

Miro Board comments from DF Focus Group Listening Session 11th April 2024

This doc collates some of the points raised in the Listening Session on Thurs 11th April. We kept notes on a Miro board here <https://miro.com/app/board/uXiVNbdv40=/> - but on the advice of those present, we have pulled the comments out into this doc, since Miro is not very accessible for many people.

Comments on this doc are open, so please add any further thoughts you have - and, if you were there on the 11th and you can see something we missed, please add it, or if you recognise a point you yourself made but it's not captured quite right, please feel free to correct it!

Positive feelings

None

In-between/ambivalent

- Was (and still am) in favor of the decision, but from the POV of an outside observer it felt closer to academia's / CeFi's way of doing things
- it was good it's made people talk
- We should look into wallet behaviour in this vote, and number of wallets voting
- How many people CAN vote - how many wallets are there?
- How many have voted?
- This merger is a chance to get ahead so that the future of AI is not dominated by multinationals like Microsoft et al.
- this is a special case - it's not just internal governance, and there's no real precedent for it

- nobody here is Agix-rich - so how much representation should you have compared to someone who holds millions? IP1V is trash
- it is a corporate structure - we shouldn't expect to be informed

Negative feelings

- Felt it was all sprung on us a bit
- Felt like it was a done deal already
- it was too rushed, proper community engagement takes time
- Is this the first time among many? If this goes thru - or even if not - will things be done in this rushed way again? Are we setting a precedent that we can't come back from?
- we were missing the conversation that builds the doc that gets voted on - the intermediate steps
 - We need feedback from management on the intermediate steps that led to the merger
 - Intermediate steps is very valuable, I agree Samuele. Allowing non committed individuals to participate in the document that is voted on. Love it [*for context - this refers to the idea that we should not have moved straight to a vote on the merger - there should have been several decisionmaking steps, e.g. agree what the merger should look like, and allow the community to have input on the terms of it*]
- How would we connect the voting, with the sharing of opinion and feeling engaged? Several voting rounds? Consultation before the vote?
- There are 2 parts - the "what" was done (sounds good in theory) and the "how" it was done. The latter, I've not seen it articulated to the community.
 - should have let the community talk it thru.
 - the supervisory council didn't have a mandate to put out that statement. [*For context, this refers to <https://blog.singularitynet.io/joint-statement-from-the-singularitynet-foundation-and-supervisory-council-on-the-asi-alliance-d2399d8772d8>*]
 - and the "why" hasn't been articulated. beyond a blogpost
- Because of the mechanism, we can't tell the difference between someone who understands the issue, and someone who's just voting for the sake of it. How do we onboard people to learn about the issue?
- we shouldn't put it all on one person or group to sort out community engagement
 - but we do have to recognise that there is an information asymmetry. Management know things we don't know, so they need to come to us to share that - and they should meet us where we are.
 - They don't come to us. For instance they don't talk to us in Discord - we have to go to them.
- The joint statement by the SC and the foundation says "we agree to have further discussions on decentralisation with the community. When is this going to happen

- and more importantly why is the community waiting for the foundation to tell us when? In a decentralised community wouldn't it be the other way round?
- i feel very unclear about the voting mechanism, how voting power is determined etc
- People need help, and it's a big hurdle. We have to be aware that help is there, if it is. We need to implement tools to help, or humans
- I felt they needed my vote just to help with the impression that it was a decentralised process
- It IS corporate, so is it a pretence at decentralisation?
- Even if I vote no, I'm just legitimising the process
- It's decentralisation theatre!
- a lot of the info is written so it is not so good if you're dyslexic
- Felt like when the management shared opinions it was all just positive - like they didn't recognise there were concerns
- there should have been an abstain option, to demonstrate that not voting is not the same as "can't be bothered/has no interest"
- didn't feel confident enough to vote
- I didnt feel Included
- Disappointed we are deciding something so important by VOTING, which is not a good way to decide things.

Specific to DeepFunding?

Although the Deep Funding team are keen to hear people's insights, there is a limit to what they can do about general problems and concerns about the token merger.

However, they might be able to address concerns that are specifically about how the token merger might affect Deep Funding.

So if you have anything further to raise that is specifically about Deep Funding, please add it below.