FACTOM COMMUNITY

MEETING MINUTES

GUIDE MEETING #1

2018-04-09

FEDERATION

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.

Note: This version control is for the Template, not the individual meeting minutes.

Date and time of meeting	2018-04-09 (14:06-15:54 UTC)
Date minutes drafted	2018-04-09
Date minutes approved	
Organization/Team	Factom Guides
Attendees	Tor Hogne Paulsen (Quintilian), David Chapman (DChapman), Niels Klomp (Niels), Brian Deery (Brian), Matt Osborne (Matt O),
Members not in attendance	
Other attendees	Paul Snow (Briefly)
Chairman	
Secretary	Tor Hogne Paulsen

Subject 1	Discuss potential for selecting a chairman and secretary
Discussion	Guides discussed benefits of having a chairman to lead the meetings, as well as a secretary-function for doing minutes and ensuring proper follow-up regarding storing and hashing of the minutes. Paul Snow commented that we should not have defined "standing roles" but do this ad hoc for every meeting. No issues with the same people tending to the same roles.
Conclusion	Guides will start each meeting with appointing a meeting leader and a meeting secretary.
Follow up	Add the "conclusion" to the governance doc(?)

Subject 2	Roll call and approval of minutes from previous meeting on (INSERT DATE).
Discussion	Roll call performed. No minutes to approve as this is the first meeting.
Conclusion	All attendees present.
Follow up	N/A

Subject 3	Approval of Agenda - (Any subjects to discuss not already listed?)
Discussion	**N/A**

V. 1.0

Conclusion	N/A
Follow up	N/A

Subject 4	**Personal intros of guides. Background, location, experience.**
Discussion	Agreed not to spend time in the meeting for this. Should though be done at a later stage as to formally introduce the guides.
Conclusion	Guides will prepare bios and publish at a later time.
Follow up	Added to Guide tasklist.

Subject 5	**Determine meeting agenda document format** Note from Tor: I suggest we use the format in this document. Before and during the meeting it is effectively an agenda; and after its finalized its "converted" into Minutes. Open for suggestions regarding a consent agenda (standard items for every meeting)
Discussion	
Conclusion	Meeting is in agreement to use the document as is. Decisions by consensus where applicable, or by vote if consensus cannot be reached or if the subject is of such a nature that a vote is required.
Follow up	Add the "conclusion" to the governance doc(?)

Subject 6	**Define what processes the Guides will use for different tasks such as**
	    - **Governance Document Editing and Factomizing**
	    - **Documenting work done and document handling**
	    - **M3 Authority Node Application Process**
	    - **Questions from community (and response to it)**
	        Note from Tor: I think we need to figure out a way for the community to be able to make a request/question to the guides and then be able to get an unified answer from the guides. Asking a question in the #Governance-channel and then receiving ad-hoc responses from one or multiple guides with differing perspectives is not necessarily appropriate.
	        I suggest we establish a "Guide-questions" channel where people may post a question and have it discussed by the guides in the next Guide-meeting and then get a unified answer from the guides (posted as a response in that channel).

V. 1.0

	- Other tasks?
Discussion 7	**Governance document editing:** Hash written directly into the document. One document to list and bind them all (with hashes). Use the google documents as their own working documents after hashing has been executed. **Documenting work done and document handling:** Tor will propose a system prior to the next meeting. **M3 Authority Node Application Process** Brian talks about risks to the network with many involved individuals from the start hosting servers. If all servers are not working together everything stops. Factom pushed towards safety, and will shut itself down instead of forking. Initially Factom was thinking in the lines of along the Testnet. Admins can do limited administration to kickstart the network, because we still have bugs in the system. Brian advocates for a slower growth in the number of organisations that hosts the servers to build up institutional knowledge. Acknowledges that this will be an unpopular idea. Guides will have to find and define a balance. Ballpark of entities: 7-10. Limiting factor is coordination. Niels advocates for a lower number of nodes in the start due to the value involved, and we should consider a lower amount of nodes. Start out with a lower number of organisations and then add nodes at a steady rate. Also technical side will be difficult with a higher number: the more servers can fail. David: David expressed his concern about section 3.3 of the Governance Document and how there is no weighting for Standing Parties votes, only defined variables. As such, how it is currently worded, there is no space for Guides to vote on the Authority Nodes and eventually for Standing Parties to vote on the Authority Nodes once the role of Guides is automated. He went on to share the following which he previously wrote in discord: *"I'm pondering how Authority Nodes will be elected/approved and just as importantly, that process automated eventually. My understanding is that the Standing Parties will vote for Authority Nodes eventually. At present, under, "Campaign Factors (3.3) of the Governance Doc, the campaign factors and the weighting for Authority Nodes is Node Reliability (30%), Efficiency (30%), Node Specs (30%), Location (10%). While these variables are easy to automate, what is there to vote on for the Standing Party? It's just who has the highest weighting wins. But what if an entity going for an Authority Node does ok with these variables but has so much more to offer which is showcased in their campaign document? At present, there's no weighting for that. As such, I'm of the opinion that this needs to change so that human determinable aspects of an entity*

V. 1.0

campaigning for an Authority Node can be taken into account and scored by voting of the Standing Party. One thought is splitting the automatic weighting of the current variables which really don't need voted on and the votes by the Standing Party to X% and Y% respectively to give the total Z% with the highest Authority Nodes with the highest Z winning. According to the wording of the Governance Doc, initially, Guides would be the ones voting for the Y% but once Standing Parties can, they will instead."

Brian: Think through the technical and economic parts separately.

David: Important to make a roadmap available to the community. Showcase rough estimates for when additional servers are brought online.

Brian: Roadmap sounds like a good idea.

Tor: Should discuss selecting more organisations than we put online starting out, and have them run servers in parallel to the authority set, and then bring them on in the next wave.

Niels, Brian and Matt supports that idea.

Matt: Asks, without advocating for it, if we should postpone M3 to work through the technical issues and launch with more groups from the start?

Brian: It's possible, but we are trying to get control pushed out faster rather than later.

Tor: How many servers will Factom run?

Brian: Somewhere in the 20% range for the near and medium term. Part of M3 is to also fund development of the protocol at Factom.

Tor: Is there a technical reason for running 20% of the servers.
Brian: No.

David: Insight about technical milestones for M3?

Brian: Under rapid development. Command line based tools for tweaking the protocol in regards of block payouts etc. Leverages identity software already in use.

David: When will Factom be ready for the M3 rollout so we can build the roadmap around it?

Brian: Targeting the end of April 2018.

David: Will this be rolled out on the Testnet first?

Brian: Will be tested on Testnet first.

	Tor: Application process? Google forms?

David: Split discussion between weighted criteria and the human element brought to the table.

Brian: The standing parties, the token based, are expressions of the will of the entity signing those entries. They will be the human element. It makes sense that the guides provides the human element at this time as the tooling is not ready for that yet.

David: The governance document does not provide weight for the human element, and currently only the criteria listed will have any weight.

Brian: Suggest we discuss this in Discord and will have to work it out.

Niels: Tor and Davids thoughts on number of organisations in the initial authority set?

Tor: Would prefer more entities on the testnet (15-20) in the initial phase for decentralisation, and believe good communication channels can alleviate.

Brian: it's more about risk management than a technical issue.

David: Should we restrict applications for the testnet and main net due to bringing on a lower amount of entities starting out?

Niels: Effective roadmap will go a long way.

Matt: Brings up idea of pausing testnet and authority set applications. Expresses concerns applicants wont see roadmap also. Suggests integrating the road map into the reply email after applicants submit testnet application.

Tor: Will add roadmap to the testnet application process.

Questions from community (and response to it)
- Meeting in agreement |
| **Conclusion** | **M3 Authority Node Application Process**
- Start out with a smaller number of authority nodes (7-10) and also look into electing more than that initially and have these as standby/backup nodes, as well as being the next "wave" of servers that will be onboarded.
- Make an amendment to Governance doc para 3.3 that provides standing parties with 50% weight for voting. Initially the guides will execute this function and no standing parties have been defined.
- Make a roadmap with published milestones for expanding the authority set and onboarding new entities post M3. |
| **Follow up** | David: Draft 3.3 amendment.
Tor/Niels: Draft roadmap |

V. 1.0

Subject 8	**Make a plan in regards of how we are going to do and structure the Guide work.** - **"Solo" in between meetings?** - **Task oriented?** - **Could and should people in the groups plan to work on stuff together in between meetings?**
Discussion	
Conclusion	Will be dependent on the task. Work on a case-by-case basis.
Follow up	**Documenting work done and document handling:** Tor will propose a system prior to the next meeting.

Subject 9	**Determine roadmap including Auth Node Application Deadline**
Discussion	Been discussed previously in the meeting. Guides will start working on the roadmap offline with the end of April 2018 in mind. Matt: Dependent on the technical aspects and when code will be ready. Brian: help from 3rd parties is appreciated for things outside of the base protocol; we can utilise tools outside of the Factom Inc. protocol David: Can you provide examples? Brian: Higher level user interface stuff. For example UI for voting protocol. David: We should make a list of what is needed for M3 to go live. Enablers. Tor: What do we need before we go live before M3? David: Suggest we make the list offline. Meeting in agreement. Matt: We should not release anything that would be constantly changing, but instead provide near finalised documents for the sake of stability of the community. Too much

V. 1.0

	backtracking by Guides could cause the community to lose trust/faith in Guides ability to deliver, trust in Guides is integral. David: We should share information as quickly and transparent as we can. Effective communication.
Conclusion	Tor will create a document for holding the list of enablers for M3.
Follow up	Tor: Create list.

Subject 10	**Determine best way to list current Federated Servers, Audit Servers, and Followers registered to be Auth Servers and Operator contact info**
Discussion	David: Suggest this can be handled efficiently. Brian: Entity and server operators can be different, should have different contact info for both.
Conclusion	Look into how to host, pupulate and update such a list
Follow up	Add to tasklist.

Subject 11	**Discuss important factors for Authority Set**
Discussion	Was not discussed as its own subject.
Conclusion	N/A
Follow up	N/A

Subject 12	**Election software creation** Note from Tor: Valentin Ganev (Sanchopansa) has drafted an <u>on-chain voting protocol</u> that can be utilized for votes in the Factom community. <u>Link</u>. My understanding is that we don't need any new software to start using this, as the Factomd CLI will be sufficient to cast votes starting out. In a longer perspective software should be created via a grant.
Discussion	Brian: Have not looked at it yet. Impressed and pleased the people stepping up. Will test on the testnet. David: Suggests that testnet admin reports back how this functions.

V. 1.0

Conclusion	Move on with the proposed protocol for the upcoming testnet votes.
Follow up	Tor coordinates with testnet admins.

Subject 13	**Take over posting of the, "Weekly Thread" on the /r/factom subreddit and determine what content to share in it.** Note from David: I have talked to Paul Snow. He's fine with us taking over the weekly thread. Guides can request Moderator Status from Paul Snow if so desired.
Discussion	Niels: One should look into posting the guides names online for personal tax reasons (to provide proof of our role) as well as a public e-mail address or communications medium for people to reach the guides. Attendees in agreement that we will add this information somewhere public.
Conclusion	Guide names already pinned in Discord #Guide-workspace
Follow up	Publication of names: Added to tasklist Daily reddit thread: David creates a new thread this week.

Subject 14	**Governance document basic cleanup (presentational, capitalizing, defined terms, etc.)** Note from Tor: Is there anything we need to do right away? Has the initial document been factomized yet?
Discussion	**Is there anything we need to change in the document at this point in time?** Matt: Document should be more professionally written as to be more legally binding. Non-pressing issue though.
Conclusion	For now we make our own notes, and we start working on the M3
Follow up	

Subject 15	**Exchange contact info for emergency coordination**
Discussion	
Conclusion	Guides agree to do this offline.
Follow up	

V. 1.0

FEDERATION

Subject 16	Community Comment
Discussion	All the participants in the meetings should declare that they are present (preferred that its done in text format) (Note: At a later date someone at Discord offered to make a Discord-bot that automatically monitors the meeting-channel and generates a list of attendees. Some guides responded favouably to this, and suggest that it should be used in the future) Niels: Who should be able to attend the meetings? Should all members of the community be invited? David: Concerning a specific agenda item community members can request to be recognized at any time during the meeting to add comments. Niels: Should people attending a meeting bring up unrelated things as well? Could be a long meeting otherwise. Maybe postpone that to the next meeting? David: My personal thought is to let people post in the channel to be recognized during the meeting to talk about items we are already talking about and then let the Community talk about whatever they wanted during the, "Community Comment" period. There was concern this could create long meetings. David then suggested that people could instead ask a Guide to add it to the Agenda for the next meeting if they wanted it discussed during the meeting or simply post in Discord for discussion. There was consensus for this idea. It was decided the Guides will post the agenda for the next meeting as early as possible and invite people to have agenda items added.
Conclusion	- Community members can request to be recognized at any time during the meeting to add comments to specific agenda items. - Attendees may add specific items to the agenda prior to the meetings to have them discussed, but can not bring up new agenda items during a meeting.
Follow up	Add the "conclusion" to the governance doc(?)

Subject 17	New Business
Discussion	Brian: Uptime and response-time will be paramount starting out, and individuals hosting is less desirable than groups with more sysadmins that can cover for each other when one is unavailable. Authorities that comes forward as Organizations are the most desirable at this point. From a large institutions perspective it would be better with companies running the servers than single persons.

V. 1.0

FEDERATION

David: So the important part is to have 24.7 support available?
Brian:Yes.

Niels: Should people in the community team up and form groups and companies for this?

Brian: Yes. The ability to have an Organization and attention paid over an extended period of time is important for coordination.

David: What kind of reaction time should we expect?
Brian: This is a factor not a requirement. This is one of the things we will have to take into account when we select the authority servers. The protocol is still young and we are still learning, and we will probably have some training wheels on in the beginning when we are starting out to help mitigate this, and this is something the applicants should take into account.

Niels: We should have a baseline with at defined response-time, for instance 6 hours - what does it mean to be responsive 24.7?

Brian: Putting numbers on it might be a bit preliminary, and people should just think about it when making applications.

Niels: Do we take that into account when we make the score? Should we have a baseline? Leave it up to the applicants?

Matt: It is very easy for an applicant to give the appearance of a strong support team, this is easily gamed. It is as simple as copy/pasting a random person's profile from LinkedIn into an application. We will have serious issues verifying.We should consider intentionally taking testnet down to see how quickly people respond.

Niels: We should have it more formal, so we can keep people responsible

David: Enforce this socially instead? You don't want to be last to respond….

Brian: Easy to game. Hard to quantify. Makes it more a social thing, as time goes on and the protocol gets more robust, and the different teams get better at what they are doing we can start figuring out what kind of metrics we have.

Niels: All I'm saying is that it's easier to game when its undefined.

David: What needs to change for you to be comfortable with specifying a defined response time?

Brian: I`m not sure.

David: Can you discuss it internally at Factom?

	Niels: We should define what's unacceptable downtime for the main net. Brian: Downtime will be inevitable. Currently the Factom network goes down every other weekend when updates are performed. Defining a response time will be more reactive as we get more experience running the network.
Conclusion	Brian and guides will keep thinking about this until our next meeting.
Follow up	N/A

Subject 18	**Other items not on the agenda.**
Discussion	Matt: I have some names for Appendix A that's not included in the list. I can upload screenshots to the Google Drive to have it recorded for posterity? Meeting in agreement. Niels question for Brian: - Will you continue to support the testnet until and after M3? Brian: We are currently viewing it as an experimentation zone, so new software have a bigger test platform. We hope it goes forward. Matt: The community could use some clarity in regard to Factom's inc new role. David had brought up Trademark status for example. Also, how does sales process work? What if I have mortgage lead? I don't have access to Harmony software. Questions such as this would provide a lot of clarity. Brian: Not his department, but there are people we can talk to.
Conclusion	N/A
Follow up	N/A