**FACTOM**

**COMMUNITY**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**Factom Guides**

**Meeting #19-**03

**201**9**-**01**-**14

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date and time of meeting** | 2019-01-14, 20:00 UTC |
| **Date minutes drafted** | 2019-01-14 |
| **Date minutes approved** |  |
| **Organization/Team** | Factom Guides |
| **Attendees** | Factom inc (Brian Deery), Canonical ledgers (Sam), DBGrow Inc (Julian), The 42ND Factoid AS (Tor), Centis BV (Niels Klomp) |
| **Members not in attendance** |  |
| **Other attendees** |  |
| **Meeting Leader** | Factom inc (Brian Deery) |
| **Meeting Secretary** | The 42ND Factoid AS (Tor) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject 0** | * **Roll Call** * **Approval of minutes from previous meetings on 201**9-01-07 |
| **Discussion** |  |
| **Conclusion** | All guides present.  Meeting minutes approved from last meeting. |
| **Follow up** | Sam will upload approved meeting minutes to the document management system at Factomize. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject 1** | Factom Community Grant round #19-01 |
| **Discussion** | Julian:  I did not actually write this grant round document, but the current discussion has turned towards a different way of voting on the grant round, which you can find in Doc 153 - Grant ratification thread on Factomize.  The crux of the issue is that in the last grant round we used a 0-100 voting scale, and many people felt there was ambiguity in regards to how the vote was administered and what voting strategy was used.  One example is that an application needed 60 points to be eligible, but that is contextual as we had nothing to frame that against. Many used 60-100 as their voting range, as most grants were eligible, while others again voted between 0-100. The way to fix this, me and Nic wrote up a document to suggest that we do a rank-based vote where everyone ranks 1 to however many grant there are, basically putting their grants in a rank. This creates uniformity in the voting strategy that can be employed. That is on Factomize for discussion and I believe it will resolve many of the issues we saw the last round.  Brian: I’m glad to see some progress on that. I don’t think that any solution we will came up will be 100% correct; but I am pleased that we are moving forward.  Brian: Sam, did you have any thoughts on this one?  Sam: Just that I would like to encourage people to visit the forum and discuss the document. We need to figure out a few issues, like if grantees are able to vote on their own grants. We need to finish it up this week. If there is not enough participation we might need to make a poll, but we’d need people to participate there as well.  Brian: Thank you. Any comments?  Niels: This is a big improvement. One of the drawbacks however.. If it is a drawback… Is that we would empty out the grant anyways… Doing a vote on the grants with points you can have a cutoff, but doing a ranked system you might award them anyways.  Julian: I forgot to mention before… it is actually addressed. The vote is actually split in two; there are disapprove/approve there as a component for each grant as well. So in addition to ranking the grant applications each standing party also votes agree/disagree on each grant, and for a grant to be approved you need 3/5 approval rate for it to go through. Does that address the issue?  Niels; Good to hear that - I’m just catching up after my vacation. I was talking about grants not necessarily be up to par, and if there was enough money in the pool every grant would be approved… But this takes care of it; good to hear.  Brian: I would also like to encourage people to move to Factomize for this discussion. |
| **Conclusion** |  |
| **Follow up** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject 2** | Upcoming releases (Brian) |
| **Discussion** | Brian:  This is going well. It is hard to quantify between various degrees of going well. At this point the long standing difficult to debug issues have been resolved, and at this point it is just a minor issue at boot that we are trying to get through. We thought we had a release candidate late last week, but after a little more testing it was proved that it had some panics in some specific scenarios, so we are not yet all the way there, but we feel very close.  Expect to see a release candidate over the next few days if everything goes well.  Tor: Just to clarify, this would be for the testnet right?  Brian: Yes, first testing on the testnet and when there is enough confidence we should try it out on mainnet.  Tor: Any kind of specific testing you would like to have done?  Brian: All kinds of testing would be needed. Several months of updates are all accumulated into this update. The testnet is a different environment and has more variety than test environments. A good place to start testing is to do all the things we haven't thought of yet with the internal testing. The testnet is good because it had more edge cases to exercise, which we can’t test with simpler environments. |
| **Conclusion** |  |
| **Follow up** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Subject 3 | Upcoming ANO election round (Julian) |
| Discussion | Julian:  Nick and I have been writing that document. The past few days we have focused on the grant round issues. Now that is posted and fairly settled, we are going to turn our attention back to the ANO round document as well as figure out what needs to be updated in Doc 001 before we can ratify the ANO application document. |
| Conclusion |  |
| Follow up |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Subject 4 | Guide Election and Removal Document ratified |
| Discussion | ---  Copy/Paste of announcement on Discord:  ---  Doc 100 - Guide Election and Removal Process has been formally approved by the Factom Standing parties after being put through the document ratification process described in Doc 002.  5 out of 5 Factom guides voted in favor of the document. 25 out of 25 ANOs voted in favor of the document.  The document states that Guide terms shall be one year starting April 7th, which means that a new Guide election round will commence sometime later in Q1 this year.  Thanks to everyone who participated in the process by drafting the document, discussing it publicly and finally voting on its implementation!  The document is currently available in the Community Drive and will be uploaded to the Governance section @ Factomize shortly.  Link to the Guide election and Removal process: <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1H3KUHexpM9TqqSJspow9PcJL4IrAV6AQi9WKrv2GgRA/edit?usp=sharing>  Link to the discussion and vote thread in the community forums: <https://factomize.com/forums/threads/doc-100-guide-election-and-removal-process.1440/page-1>  --- |
| Conclusion |  |
| Follow up |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject** 5 | **Follow up: tasks from last meeting / upcoming tasks** |
| **Discussion** | **Sam:**  (Text from previous meeting begins)   * Finish grant round document and facilitate ratification process * Look at what amendments are required to Doc 001 for Guide Process document   (Text from previous meeting ends)  This week:  **Tor:**  (Text from previous meeting begins)  Not much to add after Sam. He and I have been working on the same stuff the past week, and will continue to do so next week with grant/ANO-application round. I will also work with Niels on the Bug Bounty program funded the past Grant round.  (Text from previous meeting ends)   * Finalize grant round ratification. Get ratification of ANO-application process document started. Work on the Bug bounty (got delayed)   **Julian:**  (Text from previous meeting begins)   * Hope to finish this ANO round document, maybe start looking at creating updates to Doc 001.   (Text from previous meeting ends)  Brian**:**  **(Text from previous meeting begins)**   * Continue on 6.1.1 * Continue on Wallet updates with identity and encryption * Continue with community docs   **(Text from previous meeting ends)**  Niels:  (Text from previous meeting begins)   * (Niels was not present in the previous meeting.)   (Text from previous meeting ends) |
| **Conclusion** |  |
| **Follow up (until next meeting)** |  |
|  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject** 6 | **Open floor** |
| **Discussion** | Brian: Luap asks about the Michael Perklin audit. There is no new news on that. There is two aspects to this one. The smaller aspect is the report from to him to the community saying that Factom has become decentralized. The major aspect of it, at least from Factom incs. Perspective, the rational was to release the funding for the 2015 software sale. And so that is the main motivation from factom incs. Perspective, and so that has been a lower priority compared to the active governance and maintaining of the current system instead of looking retroactively back to 2015, and so while it is not stopped it is on the back burner. As everyone knows, there has been very little rest over the past of the few months in Factomland, so there has always been higher priority things that has been taken precedence than unlocking some old money from the software sale.  Does that answer the question Luap?  Luap: Yes thank you.  Brian: I would encourage everyone to point their bandwidth to the ratification document on Factomize. |
| **Conclusion** |  |
| **Follow up** |  |

Meeting adjourned at 20:27 UTC.