**FACTOM**

**COMMUNITY**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**Factom** Governance **Meeting #**20**-**01

**20**20**-0**1-07

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date and time of meeting** | 2020-01-07, 20:00 UTC |
| **Date minutes drafted** | 2020-01-07 |
| **Date minutes approved** | 2020-01-13 |
| **Organization/Team** | Factom Guides |
| **Attendees** | Factom Inc (Brian Deery), The 42nd Factoid AS (Tor), Centis BV (Niels), TRGG3R LLC (Nolan) |
| **Members not in attendance** | DBGrow (Nic R) |
| **Other attendees** |  |
| **Meeting Leader** | Centis BV (Niels) |
| **Meeting Secretary** | Factom Inc (Brian Deery), |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject 0** | * Roll Call - 4 guides are in attendance, Nic mentioned before that this and next meeting would be absent. * Approval of Minutes proposed by Niels , 2nded by Nolan. All vote aye to approve. |
| **Discussion** |  |
| **Conclusion** |  |
| **Follow up** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject 1** | Announcements/Reminders/Process timeline |
| **Discussion** | * Current ongoing processes:   + Ongoing Document Ratifications:     - N/A   + Grant success determinations’: None   + Governance Discussions:     - [Should ANOs go down to one server?](https://factomize.com/forums/threads/should-anos-go-down-to-one-server.2671/) * [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 | Brian: Not a lot going on over the past week due to Christmas. Testing of p2p2 has gone forward. We are getting close to having the new release candidate out on the testnet. Give it a day or so, and it will then have a week or so of testing on the testnet (6.5.1-rc).  Adding some features to followers to have better security, so keep your eyes peeled on that for the next couple of weeks. |
| Conclusion |  |
| Follow up |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Subject 3 | Testnet Admin election (Tor) |
| Discussion | One of Tor’s follow up items. There was some issue with testnet governce document. Ammended 3 days ago through governance. Today Tor started election. People can put in candidacy, and in 7 days it will go to a vote to the standing parties.  Niels: Is this a forum or thread to announce candidacy?  Tor: There is a link to the appropriate subforum in the announcement, where an appropriate thread can be made. |
| Conclusion |  |
| Follow up |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Subject 4 | Threads on Factomize for re-forming committees (except Core Committee). (Item from previous week: Nic) |
| Discussion | Niels: Nic had removed some hthreads made over the holidays to avoid being voted on during the holidays. Niels would take on making the threads to start discussion to announce candidacy for the committees.  Tor: are you planning on making the core comittee formation thread?  Niels: He is planning on making the formal discussion thread with an 8 day period then vote. |
| Conclusion |  |
| Follow up |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Subject 5 | ANO Alert System Bot Update (item from previous week: Nolan) |
| Discussion | Nolan: There has not been progress waiting on the core committee formation. IT would probably be the first task the new core committee takes on. Will circle back next week. |
| Conclusion |  |
| Follow up |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Subject 6 | Propose Grant Applications defaulted to not approve (Nolan) |
| Discussion | This is something nolan proposed. There were potential changes to the upcoming grant round. The default scoring method would uncheck approval of grants, so make standing parties to default to manually approve grants so there is more accountability. Nolan wanted to ask guides despite not really needed in to be part of the governance documents.  Niels: In EU there is an analogy to opt into a subscription which is mandatory, rather than default opting in to a subscription. This would make the default to be not approved.  Nolan: Is worried about forum owner having arbitrary decision making freedom over the grant process.  Tor: This part of the grant process was not part of the grant documents that were approved. If it is unspecified, then it can be done however the forum owner can follwo their own design.  Brian: When there was spreadsheet based voting, the default was to not be approved.  Tor: When the grant was updated to rank based voting, nonvoting was changed to abstain rather than a vote for non-approval.  Noaln: is willing to defer to rest of guides if needed.  Tor: Would want to abstain from a vote on this, since it doesn’t seem like a governance item.  Nolan: Will reach out to the forum administrator to make the update.  David Chapman: Is unwilling to make a change without some form of governance action.  Nolan: This overcomplicates the process of updating the grant process.  Niels: If this kinds of details are being put to votes, it will increase standing party apathy. Wants to put it out for a vote, even if it not nessicarily required.  Niels: Should the default for the grant round check box be unchecked by default on the forum? 2nded by Nolan.  TRGG3R LLC (Nolan) votes Aye  Centis BV (Niels) votes Aye  Factom Inc (Brian Deery) votes Aye  The 42nd Factoid AS (Tor) abstains from the vote  The vote satisfies the forum administrator to update the forum defaults. |
| Conclusion |  |
| Follow up |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Subject 7 | Type of voting on Factomize discussion on moving from 2 to 1 servers per ANO (Tor) |
| Discussion | This type of discussion is outside the current governance framework. The number of nodes is not defined in governance documents.  Nolan: There is a lot of contention on this subject and the question is a bit vague.  Niels: Interesting that this is not part of governance. This is a big of a change, and makes sense to have a larger discussion. Thinks that this was not widely known through the community.  David Chapman: [2:41 PM] [Factomize]David Chapman: https://factomize.com/forums/threads/should-guides-be-allowed-to-vote-with-greater-weight-than-any-current-ano-in-ano-election-round-3.1518/  [2:41 PM] [Factomize]David Chapman: https://factomize.com/forums/threads/should-we-have-a-maximum-amount-of-anos-allowed-into-the-authority-set-for-ano-election-round-3-and-if-so-how-many.1519/  [2:41 PM] [Factomize]David Chapman: https://factomize.com/forums/threads/should-we-implement-a-trial-period-for-new-anos.1526/  Tor: The official vote is describes in 002, this is not a change in a goverence document, and this is not a change of a document. There is documentation that was voted on with the full standing parties, that this precedent has been set to involve the full standing parties.  Niels: Misunderstood the question about who votes vs the type of thread. Lets table discussion, and continue the meeting. |
| Conclusion |  |
| Follow up |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject** 8 | U**pcoming tasks** |
| **Discussion** | Nic:  Next week:  **To**r:  Next week:   * Oversee testnet election * Participate in ongoing discussions   Nolan**:**  Next week:   * Working on ANO server number discussion * Alert system Bot   Brian**:**  Next week:   * V6.5.1-rc1 rollout to testnet * ANO server number   Niels:  Next week:   * Official discussion and vote for core committee * Unofficial threads for other committees. * Guides and ANO efficiency thread he posted today * Bug Bounty |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject** 8 | Open Floor |
| **Discussion** | MattO: Considering the concurrent Factomize threads, does it make sense to stagger the committee/working groups threads so as to not overload people?  Niels: These threads are informal and are more for the people already involved in those groups already.  MattO: I was under the impression we needed to figure out if some of these committees should even still exist, correct? If so, that's time consuming.  Niels: Thought that this was an item for the official threads. Hopred it was not too much to ask ANOs for governance work.  MattO: So (1) we'll figure out who wants to be in a committee (2) Then figure out if we have a committee? Ideally, yes, every ANO would participate in this. The reality is that this is not the case since they are already overloaded. |
| **Conclusion** |  |
| **Follow up** |  |

Centis BV motions to adjourn, Trigger llc seconds.

Vote result:

Meeting adjourned at 20:52 UTC.