

FACTOM COMMUNITY

MEETING MINUTES

Factom Guides

MEETING #10

2018-06-24

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	
Date minutes drafted	
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	
Meeting Leader	Canonical ledgers (Sam)
Meeting Secretary	The 42nd Factoid LTD

Subject 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Roll Call - Approval of minutes from previous meeting on (2018-06-17).
Discussion	All members present.
Conclusion	Meeting minutes from meeting 06-17 approved.
Follow up	Brian factomizes the previous meeting minutes.

Subject 1	Change frequency of Guide Meetings to fortnightly (Sam)
Discussion	<p>Sam: The reasoning for this was ending up with meetings with very few agenda items. Governance document calls out weekly minutes, so we will have to amend the governance document if we'd like it changed. Personally I don't feel we need to do that because it's a lot of effort for something that may only be necessary temporarily.</p> <p>Brian: If we had some other governance actions going forward through the amendment process we could look at this simultaneously. It's nice to keep this stuff moving along. But I agree, weekly might a lot.</p> <p>Niels: We could look at a standard time for hosting the meeting</p>

	<p>Julian: Also preferring weekly meetings, might be an uptick in number of agenda items.</p> <p>Sam: Sounds quite sensible. Might consider this later.</p>
Conclusion	
Follow up	

Subject 2	Guide Emergency Test System Update (Sam)
Discussion	<p>Sam: I ran into a limit in pagerduty, which is the system I was using. Pagerduty was one of the ones recommended by ANOs. It's quite powerful, a lot of features. Almost too complex for what we want to do. Cannot go above 10 numbers in a single account. Bunch of options; I can do this programmatically or look into other options. Stuart from TFA has been looking for a discord alert bot that might be suitable.</p> <p>Sam: One contact number for each ANOs. Xavier posted a link (call-em-all.com) in governance-chat but I don't think that works outside the U.S. I will give this and others solutions another look, and also the TFA bot which might look like it's suitable.</p>
Conclusion	
Follow up	

Subject 3	ANO Selections Round 2 (Sam)
Discussion	Review number of current applicants. Discuss minimum score, number of applicants to choose and timeline.
Conclusion	<p>Sam: So we put out this signup-sheet, last time I checked it had 8 potential applicant - which is good. This is currently people within the Factom ecosystem and on the testnet. This is a decent response as we have not reached out to others to apply. We will have to look at what timeline we should use, minimum score, number of ANOs selected etc. What is the other guides thoughts on this?</p> <p>Julian: So for the minimum score it seems like we need to spend some time look it</p>

	<p>through. We could look at the score from last time, but we might want to change some of the grading etc... We should maybe talk about this in the guide workspace and figure it out from there. As for the ANOS selected, I think 5 sounds fine with 8 applications. But looking us into 5 might not be a good idea.</p> <p>Niels: We have to discuss it. If I remember correctly the governance document already has a cutoff included, but we need to look at if it applies for this round or not.</p> <p>Brian: This is kind of a hard thing. We want the community to grow, but we also want qualified people to be part of the authority set. Finding the balance is difficult to say the least.</p> <p>Niels: For instance, what we saw on the testnet the other day with 2 ANOs not having their firewalls in order worries me a lot.</p> <p>Julian: We also need to keep spots open for other good ANOs for the next months. Once we hit >32 ANOs we run into complications, federated vs audit, 1 vs 2 nodes, it is more simple before then, so leaving space open to onboard ANOs before it gets complicated is useful.</p> <p>Sam: Decentralization is a continuum, and we essentially met the minimum with the M3 launch with no single ANOs having a more nodes than others. The governance specifies that we should have 65 ANOs in the end; but its the guides responsibility to ensure that we get there in an appropriate and coherent manner and that new nodes bring quality.</p> <p>Niels: We have to take into account the current ANOs becoming too powerful in the end, and we need to look at the current governance document to see if it needs amending before the next election or not.</p> <p>Brian: One of the advantages having ANOs paid by the protocol is that it aligns incentives for more groups/entities with the protocol.</p> <p>Sam: What do people think about the timeline for this? I believe we should have a timeline ready during next week. If we want to have ANOs ready for after the first 21 ANOs are on-boarded we ought to start the process rather quickly..</p> <p>Niels: Lets work on it during the next week and discuss it in the next meeting.</p> <p>Tor: Do a brainstorming to identify all the issues that needs to be addressed.</p> <p>BenJ: "Bit concerned about the quality of the applicants so far, I think we need to really consider a minimum application quality early on.</p> <p>Sam: I personally believe it should be a cutoff score and that it would take care of that concern, and I'm happy to not add any further ANOs if they are not able to reach that minimum.</p> <p>Julian: Community marking. We don't want too many applicants coming in doing it simply for the money. We want people who are integral to this community, and which can start being useful members for the community from day one.</p>
--	---

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

Subject 4	Report on onboarding of 3 new ANOs (Brian)
Discussion	<p>Building-IM, Hash-n-Store, Cryptovikings</p> <p>Brian: last wed-friday was our target date to onboard the next 3 ANOs in the queue. I will have to take responsibility for being not as up front as I could have been, working on a release on the testnet (slipped a little bit). Part of the onboarding process, there is always minor things that come up. At this point we are at the process working through the minor things. I think we are at the tail end, if everything goes well today Building-IM should be able to get onboarded today. And also HashNStore and CryptoVikings are also close in that regard as well.</p> <p>Sam: How far along are the two last groups? Will it be this week?</p> <p>Brian: Yes this week. Problems seems minor. Only tweaking of configurations, not systemic issues.</p>
Conclusion	
Follow up	

Subject 5	Factom, Inc support request for M3 audit
Discussion	<p>Brian: Back in 2015 Factom Foundation got the agreement from two people, one of which is a gentleman named Michael Perklin, to basically be a third party auditor. He had a very stellar reputation at the time, and his reputation has grown even more so to this day. He serves as the chief security officer of Shapeshift. He created a report when Factom reached M1. The M2 was basically deferred to M3, so at this point he will generate a report for M2 and M3 for the Factom project. So this does two things; 1) It presents to the outside that yes in fact, Factom is decentralized, and 2) It unlocks the funds that were collected during the software sale during the April 2015 timeline. And so, as part of this, I'm going to ask some of the ANOs, Michael Perklin has requested all 10 of the ANOs has been available for contact. Most of what he wants to do is to ascertain that Factom inc has not fabricated a community fraudulently and that the ANOs are real people. I will be making some introductions over the next week with him, and I would very much appreciate if the ANOs not ignoring mr. Perklin and not treating his requests as spam.</p> <p>Sam: I would like to point out that it's a fantastic resource that the marketing and exchange community can use. The Exchange community has been thinking about writing a document about what M3 is for outward use, having a respected third party to do this is a good idea.</p>

	<p>Xavierwjc: Is there a time line for this audit? My thought is we can do some marketing effort around it.</p> <p>Brian: I don't know. Compared to shapeshift this is a low priority i'd imagine, but it is something he has promised to do so I'm sure he'll get around to it. Are there any leaders in the ANO community that would like to assist in this?</p> <p>Brian: He is an e-mail guy. He is not on the discord which is our main communication method. Having some communication through that would be beneficial as well.</p> <p>Niels: We should make an announcement in the operators-channel to make an announcement.</p> <p>Sam: What are you referring to regarding ANOs taking a more active role, what do you mean?</p> <p>Brian: maybe reaching out to some of the peer ANOs to introduce them. I'm not sure.</p> <p>Sam: I was not sure if you meant if those ANOs should reach out to him or not.</p> <p>Brian: Basically that is what I have on that, and I will be reaching out to some of the ANOs. I might need e-mail addresses from some ANOs to reach out individually.</p> <p>Niels: I think MoFs page has all the e-mails aggregated.</p>
Conclusion	
Follow up	

Subject 6	Open floor
Discussion	Sam: All right - does anyone have more business? Guides or community?
Conclusion	None. Guide meeting ended 20:31 UTC.
Follow up	

Subject 7	
Discussion	



Conclusion	
Follow up	

Subject 8	
Discussion	
Conclusion	
Follow up	

Subject 9	
Discussion	
Conclusion	
Follow up	

Subject 10	
Discussion	
Conclusion	
Follow up	