

# **FACTOM COMMUNITY**

## **MEETING MINUTES**

**Factom Guides**

**Meeting #28**

**2018-11-12**

| 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>  | 2018-11-12, 20:00 UTC   |
| <b>Date minutes drafted</b>      | 2018-11-12  |
| <b>Date minutes approved</b>     |   |
| <b>Organization/Team</b>         | Factom Guides   |
| <b>Attendees</b>                 | Factom inc (Brian Deery), , DBGrow Inc (Julian), Canonical ledgers (Sam), Centis BV (Niels Klomp), The 42ND Factoid LTD (Tor) |
| <b>Members not in attendance</b> |   |
| <b>Other attendees</b>           |   |
| <b>Meeting Leader</b>            | Factom Inc (Brian Deery)  |
| <b>Meeting Secretary</b>         | The 42ND Factoid (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 2018-11-05</b></li> </ul>                   |
| <b>Discussion</b> |  |
| <b>Conclusion</b> | <p>All guides in attendance.</p> <p>Sam: We forgot to update the actions going forward, but except from that they are fine.</p> <p>Meeting minutes approved.</p> |
| <b>Follow up</b>  | Factomization of meeting minutes (Sam)   |

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| <b>Subject 1</b>  | <b>Governance Documents (Sam)</b>   |
| <b>Discussion</b> | <p>Brian: There was some talk of this last time, but some more has transpired. Sam would you like to provide an update?</p> <p>Sam: There isn't really much of an update since last time, but we need to figure out how we go forward. I created a draft for how to reorganize it along with legal. We should look into it. My suggestion will be to amend the Factom Governance document</p> |

|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
|                   | <p>or either add a small appendix which describes how we can add and amend documents that affects parts of governance.</p> <p>Brian: Any discussion or points to be raised in the governance-chat channel?</p> |
| <b>Conclusion</b> | Guides discuss the way forward offline.  |
| <b>Follow up</b>  |  |

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| <b>Subject 2</b>  | <b>Grant round update (Tor)</b>   |
| <b>Discussion</b> | <p>Tor provided a quick update for the current grant round. 143 000 FCT will be dispersed and voting closes in around 16 hours (13th 23:59).</p> <p>Link to Grant scoring sheet.<br/> <a href="https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1tZCVVSRT1gndgl7R5QJkViL0jS2nOFBkYbtIGjrL8oA/edit?usp=sharing">https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1tZCVVSRT1gndgl7R5QJkViL0jS2nOFBkYbtIGjrL8oA/edit?usp=sharing</a></p> <p>143000 fct</p> |
| <b>Conclusion</b> |   |
| <b>Follow up</b>  |   |
|                   |   |

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| <b>Subject 3</b>  | <b>Onboarding ANOs Status (Brian)</b>   |
| <b>Discussion</b> | <p>Brian: There has been a lot going on the past week, not a lot attention being paid to the onboarding process unfortunately. After the grants go forward... We still have our target by this week, and so we are not behind at this point and still moving forward on those. I can't really give estimates or timelines as other issues are stirring at this point as well.</p> <p>The three ANOs are very excited to get started on this, and I apologize for there not being enough bandwidth for this to happen. Hoping in the future that when these processes are being more automated it will go easier, but where we stand now with the protocol it is still a delicate process.</p> <p>Questions?</p> |

|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| <b>Conclusion</b> | Brian promotes the three waiting ANOs into the authority as soon as he has time. |
| <b>Follow up</b>  |  |
|                   |  |

|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| <b>Subject 4</b>  | <b>Next Factomd RC (Brian)</b>   |
| <b>Discussion</b> | <p>Brian: Some good and bad news. A week and a half ago Paul was able to replicate the symptoms that was plaguing the 5.4.4 RC which forced that to be pulled back. This was really exciting because being able to replicate the problem is the first step in solving it. Factom is an incredibly complex system, and a few months had been spent in chasing this bug without much tangible progress.. But now when it is replicable it can be looked into. We first believed it was as single issue that caused the problem, but we have concluded with it being a multi-factor problem and we have been spending the past week trying to fix it. Paul Snow is the best one to talk about this:</p> <p>Paul Snow: So, basically there are a lot of inner working steps in running the consensus algorithm, and there was some flawed assumptions in various places in the code, but when we fixed those assumptions there is a domino effect on other places in the code where it assumes that it would behave the way it did originally. So there is basically a cascading effect through the consensus algorithm. The current consensus algorithm handles all the VMs simultaneously, and this is an issue with that instead of us having parceled out the VMs in their own (...). A refactor might be required, and we are trying to chase down the leads regarding the cascading effect. Adjusting one of the pieces changes the timing in this complex machine, so we need to make updates to many systems to get it right.</p> <p>Niels: It is also a change in behaviour of the system?</p> <p>Paul: No, it is a question of timing; when does an election start? When does it stop? Etc..</p> <p>It is an involved discussion and only the developers would really understand. If anyone wants a deeper explanation we could do that after.</p> <p>Niels: We could also discuss it in the core committee and do a writeup about it?</p> <p>Paul: I think a call would be best, as a writeup will be very hard, as it's a lot of small parts having to be explained and trying to write it up will be a massive</p> <p>Niels: How does this impact the current version?</p> <p>Paul: The current version has the same bug, the difference is that we improved the performance in the current code significantly, and the risk has gone up for the symptoms to appear due to this performance increase. It doesn't happen on the current code due to it being rather clunky so it doesn't trigger it.</p> |

|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
|                   | <p>Brian: Since the code is not ready at this point what we started doing now is remixing all the smaller but still critical fixes into a new branch and kind of packaging that up as a release, 6.0.2.... That is undergoing review at this point, and it will also include some wallet-updates that an exchange has asked for.</p> <p>Niels: Do we have a timeline for this? I'm asking due to grant-round being open and we need a release on the 20th with only the grants in them...</p> <p>Brian: Good question. Things can happen on the testnet and on the mainnet in parallel. We can have an independent deployment of the testnet-code if this gets released as an RC in the interim.... And the grant update code can skip RC-phase and go directly on the mainnet as the only change would be the release code. That's a good point. It would change the versioning scheme if the grant code went out.</p> <p>6.1.0 - Will be grant release<br/>6.1.1 - Next factomd version with bug-fixes</p> <p>Niels: You have the activation 7 days after the release of the new code of the grants which is a minor release as it only adds the grants... But then you get into the situation where the testnet-RC goes well and would be pushed to mainnet... Would you deploy this on mainnet before or after the activation height?</p> <p>Brian: Good question. Don't know.</p> <p>Niels: My suggestion would be to do it after the activation.</p> <p>Brian: The complicated changes will not make it into the remix, only fixes for what the exchanges need or fixing the minute 9 bug etc...</p> <p>Niels: Ok, got it.</p> |
| <b>Conclusion</b> |  |
| <b>Follow up</b>  |  |
|                   |  |
| <b>Subject 5</b>  | <b>Follow up: tasks from last meeting / upcoming tasks</b>   |
| <b>Discussion</b> | ///// START: Text from previous guide meeting minutes (follow up items in orange color) /////  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p><b>Sam:</b></p> <p><b>Last week: ANO summit. Very productive. Working on documents for approval this week.</b><br/>last week</p> <p><b>This week going forward; once voting is over I would like to start a couple of timed discussions on Factomize to discuss the new documents we have been talking about (guide election document, guide removal document)</b></p> <p><b>In addition to that I'd like to work with the other guides regarding reorganizing Doc 000 and what changes we need to do for governance document.</b></p> <p><b>Thursday: We are doing an all hands emergency alert system test. Was discussed during the last guide meeting, and it's designed for everyone to participate... Unless if someone has a good reason for not participate they can contact me directly.</b></p> <p><b>Tor:</b><br/><b>Will work on exactly the same Sam mentioned. Will work with him on all of the above regarding governance docs, reorganization etc.</b></p> <p><b>Niels:</b><br/><b>Working on reviewing several documents. I will also work on the Incident management document to ensure that we'll be able to handle the next crisis better. I also hope the legal review of the governance document will come back from legal this week and I suspect there will be a lot of work to do there.</b></p> <p><b>Released the unofficial sponsor "document" in the Factomize forum for discussion.</b></p> <p><b>Currently working on evaluating other blockchain RFC and Improvement protocols, as I believe we need to get that of the ground ASAP. Will posts some remarks about that this week and then start on implementing our system with hopefully some other parties, like the core committee, documentation committee etc.</b></p> <p><b>The IM doc has had no progress sadly</b></p> <p><b>Julian</b><br/><b>Upcoming week: Most time will likely be spent on the grant round. Priority after that is working on reorganization of governance with guides and Legal. We are also hoping to release some documents on a foundation/non-profit and begin conversations on that after the grant round comes to a close.</b></p> <p><b>Last week, released decentralization findings, want to release a soft recommendation for the jurisdiction for the foundation. Working on legal issues with factominc and community.</b></p> |
|--|--|



|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p><b>Brian:</b><br/> <b>Last week:</b><br/> <b>Next week, get 6.0.2 RC</b><br/> <b>Feedback on new governance documents 100, legal report, etc.</b><br/> <b>Request for community developer wallet help</b></p> <p><b>Next week:</b><br/> <b>Doc 100 perspective on scope</b><br/> <b>Continue on 6.0.2</b><br/> <b>Continue on Wallet updates</b><br/> <b>Onboarding of new ANOs</b><br/> <b>Grant</b></p> <p>///// END: Text from previous guide meeting minutes /////</p> |
| <b>Conclusion</b>                         |   |
| <b>Follow up<br/>(until next meeting)</b> |   |
|   |   |

|                   |                   |
|-------------------|-------------------|
| <b>Subject 6</b>  | <b>Open floor</b> |
| <b>Discussion</b> |                   |
| <b>Conclusion</b> |                   |
| <b>Follow up</b>  |                   |

Meeting adjourned at 20:37 UTC.