FEDERATION

FACTOM COMMUNITY

MEETING MINUTES

[FACTOM GUIDES]

[MEETING #8]

[2018-06-08]

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	June 8 18:00 UTC
Date minutes drafted	June 8 18:00 UTC
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	
Other attendees	Paul Snow (from the floor) Alexandersupersloth (input via governance-chat)
Meeting Leader	Factom Inc. (Brian)
Meeting Secretary	THE 42ND FACTOID LTD (Tor)

Subject 0	- **Roll Call** - **Approval of minutes from previous meeting on (2018-06-01).**
Discussion	
Conclusion	Roll call performed and all guides present. Meeting minutes from 2018-06-01 approved.
Follow up	Brian Factomizes the previous minutes.

Subject 1	**Essential Grants--Voting is Open**
Discussion	Sam: Not so much to say at this point. Pretty deep discussions, and voting will be open immediately after this meeting. Voting will be going for 24 hours, and that should be plenty as we have had plenty of time discussing of it. Niels: Voting will be at the Factomize webpage. Julian: If anyone has not changed their indemnity clause in their grant, please do that. Niels: Guide one was not updated and TFA was not updated. Julian: I believe the guide one was updated. Niels: Ok. Brian: Should we hold off on voting contingent on this?

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>Niels/Sam/Tor agrees.
Paul requesting the floor and is granted it.

Paul: An alternative is to post the votes with the indemnification clause, and that it will be valid for all grants. It's a technicality and it would be nice to highlight that.

Tor: Agrees.
Sam: Grants will be factomized, and the grants should include the correct indemnification clause.

Julian: Only the TFA lacks it.
Tor: We will have the clause updated when this meeting is over.</td></tr>
<tr><td>**Conclusion**</td><td>Vote will be hold up until all grants are updated.</td></tr>
<tr><td>**Follow up**</td><td>Julian will check who has updated the indemnity clause.</td></tr>
</table>

Subject 2	**Community Emergency Contact System (Sam)**
Discussion	Sam: Tor and I have been talking about how to get the system more organized, and there is two components here; we need a way for operators that are already monitoring the nodes to ping Brian/Steven to start working on getting it up and running again. The other aspect is having Brian/Steven/network management to ping all ANOs in one go without having to ping all numbers individually. Pagerduty and Victorops(?) looks able to do this job quite nicely, and they have many options to configure and for us to expand. If all ANOs agree on using for example Pagerduty, all teams can set it up their own accounts and add their own numbers etc. We can trigger via phone call and it can dial out or send SMSs to all Operators, and it looks like there are no restrictions on how many numbers to add, and it looks like it is a suitable option. Brian: Factom Inc. has been using Pagerduty for over a year to monitor and alert key personnel, and it has worked fairly well. Sam: Niels, got any comments? Niels: Not on pagerduty itself, basically any system where you have some form of workflow and configuration will do. I wonder at which ANO we will put this system, as we will have to put it somewhere. Sam: My thought was that its dependent on how long time we would be using this. For 6 months it should be no problem, but if it's a long term thing we need to figure something out. It's only 10 dollars or so, so Canonical Ledgers can pay those 10 minutes. Niels: Should the onboarding and network committee be included in this?

	Sam: I don't know? Niels: onboarding committee should also be included. Sam: Yes, I think so too - and we can configure it as we go along. Brian: Any more notes and discussion on this topic?
Conclusion	
Follow up	

Subject 3	**Planning Onboarding of Next Group (Quintillian)**
Discussion	Tor: I just want to identify that we need to start thinking about this. It was decided a while back that we need to add the next batch in the next three weeks. This might be something for Brian to say something about. Brian: The issues we've had isn't correlated with the number of servers running so should be safe to add the next batch of ANOs a scheduled. niels: We need to look at onboarding documentation and refine it wherever possible. It's quite rough and might have references to old versions of software. Tor: Brian or Steven should update that document. Tor: I'll reach out to the next three operators. Would be a good idea to have them up and running in one week to test. Brian: The blockchain download takes a while so sooner rather than later is better. Tor: Takes around 24 hours or so? Brian: Hardware dependent. Sometimes takes longer than that. Tor: ok Brian: Anymore discussion on this topic? Paul is making a comment in the governance chat that more nodes is safer and the more that have to agree the safer you are from errors.
Conclusion	
Follow up	

Subject 4	**Review of ANO consensus for M3 begin date**
Discussion	25 May, 2018 Brian: During the last meeting, we raised the question about when the grant pool would have officially started. We basically came to the decision that this was an ANO decision and referred it to that. There was a vote on the factomize forum, not formal

	voting, but the consensus was … May 25th, so from my point it seems like this date would be good to use for this date.
Conclusion	Julian: We could do an official poll, but it seems ….
	Alexandersupersloth (from governance-chat): We need a block for this to be valid from.
	Brian: Yes, we do.
	Sam: In the factomize forum there was suggested using block #142400, and there was nobody not agreeing.
	Alex: The block was …. 142375.
	Brian: It took effect at block 142400.
	Brian: Motion to recognize the consensus of the May 25th
	Sam: With or without the block?
	Brian: I would verify that before.
	Sam: I second the motion.
	Guides all agree.
Follow up	

Subject 5	**Possible Conflict of interest between Guide Centis BV (Niels) and ANO Federate this**
Discussion	Niels: I have to mention a possible conflict of interest as a Guide. Although I operate as guide from Centis BV In the future i have to abstain from decisions relating to Federate This as there is a working relationship between Federate This and Sphereon BV and I am the CTO of Sphereon BV. (See Section 2.2.8 of the Governance document.)
Conclusion	
Follow up	

V. 1.2

Subject 6	Adjurn meeting
Discussion	Meeting is adjourned at 6:29 pm UTC
Conclusion	
Follow up	

Subject 7	
Discussion	
Conclusion	
Follow up	

Subject 8	
Discussion	
Conclusion	
Follow up	

Subject 9	
Discussion	
Conclusion	
Follow up	

Subject 10	
Discussion	
Conclusion	

V. 1.2

FEDERATION

Follow up	