

9th Meeting of European Research Council BlockchainGov Project

October 14-15-16th, 2022, Paris, France

CERSA: 10 rue Thenard, 75005 Paris, France


ZOOM: <https://sciencespo.zoom.us/j/8789855081>

AGENDA

	Friday, October 14th		
Session I	ERC BlockchainGOV	Local	Remote
09:30 - 11:00	Objective: Share updates among BlockchainGov team members on academic pieces being developed, events attended, and external communications. Readings and Discussion Points: <ol style="list-style-type: none">September papers :<ol style="list-style-type: none">TaraJamilyaSofiaCommunication: website and social media	Primavera Sofia Cossar Tara Merk Louise Frion	Vashti Maharaj
11:00 - 12:00	IGN ONTOCHAIN - DAOstar Grant <ul style="list-style-type: none">ONTOCHAIN business aspects ~15 minGuide for implementation ~30 minQ&A ~10 min		
12:00 - 12:30	Deliverable: Concrete and scheduled action points for: <ol style="list-style-type: none">Publication of september papers<ul style="list-style-type: none">2nd revision by Nov 15th.submission to a journal: early Dec.Theses roadmapsHiring communications personCommunication: website and social mediaEvents to attend and cover in Q4	Primavera Sofia Cossar Tara Merk Louise Frion	
	LUNCH BREAK		
SESSION II	Legitimacy	Local	Remote

13:30 - 16:30	Objective: Review everything that has been written in BlockchainGov Legitimacy Report. Finalise missing parts. Readings and Discussion Points: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Legitimacy Report <ol style="list-style-type: none"> How to integrate feedback from September 2022 workshop Move forward with sections III and IV Deliverables: Concrete and scheduled actions points to finalize a <u>first full draft</u> of the legitimacy report.	Primavera Sofia Cossar Tara Merk Louise Frion	Morshed Vashti Maharaj Marco Crepaldi?
	30 mins BREAK		
SESSION III	ERC 2023 Research Plan	Local	Remote
17:00 - 20:00	Objective: Review ERC 2022 Action Plan and discuss 2023 ERC Action Plan Readings and Discussion Points: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> ERC Action Plan 2022 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review current work & ERC commitments Define Milestones and Deliverables for 2023 Assign priorities and responsibilities for 2023 Deliverables: Draft Version of ERC 2023 Action Plan	Primavera Sofia Cossar Tara Merk Kelsie Nabben Louise Frion	Morshed (for a part of it)
	DINNER @ Chameleon		

	Saturday, October 15th		
SESSION I	Ethnography: Proof of humanity DAO	Local	Remote
09:30 - 12:30	Objective: Review the work done on the Proof of Humanity ethnography and define next steps. Readings and Discussion Points: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Proof of Humanity Case Study <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discuss the angle of report Discuss insights gathered during interviews 	Primavera Sofia Cossar Tara Merk Kelsie Nabben Louise Frion	Vashti Maharaj Ellie Rennie Theodor Beutel

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Map out missing stakeholders that need to be interviewed - Define which deliverables will be provided to the PoH community <p>Deliverables: Roadmap on how to finish the ethnography report and any other deliverables to be provided to the community.</p>		
	LUNCH BREAK		
SESSION III	Extitutional Theory	Local	Remote
13:30 - 16:30	<p>Objective: Gain a deeper understanding of extitutional theory and apply it to the blockchain space.</p> <p>Readings and Discussion Points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Extitutional Theory <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Primavera's intro to Extitutional Theory - Apply to on-chain / off-chain governance - Apply to DAO Star as case Study (Pillar 3) - Berxtitute Reading Group on Extitutional Theory (email jessy@jessykate.com if interested!) - The Lazega Encounter: Provoking Extitutional Theory - Additional slides from Berxtitute workshop Sept 2022  Extitutional Theory (Sept 2022) <p>Deliverables: Preliminary document mapping extitutional theory to DAOStar that can be later discussed with other extitutional scholars + workshop list of research questions</p>	<p>Primavera</p> <p>Sofia Cossar</p> <p>Tara Merk</p> <p>Kelsie Nabben</p> <p>Louise Frion</p> <p>Nettra Pan</p> <p>Florence G'sell</p> <p>Josh</p> <p>Louis MD</p>	<p>Esen</p> <p>Vashti Maharaj</p> <p>Jessy Kate</p> <p>Chris Wray</p> <p>Theodor Beutel</p>
	30 mins BREAK		
SESSION IV	Identity, Privacy & Technology	Local	Remote
17:00 - 20:00	<p>Objective: Gain a deeper understanding on how identity and privacy vis-a-vis blockchain technology are being discussed among academic practitioners and blockchain enthusiasts.</p> <p>Readings and Discussion Points:</p> <p><u>Identity</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sheldrake, P. (2022). Human identity: the number one challenge in computer science. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identity as a non vs. Identity as a verb. 2. Cossar, S. (n.d). Identity, Citizenship, and Blockchain <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inclusive citizenship and digital identity. <p><u>Privacy</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nissenbaum, H. (2010). Privacy in Context 	<p>Primavera</p> <p>Sofia Cossar</p> <p>Tara Merk</p> <p>Kelsie Nabben</p> <p>Louise Frion</p> <p>Nettra Pan</p> <p>Bea Botero</p> <p>Josh</p>	<p>Esen</p> <p>Vashti Maharaj</p> <p>Philip Sheldrake</p> <p>Theodor Beutel</p> <p>Joana Picetti</p> <p>Isaac Patka</p> <p>Wilbert</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits and dangers of blockchain systems incorporating the conception of “privacy in context” (Part III - section 9) 2. De Filippi, P., Mannan, M. (n.d) Tornado Cash: The End of Blockchain Neutrality? - Tornado Cash impact on blockchain neutrality <p>Deliverables: Roadmap with potential collaborations on privacy & identity to create academic writings in 2023.</p>		
	DINNER @ Petite Perigourdine		

	Sunday, October 16th		
SESSION I	Global Governance (Pillar 3)	Local	Remote
09:30 - 11:00	<p>Objective: Explore the various topics and case studies that we want to explore within Pillar 3</p> <p>Readings and Discussion Points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. De Filippi, P. (2020). Blockchain Technology as an Instrument for Global Governance. 2. Cosmolocalism : Understanding the transitional dynamics towards post-capitalism <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify interesting topics to explore - Plan future work for Pillar 3 - Brainstorm Louise’s PhD topic - Discussion about IGF work <p>Deliverables:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Roadmap for BlockchainGov Pillar 3 - Roadmap for DAO Model Law 	<p>Primavera</p> <p>Sofia Cossar</p> <p>Tara Merk</p> <p>Kelsie Nabben</p> <p>Bea Botero</p> <p>Josh</p> <p>Louise Frion</p>	<p>Vashti Maharaj</p> <p>M. Bauwens</p> <p>Chris Wray</p> <p>Theodor Beutel</p> <p>Louis MD</p>
11:00 - 10:30	<p>Objective:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - set up good working practices, routines, calls, etc. - plan next events and roadmap till then. 		
SESSION II	Polycentricity Reading Group	Local	Remote
11:30 - 12:30	<p>Objective: Review insights from the first session of the ERC Polycentricity Reading Group and agree on how to structure the final report.</p> <p>Readings and Discussion Points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Polycentricity Reading Group <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Plan on drafting sessions on bi-weekly basis - Incorporate first sessions in the report - Plan future sessions of the webinar 	<p>Primavera</p> <p>Tara Merk</p> <p>Kelsie Nabben</p> <p>Sofia Cossar</p> <p>Bea Botero</p> <p>Louise Frion</p>	<p>Esen</p> <p>Morshed</p> <p>Vashti Maharaj (Jessy Kate)</p> <p>Chris Wray</p> <p>Theodor Beutel</p>

	Deliverables: Revised version of polycentricity reading group agenda and report.		
	LUNCH BREAK		
SESSION III	Data Trusts	Local	Remote
13:30 - 16:30	<p>Objectives: Gaining a deeper understanding of governing data via cooperative principles, data governance in decentralised contexts, and algorithmic governance.</p> <p>Readings and Discussion Points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Micheli, M., Ponti, M., Craglia, M., & Berti Suman, A. (2020). Emerging models of data governance in the age of datafication. <i>Big Data & Society</i>, 7(2). 2. Nabben, K. Decentralising Data Governance: DAOs as Data Trusts (2022). 3. Morshed, Elettra and Janis' paper on data coops in the EU (2022), long version and short version <p>Deliverables:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Map out the longer version of Morshed's paper. See next steps doc: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1VUKYgIL1nSqbRNvOErnKHR14eJBuppGILz-XWZ9uwYU/edit?usp=drivesdk 	<p>Primavera</p> <p>Sofia Cossar</p> <p>Tara Merk</p> <p>Kelsie Nabben</p> <p>Bea Botero</p> <p>Florence G'sell</p> <p>Josh</p> <p>Louise Frion</p>	<p>Xavier Lavayss</p> <p>Esen</p> <p>Morshed</p> <p>Vashti Maharaj</p> <p>Sylvie Delacroix</p> <p>M.Zargham</p> <p>David Sisson</p> <p>Jason Potts</p> <p>Chris Wray</p> <p>Tomas Hardjono</p> <p>(Jessy Kate)</p> <p>Isaac Patka?</p> <p>Niranjan</p>
	30 mins BREAK		
SESSION IV	Exit to Community	Local	Remote
17:00 - 19:30	<p>Objective: Share updates on the DADA E2C. Discuss with Pia from Open Collective</p> <p>Readings and Discussion Points:</p> <p>Open Collective</p> <p>Explore whether the insight we got so far (mostly from DADA) can be able to help them plan out their own E2C. Especially, with regard to how do you identify your community and how do you prepare them to be able and willing to carry on the weight of governance.</p> <p>Deliverables:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Roadmap on how to support OC in the E2C 	<p>Primavera</p> <p>Sofia Cossar</p> <p>Tara Merk</p> <p>Kelsie Nabben</p> <p>Josh</p>	<p>Morshed</p> <p>Vashti Maharaj</p> <p>Pia Mancini</p> <p>Louise Frion</p> <p>Theodor Beutel</p>
	DINNER @ Bouillon Racine		

bouillonracine@orange.fr : n personnes.

Participants List

CONFIRMED PARTICIPANTS

In Paris	Online
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Primavera de Filippi (academia) 2. Kelsie Nabben (academia) 3. Tara Merk (academia) 4. Sofia Cossar (academia) 5. Louise Frion (academia) 6. Florence G'sell 7. Nettra Pan 8. Beatriz Botero 9. Josh 10. Louis Margot-Duclot 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 11. Morshed (academia) 12. Vashti Maharaj (academia) 13. Xavier Lavayssière (from US) 14. Esen (academia) 15. Jamilya (academia) 16. Jessy Kate (Toronto (EST) timezone) 17. Pia Mancini (blockchain practitioner) 18. Sylvie Delacroix (academia) 19. Michael Zargham (industry, EST) 20. David Sisson (industry, EST) 21. Chris Wray (industry) 22. Theodor Beutel

POTENTIAL INVITEES

From Paris	From Abroad
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Beatriz Botero (15 - 16) 2. Adrien Basdevant 3. Paula Heudebert 4. Louis Duclos 5. Frédéric Ocana 6. Vincent Danos 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Theodor Beutel 8. Gabriela Coleman 9. Eric Alston (academia) 10. Isaac Patka 11. Florian Glatz 12. Bodo Balazs (academia) 13. Alexander Hanff (privacy lawyer) 14. Henrik Axelsen (academia) 15. Niranjana (industry, EST)

Action plan:

Publication of september papers

- 2nd revision by Nov 15th.
- submission to a journal: early Dec.

Late researchers: ideally before Oct 20.

- Vashti
- Esen

Theses roadmaps: deadline 31st Dec

- thesis outline, with sections and chapters
- methodology for the various research sections
- list of deliverables and milestones

Hiring communications person:

- Livia ?!?
- Kate ?!
- still to be found.

Communication Strategy:

- Website : Jamilya
- Social media : Jamilya
- PODCAST !!!!! (Kelsie + JOSH) to invite in our reading groups
- Trust + Legitimacy report: translate into a blockchain-accessible doc: Kate + Livia ?
- Videos and Podcast : Kristina ?
- Op'ed – New Public, Zora, [Noema](#) ?
- Stickers and T-shirt ;)

Events to attend and cover in Q4

- Paris Blockchain Week (Paris - March 22-23)
- Consensus (Las Vegas - April 24-26)
- shall we organise our own conference?

MILESTONES & DELIVERABLES:

- all September papers submitted to publication (Dec 31st)
- Legitimacy report finalised by Oct 26th
 - publish it on Internet Policy Review
 - present it at EUI Tech Cluster
 -
- Thesis roadmaps: Dec 31st
- Papers:

- Legitimacy Decentraland paper
 - (Rule of Code published)
 - Constitutions & Blockchain paper
 - Blockchain in Real world paper
 - Decentralization paradox
 - Digital Commons
 - Institution isomorphism
-
- **Communication:**
 - mem'ified version of Trust report + Legitimacy report (Dec 31st)
 - Jessica Zartler (Blockchain Science)
 - one external podcast intervention (WorkDAO)
 - find a communication manager
-
- **DAO Model Law:**
 - revise it by Dec 31st
 - reactivate the working groups
-
- **Plan events for 2023**
 - big conference in April (at the castle)
 - small conferences in Paris or EUI
-
- **Pillar 3:**
 - identifying what DAOs want to do but cannot do
 - find ways (technical or institutional) to solve these things
 - interview DAO workers about their needs / expectations
 - (check if we can collaborate with OtherInternet)
-
- **DAOstar**
 - case study - what is it, what it is trying to achieve, how does it compare with more traditional standardization efforts (inatba, w3c, ietf, iso).
-
- **PoH:**
 - Coming up with proposition to engage in PAR with them
 - → cookbook: 'how to prevent a crisis' ?
 - → cookbook : 'how to fork a DAO' ?
 - → cookbook: 'how to deal with the post-crisis'
-
- **Op'ed on WorkerDAO**

- Op'ed on Identity / Privacy / AML
- Op'ed on collaboratively written art history (Right-Click-Save)

Extitutional theory

Extitutions: when looking at individual people interacting with each other, other logics emerge, some structured order logic must be motivating them.

Why is driving those interactions?

Most societal and doctrinal action has taught us to look at this structured logic through the lens of institutional framework to analyse and shape them. Extitutional theory provides an alternative lens, on the basis of the social dynamics underneath the social structures.

To illustrate, the example of a research centre can be taken through:

- institutional lens: part of Harvard uni, institutionals roles
- extitutional lens: a group of people interacting with each other, but also because of their identities and the relationships that have emerged through these identities

We can't understand the Berkman centre with only one of the two lenses.

The institution looks at the structure, the extitution looks at the people and the relationships.

This is for more granular understanding of why people are interacting in a particular manner.

DNA of institutions and extitutions:

- Institution: role and rules constructing the social structure, with people being relatively fungible
 - role is defining the parts
- Extitution: core DNA is individuals and the relationships between them, people being absolutely not fungible, since if you replace someone with someone else, the extitution changes
 - the parts define the role

Jessy Kate: core DNA being identities in relationships, as individuals we can have many identities, the relationship formed through them is the extitutional fabric.

Schema:

- Middle: objective layer with individuals as opposed to identities
 - Interaction of those bodies
- Interpretation layer at the top
 - individuals translated into roles
 - interactions interpreted in light of the roles and the rules in the institutional codified structure
 - with extitutional lens, individuals translated into identity, with their interaction between their identities and the relationships between those identities

- The middle layer is the real life, and the top and the bottom is how we interpret it

Nettra:

- contrast role identity with social identity
 - Role is codified
 - Identity is “experientially” met

Tara: why adding “normatively codified”, is it in the sense that every rule and norm imply what interaction should be, or that the codification base is not ideal?

P: the knowledge that the rules exist might or not affect your behaviour from a normative extent / all the rules in an institutional framework have a normative function.

Nettra: Are we talking in literal codification?

P: normative rules aren’t necessarily expressly written, codification can be informal, it has been declared, it exists and is possible to identify as opposed to

Tara: discussing social norms from the institutional literature?

P: rules are inherently institutional, codified implicitly or explicitly. The distinction between rules and norms is that the rule incorporates within its own definition an enforcement mechanism. When you have a rule, you know who will enforce it. When you have a norm, there is no rule about how it will be enforced, no certainty that it will be enforced, and you have no idea how it will be enforced. With the rule there is more predictability, not with the norm.

P: institutionalisation theory has colonised many theoretical frameworks, but here social norms should be encompassed in the extitutional framework

P: very strong concept of membership in institutions / in extitutional lens, no notion of membership but to which extent am I participating through time (network with different people participating to a certain extent through time), meaning the extitutional lens can be framed as a box, whereas the institutional network as an interconnected network getting diluted and diffused over time depending on the boundaries, with no whole.

Objective:

- institutions defined by specific outcomes, and particular features with which you identify the goals so that you can evaluate ex post to which extent the institutional actors have been completing their tasks (with KPIs- very clear defined objective base
 - institutions being a noun → “be well”
- extitutions are more about the actual existence and reinforcement of the social fabric, with a focus on how well did I participate, being more on the process rather than the outcome
 - self-referential, extitution being a verb → “to do”

Jessy Kate: language is key for extitutional dynamics, in order to understand why certain outcomes are happening, in terms of when organisations use decision making and productive outcomes.

Nettra: institutions like family to be studied: where is the goal oriented in the doing here?

P: the institution of family has a very specific purpose. It is an institution and an extitution. The purpose of the extitution of a family is to make people grow, with the institution being a scaffolding so that the extitution of the family can grow better and strive.

A slide is needed on:

- good dynamic: the work of the extitution can improve the outcome and the goals of the institution
- on itself: the work of an extitution is constructive not in the same way as the institution expects but in creating a fabric and powerful network of social bondings that in itself has value

Implications:

- because the institutions exist in boxes, once you institutionalise something, one of the inherent and ineluctable goals of the institution is to preserve itself. Because it is defined by boxes, by definition it will compete, since people have to compete to get the good roles, with hierarchy emerging. On the other hand external competition.
- in extitutional dynamics, there is no box, so the concept of competition doesn't mean anything, you have to connect, cooperation becoming the dominant strategy. When you see an institution you want to connect with it.
- From an extitutional lens, more incentives towards cooperation

When there is change, survival in institutions is to be static, whereas it is to evolve in extitutions.

Evolution to be based on the rules and the roles: what is the resonance and cohesion existing in the social group.

Rhizomatic networks:

- Mutualisation of resources hard to pinpoint in the extitutional sense
- In institutions not generative but normative

Embulbing:

- When you enter an extitution, you absorb stuff and take them out
- reciprocal phenomenon
- it goes further than knowledge, since when you move, you move the embulbed energy with you

Debulbing:

The words "embulbing and debulbing" concern acquiring stuff that we cannot name.

Nettra: salience in identity research, meaning many identities in yourself, one of them being activated depending on the trigger. Many identity interactions would be relevant here. **Literature to be sent on that by Nettra.**

P: many facets, identity being the facet you chose to display at a given time. The more rhizomes, the more facets are constantly on, and the more you can express the numerous facets.

Nettra: identity salience encompasses that → her research focuses on when identity is becoming salient, meaning a specific identity is released in a specific context.

Collaboration area:

- when collaboration needs to be triggered, how to manage multiple identity facets in order to trigger the decision
- → Identity saliency

P: institutions give you a role, but in some situations you can express an extitutional facet, although the institutional lens is making need and role react.

Nettra: with institutional colonization, schools of thought creating people perpetuating the norms of these institutions, where an extitutional approach is needed

P: comparison table

- the reaction to change is an important one
- Lubricant: good intrication with the agency concept
 - extitution doesn't constraint agency but enforce it

P: extitutional bunny / institutional duck → actually it is neither, but those two lenses enable me to speak about the thing, and the descriptive lens I use will have a performative effect on how I interact with it.

What about erroneous interpretation?

Paradoxical conclusion: to fix a problem, if you can only see one side of the coin, you will have an institutional solution (give gloves), whereas you could have gotten the full picture (feed the rabbit)

Institutional scaffoldings can come out of that: useful and improving the functioning of the social group. Very difficult to create good institutions if no visibility on the implications of the institutional scaffoldings on extitutions.

- What if the institutional solution steps on the toes of an extitutional dynamic? It creates another problem
- Vicious circle with constant institutionalization to solve the problem created by the previous problem, because institutions are blind to their effect on extitutional dynamics
- Solving the problem through an extitutional intervention could have different consequences on the institutions → constant interplay

Over institutionnalization derives from the lack of taking into account extitutional solutions.

Constantly interplay and upward / downward correlation with the objective layer, to create new rules. Any change in the institution / extitution will ineluctability create a change in the objective layer, that could create a change in return in institution / extitution.

→ To be translated in an equation

xl: current state of institutional dynamic at point I

xE: current state of extitutional dynamic at point E

Four elements to account for:

- how institution dynamics affect institution dynamics
- how institution dynamics affect extitution dynamics
- how extitution dynamics affect institution dynamics
- how extitution dynamics affect extitution dynamics

Different states:

- Embryonic state: very few rules and roles, just a few extitutional relationship
- Communal state: not just a bunch of friend but a group, and entity (the whatsapp group)
- bureaucratic: small group of friends around a shared project (build a boat), with the need for rule creation
- integrated: very strong institutional dynamics and extitutional structures → performant, healthy, cohesive and practical objective layer

Nettra: trend to substitute institutionality with the codification, when we don't talk about that, we talk about the dynamics

Jessy Kate: internally consistent physics / on the rhizomatic side, getting at the physics of the internal extitutional round, and relationship with "orbital dynamics", metaphor to pull into alignment towards a concept or a name

P: when embryonic, you interact with people, relationships are based on individual magnetism, force that brings people together. The state change comes up when the reason why you interact is not only because of the magnetism for a person but something else at the centre, the gravitational force in the extitution, that motivates. It is orbitational dynamics between one core centre and other bodies orbitrating around that core centre.

→ "change of focal point"

Nettra: institutional perspective looks at principle v. agent, but when you explain venture emergence there is a relational aspect.

P: "crazy part"

Enclosure: putting a fence over a field, under one's sovereignty or rules

Exclosure: the same fence can be used but a fence is put within the fence to create a space of freedom within an enclosed space of constraints

ex: copyright is enclosing culture / by creating a copyright licence you can have "copyleft" (creative common / open source) for freedom and extitutional dynamics like remix to exist again. It is what the institution wants to see so that they won't get in.

The only way to exclose from the enclosure is to speak the same language as the enclosure

→ cheese with holes figure / bread could be a good figure

Nettra: no man's land as a good example since two bordering countries respecting it because of institutions.

P: no man's land is public domain though, although the Vatican could be an exclosure from Italy

MEV is also an interesting example for enclosure: there is a protocol that is enclosing and all of a sudden, the rules of the protocol are being used

Enclosure requires territorialization or enclosure by an institution and carving out something inside without removing the institution.

Sofia: penetration of institutional dynamics?

P: in enclosures, you are untouchable, the system is not touching it, it would be like "gaming a system"

Nettra: hacking a virus to only operate on one file on a computer

P: soft rules and unspoken rules → doesn't change the ontological of a rule. If the rule exists in the mind of everyone and is being enforced, it is still part of the institutional structure.

Philip: extitutional dynamic is currently enclosed and constrained by institutional framework, which throws back to our previous misunderstandings of society.

P: hard to say what is closer to reality because of the descriptive / performative effect. The two models are fulfilling very different functions. We try hard not to have a moral judgement on institutions and extitutions. Institutions are good performative models. Extitutional dynamics alone are not sufficient to create powerful sustainable cohesive systems without falling into the vicious circle of extitutionalisation (nepotism, manipulation, gourdness, etc). There will always be abuses of extitutional power. Constitutional guarantees and associated confidence can only be provided by institutions. To implement extitutional layers, we need an institutional framework.

Philip: spent a lot of time in web 3 defending institutions

Jessy Kate: institutions are rather being overtrained by codification → what grammar of institutional design to help preserve and support extitutional dynamics, and how to formalise the associated interplay?

Kelsie: how does an institution become institutionalised and vice versa?

P: naming is the state change between some bilateral magnetic relationship into something that is immediately institutional and extitutional. It is the birth of the cogravitational thing and the box in which are enclosures and exclosures. Transition between something amorphous that then becomes another social system.

Nettra: "monday lunch example in an institution"

Josh: making a name of a whatsapp group v. making a name of a company → are both going towards bureaucracy?

Tara: interesting to look at how the naming occurs, with dependencies on the tools and the act of giving the name

Sofia: how do extitutions and institutions change one another?

P: extitution's habits or values can go against a behaviour that is not institutionalised (like smoking), but without institutionalising it they can't enforce it

For every problem extitutional and institutional solutions coexist, it is just a matter of choosing

Tara: reviewing, commenting and feedback as extitutional ways

P: governance is often reduced to decision-making, but deliberation questions also come with it. If you cannot get consensus and need to vote, you failed at the governance level. But can we actually create practices that are not deliberation to create transparency? Could we have ex ante signalization instead of ex post review?

A rule is always a draconian intervention whereas understanding each stance of a question enables everyone to modulate their behaviours in regards to a specific issue. Sometimes, a rule is not needed, since it is less powerful than a social norm properly integrated and understood.

→ This could be codified but is very complex, since rules must be changed every time someone changes

Kelsie: translation of indigenous rules to tech

Nettra: "being in right relationship", the most important thing being to be ok with each other

P: relates to communal living, the question never being who is right but what is best for the community
→ with powerful extitutions as strong gravitational forces, your behaviour becomes improvement oriented

Nettra: some assumptions here

- People care
- People are good

P: depends on why you are part of the extitution?

- Institutional justification makes you a bad extitutional member focused on what you can get out
- Extitutional justification since you enjoy and value the constructive relationship emerging, than rationally you would want the thing to go well

Nettra: homogeneity of the group is important together with the risk element → you want losses in your portfolio in VC meaning that you take some risks.

P: institutional frameworks are not consensus based, the goal is to maximise utility.

Nettra: risk element on the voting component, as a failure of governance. On the assumptions needed, the difficulty to make the decision must be encountered.

Josh: within a company in a group of workers to begin making a union to improve goals and means at the same time, includes a clear process for extitutions towards institutions

Bea: power dynamics with the chocolate example

P: pure extitutions is dangerous, this calls for procedures such as 1 person 1 vote. 2 ways to fix extitutional deviation, going to the extitutional side (persuasion) or the institutional side (to create a procedure). This is why bureaucracy is necessary, for no manipulation to infiltrate them.

Relates to the conflict of interest discussion to avoid discrimination.

Tara: Exclosure tactics from institutions to actually prevent exclosures? (Amazon example)

Discussion on the boundaries between embedded institutions and extitutions

Difference between extitutions that create space for freedom within institutions and groups formed to go against the institutional order.

P: pressure point, like threshold under which if too many people leave the boxes within the institution the institution collapses

Graphics with copyright examples:

- unterritorialized: public domain outside copyright law
- enclosure: some within the copyright law
- existing institution: some in the copyright law and the trademark law
- enclosure with enclosure: this is where the intensity and type of the grid matters

Interfaces: interactions between extitutions and institutions

Josh: for an institution to reflect extitutional dynamics, some interfaces must be there

P: they are the objective layer → the people / they create vessels when they don't want to be the interface if it is too much work.

Bea: institutions are built to balance contradicting interests, but at some point in the US it didn't work anymore since two sides emerged with two types of very specific interest.

P: DADA as an enclosure using tech against capitalism? The market wants to see a speculative asset, and then through blockchain enclosure where speculative transactional dynamics don't go / which explains why they won't tokenize their governance

Tara: not that big but the intention is to make it small → high entry cost since you have to part of it since a long time

Identity, Privacy & Technology

Philip Sheldrake:

- finding a vocabulary or framing for enthusiasts in digital identity to make them see the issue differently.
- "I seem to be a verb" - noun-like and verb-like identity
- NOUN-LIKE DISCIPLINES → law, bureaucracy. Computer science takes that model at face value to make "users eligible to the system" (citizenship?)
- Computer code can be written by anyone who can code, not just by 'trained' lawyers
- Computer code operates more insidiously and invisibly than la
- We are now digitised "cyborgs" lifeforms that are relying on feedback from the digital sphere.
- VERB-LIKE → phyl, pol science, architecture, design, economics (?). Human agency, human dignity, human flourishing.

- VERB-LIKE and NOUN-LIKE → there is not duality but a dualism = same as with extitutional and institutional theory (two sides of a coin).
- I am advocating for an approach to design to the digitization of digital identity that promotes psychological, ecological, and social health.
- Generativity is essential to the living process. It is autopoiesis.
- SSI has a dystopia potential, may achieve exactly the opposite of what it's trying to achieve
- SSI doesn't suck, but we might need to move beyond it; it is useful in some context, perhaps with some constraints, but not a panacea.

Isaa Patka:

- decentralized ID on blockchain; DID and VC wg at w3c; data self-custody; schema for representing portable reputation.
- conflicting opinions with ppl in the field:
 - sybill resiliency might be unachievable, by design
 - ability to have fragmented identities is good, and enabling ppl to present only bits of informations

Is it possible to have a more configurable design for digital identity? which encompasses different facets of people's identity ?

Isaac:

- DiSco, CollabLand,: building profiles in the web3 space is missing the contextual information about skills and attestations.
- can use schema.org to define ppl and organisation, but missing context around the information.
- discussion on the individual and the structure that the individual plays : need to look at context

Sofia:

- verb-like identity: the proces by which we cognitively construct identity; goes beyond the fact that we are contextual beings. Is it even desirable to make any attempt to represent identity digitally?

Philip:

- many different conceptualisation in different disciplines around the 'verb-like' nature of identity.
- Identity as a process rather than a thing, it is a means for meaning-making.
- is there a word for identity as 'relationship' as opposed to the single node of individual
- noun-like type of identity is causing injury on a daily-basis
- I'm interested in 'cogito ergo sum' vs 'corpus ergo sum' (animalism): it's our cognition that sets us apart, and enable us to cooperate. it's the mind rather than the body that enable us to coordinate.
- yet, information technologists don't like this form of identity, they want to point at the body.
- because we use democracy as superior way of organising society, hence one-person one-vote; hence we need a corporeal type of identity
- I think it's impossible for a software code base to constrain itself to work out identity system.
- can you use Legal code to work out the problem?
- notion of personal data, need to merge code-bases

Primavera:

- Identity as (1) body, (2) mind, (3) institutions
- Digital identity is actually an “identifier” and does not necessarily contradict a verb-like identity.
- We have the notion of the body.
- We have the psychological notion of identity (which can be multiple and evolving)
- The problem with SSI is more about the name -> no one is making the claim that they are trying to represent digital identity but rather digital attributes.
- Our identities are sometimes defined by things that have nothing to do with “identities”.
- The question should be if it is desirable to have code represent digital identifiers?

Philip:

- To say that you have multiple psychological identities, that still sees identity as a noun.
- Information, context is used by life to organise itself. Relationships are the pathways for that organising. Information exchange between identifiable beings.
- Identity is a distributed cognition that does not work like a distributed process at all.
- Until last year we could escape the digital world. We are now digitalized. And that code has no constraint or restraint.
- No one is designing for the constraint on the systems that build for identity as a noun.

Primavera:

- It sounds like you want to institutionalise the extitutional nature of identity.
- The legal code creates the exclosures.

Isaac:

- Are data trusts examples of constraints?

Philip:

- There is no such thing as personal data outside the legal context. In that case it is always interpersonal data.
- If we codify noun-like, let’s not let it go rampant and colonise aspects of verb-like identity that we hold dear.

Nettra:

- Aspect of cognition.
- Use cases and recommendation for practice:
- There is a difference between the physical body that you have and an identifier and the dystopian digitising of all aspects of our lives.
- How to protect privacy? Someone can guess who you are based on your Starbucks orders. There is AI being implemented to guess our identities based on our interactions online.
- What are the use cases for self-representation online?

Isaac:

- The idea that your digital fingerprint is important.
- We don’t need to look too far for any dystopian future. The case of Tornado Cash.
- Sybil Resistance is an anti-pattern -> people keep reaching for it.

Sofia:

- tech and identity can be seen through a positive lens insofar as it bridges distances.
- acts of citizenships, is there anything we can take out of this to claim rights ?
- privacy codified into code is very problematic, and dangerous.

Esen:

- advisor about GDPR;
- personal data is not really defined; ? aim is to define the data and the constraints of its processing;
- privacy = individual right to self-determination; data protection = rules defining the condition of personal data processing; 2 different things
- data is regulated, instead of the identity: who owns the data, how can it be transferred, etc.
- Privacy-by-design: systems need to incorporate guarantees for ppl to exercise their rights.

Philipp:

- Newtonian approach to drafting of GDPR; look at data that can be legally defined.
- Legal code that establish how we can use data
- but technical code looks different from that: it is pervasive and insidious
- we need to create enclosure, with space where we can just express our humanity
- GDPR puts individuals on the pedestal, hence we believe we can apply cryptographic techniques to make data inaccessible to those who have no permission.
- justice is contextual, and context need to be accounted for

Primavera:

- Everyone agrees that data surveillance.
- It seems to me that VCs (collecting credentials based on attributes assigned to me). If I have a VCs, they are not stuck to my identifier. Why are you against VCs if I have the capacity to collect them and express them as I see fit (based on my verb-like).

Philip:

- The challenge with discussing complex systems is when you go to the atomic level.
- The challenge is when billions of people are “communicating” by VCs. A VC puts you as a credential holder (one vertex of the trust triangle). The problem is when you have these systems infecting every aspect of your life. At that point you don’t have agency or choice - the system is not designed for you to express yourself differently.

Isaac:

- There is a desire for a meta credential of proof of completeness (proof that you are sharing all of your data).

Kelsie:

- Can you talk about anti-patterns? Sybil resistance in Gitcoin is a reaction to QF - do you have a mental model about this?

Isaac:

- Since the system decided to go with something that is so highly sensitive to Sybil resistance.

Philip:

- In the analogue world, the issue is not about “privacy” and control of personal data. That is only a problem in the digital world only.
- We get less intelligent

Primavera:

- Privacy in the digital and physical world is very different. When I leave digital traces it is not an extitutional being that is recalibrating - it is an AI collecting data on me.
- I agree that any attempt to create digital identities is mostly bad.
- Saying that because a solution might become a standard and thus is bad is not so solid.
- I don't think VCs goes against the verb-like.

Isaac:

- There is a concept of selective disclosure in the extitutional.

Primavera:

- We have so many ways in the physical world to express credentials.
- In real life, we interact through a combination of confidence and trust. Saying that we want a society with only trust is that we only want a society with only extitutions.

Nettra:

- I agree about the accelerating pace of digital technology adoption.
- My question is what are the big milestones that we need to reach? How do we separate the essential personal data from the rest?

Isaac:

- How do the design constraints of the system impact the choices of technology that we use? I am not able to map this out yet.

Philipp:

- we need psychologist / sociologist in the room, complex to be developed will be a mesh of tech / social / legal code mixed together, need it to be interdisciplinary

Isaac:

- The concept of rage quit is an example. What would it mean to rage quit an identity system? This might be entangled with the right to be forgotten.

- The key is not to start with the technology but with the goal.

Primavera:

- I want to argue against the superiority of the analogue: We are fighting so hard in the analogue world to escape the immediate capacity to put people into a bucket. We are trying to escape is probably 1) our nationality, 2) our physical body.
- To which extent is digital identity useful and to which is the cost bearable?
- VCs have very little costs I am pleased by.

Philip:

- You make a leap to the non-contextual quantification of reputation.

Primavera:

- With digital technology we can granularize more into web of trusts.

Isaac:

- This is an education problem. The technology is engrained in a way that cannot be pulled out. We already have things that look like VCs but are not VCs. That's already a system of VCs.
- Imagine that we have this conversation where they were deciding to implement SSL. Maybe the government says that they are taking over the system and appear over authorised browsers.

POINT OF AGREEMENT: VCs (non-blockchain based) with friction

Cosmolocalism

globalisation = one thing extend all over the world; creating one large interoperable capitalist market that people are stuck into.

internationalisation = nation-state clusters that communicate to each other

cosmolocalism =

Cosmos as cosmolocalism: hub with chains connecting to hub; talking to each other in an interoperable fashion. with cosmos you don't have to pay rent to Cosmos; you're not bound to the single market, as in the case of Ethereum

Standardised way to talk to each other; standardisation != globalisation;

standardization is always polycentric;

standardization is the product (= globalisation) or is the interoperability (=cosmolocalism)

Deliverables:

- Roadmap for BlockchainGov Pillar 3
- Roadmap for DAO Model Law

Louise's PhD

Task 2.4: MULTILATERAL COORDINATION in the blockchain space (M30-60) PI + Postdoc 3

Multilateral coordination issues will draw from *Internet governance studies* to assess whether existing theories (Wu 2010, DeNardis 2012, Mueller 2009) and practices (via institutions like IGF, ITU, ICANN) of Internet governance can be transposed in the context of blockchain governance. Moreover, this task will provide new empirical and normative observations to the emerging field of distributed governance, exploring ways in which blockchain-based systems differ from traditional Internet infrastructures, and whether they can contribute to bringing more transparency and accountability into the (self)-governance of online communities.

Subsidiary vs Supersidiarity (meta-organisations, to coordinate things that they cannot do on their own) not all meta-organisations are supersidiarity, some of them are, when there is a delegation of power to the meta-organisation

eg. FSF as supersidiarity because you assign your IP, in order to get to provide enforcement

Commons-based approach to polycentric global governance

1. commons-based governance
2. polycentric governance
3. crypto-commons = ??? mix of both

Primavera: Can we decomposed all the functions that we assign to a nation-state and see to what extent a blockchain system can fulfill these functions? (without being private nor public)

Commons-based version of Balaji's network states, blockchain-based virtual states, which are not about the state, but rather deconstructing the various functions of the state into specific

blockchain as an alternative solution, commons-based, tiers-lieux

today we have:

1. nation states service provision (national - international)
2. market based services (global)
3. blockchain crypto-commons initiatives (cosmolocal & cosmopolitan)

I would start with the descriptive paper on blockchain commons initiatives first

blockchain-based initiatives that are providing public utility services in a common-based approach

- pension funds (automatically disbursed to your pkey when you get old)
- UBI (Circles - cosmolocalism)
-

Podcast on Network State Book

- Read 1 chapter a month, choose a speaker that will destroy it, record podcast

Turn the the Global Governance Policy Brief into an academic paper

Data trusts session

3 questions:

-

Speaker 1: data in itself is worthless. Value of data is inherently contextual. There needs to be a mechanism that makes the data worthwhile. We need to think about:

- the data owner: the person who is used as a sensor, where the data comes from
- mechanisms for meaning extraction: we need to agree here

Using code for those two functions doesn't make sense, code is just the enforcer.

Speaker 2: there's an upper limit to data stewardship delegation. There's always a trust aspect involved: basically the things the steward *could* do with data but hopefully doesn't. This trust part cannot be fully automated.

Currently people don't believe they are receiving enough/ any returns for the data they are contributing. Compensating data contributions may yield a business model which is less restraint in what is allowed to be done with data and also yield more high quality data.

Speaker 3: there should be a distinction in the Data DAO between member tokens and data compensation tokens.

There are major increases in data quality if you get it straight from the producer:

- If you buy it you don't have any passive data streams to contextualize the active contribution data. Contextualization however is key in generating meaning and value from data

K: how does this map towards unions and trusts?

Z: they aren't unions in the legal sense at all. Also ppl need to stop thinking about data as stuff: it really doesn't behave like "things/ stuff". Data is more like packages of usage rights that are dependent on multiple contexts (e.g. has there been compensation? What was the nature of the compensation?)

- Data needs to be collected and stored appropriately (over time and over space, creating a lot of diversity). Then we extract signals which we need to agree generate meaning and then we turn that into returns. In that sense value extraction from data is very different from other commodity value chains

E: idea that data will be provided more when and if people are compensated for doing so. Also, establishing trust relationship with the data steward (e.g. data dao) will accelerate the data provision more

K: big and major question is "how do you value data" - major stumbling block for establishing any data DAO. Important in this context however, is to keep in mind that data is not really owned, there are just usage rights for data. Exchange value/ prices may depend on how this usage evolves over time.

P: what can people do with their data in this context?

Z: three ways to fully sign up:

- Asset manager: financializes data
- Tech company: tooling and technical data management?
- Data trust: governance