Delegate Training Call - 2025/04/02 12:54 EDT - Transcript

Attendees

Abidemi Adenle, Alex Sampson, Christopher Lema, Edwin Fernandez, Eren Targ, Eugene Leventhal, Gabriella Mena Ogusuku, Ivey SEEDGov, Jamilya Kamalova, Kenechukwu Eze, Kevin Nielsen, Kirill | LobbyFi, Manuel González, Marlene (bitblondy), Matt Haynes, Nick Almond, Nneoma Kanu, Pedro Breuer, Sury Bonfil, Tino SEEDGov, Varit Ruangsiri

Transcript

Eugene Leventhal: Hello and welcome everyone. Today is Tuesday, April 2nd and this is the second governance call of the day. Specifically, this call is going to be focused on the delegate training or excuse me, disposal that we have that many folks have given feedback to and the SA labs team with Kenna and Noma have been reading on across the link in chat here.

Eugene Leventhal: but yeah, the focus really is to kind of go through and review some of the feedback. I guess Nola and Kenny, I'll start with just asking you all if you wanted to jump in and kind of address any open questions or I know you provided some feedback on the forum already, but I don't know if it's helpful. I can share screen and just kind of walk through some of the comments that have come up and some of the responses, but I know you've already kind of digested a lot of it and responded to it. So, happy to also just pass it off to you if you wanted to reflect on any of those changes.

Nneoma Kanu: I think it'll be nice because I tried to go through the discussion thread and kind of summarize what the feedback points were into some overarching themes. So maybe we could go through that point by point and cover some of that feedback and response. and if anyone wants to chime in along the way,...

Nneoma Kanu: feel free to do so.

Eugene Leventhal: So I will go ahead and...

Eugene Leventhal: and if anyone either wants to jump in with a comment, question or anything, please feel free to raise your virtual hand so I know to jump back to the other view. but yeah, otherwise we'll jump to some of the responses on the stable lab side and if anyone wants me to go back to the original comments, please let me know.

Eugene Leventhal: But yeah, Ivy, I see you have your virtual handout,...

Eugene Leventhal: so please feel free to jump in.

Ivey SEEDGov: Yeah. Hi everyone.

Ivey SEEDGov: So I think several points or feedback that have mentioned that we can maybe digest. I think one of the big ones was regarding budget. So maybe we can focus on that a bit and just address

some of the questions some folks had pretty valuable feedback anyway but maybe focusing a bit on the budget side of things has suggested that maybe we can narrow it down a bit and I'm not sure how you guys are feeling about this. it's hard to hit an exact number, right, that makes sense for everyone, but I think budget-wise was one of the main concerns the community had regarding this program. I'm not sure how everyone feels about this or what are the thoughts. We'd be okay maybe narrowing it down a bit. but

Nneoma Kanu: I think you're muted, Eugene.

Eugene Leventhal: Thank you for calling that out. but yeah, I do see there have been some different comments on the budget. I know, yeah, with Connor's first comment on the rate and estimate of ours. I guess would anyone who has provided some of the feedback and especially thought that the budget needs revision. would anyone mind kind of jumping in and presenting any specific concerns relating to it?

Nneoma Kanu: Just to jump in really quick, I don't think Connor is able to make it here today. We've been talking async on Telegram, but one of the suggestions that I could call out from his forum post was just like a smaller cost being along, 80 per hour with an estimated 20 hours of work, which would bring the cost of module development to 1,600 per module. And then if there are two people working on a module maybe that could be a little bit more like 2400 per moduleish. and then also there was issue raised around the facilitation cost which is 4.6k per facilitated session based on the total cost.

00:05:00

Nneoma Kanu: I think that one thing to call out here as well would be that so far we've just had folks kind of opting in to the different modules that are of interest to them and where they would like to work and just focusing on finalizing the details of this proposal. And the next proposal was meant to do a proper assignments to folks and facilitators will huddle to figure out what the best compensation structure was and how to make things fairly distributed.

Nneoma Kanu: So those more granular details have not yet been finalized and so it makes sense that there's issue being raised about the budget at this point and it's early enough I guess where we can take the inputs to change that if necessary.

Nneoma Kanu: I think there's other folks who think that the budget is fine. There's folks who think be more conservative. So yeah, interested to

Eugene Leventhal: in that please.

Eugene Leventhal: You're muted if you're talking that

Matt Haynes: Sorry, apologies. I'm currently giving my kid a bath, so if I jump off or anything, that's why. But, start screaming in the background, start getting through the wall. but I was kind of wondering in terms of the development of the curriculum, it's great that we've got all these people that want to contribute and I'm sorry if this is a comment that's already been brought up elsewhere, but I was curious, have we actually gone and found someone who specializes in developing curriculums for crypto or for other types of books because maybe we can find out what their cost will be and it might actually be better if we get someone independent.

Matt Haynes: Obviously there's still aspects of things we want to see, but is there value in having a proper qualified third party person focus on this and have them develop your course and then maybe we could

deliver it something else. So point if the timing for that question is it's just too late in the piece totally fine. It was just something that came up to me as I was thinking about the cost of the course. It's kind of hard to predict what these phases are going to be unless you've got a subject matter expert that can, give you a credit.

Eugene Leventhal: Hey, Ken, did you want to jump in there? Yes.

Kenechukwu Eze: Yeah. sorry can you guys hear me? good. Yeah. from my perspective, it's easy to place on to just develop cost material and deliver it. But I think the point of this we thought about this in the first place is leveraging the experience of existing people who have done this for a long time and trying to transfer that experience to the existing delegates and we have and possible new delegates that we're going to on board. So it would not be difficult to find someone who specializes in designing a course for crypto. But the thing about it is the nuance, the context and perspective that an experience delegate brings to it. For example, if you are designing a tokconomics course, it would make sense to bring on the guys from token engineering because they are actual token engineers.

Kenechukwu Eze: So I think there's a difference between just getting someone to develop a course as in getting someone or getting a number of people with context to develop a course. I think those are two different things al together.

Eugene Leventhal: Yeah, that is a great off.

Matt Haynes: Yeah, fair enough.

Matt Haynes: No, sorry.

Eugene Leventhal: No, I was going to say I even wonder theoretically if we did want to go that path who would fall into that bucket of professional governance curriculum developers. and yeah, I guess to Kenna's point, and I know some concerns were even brought up given the delegates that are represented here in general, do we need this kind of, program in the first place? I do think there's room for expansion. But yeah, I guess if there are specific suggestions, I think it would at least be interesting to exe, concurrent to this so that we could also just get a better sense of what other people are charging.

Eugene Leventhal: I don't know if the timing will work out to necessarily surface that information in the next week or two. but if anyone does have specific ideas, please do surface those. but yeah, Nick, please.

00:10:00

Nick Almond: Yeah, thanks. I think the costs are pretty fine to be honest. I think every DAO proposal ever ends up with this is too expensive. that's just a standard, and there's what, two people that said it in the forum. So there's I think to some degree you can overindex on these things a little bit. I think relative to it's a novel course. I also think the scarcity of knowledge I think that's the right question. is there governance specialists who could develop curriculum on the planet? Who are they?

Nick Almond: Where are they? They're here probably, right? there's not a huge amount of I wouldn't know where else to look. there is a der of crypto educational content out there anyway. Most of it is very unprofessional YouTube related stuff, so I think it's scarce knowledge. I think it'll be an asset that lives beyond this. So typically when you're sort of pricing in cost for educational content you would look at what would be the lifetime of the asset. Would it live beyond this? I think other people have said that this

is a spin-up cost. ultimately the curriculum would evolve from this point and largely you're just kind of like iterating from it thereafter.

Nick Almond: So I wouldn't expect the module development cost for example to roll into the subsequent iterations of this or if it did it would be a kind of refresh. Typically if you're in educational environments that I've seen you would I remember loosely pricing a MOO for some niche skill set a while ago and it being about 150 grand. So it's not a million miles out and that was market maybe eight years ago. so I don't think it's millions of miles off market. I think there's potentially an argument that facilitation costs of 5k per session is a little bit high. that would be kind of high.

Nick Almond: if you're paying an academic to run an academic course in a university, you have an academic in the room who delivers it and that's how you keep your costs down on that. So, that's probably high relative to market. I don't particularly think curriculum development costs particularly high. so, I think there's a potential credible argument to bring down facilitator costs a little bit more than curriculum development costs. But again, it's kickoff costs. It's scarce and specialist knowledge in a particular context and you know that there's what is the necessary amount to get it going. It's probably not a million miles away from this. That's my top two cents on

Eugene Leventhal: Thank you.

Marlene (bitblondy): Thanks Nick for your comments. I do think that's reasonable as well. I think Ivy already suggested they could go down a bit in a proposal and maybe we can find between Connor's suggestion in the thread and the initial proposal we could find some compromise.

Eugene Leventhal: for sure.

Nneoma Kanu: Absolutely. yeah, there's one more thing that I did want to call out in terms of why the cost might be a little bit daunting and I think that relates to priorities. So this is in line with the comment made by Pedro from ETH Argentina around the fact that this is not the time to allocate resources to training delegates or any potential delegates but rather to focus on growing the scroll ecosystem, driving network adoption and increasing builder engagement in governance.

Nneoma Kanu: and I think that from this I can kind of tell that there isn't too much of a focus in terms of how governance contributes to these aspects but I think from professional delegate teams at least from our perspective at stable lab the work that we do consistently makes a case for the fact that welltrained delegates with context. A diverse set of delegates that doesn't just include professional delegate teams also help to drive growth, help to support positioning in the broader landscape, help to increase builder engagement depending on how follow-on initiatives after the training are designed.

00:15:00

Nneoma Kanu: So yeah, just like drawing that line between and finding a common thread between how good governance and diver a diverse delegate set and a well-informed voting body is able to contribute to growth to security. delegates act as a line of defense for the protocol. And I think a of these points were reiterated by Kenna and some of the responses but making sure that we are assigning the proper value to governance is also something that I wanted to highlight.

Eugene Leventhal: Yeah, and I'll just quickly comment on that as well before passing it off to Ivan. I do think that, in addition to what you just mentioned, the logic of trying to bring in folks with hopefully slightly

different sets of expertise and continuing to expand the sort of intellectual diversity amongst delegates is important to making sure that we are able to address all of the challenges of governance. I don't necessarily think we should kind of be doing this or doing ecosystem growth things as an either or. We obviously should be doing both.

Eugene Leventhal: And over the next two weeks we're going to dedicate most of the governance calls towards ecosystem growth and really towards prioritizing figuring out a more focused strategy there and really surfacing what ideas we think amongst the current delegate set and those in the community seem like the most reasonable and achievable things for us to prioritize from that ecosystem growth perspective. but yeah, I would just encourage to kind of right the broad landscape of challenges is wide and obviously the ecosystem growth side is one of if not the top one that we're facing. So we shouldn't pretend that's not the case.

Eugene Leventhal: But at the same time, we shouldn't forget that having a broader set of activated contributors can also lead to positive outcomes in the long run, especially hopefully as we catalyze catalyze change and make progress towards improving on the ecosystem growth side. but yeah, Ivy and then

Ivey SEEDGov: Just one comment for the record, we don't think the budget is outrageous, we think it's fine and we are aiming to a very high quality, program. It's just to fine-tune a couple of things and I think we ready to go and I know the post we made regarding the status of the scroll chain, it's being referenced, but we do see value in these kind of programs. We do think that governance should be expanded on and educated So happy to drop a comment in that line. We don't think these things are exclusive right while we try to grow the chain we can do this sort of experiments let's say. So we don't think those are exclusive. So happy to keep endorsing the program.

Eugene Leventhal: Great. Thank you for sharing.

Nick Almond: Yeah, I think again not too surprising a comment. people are desperate for growth and it's what every network wants to drive towards we want more builders, we want more apps, we want more transactions and so on. but I think this has come out of months and months of iterative deliberation in the DAO. it's clearly a desirable thing to be working towards and we've got towards the point where it's sort of crystallized into a thing. I think the response to that this is one of a plural set of goals that the network is aiming for.

Nick Almond: And I think actually one of the things that's interesting about scroll is that it is committing to things like this. So when it comes to what differentiates you as an L2 the core group of highly engaged contributors that have high context and collective intelligence around the network is one of the most valuable things that there is. So I think it's a product of a long conversation and I was there at the very early stages of these designs. These things have come out truly as a sort of collective decision, It's not come out of nowhere. So I think it's one of genuinely a really positive asset for the Dow to focus on this stuff. and I agree with what others have said.

00:20:00

Nick Almond: I think a very high quality set of governors that are scroll focused and well trained. We don't focus on capacity building at all in crypto Dows are underskilled generally. so I think I'll drop these as

comments on this forum thread but I think it's genuinely a differentiator that's happening here. So I think we should emphasize

Eugene Leventhal: for sure. Yeah.

Nneoma Kanu: Yeah, really quickly, I just also wanted to point back to something that we had discussed a little earlier on in these sessions around career delegates that might be able to be maximally aligned with the interest of a specific protocol, in this case scroll. and these programs kind of minting, you could say, those types of delegates that might not be professional delegate teams, might just be individuals that are well positioned to be career delegates focused solely on scroll governance, and in that way, they're maximally aligned with interest and have no conflict. So that's another I think benefit of opening up the floor to a more diverse delegate set. yeah, I know we have other points to discuss, so happy to move along

Eugene Leventhal: Dan, I think to Nick's point there, I personally obviously see this as very aligned with some of the longer term intentions of the Dow and how we would hope to see that differentiation form. so I'm glad it's resonating with at least some folks. so yeah definitely can jump in and add a comment there as well to be in support of that. on the budget side to kind of add my own two cents there. I do agree with the comment at least in my take in seeing the development costs.

Eugene Leventhal: I agree that those do seem quite reasonable and to give another price point I know when I was working in academia at least when it was third party service providers coming to say they will develop and deploy some kind of virtual course there is usually for 16 classes and not eight but yeah those costs usually just a development cost granted that included full AV but would start at the lowest in the 100 150 range and if there's multiple 100k that would usually be if there's multiple. So just seeing for a pure obviously we're not going to have full course development here to that depth of recording quality and multi-hour videos etc. but nonetheless the development cost does seem reasonable.

Eugene Leventhal: I was going to say on the facilitation side, it might be helpful and sorry if this is in one of the later comments and I just missed it. but it might be helpful to clarify what is part of that. I could see why, if people are seeing that, hey, you're getting paid, someone's getting paid 5K to jump in and come in for an hour. Obviously, that seems exorbitant. especially in these markets, no one should be making 5K an hour. but I also know that's not all that goes into running one hour of programming. and so I think at least clarifying that and if we do see the expectation of hours for a facilitator of a single section falling under 20 to 25 hours, maybe it is reasonable to cut those in half potentially. is just my personal assessment.

Eugene Leventhal: of course, this is ultimately, DAO proposal, Dowo decision. so we'll defer to the community there, but just wanted to kind of chime in with my thoughts there. yeah. face.

Nick Almond: Yeah, likewise I think Connor did just sort of divide by the facilitation time by the number of hours and it does seem high. So I think a concession here would be to bring that down by some margin. one of the things that would perhaps amplify the impact of that budget is quite often we would have a budget for invited speakers that if we start inviting people to particular sessions to give a 20-minute input and we're asking them to develop content

Nick Almond: for it. Perhaps a particular thing, then you might start thinking about budgets that make sense like that. If we're going to start drawing in names from around the space who are experts in these particular things and for that we want a budget and if so it might be worth spinning that out as a separate line like an invited speakers budget. in which case it's like we're putting out a public call to invite highquality people from across the space to produce that. And for that there is a fee for it a kind of PDM for it. but yeah I think there's definitely space for those. I think what we might have done here is presumed that all facilitators will be present for every session which might not be necessary.

Eugene Leventhal: Yeah, thank you for sharing there. So I realize I also don't want to be dismissive of any of the opinions that have come up. So I feel like the most foundational opinion that has come up is this the right time for slash do we need this kind of progress? I think before we keep going through some of the details, it would at least be good to pause on that for a moment and see if there are any thoughts, concerns that have not been brought up so far on the kind of why are we doing this and is now the time to do this? That means

Nick Almond: Yeah, I don't mind jumping in on that. I think this is exactly the time to be doing it to be honest. I think concentrating on governance will get hard when you're in a different phase of the market. there's coordinating highly and get basically everyone disappears when token prices are depressed and everyone's a bit depressed. So actually coordinating people to build a high coherence community, this is the time to do it in my mind. that the noise of a bull market is not a particularly great time for this. so just in terms of market timing I think it's a good time and also these are potentially people that will stick around the network for a long period of time.

Nick Almond: I don't know what are you you meant to bring these people in late once when you need them you want them there right so ultimately the complexity of decision making is only going to increase as the DAO does more stuff as network complexity increases as interdependence across the different regions increases and so on it's only get more of a difficult job so the time for capacity building is at the beginning so I think there's very credible arguments to that now is the right time for it. it's not something that you want to do later in the game in my mind.

Eugene Leventhal: And thank you for sharing. stage roll, please.

Pedro Breuer: Hey first of all, apologies for not joining the discussion before. sadly I'm not with a lot of time to join all the calls. I know you've been working in this program for a lot of time. Nick, you mentioned that. sorry and apologies for joining just at the end of the discussions. we in Ethereum Argentina have a different point of view on this. you've been discussing it. answering directly to Unic. Yes, I think the highest priority right now should be network growth. of course it's just an opinion and but in our point of view that should be the biggest priority. I understand you can say we can tackle different priorities at the same time. Yes.

Pedro Breuer: or of course it's true but I don't love the idea of having the first proposal or the third proposal of the DA being paying delegates to do delegate work I know it's not as simple as that but it's the message you sent to the ecosystem right to the builders I'm concerned on that I would love to have discussions regarding proposals to

Pedro Breuer: support builders to support development to support DeFi incentives it was delayed I understand why it needs more discussion because of what's going on in the ecosystem and on the incentives from different L2s it's fine but it's the message we are sending that concerns me the most and I mostly agree with everything that was said here. it's not that I'm against delegates training. On the opposite I agree it's very important. I agree that it's useful. It's just that I don't think it's the right moment.

Pedro Breuer: as I mentioned just where I think LG is we have a great set of delegates here even more than those I mentioned there it's not urgent I think it's something that can be delayed until we have at least a couple more priority struggle before delegates training that that's just my opinion and on what Noma mentioned before I'm not sure that a delegate training program is enough to retain that talent in the DA. the governments takes a lot of time. so having a small delegation or just completing the program I don't think it's enough to retain that talent.

Pedro Breuer: as a goal to bring more talent to the law, this will necessarily have a follow-up proposal to have incentives for that economic incentives because if not people won't stay for a long time. it makes sense people needs to earn money to work for money. So, I don't know if I agree with that, but of course it's just a point of view and Bless you.

Eugene Leventhal: No, thank you for sharing, Pedro. And yeah, especially with the diversity of opinions, I think it's important to recognize that and acknowledge it. So, yeah, I appreciate you sharing there. I will just quickly say that the foundation team will be we're shooting to put forth a proposal for delegate incentives as well in this month so that can also potentially make it for the May 1 voting cycle. so yeah hopefully within no more than two weeks we'll have something more formal to present. but yeah I know that is a separate topic and I don't want to derail us as I know we have minutes left in terms of some of the feedback here and there's a bit of a queue developing. So, let's jump to Matt and then NMA and then Abigail.

Matt Haynes: Appreciate Pedro, I really appreciate your comments. And I'm curious as to what you think would be an appropriate time then. What would be the market conditions or chain conditions that would trigger an appropriate time? and just as an overall thing, Nick and I speak a lot is that one of the things about Dows in general, and decentralized work is that you're generally expected to work a lot for free. you're just expected to turn up and do stuff. especially on the governance side of things, people kind of reward buildersish. There's an innovation gap there. It's not quite as simple as that, but governance is generally something which is just people expected to do and turn up the calls and do all of that sort of stuff. So there is something there about closing the gap on that and having a respect and value people's time. I think that's a big part of retaining people.

Matt Haynes: So yeah, just more some comments on that main question I suppose which is what would trigger a good time to do this?

Eugene Leventhal: I know my

Nneoma Kanu: I'm happy to hold if Pedro wants to respond to Matt's question.

Pedro Breuer: Yeah, I'm not sure I can say this would be exactly the perfect time to drop this proposal, but I would love to see other priorities tackled before. build some programs to support development at least what verticals we want to see in scroll developed I would like to say that the scroll now is investing in

ecosystem growth before governance growth that would be the first thing that should be prioritized after that it's fine to focus on the DAO, but I feel like I don't know.

00:35:00

Pedro Breuer: it hard to set a point on time, but it's just about the priorities.

Nneoma Kanu: Yeah, thank you for your input, Pedro and Matt. I think, just to kind of reiterate a bit of the points that I mentioned is I don't quite see governance growth as being separate and removed from ecosystem growth. I think of it as an enabling factor to ecosystem growth and having an informed set of delegates. The way we look at it at stable lab at least is the knowledge gap between token holders and a sufficient pool of capable delegates is one of the most fundamental challenges for scaling protocol security and growth. So having that aligned and informed and empowered set of participants that are governing the protocol are able to really contribute to those topline metrics that every protocol is shooting for.

Nneoma Kanu: and so that's why I see this as just sort of like a first step in enabling various growth initiatives, integrations, security initiatives and so on. I don't think that this training program is meant to exist in a silo. I think it can really give way to many of the things that Pedro you're looking for and many of us also are looking to see down the line. And of course much of these are proposed from top down from the foundation and just finding the right ways that these can live alongside each other and the right synergies that we can create between each of these different initiatives and informing training delegates. there's a module on strategic governance.

Nneoma Kanu: We can see how strategic governance plays out in different dials where delegates have more of a sense of ownership and are able to from the vantage point that they have seek out opportunities, identify growth opportunities, steward grants programs, build their initiatives, create more alignment with folks who have the most skin in the game. token holders feel more confident in the set of delegates that are present to delegate tokens and really increase that votable supply and have decision-making in the DAO be like a key aspect that enables all these things that we want to see happening in the ecosystem. so yeah that is the key point that I wanted to drive is we don't see governance growth as being separate from ecosystem growth actually we see it being sort of like the enabling aspect of that.

Eugene Leventhal: Thank you.

Abidemi Adenle: Yeah. hi everyone. Hi Eugene. and hi Omar. I think very interesting conversations that has been happening so far. But I think I just wanted to point out that perhaps the main problem that we keep having in terms of like people saying we're not ready for a governance program. we need to focus on ecosystem growth. Maybe because maybe the work is not yet holistic. So if things were happening at the same time or side by side if a lot of the local nodes were trying to get up contributors were being onboarded and also maybe being funneled into the governance program.

Abidemi Adenle: so it is going to be a consolidation of work. So people would be able to see clearly the funnel that somebody would have to a great contributor to scope the D for instance would have to go through to actually start providing value because now they would be a clear funnel. but I think what is missing is that it to a lot of people that the delegate training seems to be a major thing and they're like this sort of needs to take the back burner and we need to focus on ecosystem growth but personally I do

think that there's a very strong need for decoding because generally just participating in decentralized governance can be a very very rough

Abidemi Adenle: sports to be for so many reasons and we've seen how in so many different ways in the past and not saying other DS there have been delegates that were not even aligned with the mission of the DA or were not even really doing delegate work and in so many ways it ended up being a problem or ended up causing something because the delegates just really were not doing the work that they were supposed to do. I do think that there is a need for this. But again, I think my own impute is the problem that I'm seeing or that I'm taking out from people's conversation is that other things are not happening in tandem with the delegate trading. So people are actually mostly concerned. So yeah, that's what I think.

00:40:00

Eugene Leventhal: Yeah, thank you for sharing, Abu Demi. And I do just want to quickly flag two things because I recognize we have around a little less than 15 minutes left and there might be other points relating to this proposal that we want to get into. so yeah, if we want to slowly start changing tracks after these next few comments to see what other questions or concerns there might be for this, I think that would be helpful. and again to the fundamental what is happening alongside this one right this proposal will go up for May 1 next week and the following week we're going to have ecosystem discussions and it's possible for us to have an ecosystem plan of some kind start going live May 1st as well right so it is not impossible for us to have this potentially go to vote at the same time as an ecosystem effort so yeah I just want to be

Eugene Leventhal: mindful of that distinction and that next week and the following week our governance calls are very much going to be rooted and pretty not solely there's going to be at least one other one but yeah we're going to really prioritize ecosystem growth in terms of the overall conversations but yeah Chris and then Nick

Christopher Lema: Yeah, cool. thanks everyone for the comments. yeah. I mean, I want to touch on I don't want to make it seem like we're picking on Pedro, but I do think he brings up a great point of conversation I think it's more of, the comment he has made has come surfaced from this discussion around the delegate training, but I do think it's more of a conversation of how the current DAO is operating and how we're priorizing things, the dial has been going on for about I think six months now. Please correct me if I'm wrong.

Christopher Lema: and when we first started this out right the three buckets that we had in mind were ecosystem growth global community and governance iteration right and in those six months I think we've seen a lot of support for the governance iteration side we've seen the global community with the local nodes has been taking shape and it's doing it but it does feel like the ecosystem growth bucket has sort of stalled especially after there was an attempt to do the grants program market conditions and all that has sort derailed that. but I do think it's an important conversation for Dow to in terms of, we have these different areas that we're focusing on, these different verticals. It seems that we're not doing a good job of propping one of these up and now how do we redirect our attention to make sure that doesn't happen, because I do think Pedro brings up a good point in terms of how does this reflect to those that aren't viewing this work on a day-by-day basis.

Christopher Lema: I think we have the full context and we understand why these things are happening. But for someone that, even if they go through this delegate training program and if we do want someone

to focus on ecosystem growth, if we don't have anything for them to do, they're going to be like, why would I be interested if I don't see anything happening on that side, And I do think that sort of positioning is something to keep in mind. I don't think it should necessarily block this, right? I think this can still happen. we still have four weeks or 3 weeks or so before the next voting cycle. Is it ambitious to kind of put something together to start working towards ecosystem growth? I don't think so.

Christopher Lema: And to the point you made, Eugene, right, I think we do want to prioritize something on the ecosystem growth side over the next couple of meetings because I do agree that it seems to be out of all the areas the DAO has been focusing on, it's the one that requires a little bit more attention and redirection from the Dow to kind of orient ourselves and do it. in terms of the comment I do want to like yes from the Dow side it does seem like the ecosystem growth side is stalling but labs has been working a lot of stuff on that there's things like the open campus there is going to be soon to be more formal ecosystem fund coming to help scroll builders so there are a lot of things being worked on so it's not like there is nothing happening on the scroll side when it comes to supporting the ecosystem but I do want to see something more concretely coming

00:45:00

Christopher Lema: from the scroll dial. so just wanted to share my thoughts on that and thanks Pedro and everyone else for servicing this discussion.

Eugene Leventhal: And thank you for that,…

Eugene Leventhal: Nick, please.

Nick Almond: Yeah.

Nick Almond: Yeah, thanks for that It was really helpful. I think Matt said it earlier. There is actually a lot of focus on builders. I think in here it's just not as evident in the DAO, but it's clear that there is other areas elsewhere that probably be helpful to be surfaced in the Dow that says that that's happening. But I think Pedro made a really interesting point that people will look at the kind of DAO consensus mechanism as a sing signal to what the network is focused on and is sort of interpreting it as the priority pipeline for what the network cares about. Right? So I actually think that's a good idea.

Nick Almond: I don't think it is that now, but it could be. So, I think it would be a bad idea to kind of wind down all this work just on a kind of matter of timing on a governance paradigm that doesn't yet really exist. but it could do. I think one of the things that could help with proposal sequencing is a priority list drawn from the delegates. we did have a sequence on preference signaling at one point.

Nick Almond: it might be worth sort of bringing up the preference signaling thing again as a means to being able to more clearly define what the ecosystem priority should I actually think Pedro is right that one should be ecosystem priority. but it doesn't mean that other priorities can't exist in sequence, it's a matter of sequencing. but I think it's a really good point. and it is a mode that the Dow could move into if it wanted to.

Eugene Leventhal: Yeah, thank you for that, Nick.

Ivey SEEDGov: Yeah, circle back we don't think these things are exclusive, We can have a focus on ecosystem growth which I know you guys are working a lot on and have this governance rails just what

Naom said this enables a lot of things in the OP program there were even builders right joining the delegate training because they were curious in governance and stuff. So I think the fact that with this market and the scroll down managing this level of activity and engagement I do believe this is on a big part because of governance and because of all the initiatives we have going on. so growth is a priority. I know you guys are working on it. We've been very vocal about it. But we don't think this program in some way undermines those initiatives.

Ivey SEEDGov: and then again budget wise is nothing compared to other programs on that end. having priorities I think it's good. but we do think that this is a priority as well, right? They're not exclusive by any means. so yeah, that's what our head is at right now.

Eugene Leventhal: Yeah, thank you for bringing that up and appreciating the discussion that's happening here. So, recognizing that we have a little less than 8 minutes left, I do want to see if there's any other, we talked about the budget. We took a step back to discuss the general timing and kind of purpose and need for this kind of proposal. Are there any other questions, thoughts, concerns about this proposal in general while we're all here together? Yes. No more, please.

Nneoma Kanu: I think one interesting thing that was raised in the thread was around the incentives aspect and the program itself and that idea of passing folks who pass through the program onto a structured delegate incentive program rather than incentivizing them to go through the learning program itself. And maybe we can't really cover all the points on that in this call. I know we all have some time constraints, but I thought that was quite an interesting one to discuss and see what because I think this space is highly financialized. and there's a current trend set of offering incentives for doing almost anything.

00:50:00

Nneoma Kanu: And it's worth considering if that's the way that we actually want to go to make folks really aligned with completing the program and follow through and all the things we want to see instead of having folks drop off and having a lot of churn. but yeah, that was an interesting point raised by I think Dawn of Dows that said, this actually is The fact that you get to be trained and this opens up opportunities for you to potentially earn through a structured DIP style program should incentivize you to follow through.

Eugene Leventhal: Yeah, thank you for surfacing that. I mean, I'll quickly comment and then if anyone else, please feel free to jump in with virtual hands. I mean, at the end of the day, I think it depends on who you're trying to attract. I understand the logic of, the quality of the offering should be good enough that that should be the value itself. there is the other view that I think is that's kind of based in the idea of it makes sense to pay people to learn because a lot of the time the people who could have the most new opportunities presented from that education they might not actually have the opportunity to partake in the education unless it is compensated I have a feeling for this first goound we're probably going to attract folks who are

Eugene Leventhal: already pretty web 3 curious. but nonetheless I do think if as an ecosystem we want to prioritize kind of onboarding folks who might not always just have the privilege and luxury of just having extra time each week to do a thing for fun. this does potentially help people make it easier to justify for folks who might not be as financially comfortable to be able to partake in these programs. and I think there's always a balance there and we don't know who's going to apply yet. So that the logic one way or

another is kind of going blind at the moment. but yeah, nonetheless, that is something that I wanted to mention.

Eugene Leventhal: I think in general and where we're going to be headed with governance here is that, folks are doing consistent work, you should be compensated. I am personally a fan of training and educational programs that compensate people again because in the long run, you make it possible to deal to attract a much different user base there. but we do have to recognize that especially in the first one, maybe even two or three iterations, we might just effectively giving bonuses to people who probably would have done it without it. and we did have the survey results somewhere.

Eugene Leventhal: J, I'm forgetting where if that was in a forum post or just in a writeup, but we did see it was a non- insignificant number of people who said that they would only be able to justify the time spent on doing this if they had some money coming in and we can unpack the details, and whether or not those are necessarily the target audience or not. but I did just want to present that view.

Eugene Leventhal: Does anyone else have yeah, please.

Nneoma Kanu: Yeah,...

Nneoma Kanu: no, I was going to say absolutely. I've been through a couple programs that incentivize learning. I think that also within this program, the idea is to have hands-on tasks that can actually seed a lot of the types of proposals that would be really useful for the DAO. So, not just theoretical work, but practical work that is beneficial for the DAO. And in that case, folks do deserve to be compensated. I just thought it was an interesting point to raise to see if anyone, had any thoughts.

Eugene Leventhal: Yes.

Nick Almond: Yeah, just on that point, I think that's a really good idea. I would certainly think about phrasing the assessments to be of utility to the DAO in the wider s that it's a way of focusing delegate time and effort and attention and work on something and...

Nick Almond: it would be a really good idea to lens that into something that's useful for the DAO as well.

Eugene Leventhal: And thank you Chamila for highlighting the survey results.

Eugene Leventhal: Yeah, I know we're about to be hitting time. are there any other elements of the overall proposal that folks want to stress that, until X gets resolved that you're not going to feel comfortable voting on it? or anything to that degree. at least to just surface the topics, even if I do have a hard stop in a minute, so can't go over today, unfortunately.

00:55:00

Nneoma Kanu: I just wanted to say maybe to wrap up, we do have some good insights that we could probably take back to the facilitator group and organize a smaller working session to find out the best areas to, update, flesh out, and add some more detail and color to make the proposal, even better. and then maybe we reconvene next week and see any other outstanding aspect. So Kenna and I can take the lead on figuring out the right time for such a session. we'll definitely share that in chat in the wider group.

Nneoma Kanu: And if there's anything else outstanding then we can address that. Maybe dedicate this and next week to ironing out any last few details and hopefully send that to vote and see what comes of it. But yeah, thank you all. so much.

Eugene Leventhal: Yeah, thank you so much.

Eugene Leventhal: And we do currently have a half hour before this time of today's call slotted for next week. So, if that's still convenient, we can use that. we can obviously reschedule as needed. but yeah, thank you everyone for joining the conversation and yeah, next week we're going to start having some e growth focused conversation. So really excited to kind of follow up on the energy that was being presented there because that is really so yeah, thank you all so much and speak soon.

Nneoma Kanu: Thanks. Bye.

Meeting ended after 00:57:47 👋

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