**FACTOM**

**COMMUNITY**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**Factom Guides**

**Meeting #19-**28

**201**9**-**07-08

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date and time of meeting** | 2019-07-08, 20:00 UTC |
| **Date minutes drafted** | 2019-07-08 |
| **Date minutes approved** | 2019-07-22 |
| **Organization/Team** | Factom Guides |
| **Attendees** | Factom Inc (Brian Deery), Centis BV (Niels), DBGrow (Nic), The , Trgg3r LLC (Nolan) |
| **Members not in attendance** | 42nd Factoid AS (Tor) |
| **Other attendees** |  |
| **Meeting Leader** | Trgg3r LLC |
| **Meeting Secretary** | DBGrow |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject 0** | * **Roll Call (All Presen**t except for Tor) * Approval of minutes from previous meeting on 2019-07-01 (Minutes are approved). |
| **Discussion** |  |
| **Conclusion** |  |
| **Follow up** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject 1** | Announcements/Reminders/Process timeline |
| **Discussion** | * Current ongoing processes: * [Process to ratify nonprofit bylaws](https://factomize.com/forums/threads/vote-to-ratify-nonprofit-bylaws.2068/#post-16420) is complete.   + Waiting on insurance quotes for Directors. Once that’s complete, we can proceed. We will standby -- waiting for LRWG input. * Working group/committee Restructure -- draft to the Guides done by tomorrow, 7/09/19. Guides will first review internally. * Doc 107 up for voting for the Guides. One Guide still needs to vote. Then, the ANO’s will get to vote. * [Process discussion / document ratification timeline:](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/15QMJrxErMetSgpzwQUKQ_OjmccqfTNvuImdOLjruvlc/edit?usp=sharing) |
| **Conclusion** |  |
| **Follow up** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Subject 2 | Doc 107 up for approval by Guides, then all other Standing Parties (Nic) |
| Discussion |  |
| Conclusion |  |
| Follow up |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Subject 3 | Network Update (Brian) |
| Discussion | At this point, the Parchment release has been tagged as a release candidate; has undergone testing to try to get a warm and fuzzy sense about it. Parchment release has all kinds of updates from the community as well as performance improvements including a fix for a thing that has been panicking nodes or authority nodes on the Mainnet. New type of pokemon came out, so Parchment handles that. There are a dozen+ changes to Parchment, including optimistic entry writing and dependent holding, which big efforts to TPS? The testnet Admin can do announcements of wrangling for Parchment. Things have been looking good so far. One other note, last week there was a load test planned for Mainnet; as we discovered last week’s Guide meeting, the time was probably not quite right; seemed to be a bit of stuff that the servers were doing with network faults on the Mainnet. So, the loadtest has been postponed.   Niels: Core committee had internal discussion about loadtest on Mainnet; consensus on Core Committee is that right now the risks are too big to perform any loadtest on the Mainnet. Because we need to be aware that there are several Parties, meaning companies and exchanges which are on Mainnet, of course. If we right now to that loadtest, we could possibly stall or pause, and that would affect everyone. Thus, consensus was to not perform loadtest.   Brian: Testnet has a loadtest coming. We will see how far we can take Parchment on the testnet, which should be good! [Cube3] MikeBToday at 4:10 PM  How do we get the confidence that we can move load testing to mainnet?  MikeB (Q from gov.chat) -- How do we get confidence that we can move to load testing to Mainnet?   Brian -- Testing on testnet for Bond did continue on, but we saw some issues with follower and audit servers not keeping up, and it’s probably more of a take it slow type of situation to try a bit at a time. We will explore as the time comes. |
| Conclusion |  |
| Follow up |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Subject 4 | ANO Onboarding (Brian) |
| Discussion | Kompendium - onboarded -- Passed the audit; onboarded as of last Friday. Welcome!  Consensus Networks - having trouble with data center. waiting on form submission. Network issues so far. Waiting for them to be all set.  Factable - had some identity updates needed. Hopefully these have been checked and updated over the weekend.  HashQuark - Node configuration needed updating. Hopefully these have been checked and updated over the weekend.  \*Both Factable and HashQuark are close and passed all of the audit checks. Very easy, fixable problems, which is good.\* |
| Conclusion |  |
| Follow up |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject** 4 | **Follow up: tasks from last meeting / upcoming tasks** |
| **Discussion** | Nic:  (Text from previous meeting begins)   * The Sponsor framework is currently merged into Doc 107 (Factom Grant Process). The wording of the Sponsor framework and the general Doc 107 is being voted on by the Guides. Then ANO’s can vote. * The Committee Restructuring framework document will be done by tomorrow (7/09/19). It is planned that after community/SP review, this framework will be incorporated as a part of our governance. Primary topics of interest include not giving a Chairman of a committee any absolute power, and also providing a mechanism/path for removal of a Chairman or committee members.   (Text from previous meeting ends  **To**r: Holiday  (Text from previous meeting begins)  (Text from previous meeting ends)  Next week:  Nolan**:**  (Text from previous meeting begins)   * Follow up with Nic on the Committee Restructuring Working Group --  Nolan and Nic working on this; internal Guide review. * Doc 107 Ratification -- Nolan provided inputs and made edits and suggested changes.   (Text from previous meeting ends)   * Update Alert System Bot with newly onboarded ANOs -- verifying the config file is correct here.   + Schedule tests with new ANOs -- New ANO’s will be tested to ensure they are comfortable with the process. And we will ensure that their contact info is correct.   Brian**:**  **(Text from previous meeting begins)**   * Load test on mainnet * Coinbase Cancel verify questions. -- Went through some of the text there, and some of the confusions had been understandable, as there were some bugs in the code in the past, and so Brian checked the source code to where the current and final version of coinbase cancels are -- that got updated, and tested some of the scripts for verification to determine if things were successful. --- Document is in the Governance Drive. * onboarded Kompendium * Doc 107 review -- Up for vote.   **(Text from previous meeting ends)**   * Continue onboarding audit of 2x ANOS * Parchment Testnet -- Will work towards progress here. * Committee restructure   Niels:  (Text from previous meeting begins)   * Finish CI * Ask FIS editors and determine communication medium * Expo followup * Standing parties expansion * Working on the continued integration - Javascript client working. Opening it up for people to access it soon. Soon have to do an SSL cert for it. Niels has been at the blockchain Expo (mixed feelings here); a lot of people that were there were interesting, and it was together with IOT and data security expo, and it was a lot mixed together. Therefore, it was interesting, but audience was mixed, spoke to interesting people, Niels has some follow up to do for instance with an exchange, so Niels will bring that person in contact with the Exchange Committee. Some marketing people also came up, so Niels will direct 1 of those people to the Marketing Committee. Niels has a professor in Politics? She was interested in our governance and keeping tabs to see what she can do or use some of her students to write something about our governance model. She was interested in the decentralized nature of our community. Niels will be working on or hopefully restart the SP expansion (which is in a working group right now; in a standstill) this has to do with how Circle responded to the latest report from the SEC. Niels hopes to rekindle the discussion in that group. * Niels is working on FIS Specs. He has not asked for new editors yet, but will do so this week. We will need to decide the way and when interoperability specs are discussed. Pull requests wont work. Doing so in Discord alone also wont work, so we will likely use Github using tickets.  FIS and FIP -- to be separate or together? The first 5 editors are: Who, Luap, Valentin, Niels, and 1 other? Niels would like to thank the editors for stepping up. Getting the FIPS reviewed and critical q’s asked is important; if anyone else who like to review, please mention it.  Niels worked on the CI solution -- getting it repeatable. Jobs would be spun off, one after another. * Doc 107 - Niels reviewed * Niels worked and is working on the roadmap * Niels is working on a Medium post to share his vision for the Protocol. All techs we have now and are working on, how that should become one platform in Niels’ mind. * CRWG paper - Niels will review and suggest edits and discuss internally with other Guides.   (Text from previous meeting ends)   * Factomize meeting minutes * CI adding repeat logic outside of jobs * Asking for clarification whether we want separate FIP/FIS or combined, as there are mixed opinions. If seperate I will update FIP, if not merge back together * Doc 107 (mainly sponsor related) * Again rekindle the on chain voting group to come to a way forward as that discussion seems to stall on expanding standing parties * ANO after action report * Work on the roadmap |
| **Conclusion** |  |
| **Follow up (until next meeting)** |  |
|  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject** 5 | Open floor -- Ideally we have the governance in place that we are ALL held to as a social contract, so this would be something socially enforced as of this time. This should be something opened up and expanded to the greater set of interested individuals.   Brian -- We do have docs and process (101) to remove ANO’s. <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1JhdOhz7e93_oSpQ3JzE9YwbH5Y05rnULsOI_hf2UGr4/edit>  Niels -- Context relates to pledges being revoked after voted-in ANO’s. This pledge based vote system allows people to drop pledges and become infra-ANO’s altogether. This is the primary task, but ppl need to keep in mind that there was an election process before that. People and entities were voted in based on pledges, and if these entities dropped their pledges during election cycle, they likely would not have made it into the Authority Set. This yields a wider discussion with the whole community.  Nolan -- Yes, we need to discuss in full. Paul Snow says we need review processes. This is an action item for this week. We can likely add this discussion into our timeline at this time. We can discuss this prior to the Grant round. Nolan can add it to the Agenda. We will likely initiate this discussion on Factomize. Guides will discuss coordination of this discussion internally, and we will go from there. |
| **Discussion** | [DeFacto] Anton IlzheevToday at 3:51 PM  Question for @Guides meeting: should be any consequences for completely dropping ANO pledges set in governance?  - |
| **Conclusion** |  |
| **Follow up** | Discuss on Factomize how to go about ANO pledges. Election vs changes |

Meeting adjourned at 20:27 UTC. -- Motion by TriggerLLC, seconded by Centis BV. All present affirm with “Aye”. Meeting adjourned.