

FACTOM COMMUNITY

MEETING MINUTES

Factom Guides

MEETING #15

2018-07-29

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	2018-07-29 18:00 UTC
Date minutes drafted	2018-07-29
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) (via chat).
Members not in attendance	N/A
Other attendees	
Meeting Leader	Brian Deery (Factom Inc.)
Meeting Secretary	DBGrow Inc (Julian)

Subject 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Roll Call - Approval of minutes from previous meeting on (2018-07-20).
Discussion	<p>All guides present.</p> <p>Brian motions to accept minutes from meeting #14, sam seconds. All guides vote in favor.</p>
Conclusion	
Follow up	

Subject 1	Status onboarding new ANOs (Brian)
Discussion	<p>Brian: 3 new ANOs coming on board imminently. Rewardchain, Layertech (formerly Nx Capital), Canonical Ledgers.</p> <p>Doing audit process at the moment. Servers are brought on as audits so easier to manage new servers.</p> <p>Depending on audit process, we will promote them to authority set.</p>
Conclusion	

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

Subject 2	Recap of Network Issues and upgrade (Brian)
Discussion	
Conclusion	<p>Brian: Initial grant proposal rolled in with the upgrades to fix the network problems a week and a half ago. That testing went well. However, when FCT inc deployed some servers as auth nodes, they were building admin blocks differently. Testing that was done was running all servers same version.</p> <p>Code was deployed and then network stalled. 2 problems happening at the same time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1- admin blocks being built differently 2- the faulting had an odd bug with minute 0 <p>2 nights ago clay fixed the admin block issue, and paul narrowed down the issue with the minute 0 faulting. Upgraded from 5.3.0 to 5.3.1. Currently released version.</p> <p>It's pending right now looking at suspicious things. Want a few more hours on testnet to verify suspicions aren't a serious problem.</p> <p>In the next rollout will be the fix for the faulting that went wrong. Activation height is set at Wednesday afternoon UTC. All auth servers need to be upgraded by that block.</p> <p>Some discussion about pushing that back a little bit, but the urgency of the grants accelerated our willingness to take risk on shorter timelines.</p> <p>Niels addresses worries around timeline for code update, agree to discuss after guide meeting (short period of time, fallback scenarios)</p> <p>Tor: Also, majority only counts between the leaders yes? Not leaders+audits?</p> <p>Brian: Both majority in federated and majority in authority set is needed.</p> <p>Tor: When is the activation height?</p> <p>Brian Activation height is . 151926</p> <p>FlyingViking from gov-chat: Any reason not to update followers?</p> <p>Brian: No we have not observed any problems. Everything looks like it's working fine, just abundance of caution.</p>
Follow up	

Subject 3	ANO Application Round Update (Tor)
Discussion	Tor (Added prior to meeting):

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - So far we have 7 applications. - A few more have stated on Discord that they will submit an application prior to the round closes. - Still a total of 12 “statements of interests”, so it's natural to believe the number of applications will be close to this number. - Submission deadline is tomorrow at 23:59 UTC (July 30th).
Conclusion	
Follow up	

Subject 4	Emergency Alert System Update (Sam)
Discussion	<p>Sam: As you all know by now, we have switched from using proprietary 3rd party system to using TFA bot, it had most of the features we needed, Stuart willing to add other features required for alert system for guides to ping ANOs. Last couple weeks has been working with stuart to get those features worked out. We've tested it with a couple phone numbers. Next we are getting 5-10 ANOs to do a larger test. We plan to do a test of the system this week.</p> <p>Brian: Will alerts be preannounced?</p> <p>Sam: This test this week will be scheduled and planned, and only volunteers, so no surprise calls for people. Once working as suspected, we will want to do a full alert test where everyone is called, tricky across time zones, but should be possible. There won't be any surprises, will be scheduled.</p> <p>Brian: Does this system allow multiple phone numbers per ANO.</p> <p>Sam: It allows multiple numbers per ANO but I am not sure what the maximum number of numbers it can handle. It looks like its creating a new thread for each call its making, so there shouldn't be a limit though. Matter of the Twilio API and the way the code calls it</p> <p>Niels: Question of whether you want more than one number. Thought was making the ANOs responsible with dealing with any additional numbers past that single number called.</p>

	<p>Sam: My preference would be one contact number for each ANO, and then they will parse it out to whoever needs to get it on their system. They can also use their own version of the TFA bot.</p> <p>Xavier: If ANOs and guides use bot at same time, would that cause problems?</p> <p>Sam: No, one alert that pings everyone, guides will use that to ping you, then you can handle your pings.</p> <p>Niels: Bot could make a single point of failure. Bot is run by multiple parties so unlikely to all go down. If bot goes down through a bug in bot code and all bots do go down, we need other processes in case that infrastructure goes down.</p> <p>Sam: We still need numbers of operators to call them manually in this case.</p>
Conclusion	
Follow up	

Subject 5	Polo situation update (Brian)
Discussion	<p>Brian: Things are going well. Last week it was discovered that polo was waiting on a new version of the wallet and had stopped progress working on factomd. They finally clarified that to us, so we kicked upgrades to wallets and factomd into high gear. They want released, tested software to begin progress. Two of our engineers are working on the new wallet updates. Mostly done. Just need testing. The thought is that we would have another release shortly after sometime next week with only the change needed for polo. Might make sense to also run it on the testnet because it is a code change. It is fully compatible with 5.3.1. An ANO can run either current version or polo release, and from a consensus perspective should be identical. Progress is moving forward.</p> <p>Niels: Are code changes only in walletd?</p> <p>Brian: Needs to be a new API in factomd, you give list of addresses and returns combined balance of addresses. We need a new walletd API that makes a call to factomd for all balances of all wallets.</p>
Conclusion	
Follow up	

Subject 6	Open floor
Discussion	No discussion in gov-chat. Brian motions to adjourn. Sam seconds. Meeting adjourned.
Conclusion	
Follow up	

Meeting adjourned at time 18:38 UTC.