

# **FACTOM COMMUNITY**

## **MEETING MINUTES**

**[FACTOM GUIDES]**

**[MEETING #7]**

**[2018-06-01]**

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.

<b>Date and time of meeting</b>	June 1 19:00 UTC
<b>Date minutes drafted</b>	June 1 19:00 UTC
<b>Date minutes approved</b>	
<b>Organization/Team</b>	Factom Guides
<b>Attendees</b>	Factom inc (Brian Deery), Centis BV (Niels Klomp), DBGrow Inc (Julian), Canonical ledgers (Sam), THE 42ND FACTOID LTD (Tor)
<b>Members not in attendance</b>	
<b>Other attendees</b>	
<b>Meeting Leader</b>	Factom Inc (Brian)
<b>Meeting Secretary</b>	THE 42ND FACTOID LTD (Tor)

<b>Subject 0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Roll Call</b></li> <li>- <b>Approval of minutes from previous meeting on (2018-05-24).</b></li> </ul>
<b>Discussion</b>	
<b>Conclusion</b>	Meeting minutes from 2018-05-24 Approved.
<b>Follow up</b>	N/A

<b>Subject 1</b>	<b>Welcoming of new Guides DBGrow Inc (represented by Julian Fletcher-Taylor) and Canonical Ledgers (represented by Sam Vanderwaal). Recognizing of existing guides being representatives of corporations. Brian Deery is representing “Factom, Inc.”, Niels Klomp is representing “Centis BV”, Tor Hogne Paulsen is representing “The 42nd Factoid”</b>
<b>Discussion</b>	<p>Brian: Congratulations on winning the elections. Would you like to say a few short words.</p> <p>Julian: DBGrow and I are excited to be here. It’s been really interesting so far, there is a lot to do obviously, and it has been a great experience so far.</p> <p>Sam: Echoing largely what Julian said. Proud to be in the community. Optimistic about Factom’s future.</p>

<b>Conclusion</b>	
<b>Follow up</b>	N/A

<b>Subject 2</b>	<b>Report of Emergency Response Test of 2018-05-31</b>
<b>Discussion</b>	<p>Tor:</p> <p>Brian: Factoids are not paid out when blocks are not progressing, so any downtime affects everyone as nobody gets paid in such a situation.</p> <p>Sam: We did see your feedback, and please ping me directly if you have any feedback in relation to testing the new emergency contact system.</p>
<b>Conclusion</b>	
<b>Follow up</b>	Guides

<b>Subject 3</b>	<b>Discuss upcoming initial grant</b>
<b>Discussion</b>	<p>Brian: So I am not sure how much of this has been emphasized by the necessary aspect of the grant, and I'm not sure what needs to be discussed - the grant proposals are pending closing on this Sunday. There has been lot of discussion in the Factomize forum. A lot of progress has been made to coming to understanding. Is there any other stuff that should be highlighted?</p> <p>Niels: A lot of discussion has been going on, it's interesting to see how many grant proposals we will see this round. We mentioned that it has to be an essential grant proposal, but what is essential? We are just now waiting to see the first proposals coming in.</p> <p>Tor: Will cancellation messages be ready for the initial grant round?</p> <p>Brian: The backend code is in there, all except for one authority node has updated, but they are in the minority - so if there is a cancel they will not understand the message and they will be faulted out. However, the frond-end stuff is not public yet, there is some minor testing code but nothing that is ready for people to use. Basically the idea is that if its needed it can be rapidly pushed out as a command line program or something like that.</p> <p>Brian: Sure, yes. It is a matter of priorities, and the messages themselves are understandable in public, and so it's more of a development and documentation process at this point.</p>
<b>Conclusion</b>	
<b>Follow up</b>	N/A

<b>Subject 4</b>	<b>Registry of digital identities</b>
<b>Discussion</b>	<p><b>Tor's thoughts prior to the meeting:</b></p> <p>"Should we produce a document in the google drive which lists the digital identities of the standing parties? Currently it would include the Authority Set Operators and the guides after they produce their identities." It would be convenient for the community to be able to link identities with operators/guides, and also for grant recipients in the future.</p>
<b>Conclusion</b>	<p>Brian: Part of the process of onboarding new federated servers is the 888888-digital identity needed to be added to the blockchain, and linked to one of the federated servers that had become selected. This is necessary for operation of the system to know which identity, so that information is currently in the guides folder, matching up the identity with the ANO</p> <p>Also the guides will need identities for some of the standing party systems in the future will have to tie their digital identity to their real world identity and there will be other digital identities during the voting systems.</p> <p>Tor:</p> <p>Niels: Manage expectations.</p> <p>Sam: When do we make the information public?</p> <p>Brian: We are talking about pairing the identities with the real world operators, and logs about which servers have been performing well or not.</p> <p>Sam: Brian:</p> <p>Brian: To me it seems essential to the running of the system, so this is definitely a control document.</p> <p>Niels: Paul mentioned in the chat that as long as it is informal it is ok for now</p> <p>Brian: We are still learning how the system works.</p> <p>Brian: Do we have any more discussion on the digital identities? Do we need a motion to incorporate the identity document into the document control system?</p> <p>Niels: Yes</p> <p>Brian: Motion. Seconded by Tor.</p>
<b>Follow up</b>	<p><a href="https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1IKmMDzljq8YNrhp-fSGQzH36TKAYjhZ8sneqvFhgp9w/edit#gid=0">https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1IKmMDzljq8YNrhp-fSGQzH36TKAYjhZ8sneqvFhgp9w/edit#gid=0</a></p> <p>Include in Factom documents.</p>

Subject 5	Decide when Grant Pool would have started.
<b>Discussion</b>	<p>Brian: Part of the grant pool has not been coded yet into the blockchain, and so we need to determine when to have started counting factoids as going into the blockchain. There are a few options: The one that makes the most sense to me is when Factom inc. no longer was the majority of the system. (option 1)...</p> <p>Niels: This is all in the past of course, have we thought about legal implications of this? Basically, the further we go back the more factoids we are talking about. We could make it as big amount of factoids as we like.</p> <p>Brian: yes. September 1. 2015?</p> <p>Niels: Should we do it in the past instead of using today as that day? That's what I am asking.</p> <p>Brian: The expectation that the community has been living under at the past 2 years is that inflation starts at Milestone 3. The question is, when did milestone 3 start?</p> <p>Julian: That first choice is pretty defensible.</p> <p>Paul: Can I have the floor?</p> <p>Brian: Yes.</p> <p>Paul: Really, I think it's a bit arbitrary that the point that we become a minority is a bit harder to see in the blockchain, as all it is is changing out identities and it doesn't really matter too much. There are two other dates that are interesting. That is approval of the governance, and as soon as it was approved we manage the project by the governance rules. That is a defensible position and those tokens have been left in escrow until m3. (...) It is a marketing decision it is - is what I'm trying to say.</p> <p>Niels: I get it. On the other hand, the governance was there but we have still had a lot of stuff to do. I'm not sure if I'm ok with generating almost a million USD.</p> <p>Julian: In that case the visuals of having the visuals starting when Factom inc.</p> <p>Niels: Inflation did not start until they are created.</p> <p>Julian: But it's still a potential token, yes?</p> <p>Paul: I'm putting it up there. The discussion is a bit complicated due to the politics involved.</p> <p>Niels: As Julian said, it was only Factom inc back then.</p> <p>Paul: We do not create them until we write the code, and that will be under this distributed management.</p>

Sam: We got M3 code going live, we got ratification of the governance document, and we have the date Factom inc became a minority operator.

Paul: Those are the outstanding ones.

Sam: Personally like Factom Inc minority operator date. All 3 conditions above were present at that time. Thats defensible

Julian: One more option available is the date in which <100% eff

Niels: We also at that point had 11 operators

Brian: Not all operators onboarded yet

Sam: It's fairly arbitrary. Choose a defensible date. Propose 5/25

From Governance-Chat : 143400 first payout

Sam: Next ANO too far away to vote on this issue.

Brian: These payouts would be subject to same coinbase cancellation messages. Math of determining potential is inside code but actualization of it is cancellable.

Niels: Code will reject payments beyond grant pool balance.

Brian: Niels are you realizing difference between potential and real payouts.

Brian: Proposals as follows: 1. <100%, 2.  
Id like to get those extra 3 days in there. Not a strong preference.

Sam: I propose <100% but not strong preference

Brian: Any comments from ANO in gov-chat?

From Gov Chat: Dan reiterates block 143400, Paul agrees.

Brian: Thats a week after the 2 proposed dates.

Gov chat: Proposes a later date, today

Brian: This is the point that nobody could reverse anything. As of today things get locked in.

Niels; In the end ANOS are deciding, can always cancel transactions, but worried since that is not canceling the the start date, but an actual grant. Also worried about Guides making decision.

	<p>Sam: 2 choices, choose date ehre. Suggestions to ANOS to vote in discord. 5/22 or 5/25. Any other opinions? Dan points out voting on discord not legit. Best tool we have right now, zoom maybe better. Can download voting logs after. We need onchain voting, but can set up something on discord to make more legit.</p> <p>Brian: We can ask each ANO to have a representative vote.</p> <p>Sam: Manually verify the emoji reactions to make sure 1 rep from each entity is voting. Just takes more effort.</p> <p>Paul Requests floor, brian grants.</p> <p>Paul: Part of a guide. We can lay out guides suggestion. Socialize it. Devs are voting by coding. Anos vote by deploying it. Pretty much done.</p> <p>Sam: lets give anos several dates to vote on. Were not official suggesting dates, provide 3 dates. Will provide on discord as soon as possible.</p>
<b>Conclusion</b>	
<b>Follow up</b>	

<b>Subject 6</b>	
<b>Discussion</b>	<p>Brian asks if any new business from the floor.</p> <p>Matt O says yes.</p> <hr/> <p><b>4.4.1. Guides</b></p> <p>Guides are initially paid 200 FCT per month for the first two months and their payout will be reviewed thereafter.</p> <p>Matt posts above</p> <p>Sam: Matt is bringing up guide remuneration that ends on June 7th.</p> <p>Matt on gov chat: This needs to be raised substantially as FCT price drops</p>



	<p>Niels: As a guide, hesitant to bring up, but we do have to have discussion. This date also has changes to gov itself that are important</p> <p>Sam: ¼ guide ⅔ standing party change to governance. Tricky because we don't have clearly defined standing parties. Either unable to make changes to governance or adress before june 7th. ⅔ anos, anos are current standing parties one choice</p> <p>Tor: it says ¼ of authority set actually</p> <p>From Chat: Paul says it is a grant proposal and can be updates as part of initial grants</p> <p>Sam: 4/5 guide ¼ AS after June 7th.</p> <p>From Chat: Matt asks who reviews guide pay</p> <p>Chat: Paul sais through grant processing.</p> <p>Niels: Could also be way to address the topic of guide payments in general. We could as guides create a grant for it.</p> <p>Sam: Grant approval process requires standing parties</p> <p>Niles: This could be seen as an essential grant falling into current round of grants.</p> <p>Chat: Matt- as can change gov section 4. Avoid dealing with grants</p> <p>Sam: Next operators meeting after 7th. This should happen on discord among operators.</p>
<b>Conclusion</b>	<p>Niels: How strict are we going to have to be about this. We can just talk about at next meeting and deal with payments until then like we are now. Anyone can ask for floor, or ask in chat.</p> <p>Paul asks for floor, granted</p> <p>Paul: Grant can be issued for having done work, it leaves open door to approve a grant and fix rate but it has to go through grant process. Giving grant for work already done is actually easier, you already have work that guides have done, they deserve bonus for what I put them through.</p> <p>Sam: Coming up on end of the hour. Come to conclusion here. Any other business from the floor?</p> <p>Brian: Motion to adjourn</p> <p>Niels Seconds</p> <p>Brian: Adjourned</p>



<b>Follow up</b>	
------------------	--

<b>Subject 7</b>	
<b>Discussion</b>	
<b>Conclusion</b>	
<b>Follow up</b>	

<b>Subject 8</b>	
<b>Discussion</b>	
<b>Conclusion</b>	
<b>Follow up</b>	

<b>Subject 9</b>	
<b>Discussion</b>	
<b>Conclusion</b>	
<b>Follow up</b>	

<b>Subject 10</b>	
<b>Discussion</b>	
<b>Conclusion</b>	
<b>Follow up</b>	