

FACTOM COMMUNITY

MEETING MINUTES

Factom Protocol Guides

MEETING #3

2018-05-04

VERSION	DATE	CHANGED BY	CHANGES
(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
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	Friday, May 4th 2018, 17:30 UTC
Date minutes drafted	May 4th 2018
Date minutes approved	2018-05-10
Organization/Team	Factom Guides
Attendees	Brian Deery, David Chapman (parts of the meeting), Tor Paulsen, Niels Klomp, Matt Osborne
Members not in attendance	David Chapman (parts of the meeting; left halfway through discussing subject 6)
Other attendees	
Meeting Leader	Brian Deery (determined May 4 via Discord)
Meeting Secretary	Tor Hogne paulsen (determined via Discord May 2 19:20 UTC)

Subject 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Roll Call - Approval of minutes from previous meeting on 2018-04-17.
Discussion	
Conclusion	Meeting minutes from previous meeting approved.
Follow up	Brian will factomize the previous notes and post them via the appropriate channels.

Subject 1	Past Authority Set Recusals (per Governance section 2.2.8)
Discussion	<p>Guides should publicly discuss the recusals that happened over the past week or two.</p> <p>Brian: Recused from Factom Inc. as a result of being an employee of the company. Also Matter of Fact because an existing prior business relationship with one of the members. Federated Reserve I recused as a couple of the members are employees of the chairman of Factom's board of directors. Atlantic Crypto as they were claiming strong relationships with Factom Inc. Factom Data Writers because of an existing prior business relationship with one of the members. Multicoins because of a social relationship with principles. Factom Bridge; a co-worker is principal there.</p> <p>Niels: Blockchain Innovation Foundation (chairman of the foundation).</p>

	<p>Matt: Go Immutable (his team), Syncroblock (relationship with someone on the team), Branson Consulting (social), Digital Impact (former business relationship)</p> <p>David: Factomize LLC, Matter of Fact (social relationship),</p> <p>Tor: TFA (member), Blockrock Mining (social connection), (Cryptovikings, social + advisor)</p>
Conclusion	
Follow up	

Subject 2	Discuss resignation of David Chapman & election of new guide
Discussion	<p>David lets his written statement speak for himself. (Reads statement: "I am resigning my position as Guide. My last day will be May 11th or when a replacement is elected, whichever is first. I will continue to perform my duties until then. I found myself thoroughly enjoying once again writing for Factomize and feel I can further the protocol as an Authority Node Operator in a myriad of ways. If anything, I feel I will be detrimental as a Guide. There are more capable people with bigger risk appetites than me within this community. It may not be easy and your mind will come up with many reasons not to, but please dig deep within yourself and step up for the Protocol. To my fellow Guides, I know I wasn't easy to work with at times but I like and respect each of you a great deal. I will miss our 18 hour days together. A little. To the Community, I appreciate you electing me as Guide and I apologize for not being the right person for the position. I will do my best to make up for it in other ways. Thank you all.</p> <p>Niels: Want to comment. You are more than a good guide is my impression. David will be greatly missed. Matt: Community is extremely lucky to have him. Brian: Keeping us together. Huge asset.</p> <p>Tor: Agree. Hope you continue to voice your opinion going forward.</p> <p>Election of new guide:</p> <p>Brian: The governance guide has some protocols for that. In section 2... I move to continue the discussion of the election of a new guide to Discord, and more input from the community can be heard for this. Defer guide election and talk to Discord.</p> <p>Niels: OK with it, as long as we prioritize it and gets it done as quickly as possible.</p> <p>David: I will not disappear and will stay on for the next week until someone else is elected or the time passes.</p> <p>Matt and Tor agree.</p>

Conclusion	Motion passes.
Follow up	Set up a channel for guide election, and continue to

Subject 3	Change governance doc to recognize AS veto of coinbase
Discussion	<p>Proposal to add Section 5.4 of Doc 001 Factom Governance. Brian asks for us to discuss this.</p> <p>David: Is that only valid for the coinbase transactions? Brian: Coinbase is for all new factoids that get into existence. Its for payments to Authority sets or to grants. Moving factoids from one existing address to another does not have any bearing on the coinbase itself. That's an entirely different discussion. What we are talking about here is specifically for the coinbase and for the authority servers ability to temper progress going forward David: Lets say a million factoids are created out of thin air for some reason; Brian: Can be destroyed by a grant process, or the software on the back end can be updated to ignore those factoids at the leisure of the network, instead of being handled during the 1 week time frame. The grant pool is a potential factoids, not actual factoids. If there is a bug, the whole point is to have them not become a reality in the economy, so the software can be updated to prevent them from becoming a reality in the future.</p>
Conclusion	Brian proposes a motion. David seconds. Rest of guides vote "aye" 5/5.
Follow up	

Subject 4	Vote on Using trello as central project management tool
Discussion	<p>Matt: We need a proper management and project tool. Tor: I believe it works ok, and I propose that we continue to use it. Brian: propose motion. Niels: Seconds.</p>
Conclusion	Motion passes after guide vote.
Follow up	

Subject 5	Determine where to locate list of ratified/official Factom community documents as well as list of current and former Guides (Tor)
------------------	--

Discussion	<p>Note by Tor prior to the meeting: I'm here referring to the list of documents I suggested last meeting that we should insert into the Governance document. It was rejected due to two concerns (if I recall correctly):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) The governance document should not link "out" to documents we do control. B) There might be many changes to the list over the coming months and it would require the governance document to be updated often. <p>After some thinking I still believe that the list of documents should be included either directly into the Governance document, or better; as Appendix A (DOC 001A) to the governance document.</p> <p>The reasoning behind this is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There should be a "master list" of documents that's ratified by the guides (and later the standing parties), so these documents are provided with the authority they need. Linking out of the "governance document" should not be an issue really, as these documents cannot be changed by anyone else than the guides. - It provides a much needed overview of what documents exist, and which ones are valid. - It provides links to all the documents in one place (live version can be linked to from Discord). - If created as an appendix it can be changed and updated by the guides without having to ratify a new version of the <p>Additionally there is a list of current and former guides included. I suggest this should also be an appendix to the Governance document (DOC 001B).</p> <p>Link to proposed Appendixes</p> <p>Brian:</p> <p>Let's talk about the guides first; as a tracking mechanism for those.</p> <p>Niels: For guides it's pretty clear. How about the legal concerns? We are doing it without ratifying the governance document itself.</p> <p>Tor: Related to the governance of the protocol</p> <p>Brian: Like the idea of an index-document.</p> <p>Niels: I would like that as well. We need somewhere for people to find pointers to all documents with a short explanation for convenience.</p> <p>Matt: I'm kind of on the fence.</p> <p>David: Not at this time, no.</p> <p>Brian: Would we need guide</p> <p>David: Could you have the governance document inside a Factom chain along the governance document</p> <p>Niels: It's just an easy way for other parties to access the individual documents.. The index links to the documents, and a small description of the document. We could also give the link to the drive, but it is harder to find content that way.</p> <p>Tor: Should the index be factomized?</p>
-------------------	---

	<p>Niels: I'm not to sure. We also need to factomize the individual documents, and I don't see any benefit of factomizing the index document itself as well, since we would be factomizing twice</p> <p>Brian: To me it seems like the best way would be to have this document live outside the document process, and have it as a living document.</p> <p>Tor: Can we call it Doc 000 and put it in the 0_folder on the governance drive?</p> <p>Brian: Propose a motion to produce a document for tracking documents in the document process.</p> <p>Tor: Seconds.</p>
Conclusion	Unanimous vote for the motion as described above.
Follow up	Tor creates a tracking document.

Subject 6	Review of Governance for suggested changes
Discussion	<p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1RVaVR7lvfGgOBMG-7oca9TtpnR7qaEfr6XJVZJwd3M/edit#</p> <p>Page 9: Delete a space. Seems like an error. Rejected.</p> <p>Page 10: Change "3" to "three". Approved.</p> <p>Page 10 (para 2.3): Suggestion to remove "initially" from the document <i>"I suggest removing any "Initially" related words from 2.3.1, 2.3.2, and 2.3.3. Shouldn't the governance document be authored in a way to represent current approved version/clauses?"</i></p> <p><i>I would avoid having verbiage that is tied to a set time period and instead construct the clauses in a way that makes them timeless unless a change is approved. It will help reduce the number of amendments and voting rounds you need as "dates pass" and verbiage automatically becomes stale forcing you to do cleanup.</i></p> <p><i>For example, if the guide team is "initially" made up of 5 guides could we just simply state that "the guide team is made up of 5 guides?"</i></p> <p><i>We are already past the April 7th, 2018 date stated in 2.3.4 so are we still in the initial state? Do we need to make an update to the clause since the date has passed?"</i> <i>(Guides take note and will discuss it at a later stage.)</i></p> <p>Page 11, 2.5.1: <i>What measurable event or whom will determine "when infrastructure is in place"? Can some specifics be defined on what will determine this state?</i> <i>((Guides take note and will discuss it at a later stage.)</i></p>

	<p>Page 11, 2.5.2: Remove double wording. Approved)</p> <p>Page 11, 2.5.4: Looks like we need to define what the limited duration is otherwise this clause has no teeth? This clause is currently at the "idea stage". I suggest we get it authored with enough detail so it has meaning or remove the clause for now. (Guides take note and will discuss it at a later stage.)</p> <p>Page 12, 2.6.2. Suggested change- "The details of how grants are awarded, priced and distributed can be found in the "Grant Award Policy".</p> <p>Because we expect the details around this to change somewhat frequently I would consider having it in a separate policy document. This way you only have to have that document approved vs. the entire governance document every time grant maintenance has to be done. If you keep it inside the Governance document we are going to have a ton of versions when in reality it is just this one section/policy that needs to keep being updated.</p> <p>We also might decide to empower let's say the Guides with approving ongoing maintenance related items (FTC price, workload, etc) based on a set of guidelines/limits we would define in the "Grant Award Policy". If we do decided to do something like this, it is better for reporting, audit, and trace-ability to have this be a separate document that is referenced in here. (Guides take note and will discuss it at a later stage.)</p> <p><u>(David Chapman left the meeting at this stage)</u></p> <p>2.7.1: Niels: We have not given the community enough time to discuss this. Moving on right now</p> <h2>1.1. Indemnification</h2> <p>1.1.1. The Protocol, to the fullest extent possible via the Grant Pool, seeks to indemnify and hold harmless Guides from any and all liability or damages Guides may suffer as a result of claims, demands, attorney's fees, costs, or judgements against Guides resulting from from the proper exercise of their position as Guides of the Factom Protocol. This paragraph will survive termination of this document and Guides termination of their position with the Protocol.</p> <p>(There has not been enough time for a community discussion or vote to ratify the above at this stage. Removed from the governance document at this stage for further discussion).</p>
--	---

	<p>Page 13, 3 Authority set:</p> <p>An approved published governing document typically sticks with having items that can be enforced today (current state). Any vague or future state verbiage could potentially get us in audit trouble and even legal trouble if its used /referenced in a lawsuit.</p> <p>I am under the impression that this is an approved published version that we are trying to enforce and code against?</p> <p>(Guides take note and will discuss it at a later stage.)</p> <p>Page 19, 4.4 Initial grants</p> <p>Suggested Change- "The protocol needs to support a number of activities immediately as part of the grant funding."</p> <p>to</p> <p>"The protocol supports a number of activities as part of the grant funding"</p> <p>Avoid future or past tense when authoring. This is a general comment across the entire document.</p> <p>(Guides take note and will discuss it at a later stage.)</p> <p>Brian: Suggests that we ratify the governance document. Tor seconds the motion. Brian, Matt, Niels and Tor approve. % approved.</p> <p>Niels: How are we sure that one of the guides are not adding stuff to the document without marking it as changes?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Discussion about this. Agreed to discuss it prior to the next meeting. Tor's suggestion is to not add proposed changes to the document, but add them to the agenda; and we then; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) Ensure we are working off the last ratified version, and B) Add the ratified amendments together in the meeting.
Conclusion	We tag and update the version of the governance document.
Follow up	Guides follow up how to ensure that malicious updates of the document are not injected without (other) guides prior knowledge.

Subject 7	Roll out of M3
Discussion	<p>Niels: Could you Brian inform us about the M3 rollout?</p> <p>Brian: Factom Inc. Was initially targeting April 30th to go live on the Phase 1 on the deployment of the code. There were a few bugs and we slipped that to May 1st. At</p>

	<p>this point the infrastructure behind factom is running on the m3 Code. Part of the ability to maintain a stable network as this point is to have the leaders all start up simultaneously, this is due to bugs in the code that's still being worked out. In order to have the authorities boot up asynchronously - in the interim the solution is to have everyone boot up simultaneously. The test-net used a docker set-up that had a fair amount of access to the internals of the node; we realized that this was against the ethos of the blockchain industry and what we were trying to do, and so at this point we are prototyping a more traditional coordination-system for the different leaders to have the docker containers to start up at the same time. Several nodes on the testnet have been running it. Yesterday some testing were successful and some limitations were found. Today we are going to expand to more nodes in the testnet, and this solution is not the ultimate solution, but this is a secure production ready system that is used in industry for different purposes, and due to the urgency of getting the system up and online, and getting the users onboarded, this seemed like an adequate trade-off. After we get the authority set onboarded, we will explore better solution. This is an inadequate solution, and in parallel; phase 3 ... Some shoutouts to Luap who worked to make his efficiency updating to run offline... That's going to be very important in onboarding authorities as well. So, at this point we are going as fast as we can, my plan is to successfully boot the testnet. Once we do that, we will have people running the servers run as followers via the portainer system, to test and get synchronous booting, and we will start handing off the authority set to those servers.</p> <p>Niels: Do you have a rough estimate for when the first operators on the mainnet should be ready according to you.</p> <p>Brian: There are two levels of readiness; running your node as a follower and then running your node as a leader. Running as follower, I'm thinking, if things go well... In two days I'm hoping - depending on the testnet tests play out. The leaders who are first to come on as authority sets don't have to come into the boot up system at the same time, they need to be in the boot-up system, but other authorities can also be in that system as well (?).</p> <p>Niels: We should revisit the onboarding process as things are going very fast.</p> <p>Brian: We are learning and debugging as we go along.</p>
Conclusion	
Follow up	

Subject 8	Motion to adjourn the meeting
Discussion	Brian: Motion to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Niels.
Conclusion	

Follow up	
------------------	--

Subject 9	
Discussion	
Conclusion	
Follow up	

Subject 10	
Discussion	
Conclusion	
Follow up	