**FACTOM**

**COMMUNITY**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**Factom Guides**

**Meeting #19-**09

**201**9**-**02-25

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date and time of meeting** | 2019-02-25, 20:00 UTC |
| **Date minutes drafted** | 2019-02-25 |
| **Date minutes approved** |  |
| **Organization/Team** | Factom Guides |
| **Attendees** | Factom inc (Brian Deery), DBGrow Inc (Julian), The 42nd Factoid (Tor), Canonical ledgers (Sam) |
| **Members not in attendance** | Centis BV (Niels) |
| **Other attendees** |  |
| **Meeting Leader** | Factom Inc (Brian Deery) |
| **Meeting Secretary** | Canonical Ledgers (Sam Vanderwaal) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject 0** | * **Roll Call** * Approval of minutes from previous meeting on 2019-02-18 |
| **Discussion** | Meeting minutes pass with quorum of 4 voting. |
| **Conclusion** |  |
| **Follow up** | Sam will factomize meeting minutes. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject 1** | Announcements/Reminders (Sam) |
| **Discussion** | * Guide Election discussion period starts soon * Governance Doc 001 v1.4 up for voting * Grant success ratification process starting today |
| **Conclusion** |  |
| **Follow up** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Subject 2 | ANO Elections Process (Julian) |
| Discussion | Julian: Still scheduled for ratification on week eleven. We just need the rest of the feedback from the Guides and then we’re good to go. |
| Conclusion |  |
| Follow up |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Subject 3 | Feb 21 Stall debrief |
| Discussion | After action report: <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1GnhfvlBAg_2gLn6PvFyMmsxVGkl_6cHMJleZnSg_DS0/edit>  Brian: This was a little bit of a wake up call. It took a bit longer than we had anticipated to get the network back up and running. So, generally there are two types of things that are stopping the network from running again: 1. Network problems themselves 2. Problems with the restart infrastructure.  The restart infrastructure has atrophied a little as people have made changes and that came out. It looks like the root cause was a brain swap that went poorly. Still reviewing logs but the initial assessment was that two Federated servers were running with the same identity.  The take aways from this is that there was a fair amount of manual coordination required to restart the network. I want to thank the half a dozen or so ANOs who participated in the manual coordination. One of our tasks this week is to work with a few ANOs to do an audit of the restart infrastructure and how it interfaces with the ANOs.. Some of you were introduced to Mike Brennan who will be the main person to work on that.  Sam: Audit of ANOs or of the infrastructure?  Brian: Of the infrastructure and how it relates to the ANOs as they all have different restart processes, some more or less sophisticated. |
| Conclusion |  |
| Follow up |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Subject 4 | Upcoming Releases (Brian) |
| Discussion | Brian: The last release was a success. The activation time slipped from Friday night to very early morning Saturday (Austin time). Delayed due to the stall but everyone managed to upgrade on time--thank you for that.  The Kraft release has been passing all the tests we’ve been throwing at it over the past weekend and last week. So the Kraft release has many months of updates. Ideally today or tomorrow we’ll have a new release candidate for the testnet to test out the brain swapping which were failing on the last release on the testnet. ANd also being able to download the blockchain, which is important. I’m happy with it has it’s standing so far.   After that one comes out we have Parchment, which will include many more pending community updates. |
| Conclusion |  |
| Follow up |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Subject 5 | Grant success ratification process starting today (David Chapman) |
| Discussion | Brian: David will talk about the grant success determination process.  David: It’s up for ratification it went through a draft process and received great contributions from the community. THe idea behind this is to have the community determine whether or not a grant was successful or not. We need to know if those were who awarded grants were able to successfully execute them in the eyes of the community. We’ve already seen past grant recipients apply for additional grants. It can be the case where some people apply frequently round after round and we need a way to judge their success.   As the grant pool grows we may have many more grants able to be awarded and if we have 30 or 40 grants awarded we need an efficient interface for determining grant success and track historical grants to allow people to evaluate future applications. We need a user interface that tracks this so people can refer to it when evaluating grants. To be expected to go back through grants and reread them is not viable as the bandwidth there will be far more effort. If you want to actually review a grant you can but we need a more efficient interface. It’s critically important we start this process now as in the future when there are hundreds of grants it will be a nightmare.  Sam: Can you talk about the interface to be? Having 2 votes on each grant is a lot overhead. These are not easy grants. They need to have lots of review. Can you talk about the extra bandwidth needed for standing parties?  David:  There may be three votes per grant. One to determine if the grant is awarded or not. And then, if the grantee or sponsor puts the grant up for determination, there's a second vote. There can be a third vote if the sponsor or grantee do not put the grant up for determination at which point the community decides via a vote if it should be.  There will be a reviewer, someone who summarizes the grant for the community. As such I suspect a lot of the Standing Parties will read the summary and make determination based on that. Those that are inclined can read the entire grant and make a determination based on their own opinion. SO I don’t believe that there's’ much overhead when it comes to that, other than reviewing the reviewers input and click a button. Where there would eb massive overhead added would be during a grant round is trying to determine if a grant was successfully executed previously without this system.   The more time that passes without having a some kind of process determining if these grants are successful or not the more of an issue this will be. I haven’t put too much thought into determining the interface but it wouldn’t be too difficult. You link to the proposals, the updates and the score of the grant. You can make it filterable and list it in various ways. Just a simple page that people can use to look up previous grants and see the score, etc. Keep it as simple as possible of course.  Tor:  Question David: The standing parties will still have to review the grants and vote for them. Will not the this bandwidth requirement also be excessive in your mind? **PaulSnowToday at 11:23 AM** Seems determining success should be automatic. Why do we need a step by the grantee? (With many grantees, we can be sure some make mistakes that wouldn't happen if the process was automatic.) **Tor PaulsenToday at 11:24 AM** I dont see how it can be automated. **PaulSnowToday at 11:25 AM** At the end of the grant, initiate the grant review.  ?  David: I guess the discussion is whether someone stepping up for the community is more bandwidth intensive than not having a formalized process and scoring system. The community may have differing opinions on that.  Brian: I wanted a high-level overview for this report and we also generated some good back and forth which we can follow up on the thread on the forum. Let’s move on to the next section of our agenda, the task list. |
| Conclusion |  |
| Follow up |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject** 7 | **Follow up: tasks from last meeting / upcoming tasks** |
| **Discussion** | Sam:  (Text from previous meeting begins)   * Last week grant round * Reviewed comments on governance * Next week * Preparing for elections * Working on 1.4 discussion for ratification   (Text from previous meeting ends  Last week:   * Concluded the 1.4 governance document amendment process * Facilitate the Guide Election process with Julian   Next Week   * If v1.4 passes, factomize document and update main doc * Start reviewing and organizing changes for v1.5   -  **To**r:  (Text from previous meeting begins)   * N/A   (Text from previous meeting ends)  Last week:   * Grant round admin (cutoff grant) * Reviewed ANO election working group documents * Prepared governance 1.4 ratification and participated in discussion * General community drive admin and cleanup. * Initial discussions for the on-chain voting working group * Coin raffle   Next week:   * Follow up with the 1.4 governance document amendment process. * Focus on grant success process to make it ready for ratification by standing parties.   **Julian:**  (Text from previous meeting begins)   * Last week: * Grant round * ANO election * Governance 001 changes on 1.5 * Next week * Reviewing ANO election * Governance 1.4 release   (Text from previous meeting ends)  Brian**:**  **(Text from previous meeting begins)**   * New Releases * Feedback on 1.4 governance doc * Guide election participation   **(Text from previous meeting ends)**   * New Release * Guide election participation * Work with ANOs with audit to correct reboot troubles   Niels:  (Text from previous meeting begins)   * Will be putting in FCT addresses and amounts into grants software; will ask Standing Parties to verify that their addresses are correct rather than reaching out to them individually but we will discuss this more * Working on documents that I’ve started and have reviewed(?)   (Text from previous meeting ends) |
| **Conclusion** |  |
| **Follow up (until next meeting)** |  |
|  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject** 8 | **Open floor** |
| **Discussion** | Xavier: Can the guides confirm how the voting will work for the upcoming Guide election? Will it be the same as last time? I saw the discussion on the Governance channel but want to know when the Guides will confirm  Sam: We’ll be following the process in Doc 100: Guide Election and Removal as it’s too late to change anything. The process is the same as last time except for restricting to ANOs this time instead of everyone, and the vote is on the Factomize forum rather than discord. ANOs will be able to vote for as many candidates as they wish and the five with the most votes will be elected.  We can look at amending the voting for Guides after this round as there are some potential weaknesses with this approach.   All ANOs will be allowed to vote.   * + - 1. The candidates will be listed in alphabetical order.       2. The vote will be open for three days.       3. ANOs will be able to vote for as many candidates as they want.       4. The results will not be revealed until the poll closes.       5. If there is a tie, a runoff thread with a poll will be created immediately and only the candidates who are tied will be listed. Notification of the runoff will be posted on all communication platforms. The runoff vote will last for three (3) days. |
| **Conclusion** |  |
| **Follow up** |  |

Meeting adjourned at 20:36 UTC.