**THIS AMENDMENT HAS BEEN MERGED INTO VERSION 1.1 OF THE GOVERNANCE DOCUMENT TO BE RATIFIED AT THE NEXT GUIDE MEETING**

During the Guide meeting I (David) shared my concern about section 3.3 of the Governance Document. At present, if we were going to choose the Authority Nodes, the ONLY variables that would be taken into account are Node Reliability, Efficiency, Node Specs, and Location. As such, Guides (and eventually the Standing Parties once Guides are no longer needed) would have nothing to vote on. Human discernable variables like team, plans, and much more cannot be taken into account. I am of the opinion that there needs to be a second weighting or similar solution that takes into account the opinion of the Guides and eventually, the standing parties. This solution then needs to be written into the Governance Doc and ratified by following section 7 (Amendments) and eventually put to code.

**Proposed Amendment to the Governance Doc (pay no attention to the change from 3.1 to 1.1 -- Google changed the numbers upon copy/paste)**

## Campaign factors

* + 1. The following are factors that will be considered when deciding which entities running follower servers on the protocol to promote into the Authority Set.
    2. A matrix of the these factors and their weights will be ratified external to this document, and used by the guides to document their processes.

### Node reliability

* + - 1. The applicant will demonstrate the ability of the entity or organization campaigning to reliably run a node by having run an authority server as a member of the Testnet Authority Set.
      2. Nodes demonstrating the highest reliability will be given first priority. This also includes planned availability of a maintenance team. (Note: Some objective criteria will need to be documented.)
      3. Proposed weight is 14%.

### Support of Protocol

* + - 1. Applicants commitment to the support of the Factom protocol will be a factor considered.
      2. An application can pledge a level of [efficiency](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1RVaVR7lvfGgOBMG-7oca9TtpnR7qaEfr6XJVaZJwd3M/edit#bookmark=id.wuxmckxabayo).
      3. Proposed campaign influence weight is 15%.

### Node technical specification

* + - 1. Nodes with the highest performing technical specifications will be priority for promotion to the Authority Set. (There is some question as to there being a minimum specification and this being a “yes/no” on the minimum specification. The argument against this is the minimum spec will be a moving target and the cost of servers will always be a natural restraint.)
      2. Proposed weight is 15%.
      3. Minimum and Maximum configurations will be ratified for the initial Authority Set configurations, and updated as a live process going forward.
      4. Plans for hot backup servers and guard node networks.

### Location

* + - 1. Having Authority nodes spread out over different geographies, jurisdictions, ASNs, and service providers will help keep the network running through localized failures.
      2. Proposed weight is 5%
    1. Standing Parties
       1. Standing Parties will be the human element that reads the campaign document and any other provided information, performs pertinent research, and makes an educated vote upon a host of variables that cannot be easily quantified such as team, plan, budget, or anything else that differentiates one entity from another. Until the code and tools necessary for Standing Parties to vote is ready, Guides will act in their place and their five votes will account for the weight. Each Guide’s vote will account for ⅕ of the weight. If a Guide needs to recuse themselves from a vote, each Guide vote will account for ¼ the weight.
       2. Proposed weight is 51%

The following is what I (David) wrote in Discord a few days ago:

*I'm pondering how Authority Nodes will be elected/approved and just as importantly, that process automated eventually. My understanding is that the Standing Parties will vote for Authority Nodes eventually. At present, under, “Campaign Factors (3.3) of the Governance Doc, the campaign factors and the weighting for Authority Nodes is Node Reliability (30%), Efficiency (30%), Node Specs (30%), Location (10%). While these variables are easy to automate, what is there to vote on for the Standing Party? It’s just who has the highest weighting wins. But what if an entity going for an Authority Node does ok with these variables but has so much more to offer which is showcased in their campaign document? At present, there’s no weighting for that. As such, I’m of the opinion that this needs to change so that human determinable aspects of an entity campaigning for an Authority Node can be taken into account and scored by voting of the Standing Party. One thought is splitting the automatic weighting of the current variables which really don’t need voted on and the votes by the Standing Party to X% and Y% respectively to give the total Z% with the highest Authority Nodes with the highest Z winning. According to the wording of the Governance Doc, initially, Guides would be the ones voting for the Y% but once Standing Parties can, they will instead.*