FEDERATION

FACTOM COMMUNITY

MEETING MINUTES

Factom Guides

Meeting #29

2018-11-19

V. 1.2

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.

FEDERATION

Date and time of meeting	2018-11-19, 20:00 UTC
Date minutes drafted	2018-11-19
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	Factom Inc. (Brian Deery)
Meeting Secretary	The 42ND Factoid (Tor)

Subject 0	- **Roll Call** - **Approval of minutes from previous meeting on 2018-11-12**
Discussion	All guides present. Meeting minutes approved.
Conclusion	All guides present. Meeting minutes approved.
Follow up	Factomization of meeting minutes (Sam)

Subject 1	**Governance Documents (Sam)**
Discussion	Sam: Two major timed discussions happening on Factomize right now. ANO expectations, and the second document is the ANO removal document for cause which defines the procedures for how the ANOs can collectively remove one of the authority set operators from the authority set for different reasons. This is the idea stage. We are

V. 1.2

	collecting ideas from the community. We have partially drafted documents, but the community is welcome to provide input and participate. We will then draft the official document, have legal to review it and then put it up for document ratification. We encourage everyone to participate and have their voice heard. Tor: Been working on Doc 000. Posted link below. Let's discuss it together this week. https://docs.google.com/document/d/1BSmll4dfOjXpHom6_ae1jTd-oiLjrZ1Z_jQCWkM _ltg/edit?usp=sharing Sam: Trying not to put up to many at once as to not overload everyone. I'll be picking these a couple at a time, and do them successfully and continuously so we are continuing to make process. After the two we are doing right now we have a couple more lined up, but it depends on the rea Guide elections and guide removal - so we have a removal process for guides the same way we have a process to remove ANOs for negligence or malicious intent… We will have timed discussions (8 days) for these documents as well, and after that discussion they will be drafted, legal will verify them and then we'll have a ratification process. Niels: Those documents are very important and we should focus on them. Julian: I want a document, some sort of process or guidelines for…(?) voice breaking up… (Julian's connection lost) Brian: I think Julian talked about suggesting having a less formalized document for selecting a new guide which would be in line with legal recommendations. Sam: Need to decide on distinctions between governance or guidelines...I still lean towards having obvious processes ratified, even if they are not officially part of the governance document, but the approach we have talked about with legal is to have an amendment or addition to doc 001 (governance doc) which points to document 100 for creating and amending governance documents. (Julian is back).
Conclusion	
Follow up	Guides work on this the following weekend.

V. 1.2

Subject 2	Onboarding ANOs Status (Brian)
Discussion	Brian: Four ANOs have updates. HasnStore had new identities for their nodes. They were onboarded and it was successful. VBIF also successfully went through the onboarding process, and they are now running as audit servers - congratulations. Prestige IT is most of the way through the onboarding process, but there are still some tricky issues they are working through. Multicoin is still not quite ready. They want more experience on the testnet before they step up to be running in the mainnet authority set. Niels: Do we have a opinion that? Brian: Do we have an opinion on that? Niels: We have timelines people know in advance. They have applied several months ago, and if they don't have their act together I don't believe they should be on the mainnet at all. But I would like to hear your opinions. Brian: I tend to act as a functionary in this capacity…. I do like people to be competent, I do not want to try on influence the one way or another based on the position I am serving right now. Sam: First off I don't recommend putting anyone in the authority set that is not ready… But I'm a bit confused about them saying they are not ready as the timeline were explicit… Also anyone who are applying for participating in the authority set should be ready to operate in it. Niels: I'm not sure if we should discuss this offline to be honest. Brian: Well, we got this process which is going forward right now for the ANO expectations… As they have not being paid for the participation in the protocol yet - as they have not been on boarded yet. So it might be sensible to give them some leeway before being paid… On the other hand Sam: There are two sets of expectations here… it is nice that ANOs are working on their pledges before being onboarded… But that should not be an obligation… In addition I think it is nice that ANOs contribute to the community before being onboarded; voting on grants etc… But I have a harder time accepting that an ANO that applied are not ready to be onboarded with these explicit timelines. They have also been delayed a few weeks already so they had extra time to get onboarded. We only had 6 slots for the previous ANO round and it's

V. 1.2

Niels: We also need to look at the procedures regarding the testnet, and I was of the impression that they had operated on the testnet and were ready to be onboarded.

(Input from #Governance-chat)

Sam: I'm not advocating removing anyone, I'm just expressing disappointment. You should be ready; when applying for an ANO position in a highly competitive environment and they should be ready.

Julian: I'm not ready to toss them out, and I'm not ready to toss them out. I lean towards that they should not have expectations before they are actually onboarded. Lets make our processes are ready for this.

Tor: Agree with the above (been busy typing up minutes). Think we need to look at the process for application to include a requirement to be operating on the testnet for a set time before applying.

(Community-input)

Sam: How do we proceed? Did they have a specific time-requirement?

Brian: No there was no specific timeline discussed.

Sam: I don't want they to come onboard if they are not ready. We don't want them to stall the network if they don't know what they are doing.

Paul Snow: This is one of those complicated things. There are some politics here to deal with. Multicoin managed to make themselves quite influential in a lot of places. I don't know the insights why they are delayed or why they need more time… But there is just a political element on this. I suggest we work with them and get them on track. If it turns out that they do not have any commitment - then we need to deal with that.

Niels: I hope you also agree for them to go onto the mainnet will take some time from both perspectives. We do not of course want ANOs onto the mainnet that does not know how to run their nodes. They have all the technical expertise at hand to make it work. My suggestion will be to give them some time on the testnet, help them and onboard them at a later date.

Sam: But you do not need to follow the chats here to get onboarded. There are special channels of communications set up for this and just need to check in if you have questions.

Niels: And the schedule has been available well in advance.

Sam: The consensus seems to be that we should work with them and see how we can get them onboarded.

Conclusion	
Follow up	

Subject 3	When to hold new ANO elections? (Tor)
Discussion	Tor: I would like us to discuss when to host the next round of ANO applications. The last round was concluded quite a while ago, and we have discussed it previously but did not conclude. What is your thoughts?

Sam: I think we should be looking on doing this in the next couple of months or the new year. We have seen interest from a few new entities that are highly competent… As well as some of the ones from the previous round that didn't make it. I think we should look at january, and maybe elect 3-4.

Julian: How are we going to schedule ANO elections in reference to grant rounds? Both types of elections/grant-rounds require a lot of attention from the community. |

The grant cadence seems to be every 3 months. Maybe pick a number that gives us a nice offset against the grant.

Brian: My opinion has not really changed since it was first proposed early on… The token price plays a large influence in how efficient ANOs will believe they can be; so being cognisant of the token price to me seems important - in a longer perspective than only the past few days. That is my standing words…

Niels: Agree to some extent, on the other hand we have seen a nice four days… There are no guarantees that we will see the same days in the future again. On the other hand it attracts a lot of new people, and we also know that Sam mentions that there are some larger entities wanting to become an ANO which could give us a boost as well… I agree with Julian that we should look at it early next year with an offset of the grant rounds.

Sam: I agree with all of that, but I don't think we are ready to schedule a recurring schedule for ANO selection.

Julian: January might not be good in reference to the next grant round.

Niels: A grant round for only 3 ANOs is a lot of work/overhead…

Sam: I'm wary about filling up all our slots for now, as we might have an issue with not having more room in 6 months if there are some really good candidates coming along.

Brian: My issue is also a bit with efficiency… In the second round we saw much lower efficiencies…

Sam: So it would be either January or March to be offset from the grant round.

Niels: We can set a date but don't need to set an amount… We also need to market this to new people etc, so maybe March is the best way to go.

[Factomize] DChapman Today at 9:49 PM
There are some extremely talented companies wanting to become an ANO. Such long delays is a really bad idea.

Sam: We need to revamp our election system. Higher cadence and lower amount so we can pick the absolute best ones… Can we put a pin in this and have some offline discussion and think a bit about it?

Paul Snow: One of the things we should consider is structuring this as a merit/evaluation thing too. As you walking people through… Testnet, attending meetings, contributed etc… We are a bit disappointed that Multicoin was not involved - but did not expect any involvement.

FEDERATION

	Sam: Can you elaborate? Paul: Well if they were required to run the servers on the testnet, and expecting them to be involved in the meetings etc… We could weed out the ones who wants to be ANOs but don't really have the merit to be one. I'm just raising the idea and someone can maybe articulate it better. I think that when an ANO is elected they should already be integrated in our community and systems. Niels: I also think we need to talk to the testnet admin and see if they might need to guide newcomers… When Quintilian did it a year ago he was really involved and helped people.. And now we don't really see a lot of discussions in the testnet-channels (on discord) etc.. Brian: Regarding that.. The current code has been hard to figure out.. But let's discuss that in a later point.
Conclusion	
Follow up	

Subject 4	**Formalize guide meetings at Mondays 20:00 UTC (Tor)**
Discussion	Brian: I would be happy with this time. I'm in the US, so I don't know…? Sam: I wholeheartedly support this (mostly because I don't need to do anymore doodle polls).
Conclusion	Future guide meetings will be at 20:00 UTC on Mondays, and guides will have to be responsible to each other if they don't have the ability to show.
Follow up	Make an announcement to the community.

Subject 5	**Upcoming releases**
Discussion	Brian: There are three pending releases.

V. 1.2

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>

- This week. 6.1.0. This is the update for the grants. It should be ready the next day or so.
- Release based on the old 5.4.4 which has many many many bug fixes, and that has been in progress for several months. We are seeing the light at the end of the tunnel there. Paul has talked about this during the last meeting.. But we know that this is a big update, so in parallel we are working on:
- A second release that has fewer changes, which is based on the latest release. That one will be much less aggressive,

At this point it is kind of a wait-and-see to see how quickly the bugs on the big release can get squashed. Paul is working on it, and we are feeling close. Either those are going to require more testing than the one that is going to be ready in the next few days (the grants). ANOs should be ready to update in the next few days to implement the grants. We'll have an announcement regarding that when we get closer to it.

Tor: First release got an activation height right?

Brian: The next week we'll have a celebration here in the US and it's unclear that much attention will be paid to this.

Tor: If a majority has updated prior to the activation height and the minority has not - what happens then?

Brian: If everything works out, the federated servers that has not updated will get demoted and replaced by updated audit servers.

</td></tr>
</table>

Conclusion	
Follow up	

Subject 5	**Follow up: tasks from last meeting / upcoming tasks**
Discussion	///// START: Text from previous guide meeting minutes (follow up items in orange color) ///// **Sam:** **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)**

V. 1.2

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.

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.
Update:
Had an all hands test. One ANO had their phone off, and one did not get the alert. Did another test with them a little while later and it worked. Did a second test 20 minutes later, and only about half of the ANOs got that second test. Might be some inconsistency with the code. Had an interesting issue last night where I was testing with some of the users - and another user that was not part of the test got alerted… Seems like a configuration issue, and Stuart is also helping to debug.

Started the timed discussions for the two documents we are looking at and been facilitating that discussion.

Next week:
Would like to start the new ideas discussion next week. Also making the pull requests for the grant proposals.

Tor:
Will work on exactly the same Sam mentioned. Will work with him on all of the above regarding governance docs, reorganization etc.
Update:

Next week:

Niels:
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.

Released the unofficial sponsor "document" in the Factomize forum for discussion.

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.

The IM doc has had no progress sadly
Update:
Mostly a slow week because of personal reasons. Worked on the document for the grant round problems, the problems I noticed and several others as well. Hope to have that document ready by tomorrow - maybe Wednesday. Not sure if I want to release the document now or wait until the grant round is really over.

FEDERATION

	Also been working on the Factom Improvement Protocol. We talked about that after our last guide meeting as well. Core development and also for second layer development. What we are currently seeing is that several ANOs come up with rather similar solutions and development - and of course sometimes you will have competing products and that's ok - but other times it might be better to have a centralized discussion about these kinds of development so several people can integrate and work on it. Had an issue with someone proposing a solution that was already described in another project… Etc…
	
	Next week:
	I have basically borrowed the FAT improvement protocol and will work on that as well…. We also have the Bug bounty and the incident document...
	
	Julian
	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.
	Update:
	Ongoing legal discussion with Factom inc… Will continue to work on that this next week and we can hopefully have some public conversations this coming week regarding trademarks etc.
	
	Next week:
	
	Brian:
	Next week:
	  Doc 100 perspective on scope
	  Continue on 6.0.2
	  Continue on Wallet updates
	  Onboarding of new ANOs
	  Grant
	  Update:
	
	Working on community issues with JulianFT, etc.
	Getting the ANOs onboarded as much as they can have been my main focus. Far more of a manual process than I like, but it is where I am now. Also in the spirit of the compability, the new walletd release will also have the identity management stuff that is used for the protocol voting.
	
	Next week:
	Still plugging away on the same action items as before.
	
	///// END: Text from previous guide meeting minutes /////

Conclusion	
Follow up (until next meeting)	

V. 1.2

Subject 6	Open floor
Discussion	David Chapman: Factomize is currently developing a system that will enable us to display the authority nodes. The nodes, committees, core developers etc. Will be included into the protocol website. This is what we want to display; professional pictures of the executives in the ANOs… Comapanies that are targeting enterprises and governments and they come to our site and see a bunch of…. Nobody having pictures - or pictures are less than professional. I hope that some of the people in the meeting here will lead by anonymity. I know that many here value their privacy, but I believe it is important to look professional. Niels: There is no linkedin on there? Will it be included? David: The only thing an ANO will be able to input information on the link I provided except for a professional picture. We are working on an addon where one person in the team can input all the info for the other team members - but not the picture (which will be a personal choice). Sam: I believe we should tailor ourselves to the corporate culture and it will be important if we want to be taken seriously. Niels/Tor: Agrees. Good initiative.
Conclusion	
Follow up	

Meeting adjourned at 21:24 UTC.

V. 1.2