**FACTOM**

**COMMUNITY**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**Factom Guides**

**Meeting #19-**38

**201**9**-**09-16

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date and time of meeting** | 2019-09-16, 20:00 UTC |
| **Date minutes drafted** | 2019-09-16 |
| **Date minutes approved** |  |
| **Organization/Team** | Factom Guides |
| **Attendees** | Centis BV (Niels), DBGrow (Nic), Factom Inc (Brian Deery), The 42nd Factoid (Tor) |
| **Members not in attendance** | Trgg3r LLC (Nolan) |
| **Other attendees** |  |
| **Meeting Leader** | Factom Inc. (Brian Deery) |
| **Meeting Secretary** | DBGrow (Nic Robinette) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject 0** | * Roll Call - All Present (except for Trgg3r LLC - Nolan) * Approval of previous meeting minutes - Motion by Factom Inc., Seconded by DBGrow. All vote “Aye” except for Trgg3r LLC (who is not in attendance). |
| **Discussion** |  |
| **Conclusion** |  |
| **Follow up** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject 1** | Announcements/Reminders/Process timeline |
| **Discussion** | * Current ongoing processes: * New ANO election/demotion process - up for ratification; Doc 005. - All Guides have voted. ANO’s are now voting. * Doc 001 - Will need to be ratified should the ANO election/demotion process be accepted. We will move Doc 001 forward in the timeline. Seeking input from community for any potential changes. Will involve some possible changes based on ratification of Doc 005. Nolan has started a Factomize thread asking for input. * Doc 109 - (committee framework) - Being re-worked currently. Currently being parsed out between working groups and committees. Committees will be more formal. Working groups will be more informal and easily formed or destroyed.   + - [CL] Sam Vanderwaal: Why is it being reworked? Last time I checked in this was almost done and it has been in the works for a long time.     - Shuang and Niels concerned about the Doc’s potential formalities in some places and none in others. We take a risk of being seen as a common enterprise if we have too much formality around this process. Hence, this is why we largely want working groups rather than lots of committee-based formality.   The original document was Informal in creating something, but formal in making votes or the relationship with the Standing Parties for instance, and it didn’t make the distinction between formal committees and loose working groups. Mixing up formal and informal, and then there is the common enterprise argument.     - [CL] Sam Vanderwaal: I see, thanks. Is there a timeline for the completion of this?     - [CL] Sam Vanderwaal: From what I can tell this has been in the works since June which is quite a long time for developing a governance document. Is Nic still leading this?     - [Factoshi] Alex: Why has it taken so long? * Testnet governance - working group lead by Mike (Cube3) and Alex (Factoshi) has concluded planning of the content, and has started typing up the actual testnet governance document.  Mike: “We’re at the point where we have a working group that is focused on testnet governance, and we are working on an approach to it with some structure to it, and we have produced our first draft -- which is going through working group for a proper review, and after that, the community will review.” * [Process discussion / document ratification timeline:](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/15QMJrxErMetSgpzwQUKQ_OjmccqfTNvuImdOLjruvlc/edit?usp=sharing) |
| **Conclusion** |  |
| **Follow up** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Subject 2 | Network Update (Brian) |
| Discussion | Things are going well. At this point, we have the Xuan release, which had been tested on testnet about a week ago with a couple of the ANO’s on the testnet, and they both got faulted out, and so we went back to examining a little bit closer as to what was happening there, and we had found that there is an occasional problem where the Factoid block -- at this point, what it’s looking like is a race condition of some sort, and the different nodes are building the factoid block differently (either something with the header or something with the minute markers), and so this was the root cause or the symptom at least in the system as to why. So the way this manifests is when the majority of the Federated Servers all build a block together, they will see what they built themselves, and then send out a signature that basically signs the block that everyone else would have previously built.  At this point, when the Federated Servers build the blocks differently, when one of them is acting as a Follower for one of the sub-sections of code, and they disagree with the other Federated Servers on how to build this Factoid block, the thing that they send with the signature is invalid. So followers will be able to continue on by downloading a block 10 minutes later, and Leaders would get faulted out. And this is the current operating theory. We just started looking for the root cause of this this morning. But now we have something to look at and narrow in on. This is the last bug holding up the Xuan release from testnet, and after that, it’s going to be a big improvement. I don’t have a timeline for when the testnet should be ready for this, but the testnet is being used for testing of PegNet, as well. It’s obvious when Followers are not keeping up because people will not win blocks on the PegNet. They are not keeping up with minutes. There is demand from the PegNet, as well as from the Federated Servers, as well.   Tor: Are developers outside of Inc. working on this release candidate?  Brian: Sphereon is working on the Live Feed API, and other API changes. Basically, entire re-factoring and changing around of the (internally) that the Sphereon team has accomplished, and that’s going out in Xuan, as well. Best I can tell is yes, Niels would probably be a better one to speak on development that Sphereon is focused on.  Niels: Yeah, there will be a blog post soon about the work our developers have been doing on the live feed API, and what it entails for the Factom ecosystem. They are still finishing up a lot of stuff for the live feed API: factomd itself (emits the events) and a 2nd layer -- lots of documentation involved, and automatically generating the documentation, and a GraphQL export, as well, of the event data. It still needs some work, and I have to follow up with developers (which I will tomorrow) about current states, but this is progressing nicely. There are some troubles with automatic generation for documentation and models right now, so we may use a 3rd party to improve these things. This is not internal to factomd, itself. |
| Conclusion |  |
| Follow up |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject** 3 | **Follow up: tasks from last meeting / upcoming tasks** |
| **Discussion** | Nic:  (Text from previous meeting begins)   * Discuss Doc 109 - committee framework with community. - presently being re-worked with consideration focused on working group vs committees and essential vs non-essential committees. * Voted on ratification of Doc 005   (Text from previous meeting ends  Worked on this week:  Next week:  **To**r:  (Text from previous meeting begins)   * ANO Election ratification - incorporated some changes * Work with other guides to (finally) land the committee framework. - postponed for now. Goal of finishing this up in next few days.   (Text from previous meeting ends)  Worked on this week:   * ANO Election ratification * Was supposed to work on committee framework but previous suggestions from me and legal working group has not been incorporated yet   Next week:   * Committee framework * Doc 001 - will provide input with regard to changes needed relative to Doc 005. * Follow up on grants from previous round.   Nolan**:**  (Text from previous meeting begins)   * Continue with New ANO election/demotion process ratification * Doc 109 discussion * Doc 001 Open discussion with community   (Text from previous meeting ends)  Worked on this week:  Next week:  Brian**:**  **(Text from previous meeting begins)**   * BI-Annual ANO Review feedback suggestions -- Brian to come up with some alternates; some concern over effects on the ecosystem overall. Seems to favor creating more internal activity, and chatter rather than facing external work. He will have more fleshed out suggestions there. * Doc 109 discussion - Brian is interested in Essential vs Non-essential discussion. In past, there was multiple marketing committees discussed, so Brian wants to ensure we do not stop something like that from happening (if there was interest in something like that happening).   **(Text from previous meeting ends)**  Worked on this past week:   * Doc 005   Next week:   * Doc 005 * Doc 001   Niels:  (Text from previous meeting begins)   * ANO support voting & ANO candidates document changes/discussion -- Hopefully up for ratification soon * Bug-bounty 1 submission - replying to another entity at this point; not terribly urgent, but Niels plans to respond to the submission. It’s not something that necessarily falls under the Bud Bounty program. There is also one other inquiry re: bug bounty. * Working group and committee (doc 109) -- will review after Nic’s changes by 9/10/19 (tomorrow). * Doc 001 - Changes relative to Doc 005. Also has implications involving Doc 109. Thus, when it makes sense for some committees to be more formalized and listed in Doc 001 (as stipulated in Doc 109 shortly).   (Text from previous meeting ends)  Worked on this week:  Next week: |
| - |  |
| **Follow up (until next meeting)** |  |
|  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject** 4 | Open Floor |
| **Discussion** | Sam: “I think that tone and intent can get lost too easily in text. This is not meant to be a hostile question. This is regards to what Brian stated before the Guide meeting. Approach to voting on items as a Guide, you seem to imply you vote “Yes” on everything unless you view it as spam. True?  Brian: “So, this is a thing which has emerged over the past year or so. This is kind of a result of the (during -- I forget which ANO; they ended up resigning) most several of the governance things that have come along, such as Julian voting along these lines in the past with the website committee, where the idea is that Guides are there to present things to the ANO’s, and if there are (not really to act as strong gate-keepers) more as weak gate-keepers to prevent frivolous ANO for cause motions, for example, or repeat ones over and over again, or something like that. And so, part of extending that mentality is that the governance really should lay in the hands of the ANO’s, and so for rejections of governance ideas, it should really lay with the ANO’s, rather than with the Guides, unless it’s something which is akin to repeatedly rejected items or (this is the problem -- it’s subjective, and this is why we have humans involved).  Sam: Are we supposed to infer that if you vote against something as a Guide, do you feel it shouldn’t be brought forward to the ANO’s? That it is frivolous or spam?  Brian: “So if we’re talking about from the Doc 001, from way back when, this was kind of before Doc 001? This was before this had really emerged from within the Guides.  Sam: I suppose that answers my question.   Nic: I view each vote (whether ratification or otherwise) as an individualized context as it relates to relevance, necessity, and urgency. If it is within those things, I vote “Yes”. If it is not, I vote “No”.  Niels: Same as Nic, yes, I do see the Guides as a gate-keeper, but for me, there is no reason to only be gate-keeping; Guides should Guide and help ANO’s define the governance, and in the end, Guides facilitate -- not a directing position, they need to take all context into account and all voices, but in the end, there’s also people that need to do the work. It is also, of course, having your own opinion, and if you look back at any vote, Niels voting as a Guide is very different than BIF voting on things. And that’s a good thing because as a Guide you take into account other considerations than as an ANO.  Tor: I agree with Nic and Niels. When I vote, I try to vote in the best interest of the Protocol; I use my Guide vote to benefit the Protocol. I also vote on each item to item as an individual context.   Sam: Thanks for the clarifications; I appreciate it, guys.  Mike: [Cube3] MikeB: How do the guides propose to reconcile the differences discussed?  Niels: I think it should be an open discussion, both among the Guides as well as the Standing Parties. But I, for instance, do acknowledge that Guides do have a gate-keeping responsibility. It’s not that our opinions completely conflict, but I and other Guides feel that we vote on things with a different view than as an ANO, and I’m not sure whether that really needs to be resolved, to be honest.  Sam: How does Brian’s approach as a Guide apply to voting on Grants?  Brian: At this point, for the Grants I also go closer to what some of the other Guides were talking about -- trying to maximize the utility for the Protocol, and so for the documentation/ratification for being the gate-keeper is not the end all, be all. With Grants, grants are not a gate-keeping process, that is optimizing for the Protocol.  Sam: Why are grants not a gate-keeping process?  Brian: Guides have a vote alongside the ANO’s in the Grant process. And in doc/ratif process, it’s the Guides who have to vote before the ANO’s vote.   Sam: Isn’t there a larger potential conflict of interest in Grant votes, though?  Brian: Potentially? There are conflicts of interest throughout the system, but I am trying to optimize things for the Protocol, and Factom Inc. has voted for other peoples Grants ahead of the Factom Inc. grant in the past.  Niels: Could you narrow your question? For instance, if we look at Centis BV, Centis BV abstains from anything directly or indirectly related to me as a Guide, and also Centis BV as a Guide always looks at core development work first, committee work first, stuff like that. In what context do you present conflict of interest here?  Sam: So, I’m not trying to pick on Brian, but it seems he has different standards from the rest of the Guides, and between Grant voting and Doc voting. Doesn’t really apply to Centis BV so much; just trying to pique Brian’s head to understand his approach. There shouldn’t be a fundamental difference between voting on docs and voting on Grants; I know there has been discussion among the Guides related to: Are Guides gate-keepers? But there’s been nothing formal to define anything like this. So that makes me uncomfortable; and I do understand the reasoning provided, but I don’t necessarily and entirely agree with it. Brian seems most different in his approach relative to the other Guides.  Niels: Longer discussion is needed. Somehow the doc/ratif threads clearly show we are the gate-keepers, because, indeed, we are the first to vote on it, then the rest of the ANO’s get to vote on it. I do get Brian on that. For doc/ratifs, we are therefore gate-keeping the process.  Sam: I’ll yield, thank you for the time here during open floor.  Niels: It’s a good point, if there’s differing standards amongst Guides, it’s something we need to discuss and hopefully come to consensus about, as well.  Sam: Okay, thank you. |
| **Conclusion** |  |
| **Follow up** |  |

Motion to end the meeting made by Factom Inc. and seconded by The 42nd Factoid. All in attendance vote “Aye”.

Meeting adjourned at 20:45 UTC.