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**201**9**-**10-21

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date and time of meeting** | 2019-10-21, 20:00 UTC |
| **Date minutes drafted** | 2019-10-21 |
| **Date minutes approved** |  |
| **Organization/Team** | Factom Guides |
| **Attendees** | Centis BV (Niels), DBGrow (Nic), Factom Inc (Brian Deery), TRGG3R LLC (Nolan |
| **Members not in attendance** | The 42nd Factoid (Tor), |
| **Other attendees** |  |
| **Meeting Leader** | Factom Inc (Brian Deery) |
| **Meeting Secretary** | DBGrow (Nic) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject 0** | * Roll Call - All present except for The 42nd Factoid Authority. * Approval of previous meeting minutes - Motion by Factom, Inc., seconded by TRGG3R LLC. All present say, “Aye”. |
| **Discussion** |  |
| **Conclusion** |  |
| **Follow up** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject 1** | Announcements/Reminders/Process timeline |
| **Discussion** | * Current ongoing processes: * Doc 001 - Nolan spent the past week consolidating the additions and suggested changes; cleaning things up - there is only one item needing some decision with regard to linking out to Doc 005; if Guides can provide input on this in the next day or two, we should be able to bring it up for ratification here in the coming days. * Doc 109 (committee framework) - Niels: “If Doc 109 passes, every committee will have to follow the process because in Doc 109, it ensures every committee is a part of governance, so it makes the distinction between working groups and committees. I think that if you look at the intent of Doc 109, there may be some committees currently that probably should be working groups, so I believe every committee should follow Doc 109, meaning that current committees should reform in line with the process contemplated and set out in Doc 109. This would also be a good moment to get rid of some committees that are unneeded or should be working groups, anyway.”   Sam agrees and so does Brian Deery and Nolan Bauer.   Nolan: “We will have to put up each committee for approval; we would create the threads on the Protocol subforum to determine if the existing committees are actual committees.”  Brian: “Website committee is already a part of governance, but I appreciate the sentiment of this change.” * Testnet governance - Mike: “Working group has finished deliberations; “Testnet governance” document is on Factomize under major discussion for the next 8 days. Please look at this and provide feedback; would be great to have community’s views on this, please.” Mike will add a link to this under #governance-chat on Discord. * [Factom Protocol roadmap feedback](https://factomize.com/forums/threads/factom-protocol-roadmap-feedback.2434/#post-19945) - Thread was open with a poll, but thread is closed by now. The outcome - many people had difficulty voting because it was not a clear vote. People voted against it. Niels believes it would be good to follow up with the website committee about what their plan is now. It cannot be included as is; Niels will make sure to discuss with website committee about this. * [Trademarks, licenses and approach for new protocol name](https://factomize.com/forums/threads/trademarks-licenses-and-approach-for-new-protocol-name.2424/unread) - … No update here as of this time.. * [Process discussion / document ratification timeline:](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/15QMJrxErMetSgpzwQUKQ_OjmccqfTNvuImdOLjruvlc/edit?usp=sharing) |
| **Conclusion** |  |
| **Follow up** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Subject 2 | Factom, Inc rebranding - Potential of Factom Inc. to rebrand, itself. |
| Discussion | BIF] mboender: @Guides For tonight's meeting:  I like to ask for an update on my earlier question: "Is Factom Inc willing to change and rebrand their name (vs rebranding the protocol and community). And if yes, can this be confirm in writing to avoid any misunderstanding."  Thank you.  Brian: “This is one of the options for the rebrand of the Protocol. This is kind of a much broader question rather than a simple governance item, so the responsibilities about the Factom Inc. brand extend far beyond a Factomize vote, and so Factom, Inc. would change its brand on its own volition, but as the committee knows, this is a very expensive and very time-consuming operation to do a rebrand. And, it’s not entirely clear right now if Factom, Inc. is in a position to turn this decision over to the community to rebrand itself and undertake that cost, so I would say that it’s probably not something that we would want to offer as an option as part of the Protocol rebranding at this point. There are many factors that go into this that extend to investors and other stakeholders. I am looking forward to a Protocol rebrand; this is something that a lot of people in the community are looking forward to. I know that many members of the community do not prefer the name of our blockchain protocol due to the history associated with it. I am looking forward to seeing the new names and how they turn out.” |
| Conclusion |  |
| Follow up |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Subject 3 | Network Update (Brian) |
| Discussion | “This has gone very well. I would like to extend my thanks to all of the ANO’s for upgrading the network successfully. At this point, it is very relieving; all of the Federated Servers and ANO’s are reporting that they have upgraded. We are now on the most stable code that we know of. This code, when it went on testnet, it was able to take more load than the testnet load generator was able to generate at the time. I am confident that it will perform well on the mainnet, as well. I can go on vacation knowing that things are going to be in a stable position for the next couple of weeks. I appreciate the ANO’s updating. I am going to Europe - London and Oxford. The weather looks miserable there.” |
| Conclusion |  |
| Follow up |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Subject 4 | Exchange situation (Julian Fletcher Taylor - if present in meeting) |
| Discussion | Julian not present for meeting, unfortunately. Paul does have words to say here, though.  Paul: “Poloniex was at the conference that Paul was at in New Hampshire (free state conference aka crypto conference; plenty of Polo people in attendance that are involved in listing and engineering for token support). They had real positive assertions about what Polo will do as an international entity. They also asserted that companies inside of the US can continue to get accounting at Poloniex probably through demonstrating that they are accredited investors, so even if Polo sold tokens, they would be qualified to have them if those tokens are securities. We are going through that process now to not just take the word of some Polo people at a conference, but to ensure we can get such an accreditation to continue to access Polo as a company, and I can give people more info about that as we go along. They also said they will have a series of announcements about what their plans are to provide liquidity worldwide and help with crypto trading and access worldwide. They have some goals to be the most desirable exchange for tokens to be on. Generally kind of pumped about what it means for Polo to get out from under the thumb from people that are US-centric and the regulatory environment of operating within the US. None of that helps us right now, so we are also pushing to get ourselves listed on US exchanges and international that will help, and we are taking steps to increase attractiveness to Factom + Pegnet in the Asian market because we have not in the past deployed apps on Fatcom that have attraction to the Asian market, but I think we are changing that story. And that is going to help us in the immediate term to some extent. Certainly about getting listed and increasing volume internationally. For most of the major tokens, the real speculative push that drives their capitalization comes from Asia, and we have really neglected that market in some sense. Then, I also made a post about what we are attempting to do to create liquidity. I hope everyone has seen it. Please ask questions here, if so.” |
| Conclusion |  |
| Follow up |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject** 5 | **Follow up: tasks from last meeting / upcoming tasks** |
| **Discussion** | Nic:  (Text from previous meeting begins)  Doc 109 - Added context relevant to removing a Chairman and electing a new Chairman. Reviewed Tor, Shuang, Niels, and Sam’s comments/feedback. Answering/incorporating Tor’s suggestions and Shuang’s suggestions; reviewing incorporation of Doc 209 placeholder (as it is referred to in Doc 109). Establishing majority of Standing Party vote rather than quorum due to the possibility of low governance participation (Sam’s suggestion).  (Text from previous meeting ends   * Will review new grant guideline factomize thread (and overdue grant topic). [factomize thread] - “Next Grant Round and Overdue Grants”. * Reviewing doc 001 incorporation (factomize thread) “Linking out from Doc 001”.   **To**r:  (Text from previous meeting begins)   * Final review of Doc 109   (Text from previous meeting ends)  Worked on this week:   * Final review of Doc 109 * Started principal discussion about linking out from Doc 001 * Followed up on grants from previous rounds   Next week:   * Ensure doc 001 and doc 109 are being put up for approvalratification.   Nolan**:**  (Text from previous meeting begins)  (Text from previous meeting ends)  Worked on this week:   * Consolidated suggestions and incorporated into Doc 001 - Ready for ratification * Doc 109 review - comments * Assisted with Grant round amount calculation * Grant round announcement on Reddit   Next week:   * Doc 001 ratification * Doc 109 final adds   Brian**:**  **(Text from previous meeting begins)**  Worked on this week:   * Doc 001 review * Release process of Xuan   Next week:   * Doc 001 - simplify changes, link out a, la a constitution * Release process of Xuan * Vacation starting in a couple weeks, missing guide meeting 28th.   **(Text from previous meeting ends)**  Worked on this week:   * Release of Xuan Successful !!!   Next week:   * Doc 001 - simplify changes, link out a, la a constitution * Vacation, missing guide meeting 28th.   Niels:  (Text from previous meeting begins)   * Bug bounty responses and community update * Doc 109 & impact on 001 - hope for feedback from LRWG Chair (or just a member, even). * Taking a shot at an informal process for trademarks/naming   (Text from previous meeting ends)  Worked on this week:   * Had some issues in private life that required my attention in the beginning of the week, so unfortunately didn’t do a whole lot this week * PegNet presentation   Next week:   * Doc 109 prepare for ratification * Bug bounty submissions and core-committee discussion about these * Follow up with website committee about roadmap * Follow up on Factomize about rebranding, copyright, and licensing. |
| - |  |
| **Follow up (until next meeting)** |  |
|  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject** 6 | Open Floor |
| **Discussion** | [ |
| **Conclusion** | Guides to update the document post-meeting. |
| **Follow up** |  |

Factom, Inc. motions to adjourn. TRGG3R LLC seconds. Meeting adjourned at 20:37 UTC. All present say “Aye”.