**June 2018 ANO**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**[Factom Authority Node Operators]**

**[MEETING #2]**

**[2018-06-28]**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date and time of meeting** | 2018-06-28 16:00 UTC |
| **Date minutes drafted** | 2018-06-28 |
| **Date minutes approved** | 2018-07-26 |
| **Organization/Team** | Authority Node Operators |
| **Attendees** | [https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1r1f\_XXOlaMCHqJH6\_p-nGeodBuWwmQ-DhKELazk\_AOI/](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1r1f_XXOlaMCHqJH6_p-nGeodBuWwmQ-DhKELazk_AOI/edit#gid=0) |
| **Voting Platform** | <https://factomize.com/forums/factom/ano-polls/> |
| **Meeting Leader** | Xavier Chen (NX Capital, LLC) |
| **Meeting Secretary** | Jason Chen (NX Capital, LLC) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject 0** | * **Jason** ask that those early fill out the attendance themselves before the start of the meeting * **Xavier** starts the meeting * **Jason** takes Rollcall * **Xavier** explain modification to Robert’s Rules of Order for the meeting:   + Main goal is that everyone is heard. Speak up if you feel like you’re not being heard regardless of Robert’s Rules of Order. At the same time, need to move the agenda along.   + Each agenda item will have 5 minute time limit. We can speak beyond 5 minutes by refilling the time slot. This helps with spending too much time on one topic.   + We will be using voice vote on minor matters to avoid too much poll votes |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject 1** | Approval of previous ANO meeting minutes |
| **Discussion** | **Xavier:** Any suggestions or changes to last ANO meeting minutes?  Xavier posted link in chat: [https://docs.google.com/document/d/1beXeGeNmAJjmyFU7VDMea7XBtJUUDDvVJTyeRLVvex8/](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1beXeGeNmAJjmyFU7VDMea7XBtJUUDDvVJTyeRLVvex8/edit) |
| **Conclusion** | No Feedback. Minutes approved. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject 2** | Monthly Committee Reports. Poll #1 - “Approve Committee Reports?” |
| **Discussion** | **Xavier:** Instead of voting on each committee report, I suggest we group them all together and vote at the end.  **Core Committee (Brian Deery):** Start out release process every 2 weeks and re-integrated testing on testnet that will add certainty, expectation, and confidence in code that will be rolling out on the off weeks. The intent is to go back and forth between test and main net every other week.  **Code Deployment and Factom Network Committee (Brain Deery):** First release that was early this week is more stability changes. There are few performance changes that has been on backlog that we hope to throw out to testnet next tuesday. We’re doing some internal testing on that before deployment.  **Exchange Committee (Sam):** Everything in the report. We had a slow start,but we have a plan of attack moving forward. We plan on electing chairperson soon to formalize the governance for this committee and we will target several exchanges soon. You can read details in the report.   * <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1EzVNna-Xnis7sYKPC_qynUsMXugGcogDMSV2DEabsE4/edit?usp=sharing> * **Paul Snow:** Are we going to list what exchanges we are targeting and how it is progressing * **Sam:** We have a spreadsheet we put together that lists every cryptocurrency exchange they were able to find. We will have status for each. We will not push all exchanges at once, we will chose one and go forward. The problem is that most these exchanges require you to have NDAs with them and the info you like to share is cover in the NDAs. We will have to keep spreadsheet and status private to exchange committee. We are committed to provide as much transparency as possible to what we are doing, but our hands will be tied. * **Paul Snow:** *sarcastically* I have no experience with NDAs   **Factom Use Case Research Committee (Jason Chen):** We have plan on committee function and governance, but held off on sharing until committee refactoring was discussed.  **Governance and Legal Committee (Jon):** We are waiting on grant to come online and then we will be administering the legal review.  **Marketing Committee (Greg):** Picked co-chairs. Myself, Dan G and Brooke from Matter of Fact. We are in organizing mode. Main strategy is how to best use community to spread the word about Factom. We had meeting with Jay Smith from Factom Inc. We can learn from them so we don’t have to recreate the wheel. We discussed about NDAs so we can speak more freely. Jay mentioned Factom Inc. is looking into reseller agreement for some of their products like Harmony. We have another meeting scheduled with Jay the week of July 9th. We plan to have regular meetings with them to absorb their knowledge and strategically work together to spread the word. We started a document for PR outreach, taking different blogs and publications both mainstream and crypto. When we have news to spread, we have database of contacts to help spread it.   * <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1_vd8-wSg4DtJzLHcV_zRwgfv-ckLnzcFFzNQEZuWSro/edit?usp=sharing>   **Strategy Committee** - No updates  **Technical Committee** - No updates |
| **Conclusion** | Motion passes - Poll #1 - “Approve Committee Reports?” |
| **Follow up** | Make sure to submit monthly committee update prior to next ANO meeting. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject 3** | Organize Hackathons. Poll #2 - “Should we create Developer Relations Committee?” |
| **Discussion** | **BobbyEK:** We would like to see more hackathons with more lucrative rewards to attract more people  **DBGrow:**  (Spencer) Are there any guidelines on how a Factom hackathon should be run?  **Jay Smith:** We might be able to provide this, let me look into it.  **Xavier:** NX Capital is exploring partnership in Chicago to host a hackathon. Our plan is to share our experience with the community. People can then replicate.  **Jay Smith:** Can you reach out to me? We are looking to do one in Chicago in the September timeframe as well. We can band together.  **Unknown speaker:** We can host and it can be marketing in itself.  **David Chapman:** Did Xavier attend Factom Inc hackathon and got 2nd?  **Xavier:** Yes, I was there. Based on that experience, we would like to replicate that energy everywhere. This is the quickest and most tangible way to improve on marketing efforts. Specifically in developer community.  **David Chapman:** We should have some ANO to lead the charge for Hackathon, Xavier’s experience at Factom Inc. Hackathon, are you willing to lead the charge? If not, is there ANO out there that’s willing? Or team up to get ball rolling.  **Xavier:** Great idea, we were concern on prize money. We are waiting legal review of grant proposal.  **Paul Snow:** There’s one big issue with prizes in general depending on the jurisdiction, but mostly in US. If you are going to give prize money or a value, you have to make attendance to hackathon free because otherwise it will look like a game of chance or skill. If an entity accept the grant, report that as income and pay the taxes; then provide that as the reward. Just be certain you don’t charge entry to avoid gaining issues. There is a big exception. Factom Inc itself, we can’t take the tokens and reliably avoid SEC issues because we could arguably be the ones that made the tokens in the first place. Factom Inc. probably cannot accept a grant and be in the clear to run a hackathon. The $10k for last Hackathon was Factom Inc’s own money.  **David Chapman:** Is there any reason prize money cannot be made to the winners after the fact?  **Paul Snow:** I don't know. I think the second you start making it complicated we should go back and get some legal review.  **Xavier:** It sounds like a lot of groups interested in hosting hackathons. Maybe like David suggested we should get together and figure out clarification on legal and logistical for different jurisdictions.  **Matt O:** Motion to form hackathon working group  **Multiple 2nds**  **Matt O:** Does someone want to head off this working group?  **Xavier:** NX Capital can head off since we’re looking to do one in Chicago. Happy to have Co-chair  **Spencer:** If we are looking to create hackathon working group, it would make more sense to have it titled: Developer Relations to be a catch all for outreach to developers. Hackathon doesn’t fit into marketing.  **Paul Snow:** Agrees  **Spencer: Motion to amend** hackathon working group to Developer Relations Group  **Paul Snow:** 2nd Motion  **Matt O:** Amend to say committee instead of group  **Spencer:** 2nd Motion  **Sam:** Not against the motion but have a comment. We have new business to discuss refactoring committee, I am not sure how creating new committees fits into that. |
| **Conclusion** | Motion Passes - Poll #2 - Should we create Developer Relations Committee? |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject 4** | ANO Annual Summit. Poll #3 - Motion to have Jay (Factom Inc) organize annual ANO summit during Texas Bitcoin Conference |
| **Discussion** | **Paul Snow:** Texas Bitcoin Conference interested in coordinating and doing organizational work for this. Do this at the end of October, in or around the date of Texas Bitcoin Conference. I am interested to work with whoever would like to work on that.  **Sam:** We did a poll previously for people’s availability in and around Texas Bitcoin Conference and it was favorable. Not everyone was available, but it was a majority.  **Paul Snow:** If I recall, a lot of people said it was too early to say.  **Sam:** I rather see someone volunteer to lead this instead of assigning it to committee.  **David Chapman:** A lot of committee were created just to have a committee. There wasn’t define role or specific task. Quite often it was a ghost town because there’s nothing to discuss. Thinlyslicedmeat touch on this. My opinion is that committees should be formed when there’s a very specific task that need to be dealt with. Once dealt with, committees should be dissolved. It will also be easier to create compensation for those heading up the committees. For example, whoever is going to organize the annual summit - there’s a lot work involved. There should probably be a small amount of compensation for that work. To put it in marketing committee - marketing folks might not be expert with organizing something like this and they will be busy with other tasks. Very specific tasks should result in committees being set up and not board reaching.  **Xavier:** I would like to add to David and Jon’s point about making sure there are action steps that the committee need to fulfill. We also need accountability on who’s actually leading the charge. Otherwise you spread responsibility amongst 5-10 people and no one will step up because it is human nature.  **David Chapman:** This is part of reason why I voted no on Developer Relations Committee, if there was a hackathon committee I would have voted yes for that. Developer Relations Committee is much more broad reaching and we do not have specific tasks other than hackathon. I worry there will be a lot of finger twirling and wasting time coming up with tasks, instead of focus on specific task like let’s get a hackathon going.  **Jay Smith:** I will be willing to organize the annual ANO summit since Factom Inc will be sponsoring the the Texas Bitcoin Conference. If I do this, I will be reaching out for help.  **Paul Snow:** I will make motion to have Jay organize the summit. I want to make sure embolden the operators and not have Factom Inc. solely drive this.  **Sam:** 2nd |
| **Conclusion** | Motion passes - Poll #3 - Motion to have Jay (Factom Inc) organize annual ANO summit during Texas Bitcoin Conference |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject 5** | **(1)** Creation of Factom Application Architecture Review Group, **(2)** Creation of Grant Committee, **(3)** Creation of Documentation Committee, **(4)** Refactoring Committee Structure. Poll #4 - Create documentation committee |
| **Discussion** | **Xavier:** For timing purposes, I suggest we combine discussion since they all relate to creating new committees.  **David Chapman:** 2nd  **Luap:** I don’t think adding another group will be useful it’s already happening informally in the technical channels on discord. I like to withdraw Creation of Factom Application Architecture Review Group proposal.  **David Chapman:** We have lack of leadership and no defined tasks in most our existing committees. I think this is just a waste of time. I originally thought to combine them, now I think we should dissolve them. We shouldn’t have the committee until there’s a specific task for that working group to work on and have at least one person take charge. If there isn’t someone to head it up at the time of the motion, it shouldn’t be created.  **Sam:** I agree with that. We all have a lot on our plates and creating bureaucracy doesn't help. Marketing and Exchange are examples where they have specific goals and we seen progress in those.  **Ben (BIM):** There’s only so many individual and we’re looking at around 15 committees now. Our small community cannot support so many committees.  **Schalk:** Everyone is answer questions on discord, no need for Creation of Factom Application Architecture Review Group right now.  **Alex:** For testnet we have people form working group themselves when they felt have something specific they want to work towards.  **Xavier:** Reminder that there’s nothing stopping people from creating working groups or committees outside of this meeting.  **Xavier:** Creation of Grant Committee, any discussion on this? Hearing nothing, moving on.  **Laende:** Creation of Documentation Committee, I had talk with Jay Cheroske.  **Matt O:** Jay Cheroske is an independent contractor for Go Immutable. This is Jay on his own.  **Laeden:** I like to make motion to create Creation of Documentation Committee. Like David mentioned, this is specific task for this committee.  **Schalk:** 2nd. I feel like technical documentation is lacking at the moment. This will give Factom a facelift and more development involvement.  **Laeden:** amendment to motion to have Laende, SilverPro, Jay Cheroske, Schalk to head the committee.  **Sam:** 2nd.  **Xavier:** Any discussion on Refactoring Committee Structure  **David Chapman:** I like to withdraw this. I don’t think this is that great an idea anymore since we should only have committee if there’s leadership and specific task to do. If there’s no updates from a committee next month, I would suggest dissolving them. |
| **Conclusion** | Motion passes - Poll #4 - Create documentation committee |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject 6** | Poll #5 - Combine Core, Technical, and Code Deployment and Network Committees and be called Core and Technical |
| **Discussion** | **Brian Deery:** We have the Core and Code Deployment and Network Committees and they seem like the same thing to me.  **David Chapman:** There’s actually 3, Core, Technical, and Code Deployment and Network Committees on the Refactor Proposal.  **Brain Deery:** I’m not sure what the technical was for.  **David Chapman:** All three are ghost towns.  **Niels:** Technical is more about administrative purposes. The name probably wasn't chosen as wisely. Deployment and Administration are two seperate things.  **Paul Snow:** Motion to Combine Core, Technical, and Code Deployment and Network Committees and be called Core and Technical  **David Chapman:** 2nd  **Niels:** Technical description is to develop best practices for operations. That’s more on admin side.  **David Chapman:** Niels I agree 100%, but combine the 3 would be dissolving technical until ANO have task and leadership to that technical description. Right now committee not utilized.  **Paul Snow:** Combine technical right now because coordinating with testnet and those aspects are what we’re trying to get working in code development and testing effort. Until there’s some independence, this is reasonable way to organize. Let’s call this Core and Technical Committee. |
| **Conclusion** | Motion passes - Poll #5 - Combine Core, Technical, and Code Deployment and Network Committees and be called Core and Technical |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject 7** | Fixed Monthly ANO Meeting Time/Date. Poll #6 - Future ANO meetings occur on 1900 UTC on last Thursday of the month |
| **Discussion** | **Xavier:** Any suggestions or changes to this proposal?  **Bobby:** Some of us, myself included can’t commit to this even if it’s a month in advance. We’ll make every effort to join. |
| **Conclusion** | Motion passes - Poll #6 - Future ANO meetings occur on 1900 UTC on last Thursday of the month |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject 8** | Third Party M3 Audit |
| **Discussion** | **Brain Deery:** Part of the token sale in 2015 was to have an third party auditor named Michael Perklin (good reputation and serves as Chief Security Officer of Shapeshift) to audit Factom Inc. He would like to chat with some of the ANOs to ascertain that these are actual people and this is a distributed network. Expect email intros to him in the next couple of days. We haven’t got into the stage of asking for volunteers. The output of this will be a public report giving legitimacy to Factom network.  **Unknown speaker:** How many people should participate? Shouldn’t it be everyone?  **Brian Deery:** He mention first ten coming online. If first ten don’t participate i’m not sure what next. We’ll find out.  **Jason Chen:** Can the other ANOs that are not top ten participate?  **Brain Deery:** Yeah we can do that, but that wasn’t part of what he wants to audit. But we have more than first 11 and we have more evidence.  **Jason Chen:** I like to volunteer my time if it’s possible to help with audit. |
| **Conclusion** | Expect an email from Brain Deery with more details |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject 9** | Designation of Responsibility for Organizing Future ANO Meetings. Poll #7 - @Xaiverwjc to lead future ANO meetings |
| **Discussion** | **Xavier:** archaeopteryx was elected by ANOs last meeting but had to stepped down due to his Guide position. He asked me to lead this meeting. We need to decide whether to give this responsibility to a committee, subcommittee or an individual?  **Paul Snow:** I like to motion that we keep you.  Multiple 2nds  **Xavier:** Anyone else like to step up? I don’t necessarily need to take this role. Hearing no one, open to vote.  **Unknown speaker:** Xavier do you actually want this?  **Xavier:** I think this is an important role, but I’m willing to give it to someone because I can contribute elsewhere. If no one else step up, I’m willing to continue this role. |
| **Conclusion** | Motion passes - Poll #7 - @Xaiverwjc to lead future ANO meetings |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject 10** | Testnet Crew Compensation. Poll #8 - Testnet Crew Compensation - Motion to continue discussion factomize forum |
| **Discussion** | **Neils:** Motion to un-table this. Walked away for a few seconds when this was up. There has been discussion on factomize forum. If we do nothing on this, we will upset some people.  **Bobby:** 2nd  **Neils:** The first mistake is not inviting CrytoViking or ilzheev. They would like some form of remuneration. My personal opinion is that I do agree with it. Ilzheev hasn’t been chosen by community, but FlyingVikings. I believe FlyingVikings should receive grant for running testnet and have freedom to pay others to help him.  **David Chapman:** I think you covered it well and agree with your assessment. My concern was if FlyingVikings receive the funds and disperse it to his subordinates; if grant could specific how much (e.g. 75% to him and 25% to ilzheev) it could avoid double taxation.  **Neils:** Do we want to make motion to discuss or let’s create some polls on the forum?  **Unknown speaker:** We should do what we do with guides and do multiple votes on forum.  **Neils:** I agree, do not want to make decision right now.  **Jason Chen:** I agree and would like to highlight that there was a forum regarding forming non profit foundation. We may be able to create non profit, send funds there, then the non profit distribute it. I believe that route would be tax free since this is for the benefit of all instead of a single ANO. This would take place after legal so I don’t know if we can rush this or wait until after legal review.  **David Chapman:** To get the ball rolling, we should have a vote to pay without any specifics. Then work out the details later.  **Matt O:** To me this is not just about testnet. There are a lot of people putting in time. Are we going to compensate people for putting in time on top of what they pledge. Where is the line who gets compensate? I believe testnet is super important, but do we compensate xavier for running this or people running committees? Is this something that should be put out through grants or amended to governance? We have legal review as well. I personally am not comfortable making these decisions until these questions are answered and legal and grant pool figured out.  **Sam:** Matt stuck at the heart of this. There are a lot of people putting in time and there could be resentment if we’re not careful. There should be clear rules on who and when to compensate.  **Neils:** Motions to discuss this further in the forum. Depending on discussion have poll on factomize.  **Schalk:** 2nd |
| **Conclusion** | Motion passes - Poll #8 - Testnet Crew Compensation - Motion to continue discussion factomize forum |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject 11** | **Open floor - Poll #9 - Create ANO contribution working group?** |
| **Discussion** | **Xavier:** It seems like all the polls will pass except Poll #2 - Should we create Developer Relations Committee? There are still few people who hasn’t vote and can change the outcome. Please vote during this open floor so that if Poll #2 fails, ANOs can still motion for new poll like creation of hackathon group during the open floor.  **Xavier:** In the process creating this agenda. I think we need to solidify a mechanism to add items to this agenda. For example, the testnet compensation. The topic was brought up by non-ANO Anton. I wasn’t comfortable adding it because it would set a bad precedence where anyone in general public can put things on the agenda. Luckily, the forum discussion, the ANOs reached a consensus and CryptoVikings, an ANO, requested it to be added to this meetings agenda. Had CryptoVikings and other ANOs not speak up, It falls on me, the meeting organizer, to decide if we need to add this proposal to the agenda. I believe this gives me too much power, so I like to throw it back to community to see if we need to set certain guidelines. One suggestion is to have only ANOs allow to add items on this agenda. If non-ANOs would like to add something, request an ANO to sponsor your topic. Afterwards, the topic needs to be posted on factomized community thread for discussion before the meeting. What are your thoughts?  **Adam:** I agree with your suggestion.  **Xavier:** If there’s no objections, I will continue to do this as informal rule. I don’t think this is something we need to vote on. If this becomes an issue, any ANO can bring it up for a vote to formalized the process.  **David Chapman:** Nikola unable to login to forum. I reset his password, but he’s asking to reset his two-factor authorization. I’m concerned that he’s not the real Nikola. Does anyone know him and can vouch for him?  **Nikola:** I respect that. I think that’s the right approach and this is the “allegedly” Nikola. Is AlexSuperSloth here to vouch for me?  **StevenM:** That sounds like Nikola  **David Chapman:** That’s all I need. We’ll take this offline and i’ll fix your stuff.  **Matt O:** There’s been talks about how we monitor current ANOs and what’s the process of upholding pledges and what happens when we have 32 ANOs and we have more qualify candidates that want to be ANOs. As we grow we need to figure these issues out. I like to motion a working group to answer these and define next steps. Working group called: ANO Contribution Working Group.  **David Chapman:** 2nd  **Xavier:** Who will be leading this?  **Matt O:** I will be happy to lead it or be a second to a lead if someone like David wants to lead.  **David Chapman:** I will co chair with you  **Neils:** I will be happy to lead as well if needed. |
| **Conclusion** | Motion passes - Poll #9 - Create ANO contribution working group? |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject 12** | **Announcements** |
| **Discussion** | **Xavier:** Any announcements by ANOs?  **Xavier:** NX Capital will like to make quick announcement. Starting July 1st we will be rebranding to Layer Technologies. We will be sending our quarterly update for the community. This is just an FYI before the public announcement. We will update our contact information with that domain name starting July 1st.  **Dan G:** Observation regarding community management. It’s pretty common at times like this with market sentiment to have a lot of negative emotions in this community. As we recruit more members, I would argue that it’s worth a thought to create a seperate channel in factom discord called Mindset Check or something along those lines where we can direct people that need to express this negative energy. Instead of seeing it in #general, the first place people will go. As broader perspective, I think all of us as ANO can help direct people to have conversations in the correct channels. This is not an motion, just a notion to see if anyone supports this.  **Xavier:** For future ANO meetings - it would be great to have additional volunteers. Right now Jason is serving as secretary role for both notes and polls. As you can see there are some delay in getting the polls out. If anyone would like to step up please let me know. If you have any suggestions to improve flow of meeting, I’m all ears.  **Xavier:** Motion to adjourn or would you guys like to continue the meeting?  **David Chapman:** So moved.  **Xavier:** Meeting adjourned. |