

#17 Reflection & Refining | Pre-Vote Check-In - 2024/12/11 12:59 EST - Transcript

Attendees

Ben Biedermann, Christopher Lema, Daniel Ospina, Eugene Leventhal, Eugene Leventhal's Presentation, Laura Barajas, Matt Haynes, Nick Almond, Sarah Smith, ZER8

Transcript

Eugene Leventhal: Hello and welcome everyone. Today is Wednesday, December 11th. This is I forgot call number 17. and in the original kind of planned flow of things today was going to be kind of the final review of proposals before they went to vote tomorrow. I'm worried I just accidentally rejected instead of accepted someone. but with a slight adjusted timeline. yeah, just things are looking a little different. So basically the first proposal that we want to move towards is one that is oriented around strategic deliberation.

Eugene Leventhal: and basically one point of input from there was in order to provide that input from the DAO side, we actually need to have a little more clarity on the strategic direction from the lab side. That way we kind of have a sense of where labs is trying to Where does the DAO want to kind of jump in on the same things? Where do we potentially want to supplement? and then from there we can start defining grant programs and local node strategies and etc etc so we've been having a series of ternal between labs and foundations some internal discussions really led by labs and I think the last one that we need to have is hopefully tomorrow morning and then we should have kind of tomorrow by end of the week some public elements that we could share of the lab strategy

Eugene Leventhal: so yeah excited to get to communicate that more clearly and based on that or rather quickly concurrent to that there was already a proposal thrown out in the delegate chat on strategic deliberation and I can share a link for those who want to hop into that chat to see the state of it. I guess you could also just go through the Google drive and I will share that link. but it's starting to come together and so as folks want to chime in on that I do think this is really going to be the first proposal that we vote for and let me drop a link to that proposal in chat and so hopefully as we actually provide the strategic input and as some of the high highle elements of this proposal start getting refined in the coming days we will hopefully be in a position where kind of by Monday Tuesday sometime early next

Eugene Leventhal: week this proposal is refined and then I guess the voting cycle this month will be ad hoc and starting January we will propose a more consistent cycle that will be more predictable. but it feels more important right now to provide a little more time and space to flesh out this proposal as opposed to kind of sticking to the arbitrary monthly cadence that we chose to start with. and then we can kind of revisit it So first things first I will pause and see if anyone has any questions, thoughts, concerns in terms of anything DAO related process the first proposal what does that mean for the other proposals etc.

Matt Haynes: So that's a great point What does that mean in terms of the proposals? Are you preferring to see things go up one at a time and...

Matt Haynes: give each one time to breathe or are you thinking something slightly different?

Eugene Leventhal: So it is definitely okay for multiple things to come together and...

Eugene Leventhal: I guess another way of going about this could just be reviewing the list of proposals that generally resulted from the creation cycle so far and we can kind of go over them one by one with what that means. so for some of these proposals let me I have a bad tendency of using I think some broad language too much as opposed to being explicit. So there will be a few proposals that the foundation will field first just because it feels more appropriate for which tooling are we going to use as the foundational tooling across all of the grant programs.

Eugene Leventhal: It feels more prudent for the foundation to just kind of lead with this to do it transparently. That way we can continue getting input from the delegates, But the foundation is really going to be the one executing it. And most likely it does seem to be the norm that paying for this kind of tooling comes out of the foundation budget, not the DAO budget. So we can just kind of run with this. And I'm waiting and coordinating with Karma Gap and with Impact Gardens to kind of flesh out the cost structure. and I'm more than happy to quickly double click on this one and give you all a sense of where we're at with it, but I think for this one likely to be led by the foundation. and so, we could theoretically have just a pure signaling vote on it. I also just want to be mindful of if people gave input and they feel good with that, do we really need the performative step of the signaling vote if the foundation is just going to do it anyway?

00:05:00

Eugene Leventhal: I also just don't want to ask you all to vote on things that are purely performative in that sense and to save it for these other ones that we need to flesh out and then define and then once it's approved then the budget will come out of the DAO side that seems more just accurate with how the processes will roll out, the broad deliberation and sensemaking proposal. This one is on hold because we're doing a specific subset of it as the first one to go through. So in my opinion from strategic deliberation, right, the grant program, local nodes, the incubator, these feel somewhat on hold pending the strategic deliberation one.

Eugene Leventhal: While some other ones like training for delegates, treasury diversification, potentially even user research, The focus of the user research will be affected by the strategic deliberation, but the process of how we will go and let's say whether it's for, in a purely virtual environment or country specific we can still start fleshing out some of these things regardless of the strategic deliberation. So, I do think some things can happen concurrently. Matt, you explicitly asked, is the goal to only have one proposal going live for vote in a given month? no, not necessarily. It just feels like the training one doesn't feel ready yet. So, I don't want to just rush it that we need to have two. It feels like strategic deliberation is the one for December and then starting January, maybe we could have more than one.

Eugene Leventhal: but yeah, I guess to just finish education does feel like it could both still make advances and somewhat related to the strategic deliberation. I mentioned these three feeling like they are very contingent on the strategic deliberation. I think the preference signaling one. I know that Matt, yourself, Nick, and Connor McCormack are all kind of working on a proposal here and I'm very interested in getting input from the delegates in the DAO. Given that there was pretty strongly mixed opinions from the polus exercise and the other elements of the co-creation, the foundation might just feel this from the foundation budget. if it seems like this doesn't Yeah.

Eugene Leventhal: if it doesn't seem as appropriate or exciting for the DAO given these other priorities, the foundation is open to taking on the reviewing of this and kind of running it from the foundation budget if we choose to move forward with it. Though again, same as with the data and metrics, I want input. The goal is not to say, hey, actually this isn't the DAO's pervue. Let's take this away from the DAO and hide the decision or the logic from the DAO. That is not the goal. It just feels, like all of these things intensely relate to the Dow's budget and future.

Eugene Leventhal: and we definitely want these to be driven by the Dow whereas some of the data and metrics and preference signaling at least to me feel more like it's falling into this should be a foundation decision for now and then in the future adjustments to these or the next round of this if we go forward with the first round those might potentially come from DAO budgets and in turn be related to DAO votes. so yeah. did that provide clarity or answer what you were hoping to get answered there.

Matt Haynes: Yeah, perfect. Thank you.

Nick Almond: Yeah, really useful. Thank you, yeah, so obviously we'd be quite keen to have that conversation with the foundation and move that forward. we've been sketching out timelines and things like that and there's just some time dependencies on whe whether we hit particular targets. So, we just want some clarity on ...

Nick Almond: yeah, that decision- making process generally, I guess. the reference signal.

Eugene Leventhal: And...

Eugene Leventhal: for that when you were specifically talking about the carpent signaling yeah that makes sense.

Nick Almond: Yes. Yes.

Eugene Leventhal: I think also, this will have to also just be a balance between foundation and DAO and depending I just think there are going to be certain topics that get the delegates more excited and it's going to be easier to run through the DAO whereas there's going to be certain ones where the delegates are like, hey, we're really not sure about this, but the foundation might decide that it's worth doing and so we'll just run it out of the foundation budget. I don't know how to systematize that yet of what is the clear decision criteria of what gets funneled which way. Right?

Eugene Leventhal: The goal of doing this kind of public co-creation cycle is that all of it's still going to be done publicly, just, the foundation retains the right to kind of say of hey, this makes more sense out of our budget than the Dow budget, so we're just going to run forward with it a little quicker. so yeah, that's just some of the logic there. If someone wants to talk about that meta logic and either push back on the decision- making or anything like that, please feel free to let and yeah, I see to Ben's question before I pass it off to you, Nick, it would be great to still link back to these again, just so that other folks can at least contribute their, thoughts on it and...

00:10:00

Nick Almond: that so I wasn't working in these documents. So I'll ...

Eugene Leventhal: feel free to link it. Right.

Nick Almond: if I think we could just drop it in there right now.

Eugene Leventhal: by doing this process we are not saying that we are ultimate fans of Google Docs and must do everything out of Google Docs. that's exactly yeah

Nick Almond: Matt, you've got access to the dock, haven't you? Can you just copy our proposal into the dock there?

Matt Haynes: Yep.

Nick Almond: Yeah, we'll drop it

Ben Biedermann: Yeah. connected to this, is there even desire to have a collaborator because that was one that I preferred over the strategic deliberation one. but I mean I'm not going to squeeze in ...

Ben Biedermann: if you're already

Nick Almond: Let's No,...

Nick Almond: let's have a chat. We're very much framing it around multiple ways for people to get involved in it shape it with us. So yeah, absolutely. let's arrange a chat and anyone else for that matter that's interested in that one.

Eugene Leventhal: So, please do just drop that link whenever you get a chance. or yeah, I guess if others are also interested in hearing a quick run through on it. very welcome to either just do a quick TLDDR on it now or I can take this offline in a telegram. Please let me know if the dogs get distracting. I don't know how much you can hear that. Sorry.

Ben Biedermann: Blind

Nick Almond: Is that there? Yeah, I'm happy to do a T TLDDR on Matt it's whenever it makes sense in the process of the call.

Nick Almond: I'm happy to do that.

Matt Haynes: I'm just trying.

Matt Haynes: My internet connection is being really dodgy and coming in and out. So,...

Matt Haynes: I just heard you comment. Nick, did you want me to do Okay. Yeah. do you want me to do that or do you want to take it?

Nick Almond: Yeah, we're just going to do a quick TLDDR of the proposal we're working on with Connor.

Nick Almond: Yeah, go for it.

Matt Haynes: Okay, cool. If you give me just two sec. I'm just trying to get that doc. so I'm just going to get up and running and then I'm going to copy it across. So, soon as I copied it in, I will give a TLDDR. So,

Nick Almond: Okay, let's come back to it.

Eugene Leventhal: Yeah, we'll come back to it in a little bit. So, yeah, that's kind of where we're at with things. I think I know the strategic deliberation proposal Antoine and I believe some others added to that. I want to go through and review and make some additional suggestions there and I definitely have some thoughts. I don't know, I know Daniel, you were working on something in the direction of the user research side of things. I don't know if you wanted to potentially speak to that one if anyone has any other proposals that they want to briefly touch on. but yeah, also we can pull back to any of the other topics that we've spoken about.

Eugene Leventhal: if something feels either more pressing I guess Daniel and for anyone else who jumped in I was just saying for the strategic deliberation side of things we've been having some internal meetings and hopefully by end of day tomorrow we will have some clear language that labs is comfortable sharing. I think we can already start signaling some things. but yeah, from there we'll be able to really kind of sprint through refining the strategic deliberation proposal and have that ready to go for vote next week. yeah, I'll pause there to see what folks want to dive into. Please, Daniel.

Daniel Ospina: So happy to share a little bit about the user research as I believe this well touches upon a bunch of other things including the strategic deliberation. So the baseline of the user research is that in web 3 we've been spending a lot of money to attract builders but there is not that much to show for it's well known that grant programs have issues that there has been a lot of wastage and essentially that we're lacking more mainstream use cases real world applications more apps in general. So there is also a massive amount of competition between L2s and giving incentives etc.

00:15:00

Daniel Ospina: So what we're suggesting is that rather than trying to brute force it given that the scroll treasury is definitely not one of the biggest in the ecosystem, what we can do is be very strategic about how we support builders. and so to figure out what that actually means, the idea is let's first try to understand what really makes a difference for builders. So let's look at different programs and support systems that have been tried out. Let's look at for example what B is doing, what Arbitrum is doing, what other ecosystems are doing etc. let's learn from that quickly.

Daniel Ospina: Let's compile all of these research reports etc that have happened about grant programs and about other type of programs and let's just kind of compile that knowledge and then let's go and speak with users to really understand where are the support gaps because what we're getting anecdotally is that there might be different forms of support that is not even financial. It might be a little bit of marketing or a little bit of connection with investors or simply visibility or simply validating that they're a legit project etc. or anyway there is a bunch of possibilities there and we don't yet know which of those are the lever high impact things that we can do to attract a bunch of builders and then of course to help them succeed because if we attract a bunch of builders but then they all fail that doesn't serve the purpose either.

Daniel Ospina: So essentially that's where this research initiatives comes through. we'll do desk some user research. We'll speak with both builders and with grant program managers and with others who are not running grant programs but other type of programs to support builders. Gather all of those lessons and present them to the scroll dow. Then once that is done once we have presented that those learnings there is an optional second part that we could go into and here is where there could be a little bit of overlap with other proposals etc.

Eugene Leventhal: I'm dead.

Daniel Ospina: So I'm not necessarily attached to including this within the user research proposal but I think it should happen somewhere. So if there is not another clear place where it's happening we could include it here.

Daniel Ospina: And that second bit which in the current draft are steps four and five is essentially hosting some sort of strategy process where with the findings that we have plus the knowledge that everyone else has in the community that includes labs and the foundation and all the delegates. we actually go and try to create a framework for what would builder support look in scroll. how should these programs connect together and that kind of stuff. of course that can start beforehand in some embryonic form. but this would be a way to kind of concretize those outputs and figure out questions like how do local communities interface with other programs or what type of things really make sense to do.

Daniel Ospina: so the research would inform all that and then optionally we could kind of host a couple of workshops to figure it out and then the R&D team also commits to facilitate the process throughout so that at the end we actually end up with a viable document where the majority of us have converge and there is some good coherence and this could be found the strategic foundation for a lot of other proposals and small programs and also helping all the other programs and proposals to kind of work together in a cohesive manner. so we don't have these shortcuts that at least in our preliminary research with some regions is some of the issue. You on board people with a wallet but then there is no clear next steps etc and so you lose all of that effort. so here we can end up with that cohesive framework on how to support builders in a effective manner.

Eugene Leventhal: Yeah, thank you for walking through that, Daniel. Would love to hear what others think. If anyone has any immediate reactions, I dropped the link to it in chat. yeah. Sorry, Nick. I missed your comment earlier. Right. Let me pull up here.

00:20:00

Daniel Ospina: Not all at once.

Eugene Leventhal: So I guess maybe a concrete question to ask folks. Let me share screen on this portion of what Daniel put together. So this is looking at and Daniel correct me if you think I'm misinterpreting anything that's here but this is doing general user research right so who are the users it's really talking about builders and where are they choosing to build and why is at the core of this kind of question exploration right so why did builders choose a specific ecosystem what type of support do they want what's an address what types of builders are there so getting to persona mapping and right

Eugene Leventhal: this is kind of assuming 15 per ecosystem across three. So we could choose three

Daniel Ospina: We could do only one ecosystem, we could do five, six, but about three and these number of interviews, it's not the most comprehensive thing. This is kind of for me what feels like a minimum viable. and what my team is suggesting. so this is kind of like trying to make it as fast as possible and as low cost as possible knowing that probably there will still be some open question about certain details that because there are different builder types. So within one of those builder types we just won't have enough data for super clear things. So maybe we need to do more research in the future. But this gives us at least a good initial foundation so we can get going.

Eugene Leventhal: And a way I can see this going and I'm just going to specifically react to this because Daniel put this together. and so, I think from the foundation perspective, we'd absolutely want to work together to define, in detail of what's being explored and what are the questions which ecosystems. We also want input from as many of the delegates as possible. And I feel like Daniel very aligned to what you were saying. This should not be seen as the all beall user research. I would actually see this as step one in a massive program of consistently doing user research. So whether I'm assuming as written here this would have Daniel and our endow team executing this. I think there will be versions of expanding this program to also include multiple groups contributing to this.

Eugene Leventhal: I think it's going to be very important to create a single repository and base where theoretically right and to the ethos of decentralization and the long-term goal right how do we have multiple groups contributing and doing separate pockets of work because even this right we could add a whole geographic layer here right and start drilling into who's doing what in Malaysia who's doing what in Kenya who's doing what in Argentina or whatever other face and who does it in which part of the world might be worth having different groups with having connective threads across them. Right. So again the goal now is not to define the perfectest program ever. and what I really appreciate with the way you frame this Daniel is that this is the thing that is kicking off a larger program and the first kick at the can.

Eugene Leventhal: And I don't actually remember if this is explicitly written into this as it currently stands, but what I would want to start emerging from this or as an immediate follow on to something like this it is defining if every user interview is recorded where do they all get saved in the end so that as we expand this to have multiple rounds multiple iterations we can have a single repository where all this information is

Eugene Leventhal: going that way if 3 months later we realize here's another lens to assess all this information through so we can go back and quickly review the transcripts and again as this goes from 45 to 450 to etc etc if we have transcripts and whatnot and actual LLM trainable data from many of these kind of things right we could spin up a local GPT instance that's trained on this to interact with 45,000 and interviews and to sus out information better and this is getting well ahead of what we should be focusing on now but thinking of how does step one enable also these bigger programmatic explorations. So Chris and then Daniel

Christopher Lema: Yeah, I'm happy to go. I think Nick also put something in the chat. I don't know if you want to expand on it a bit. I don't know if that's needed or...

Christopher Lema: I can continue

Nick Almond: Yeah,...

Nick Almond: happy to just very briefly it's the nature of open research, I think understanding what users need and want is crucial. but yeah, just like what we're funding is essentially a public good of this information.

00:25:00

Nick Almond: It's just something to incorporate into the thinking about our position with how we approach the project.

Christopher Lema: Got it.

Christopher Lema: Yeah, mine is sort of thought processes there I think one thing I was thinking of is how does this sort of because I think one thing that's missing from my perspective would be how do these builders view scroll in terms of what are the differences that they know exists between these different protocols right you have base you have zk sync optimism from a builder's perspective where do they see the advantage or what they don't know of score I think that to me is an important question and I was wondering from your perspective Daniel is this something that you think we should be doing as part of this initial one or maybe it's like after we do this one we ask we go deeper afterwards but sort of I think for me it's like one of those distinction because I think it would be helpful for us to understand more from builders that maybe haven't built our score are thinking about it what do they know what is their baseline because that might be something we need to work on even before getting to being able to support them because they might just not even consider scroll at that

Daniel Ospina: To answer to that, I think the critical question that we're trying to answer is how do builders view ecosystems? what do they actually really look at? Because I'm pretty sure it's not at all that way. And that's like when people try to optimize mobile phones and make them smaller. and Apple realized that people actually care about taking pictures and having a nice UX and they killed the market with it. So that of course I believe strongly we should include scroll as one of them. any of the if we're looking at builders in other ecosystems, we should ask them Do you think anything about it? My impression is that many of them might just not have any reason to have looked into scroll deeply enough.

Daniel Ospina: but that's just a hypothesis. That's something that we would seek to confirm. and one category I would be particularly interested is people who have migrated from one ecosystem to another especially if we find anyone who has left scroll. That would be amazing to understand why and how that process happens because I imagine we can get a lot of valuable insights of that and as you're saying perception of scroll is super interesting. maybe that's something we should make more explicit in the proposal. Generally the way we're thinking about it is these research questions are sort of directional and the fine details of these need to be worked on that's going to take a few days of work to get the whole research planning finished. so in our view that's kind of part of the beginning of doing this work is when you actually go and craft the interview guides etc.

Daniel Ospina: and at that moment we'll have opportunities for feedback from people who are interested to accompany this initiative most notably from labs and the foundation but also delegates who essentially want to dive into the weeds with us. does that answer enough of your question and if you have any recom special recommendations here in terms of what makes this viable in terms of passing the proposal soon that'd be super appreciated.

Christopher Lema: I'm like trying to just figure out where do you see this? So we can try to plug it in. I think the way Nick summed it up right here what is the perception of scroll is probably an important question here in general. but yeah I think once you get to the proposal type defining the personal people who have left scroll or probably maybe we can help source people that would be good candidates for that as well once it gets to that point. But yeah, I think overall I think this is definitely needed and I'd be curious to get that especially from a neutral party sometimes because even when you try to do user research from your end, that person is biased just because you're So I think it is super helpful. thanks for clarifying that.

Daniel Ospina: generally unless we kind of got everyone in the DAO to sign an NDA by default this would be public information. so I don't think it's really feasible to make it private. That being said there can be details about these that are kept private by nature it's impossible to write everything you learn in a report. so what we usually do is we have calls and we make ourselves available for future interaction and we are

delegates in scroll. We're not going anywhere. So we'll be trying to bring continuously and in the future any insights that we gather from these we'll keep on sharing them and helping inform things.

00:30:00

Daniel Ospina: but we can also have private conversations with members for example from the foundation or labs or specific delegates to dive deeper into specific topics that are not included in the report. As I'm saying it's just impossible to include everything you learn in a report. It's just too much data. It will end up being literally a transcribe of all the interviews and that is not useful. also for GDPR reasons the primary data meaning the transcribe of the interviews often tend to be not shared at least as a practice in web two even when you're hiring user research agencies etc. often you kind of want to separate yourself a little bit from that data because it's very sensitive. So you can let the user research agency keep it and what you take is the consolidated insights.

Daniel Ospina: so there are no concerns there and after a while the personal identifiers of the data are eliminated before 3 months usually you have done all the processing and then you go and kind of wipe them out. so you delete the name of everyone involved and so on. there are ways we can start to look around this. and I think the idea of kind of having a database maybe of the row interviews or different things that could evolve for scroll would be amazing. We've been trying to think about this and build this for almost three years in Arendelle. at the end we haven't made nowhere enough progress in this front because it is very complex both regulatory speaking and just pragmatically and given the nature of thous.

Daniel Ospina: So the way I'm kind of thinking a bit of a road map for building a research capability is let's get a first piece of research done quickly so we can inform the strategy. Then maybe in parallel maybe after these we can start to build a system to contract and manage research projects from the DAO. So that can be some sort of mini research fund or something like that that could widely multiple research suppliers arbitum is already evolving something in this capacity. There were some important mistakes in the way that was designed or rather some learnings. So we can incorporate this and start to craft over time a proposal of what a research council or research grants program or something like that could look like.

Daniel Ospina: and then over time that can evolve to develop its own infrastructure as well. which for me is kind of starting to be phase three. But yeah, something we can start to discuss and think about from now while making sure that we're prioritizing strategy. At least that's my current view. If anyone disagrees, let me know. And Nick would love to hear your thoughts.

Nick Almond: Yes, thanks yeah, I just thinking out loud really about the sort of nature of research in these environments. and the level of I think there's a few things at play here, So one is economically speaking if we're creating data that is valuable to all Dows essentially generalized it will make all Dows better to have good user research data on how people approach L2s for example so yeah the question is why not multiple Dows contributing to it or something like that there's just where the utility of the proposal lies. as just one sort of thing.

Nick Almond: which is why I think the focus on scroll made it that's why this right because it's explicitly around what is it about scroll that but again I completely understood your point on that is a very limited audience or population in terms of research scope and then there's this data handling piece which again I think is

Nick Almond: foundational for this kind of work which you're sort of hinting That this leads to a more infrastructural piece of process for collecting data from users and handling it properly and deciding where the line on what's public and private because necessarily some of it just for research ethics essentially needs to remain private on some level and as GDPR and compliance and all that sort of stuff. So yeah, that's where I'm at on those things at the moment.

00:35:00

Nick Almond: But yeah, I like it.

Daniel Ospina: Yeah. No,...

Daniel Ospina: I appreciate it. And in part we started R&D three years ago thinking that we could create a cross dowo R&D center and just do some research shared together. That vision has largely failed despite us kind of trying to advance that for three years just because the complexities of getting a single DA to fund anything are insane. very often I'm like...

Nick Almond: Yes, I know exactly...

Daniel Ospina: why the f*** am I doing this to myself? right as Yeah.

Nick Almond: how you feel, mate.

Daniel Ospina: Yeah. I know you've been in the trenches as well with that.

Daniel Ospina: So the way I'm kind of trying to think about it to still present a good proposition through scroll is well on one side is if we want to have good research to base the strategy upon something we probably just need to fund it and not make it too complicated trying to bring other partners etc could delay this by months maybe just make it completely unviable. That being said, I know Arbitrum is we made a proposal for user research based on arbitum and it wasn't this same thing but it had some similarities maybe arbitrum will go with some version of that. So at least that allows us and I'm a delegate there so I can kind of monitor that and make sure that at least we're not repeating the same research but we're doing different research.

Daniel Ospina: at least that's the minimum viable thing we can do. Then on top of that yes there is a customization around scroll and the specific needs and the specific research questions that we do here. Another thing is that we conceive about is also about speed and if we have the clear process and that's kind of like the interest of having those other steps potentially within this proposal or at least be ready within another proposal for this to happen quickly is that at the speed that web 3 moves if we can go from these are questions we have insights now we have a strategy now we can execute and we just move faster in that pipeline

Daniel Ospina: that can be 10 times more valuable than just having the data itself because other people can know the insights I mean that's why startups are able to outpace corporations is corporations often have the insights they just can't move fast enough

Nick Almond: Yes. I completely agree. And yeah, I think there's a couple of points that there's having sort of wrestled with different flavors of proposal over the years. it's the level of granularity that you go into around how much you scope the project in this thing. and I think we get over scoping sometimes where

we overthink things and end up not doing anything. And Dows largely just didn't move through the entire bull run last time at all.

Nick Almond: they'd have sat on billions of dollars and and watched it go down. so I think it's like finding the right architecture for these proposals that allows things to move quickly. So what I'm reading is we're moving into a fairly ad hoc voting regime where proposals are going to emerge rather organically when they feel ready. we go to a vote rather in an ad hoc approach rather than which I think given the sort of coordination around the DAO at the moment probably makes sense. and so yeah, I think it's just understanding what the cadence might be and I guess how liberal on the Treasury that we're going to be is one of the important things here, so yeah I think there's a kind of haste dynamic that gets particularly important in these sort of market contexts as well.

Nick Almond: So, I think this is largely going to be the case with all the proposals where we've got this initial state that gets things moving and then more elaboration of a sustainability sort of dynamic that comes with them after

Nick Almond: how that then is owned by the DAO and has a meaningful value ad to the Dow. think that's the bit that I think we need to get into.

Eugene Leventhal: Yeah, for sure.

Eugene Leventhal: And I do also want to add that right I very much see the goal of the foundation in the early days is both to try to provide some framing for things but also to fill in the gaps where the Dow may not have a clear path or be ready to do a thing right the goal isn't to get it lost in indecision to just fully centralize but if it's like hey the results of this is that the foundation then owns clearly working to define the next level and the next level I think those are reasonable

00:40:00

Eugene Leventhal: expectations in the scroll ecosystem. We want to play that role. We want to be working with you all to define the ideas and where it makes sense for there to just be, I keep thinking of who gets yelled at if a thing doesn't happen. that makes sense to be me for now, right? I should be helping move all these things along. And I think it's actually healthy for an ecosystem to have that just because it creates more consistent accountability. So, yeah, definitely want folks to be aware of that. And I also just want to mention one quick thing before handing off to Chris, just because I feel like this might come up with some of the proposals, right? I signaled early in the co-creation cycle that let's separate out the idea from the execution, but already with this one and with preference signaling, the foundation does not have the capacity to do this single-handedly, right?

Eugene Leventhal: So I think then it starts flipping the other way of how does this beginning proposal make space for others to come in and contribute to these kinds of large-scale efforts and to the conversation so far right we need someone to just get it moving and then the foundation will play the coordinative function of who else wants to be part of it and how do we expand it so I did just want to add those kind of meta things of like we don't need to get lost in indecision of finding the perfect form of a thing it's going to just behoove us to let's start try something in a small scale and then learn from it, evaluate what just happened and then try to ramp up as appropriate. but yeah, Chris, I know you've been patiently waiting, so I'll pass it off to you.

Christopher Lema: No, for No, I think this is a great discussion and I think, Nick, thanks for bringing up because I think sort of the balance between funding public goods and funding something that's specific to the Dow is going to be a very important one for everyone to answer here, Because I think there are going to be things that we're doing that others can obviously help fund. but you also run into the situation where, someone just needs to be the first mover and show that it actually works for others to then want to get on board. And I think for things like this it's great for us to just think through this is obviously clearly something that would be helpful for us to make our decisions long term.

Christopher Lema: So even if others benefit I think we can kind of just set the tone like hey let's just fund it see how it works and demonstrate to others that this is actually valuable and then maybe in the next one R&D can then all of a sudden say hey we've done it for all these it's worked if you want to get funding from someone else now you have the actual proof of work that makes it somewhat easier to get funding right so the dial overall I think part of the strategy is probably one question is how much of our proposal should be like hey this is really only benefits us

Christopher Lema: versus a larger public good. I think ideally where I would love to see the DAO and the foundation itself is a lot of the work we're contributing is not just going to be for scroll itself but also for the broader Ethereum community web 3 community right I think that's something that we should always try to do. it should be more of a positive sum game where everything we're doing can also benefit others and not necessarily just scroll itself. obviously there should be a balance there. and Nick's question about sustainability is important as well, but I think one thing to keep in mind is we're still very young and a lot of these ideas are important to see how we approach things going forward. this user research we're not just doing it also as a public We're doing it because we needed to be able to build a good grants program for scroll now and no one has really done it. So let's make an informed decision here rather than just trying to gungho and just do what everyone else has been doing without any data.

Christopher Lema: So I think at some point I do want some of this work to go from hey, it's only being funded by scroll down, but hey, we're actually getting other Dows involved and working on that together. I think that's something that, foundation and DA can then think through afterwards. But if we try to do that now, it's such a huge undertaking. and in terms of balancing speed versus, trying to do coordination, I think right now I lean towards more being a little bit speedy. but I'm I'm happy that people are thinking about these questions because these are longer term maybe in six months we come back to this and say hey we can't just keep funding all these things in purple ourselves let's get other people involved if we really do think it's a public good.

Christopher Lema: So want to chime in here, but thanks for bringing it up, Nick and Daniel.

Eugene Leventhal: Yeah, and...

Eugene Leventhal: just to that last point, I'll signal that if there is appetite, right, especially as we go into next year and we think about clusters, committees, working groups, variations therein, if there's appetite for certain folks to be more on the crossed out collaborative side and to work closely with us in thinking about how we can seed and support some of these things, would definitely love to be part of those conversations. I think in the shorter term there's definitely at East Denver for anyone who's going to be there. I'm going to help organize another governanceoriented community that can happen either through the Metagv house or through another space. So there will be great opportunities to try to seed some of these things. and I'm already trying to coordinate some more focused kind of research activities across DA.

00:45:00

Eugene Leventhal: yeah, plus one to appreciate folks bringing that up and, we'll have to continuously evaluate that balance of we both want to maximize public goods and we also need things to make sense for us and, provide value. yeah, but I know both Chris and I are very critical of things that are purely public goods and marketing and nothing else. So, striking that balance is going to be its own kind of open-ended challenge. so recognizing we have a little under 10 minutes left. So, I'll drop the link to this proposal again. And I know I dropped the link to the Google Drive with all of them already.

Eugene Leventhal: so yeah, as folks want to hop in on any of these, I do think this user research one, going back to your question at the start of the conversation, Nick, there's a chance that we vote on this one as well as's as well as the strategic deliberation one before the end of the month with the revised timing next week because I do think this kind of user research is going to be very important and as we define the strategic goals then we can do even more nuanced user research explorations in the future right these aren't a single time effort by any stretch so I'll pause in case anyone does want to jump in with any other thoughts comments questions concerns about this

Eugene Leventhal: or a user research proposal or I guess zooming out to any of the proposals at the moment. I can give a quick update on where things are with data and metrics and what we're thinking about there. We can ask Matt to give an update on yeah, it seems like there's some interest in that. So, I'll do that and then if we have time,...

Matt Haynes: Sounds good.

Eugene Leventhal: maybe I'll pass it back to Matt for you to do a very quick TLDDR on the preference signaling one. Perfect. So, with data and metrics, we're still figuring out how much do we want to go Air Table or HubSpot or Charverse as obviously those are not comparable tools. It's CRM versus a grant stack.

Eugene Leventhal: but nonetheless we're kind of thinking through and exploring charm verse verse in terms of web 3 grant stacks or doing something more like a survey like deform or type form feeding into an air table or a hubspot. So I think those are a few questions that we're recognizing that certain tooling like is labs already uses a certain CRM. So if we use the same CRM we can have more information in the same internal database which can just maximize visibility across the organization. but then in terms of specifically tooling that can enable more impact valuation in the future we are leaning towards using karma gap and impact garden.

Eugene Leventhal: we recognize both of these tools are early days and if we do move forward with them, it would be for kind of a 12-month agreement. So, we would get a lot of collaboration with them and in turn say in how the tools can improve. And I think that's why it might be better for us to take these kind of at least 12-month views in initial experimentation and in a tooling sense because less doesn't give us enough working relationship to improve these tools either. so yeah that's that side of it and then whether we use something like Charm or Aloe or we do the form and CRM we're making sure that the field architecture of the information captured for the grant program will comply with DAO IP5 which is the grant metadata standard out of Dowstar because by doing so it will be very easy to either if it's web 3 tooling to fully automate this information going into open source

Eugene Leventhal: observer and public data links for better analysis of data. or if it's done with web two tooling, it will be easily set up so that we could run a monthly effectively like a CSV export pass it off to the Dowar team that can then simply adjust it and get it going. yes, Nick, I will drop those tools in a moment. I'll pause for a second in case anyone does have any questions and comments as I go and find the links to those tools. So, this is the general gap one. I know there have been questions and concerns around where was that one? Yeah, and this is just so you could see the visibility of the tool for all of the Gitcoin grants.

00:50:00

Eugene Leventhal: again, it's early days. both of these tools, and I'll link to the impact garden one as well, both of these tools recognize the UX challenge of having a separate interface, where someone else goes to add all this information, and that actually makes it much more challenging. So, they're both trying to make it easier to fill this information out from other, views or windows. yeah, so that is a thing. And let me see if I could I'm forgetting the link for impact garden. There we go. yeah, and I guess just a point of disclosure. I will not be the one making the choice on the Karma Gap side because I am an adviser to Karma Gap. So that is obviously a conflict of interest. So Chris will be the one making the call on that side for the foundation to just separate that out a little more clearly.

Eugene Leventhal: but again I'm also unaware of and I've been researching this space for two-ish years like unaware of any other realistic alternatives. So if you have any other ideas of tools to be using for that self-reporting of grantee accountability please do us know. So yeah those are the tools I dropped in chat there. unless I'm not seeing any questions come up and please feel free to comment in the Dow delegate chat or elsewhere. but yeah, if we could get a quick sprint through of the preference signaling one just to give a sense for folks that would be great.

Matt Haynes: Yeah, no problem. hope you can hear me and see me. I'm going to keep this verbal. as my explore as a side of it is completely frozen. I can't really do much of the screen. so I don't want to crash the call on my call. So I'll go through this as we have a TLDDR, but we're calling it negation voice. we're framing as a DSI experiment in preference signaling. so in terms of just an overall summary of it, negation voice basically introduces two complimentary governance tools. the voice app and the negation game. So the goal is to pioneer a scalable mechanism orientated approach for preference signaling within the skull dow.

Matt Haynes: So rather than relying on maybe some of the more traditional sort of Dow conversations in forums and on discords and stuff like that and extended discussions or it could be simple voting using snapshot or something. this experiment is going to employ structured datari protocols to capture both what the community supports in voice and what it rejects in the negation game. So it's like finding the ceiling and then finding the basement so voice uses semantic ballot voting which is a variant of quadratic voting which I'm sure you guys are familiar with. where people can basically allocate things across a semantic tag. that builds graphs and then that's basically enriched with natural conversation with the user.

Matt Haynes: so you can start to look at the complex relationships between different points on the graph where those things intercross and where they don't and learn more about the needs and understanding of the wants of the community. The negation game on the other hand is inspired by epistemic and economic theory. Now the protocol focuses on falsification and bargaining. So it tests the defensibility of

community beliefs by encouraging participants to challenge, refine or reject oppositions. there's a sort of financial credibility piece to as well that you have to stake. So that in it incentivizes intellectual honesty and careful reasoning. So we feel these two things together actually a really exciting experiment for scroll down to be leading the space with.

Matt Haynes: now there's a bit to do. I'm not going to go so much into the technical things as it stands in this moment because I don't think we've got the time to really jump into that, but happy to. It's all in their proposal. but ultimately what we're thinking is that there is this moment and you mentioned it already Eugene, which is ETH Denver. and we would love to be able to take this live effectively in ETH Denver. So whether that's, the kind of event you were just talking about, Eugene, with the group that you're running it with and essentially we run the negation game with as many participants as possible. So a combination of an IRL event and there could be an online piece of that as well. So people who aren't in EA vendor can still be involved in the game. that's absolutely within the realm of what we're doing. and that's the kickoff point effectively.

00:55:00

Matt Haynes: And then from there we go into a series of live events and series of online events as well and async and start to train trainers effectively. So hopefully people can take this tool as the goal is to leave it on scroll as a public good going forward. So this is not just a oneanddone situation. This is like everyone's going to contribute towards the beginning and then over time the goal is to be for people to be able to run their own instances of this as well. So whether it's the local up group that is meeting in anywhere in the world basically and they want to run this we can help them get trained up into doing that and the ideal goal would be to help fund those events as well and then have some sort of synthesis event towards the end.

Matt Haynes: would have a follow-up of another negation game ideally sorry in person but in between that we're running these things solo so there's the voice running its own events and then you've got negation game as well running its own events they obviously meet different needs the negation game is very well suited to doing online but you could also do in person as well and voice is perfect in person because it promotes dialogue in between individuals. So, I know I touched on a lot of bits and pieces there. There's probably things I skipped as well, which I didn't really mean but I'm conscious of so yeah, I'll leave that there. And if anybody has any questions, like I said, I will put a copy of this into the doc once my Internet Explorer is working properly. I'm so old I said Internet er. I meant browser. Yeah.

Eugene Leventhal: do just want to call out I know we're a minute after so if anyone does have to jump but we appreciate you joining and excited to continue these conversations and yes Matt do please feel free to add to it for those who can hang out or want to keep the conversation going I know Ben you just hopped off mute did you want to say Something.

Ben Biedermann: Yeah, so I have a hard stop but I have one question. So with all of this being going live in at ETH Denver the main question I have how much is this proposal based on tech you already have built that is kind of owned or...

Ben Biedermann: within a structure? because that kind of conditions to what extent I feel like contributing makes sense.

Matt Haynes: Yeah, of course.

Matt Haynes: We've actually built most of this. So, there's two different systems there. So negation game is Connors and Nick and I have been working on voice and we've effectively built and been running these local events in London specifically with real groups people using the tools. Now there is work to do to get it production ready i.e. that's a really tight time frame we've given ourselves there. I mean Eth we're not w to it or anything like that.

Matt Haynes: We just think it'd be a beautiful, beginning to life basically and a real nice thing for Scroll to put a tent pole around at East Denver. And the only reason we're doing that is because we feel like we can deliver in six weeks what needs to get done. technologically speaking, everything largely There are things that need to be put together. We're probably something like I would say 60 to 70% development completed. there's just integration things we need to work on front ends. in terms of the final piece we're talking about in terms of having a public good that anybody could come and deploy their own instance of voice or that requires slightly more work to get the factory contracts ready into all of those bits and pieces. But otherwise we've been working hard on this for quite a while.

Ben Biedermann: Yeah, that's very helpful background. Thank you.

Matt Haynes: No problem. Yeah, the question Yeah.

Eugene Leventhal: All right,...

Eugene Leventhal: Yeah, I guess let us know if anyone else has questions or anything else they want to jump into now. Otherwise, we can wrap there. And yeah, Matt, it'll definitely be good to coordinate on assuming we push forward with this, what are the timing and everything. yeah.

Matt Haynes: And I'll update that doc if anybody wants to jump in and have a chat or whatever the case may be. Please feel free to ask questions. yeah, so Fileverse is beautiful. I love it, but definitely docs stored in IPFS are not clearly quite there yet,...

01:00:00

Eugene Leventhal: Cool. Thank Yeah.

Matt Haynes: but they'll get there. apologies for that. But yeah, we'll get it up.

Ben Biedermann: I met Andreas. He's a cool guy, too. So, good that you're supporting him.

Matt Haynes: Was that ...

Ben Biedermann: Andreas is the founder of Files. He's a cool guy.

Matt Haynes: yeah. Yeah, he's great. Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. I really love Barber. It's like I don't know if you ever used Crip Pad earlier in the last B circle. That was great as well, but really didn't work. you, tried two people working in that, but Far is steps forward. So, they've done a great job.

Eugene Leventhal: Okay.

Ben Biedermann: All right. Thanks, Matt. I need to drop we'll talk async. Thanks,

Matt Haynes: Look forward to Cheers. If you have any questions, Eugene, feel free to or

Matt Haynes:

Eugene Leventhal: Yeah, I honestly have not had here,...

Eugene Leventhal: let me just stop recording, too. But I have not had a chance to review it

Meeting ended after 01:01:12 🙌

This editable transcript was computer generated and might contain errors. People can also change the text after it was created.