

FACTOM COMMUNITY

MEETING MINUTES

Factom Guides

Meeting #26

2018-10-22

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	2018-10-22, 20:00 UTC
Date minutes drafted	2018-10-22
Date minutes approved	
Organization/Team	Factom Guides
Attendees	Factom inc (Brian Deery), , DBGrow Inc (Julian), Canonical ledgers (Sam), Centis BV (Niels Klomp), The 42ND Factoid LTD (Tor)
Members not in attendance	
Other attendees	
Meeting Leader	Canonical Ledgers (Sam)
Meeting Secretary	The 42ND Factoid LTD (Tor)

Subject 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Roll Call - Approval of minutes from previous meeting on 2018-10-15
Discussion	
Conclusion	<p>Every guide present.</p> <p>Meeting minutes approved.</p>
Follow up	Factomization of meeting minutes (Sam)

Subject 1	Happy Birthday Niels!
Discussion	
Conclusion	

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

Subject 2	Emergency Alert System (Sam)
Discussion	<p>Did a test last week with about 12 ANOs. Completely successful. We had two ANOs who monitored via their bots, and 10 who had their numbers called via the guide-bot. Previously had an issue when calling multiple ANOs at the same time, but Stuart (from TFA) fixed this through a patch. Plan now is to perform a new full scale test during the ANO-meeting the week after the summit. Some small issues to sort out, but nothing major.</p> <p>Would like to remind the community that they are welcome to request the floor during this minute (text, or request the floor).</p>
Conclusion	Follow up full scale test.
Follow up	Sam plans and executed a full scale test during next ANO-meeting.

Subject 3	New IP Address for ANOs to Open to (Brian verbally confirms address)
Discussion	<p>New IP address for ANOs to open up to Factom Inc for reboots of the network. Alex suggested that we should have one more confirmation to reduce the</p> <p>Brian: new IP address is. 18.203.51.247.</p> <p>Infrastructure on Factom inc. side is not done yet. Working through internal stuff. But the most difficult part is getting the ip address opened up. Eventually the older IP-address will go back into the AWS-pool. I can answer some questions why we need to change if people are interested.</p> <div data-bbox="404 1402 1185 1606">  <p>[Factoshi] AlexanderSupersloth Today at 10:06 PM Thank you Brian! Can we make it a policy that you offer these verbal confirmations for risky changes?</p> </div> <p>Brian: I guess that depends on risk itself and the nature of it. I'm certainly happy to do these verbally confirmations when the community deems it necessary.</p>
Conclusion	

Follow up	

Subject 4	Updates from Factom Inc. (Brian). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Withdrawing ANO; removal of identities. - M3 review by Michael Perklin status. - Next testnet release; status?
Discussion	<p>Brian: Withdrawing ANO. There is a process for removing ANOs that is being worked on on for removing ANOs, but that one is more for involuntary removals... We are currently replicating the future on-chain processes manually, and despite that process not being finalized yet, we have a resignation that has been confirmed by multiple sources. Block party. This being a resignation this seems fairly straight forward. As the alternative is them shutting off their servers and leaving holes in the network, at this point we will move forward with the motion of them by the authority set to create an easy exit and departure that doesn't disrupt the network. And then have the different infrastructure around the authority set (factomize, discord, dashboards) reflect the removal.</p> <p>Tor: Have you decided what block or date they will be removed?</p> <p>Brian: Specifying the block itself is very tricky to do, as the timing is in real time and its hard to do things in real time. It is not as an automated script that gets run or a trigger that happens in the code at this point.... But Block Party doesn't seem to want to drag this out. I have not seen any objections to wait on this... There is a few aspects. There is the actual removing of the authority set, and then the social aspects mentioned above.... Do we need to have those happen at the exact same time?</p> <p>Tor: No not exactly at the same time, but maybe at the same day or so?</p> <p>Brian: Ok. So maybe today or tomorrow then.</p> <p>Brian: M3 review by Michael perklin. This is the thing to unlock the token sale money for Factom Inc. Sadly, this is still pending. All the maintenance of the governance and the upkeep of the network itself has taken a higher priority than unlocking those funds and having that report be generated. It is still on the map, and a thing we are striving for but it has been preempted by the forward movement of the governance and code.</p> <div data-bbox="406 1652 1031 1806"> <p>[LayerTech] Xavierwjc#3480 Today at 10:16 PM</p> <p>Can ANOs/Guides take lead on the M3 review since Factom Inc. has higher priority?</p> </div>

Brian: I suppose. It depends on Michael Perklin, seeing that this is a way to unlock the Factom inc funds that might be a bit odd. And the decentralized report is kind of a side benefit of this.. I don't have a good answer for that right now.

[Go Immutable] - Matt Today at 10:17 PM
Will Michael be coming to the summit?

Brian: I doubt it very highly. I don't know if he is coming to the Texas bitcoin conference. I have not heard one way or another.

Brian : **Next testnet release.** This is going OK. Some good news.. This one will include all the stuff that was removed from 5.4.4. The tests so far have not shown any of the crashes that happened during 5.4.4. We got another week of testing under our belt for that, which is promising. That is one of the items... There are about 22 different things that are planned to get merged into this release. This one has a lot of accumulated stuff from the past. The last release 6.0.1; was a fairly serious bug fix. 6.0.1 Prevents someone who makes an entry that has a clock set wrong by 1 hour, to create a situation where it crashes the network and causes a hard-fork situation. Would thank everyone of the ANOs as they updated their servers quickly. This has been fixed since the last patch, and it was the only fix included. 6.0.2 has much more fixes included. It also updates many of the other libraries that factomd relies on, so this one should have more attention paid to testing and the testnet as it has a lot more changes in it than previous releases. Also, this was the first release a non-factom inc employee had a committ in; Luaps fix for the API. Nice to finally have a breath of support for.

Brian: Few more

Sam: Paul added that this release also has a CLA in it?

Brian: Yes, it went out in 6.0.0, but this release will have the first one with a non-Factom employee in it.

[Factomize] DChapman Today at 10:23 PM
Brian, will this release result in an increase of TPS?

Brian: I don't have the numbers in front of me, and it will be part of the upcoming development report from Inc.

Sam: Will it be included in the upcoming October report? Paul?

Paul: We have a range of tests that internally gives us a whole set of numbers, but what I have to do is select the tests we run.... Need to run it with the prior version and then on the new code and it will give a delta of improvement. But we don't really know

	<p>how that will function on the mainnet due to differences from testing environment and mainnet. We will release something but I'm unsure when.</p> <p>Sam: is there a way to establish a baseline for the mainnet?</p> <p>Brian: This was kind of what happened on the testnet; testing it until it broke.</p> <p>Paul: The best thing we could do is update the testnet to the new version, test it, and then test another version and compare.</p> <p>Sam: Having a rough method to determine this would be good for advertising our capabilities, as well as for ANOs building on top of the network so they know what numbers they can work with. Understand that it is hard to determine these numbers.</p> <p>Paul: I agree, and what I want to do is give you realistic numbers... Our internal testing gives very good numbers, but I don't believe it carries over to the mainnet. I spent a hour or more going over things that limits our TPS, and we know way more about what is going on in the protocol now, and what issues we need to fix. It is very important for us to get to a stable point with this codebase so we can have that stable while we focus on improving the network stack... As long as we are in bug-removal mode it limits our ability to focus on working on higher TPS to achieve.</p> <p>Sam: Do you believe we can improve TPS prior to sharding by refactoring?</p> <p>Paul: I believe there are couple of orders of magnitude we are missing out on due to the complexities of the machine, currently simulating multithreading in a more restrained fashion. Anyone want to go into depth, we could have a meeting about this and I can talk about it in detail.</p> <p>Sam: I think there are people who would like more details.</p> <p>Paul: Maybe we can grab some more time next weekend?</p> <p>Brian: While the individual components themselves works independently, there are some bugs that are being exercised when they are merged together. We cannot give a timeline for when the testnet release is ready. We were aiming for early this week, but it might need more extensive testing first.</p>
Conclusion	
Follow up	

Subject 5	Follow up: tasks from last meeting / upcoming tasks
Discussion	<p>///// START: Text from previous guide meeting minutes (follow up items in orange color) /////</p> <p>Sam: Last week was a lot of working on documents. We finished Doc 152 (grant round 2), got community feedback on it and ratified it. We have some other documents in the works as well (ANO removal, guide removal), and I also finished my script for backing up the Governance google drive. Small python script that downloads the community folder to a storage. I'm going to make it public so anyone can make a local copy, as well as make the python script open source. This to ensure we don't lose any documents accidentally. Next week also doing a new test of the emergency system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Worked on three things, published my little script for backing up the governance drive. I did the emergency test for the ANOs, and worked with other guides with a number of different documents for the community. - Next week is the Texas bitcoin conference and the ANO summit. <p>Tor: Finish ratification/approval document, work on Doc 152 and the incident management document. If I have time, also wants to look at Authority Set update procedure document.</p> <p>Niels: The upcoming week I will work on incidence management document, and we need to make sure that communicate with all parties involved during an outage so people know what is going on etc. Working on reviewing several documents. Working on the sponsor role. It's basically drafted... I will post it tomorrow. It's about what you can expect from a sponsor and how they come in play. It's not going to be an official document at this time, but suggestions for how the sponsors may function. 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.</p> <p>Julian: Finish review of 152, review of 152 from legal. Review 100 Starting guide removal document structure</p> <p>I spent quite a lot of time to take the documents above to legal for review, and a lot of time has been spent on preparing for hopefully releasing a substantial amount of legal work (larger projects). Hoping to have them released this week, or early next week if not.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Worked with legal on doc 100 and other discussions about document approval. Released the decentralization review, and we are starting to work on... Flashing out the decentralization issues in the ecosystem. Bunch of good conversations from that, which is exciting. On suggestion

	<p>from David Chapman changed the CoC's scope to not encompass the entire community.</p> <p>Moving forward into the next week: Soft recommendation on jurisdiction and foundation for the Factom protocol</p> <p>Next week:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of 100 from legal Hope to release a substantial amount of legal work. Guide removal/guide election Code of Conduct, and reqs/expectations Prepare for ratifying the above first round of documents <p>Brian:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Follow up with 6.0.1 release - Start creating 6.0.2 RC <p>Next week, get 6.0.2 RC</p> <p>Feedback on new governance documents 100, legal report, etc.</p> <p>Request for community developer wallet help</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We got 6.0.1 out. 6.0.2 RC turned out to be a bit more intensive than we had anticipated, so that is being extended out to next week. I have a bunch of feedback for the new governance documents. The legal report; I have been preparing some of my responses to that. Seems overly harsh, without getting into nuances.... Will comment on the missing nuances in the report. And also I put out a call for help from the community developer/developers to fix a bug in the wallet. There has been an exchange that has asked for this bug to be fixed... This seems like a piece of code that someone new entering the system can quickly gain some satisfaction to fix. <div data-bbox="406 1144 998 1302" style="background-color: #333; color: white; padding: 10px; margin: 10px 0;"> <p>[LayerTech] Xavierwjc Today at 10:41 PM</p> <p>Can the feedback regarding the legal report be ready before the Retreat on Friday?</p> </div> <p>Brian: My comments are addressing issues that they state Factom Inc are in fully control of...The lawyers doesn't grasp how this work, and i believe the ANOs have far more power than the lawyers think.</p> <p>///// END: Text from previous guide meeting minutes /////</p>
Conclusion	
Follow up (until next meeting)	

Subject 6	Open floor
Discussion	<p>On october 7th losmillos::</p> <p>losmilos10/07/2018</p> <p>@sittyfo1 Had a good point in the #fct-market How do you judge ANO's, especially the ones who campaign vs the ones already in production? Maybe you could introduce some kind of rating system with a sandbox holding campaigning ANO's. They all get rated and the ones with the most votes are in, the ones who got the least are out.</p> <p>Sam:</p> <p>The larger question is how ANOs rathe themselves and how they get selected. What we want in the future is a on-chain solution that would distribute this selection, but that is quite far off still. In the interim we are working on solutions that handles this. One example is the “ANO expectations and Requirements” document being drafted in the governance drive.</p>
Conclusion	
Follow up	

Meeting adjourned at 20:45 UTC.