything else? Tor: Ratification process first; and then use that process to ratify the grant process by the community. Niels: Will we make that ref the timeline? Tor: I think so. We can do it in parallel.
Conclusion	
Follow up	

Subject 4	**Network Update report. (brian)**
Discussion	Brian: Last week lot of things were happening in parallel. The last 4 ANOs from the first application round were onboarded, and that went well enough. At the same time the new version of factomd was released; however it was not suggested as an upgrade at the time - as of risks of onboarding new ANOs conflicting with network crashes. So after the ANOs were onboarded the request for upgrades went out, and at this point there is only one audit server, which is yet to be updated; and I'll bring it to the core committee to see what kind of risk tolerance we have on that - to see if we should upgrade the leaders or not.

	We also have a release candidate for the testnet, hopefully ready today. And that would be anticipated as our next release on next Monday. And that is kind of where we stand on a release. Sam: Who's audit server has not been updated, and have you reached out to them? Brian: I hesitate to point fingers; lets take that offline. They have not been reached out to specifically. Julian. Thanks. Anyone else has anything to say on this?
Conclusion	
Follow up	

Subject 5	**Follow up: tasks from last meeting / upcoming tasks**
Discussion	///// START: Text from previous guide meeting minutes ///// Sam - Emergency Alert System - Finish Google form for ANO Contact info and open to ANOs - Test system with handful of ANOs - Schedule large-scale test - We had an old form that was a combination of contact info and node information for onboarding, but onboarding happens once and contact info may be updated later we separated them. The form is now open and we need all ANOs to ensure their contact info is up to date. I have not tested the system with ANOs yet, as I got the form out a bit late. - Factomize Documents - Publish PGP key in multiple community places: Discord, Factomize, Twitter - Catch up on document backlog - I published my PGP in multiple places, and then I went through and basically signed all the previous factomized documents in batches - and then I caught up with the rest of the community documents. Going forward all documents will be hashed and signed with my PGP key. For this week I will update the factomize instructions. Tor: - Draft a process for "ratification and updates" of community governance documents. (notes added prior to the meeting)

- ○ 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.
  - ○ 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.
- 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.
  - ○ 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.
- Aggregate a list of community/governance processes and suggest what order we should start tackling them in.
  - ○ 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:
    - Doc 108 - Incident-reporting & -management"
    - Doc 142 - Emergency Alert System
    - Doc XXX - "Removal of ANO from the Authority set"
    - Doc 152 - "Single Use Process - Grants 2018-02"

Julian:
- Finish list of governance processes that need creation, updating, legal clarification, etc.
  - ○ 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.
    Niels: What about the cost? Any idea?
    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

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>

will be invaluable going forward.
- Bring first processes, such as a fully formulated ANO removal process, to legal for final review.

Brian
- Finish onboarding of batch 1 ANOs
  - Done and successful.
- Coordinate multistage release of v5.4.3
  - In progress and successful so far.
- Provide feedback on ANO removal process from governance doc co-author perspective and technical feasibility, plus how it might happen with standing parties.
  - 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.
- Release 5.4.4-rc1 to testnet
- Continue release of 5.4.3
- Update portainer for an ANO updates
- Correct some portainer degradation with some ANOs
- Develop process for integrating community code contributions (green light from lawyers - need to figure out the process for integrating that. Should be 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.
Sam: Any legal limitations on the type of request?
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.
Sam: Thanks for the work on this. Appreciate it.

- Ping Poloniex about released wallet update they requested

///// END: Text from previous guide meeting minutes /////

</td></tr>
<tr><td>

Conclusion

</td><td>

Tor:

Julian:
- Prioritization of processes for update.
- Release ANO Removal Document

Brian:

</td></tr>
<tr><td>

Follow up

</td><td>

Sam:
- Emergency Alert System
  - Test system with handful of ANOs

</td></tr>
</table>

V. 1.2

○ Schedule large-scale test
- Factomize New Documents
- Finish Doc 142 Emergency Alert System
- Update Factomize Instructions document
-

Tor:

Julian:

Brian:
- Release 5.4.4-rc1 to testnet
- Continue release of 5.4.3
- Update portainer for an ANO updates
- Correct some portainer degradation with some ANOs
- Develop process for integrating community code contributions
- Ping Poloniex about released wallet update they requested

Niels:

Subject 6	Open floor
Discussion	Xavier from LayerTech:

Xavier from LayerTech:

> For open floor: Do Guides/Brian have a policy on how much time to give ANOs to update their servers? For example, five days after release. And if not updated after a time frame, what are the follow up actions? I understand not disclosing the party at the moment, but after a week has pass, the information should be disclosed.

Brian: There has been a little bit of discussion about this earlier. This is difficult as ANOs are autonomous operators themselves, and so this is a sticky question. There are some network health things; like under attack or actively stalling that… Well I don't have a good answers.

Niels: This plays into the general software release management as well. I think many of the things should be covered by a small process; and I would like to do you with you and Tor. There is still one authority node not updated; and we need to decide to take a risk or not. I think 5 days after a release is a good timeframe as the ANOs are here to provide the servers. We need a process to make it

Sam: Every application I have seen from the ANOs have stated they will be monitoring their nodes 24/7, and it should be expected that everyone is updated in a reasonable time frame. Five days seems reasonable but it's probably the job of Core, Code and Technical Committee to decide the actual length of time. I'm not talking about

FEDERATION

	browbeating anyone for not being updated but it's a public protocol and I can figure out this information if I really want to so I don't see a good reason to keep it private. Tor: Could we make a card for this? Describing the different update scenarios we have? Niels: Sure. Julian: Any other questions? **[Go Immutable] - Matt** Today at 10:59 PM What are Guides thoughts on coming up with a more formalized process for sponsors? Additionally, maybe sponsors should be paid by the community so they are working on behalf of the community. Niels: It's already one of the cards at Trello for this week, as we are going to discuss the next grant round. We need a formalization of the sponsor role as well. It is coming up soon. Sam: There are many ways to do this, but I think the sponsors should be paid directly from the grant pool so incentives are aligned and it shows that the sponsor is supposed to report to the community. Julian: Motion to end the meeting. Brian aye. Seconded by Julian.
Conclusion	
Follow up	

Meeting adjourned at : 2101 UTC.

V. 1.2