

Budget consent, Q4 2024 onwards – main issues mentioned in objections

Issue	what Quarter(s) was it raised in?	Tracking?
Regional Guilds: The idea that regional Guilds are somehow “duplicating” by doing their own onboarding marketing, education etc. Note: this was addressed in two or three Governance meetings, and the consensus was that it’s not really a valid objection, and actually, it <i>is</i> valid for them to work in this way and to be able to respond to the specific needs of their cultures.	Q4 2024	no - resolved as not a valid objection
Value of the work: Some objections raised were about the value or worth of the work being done (e.g. Education, Video, and Strategy WGs got objections of this nature). Should we address these kinds of fundamental objections; and if so, how?	Q4 2024	yes - we decided to decouple this issue from budget discussions, and discuss it in Governance
Process for starting a WG: The idea that a new WG was created, and submitted a budget, without checking whether it was wanted. Note: Since we do not have such a process in place, this probably means we need to create a clearer process for starting a WG. Possibly, it should be (as now) simply “submit a budget and see if people support it”, but then the objection cannot be “the WG hasn’t followed due process”, but would need to be “I don’t agree to having this WG”.	Q4 2024	no - we agreed to have no new WGs for the last Q1 and Q2 2025. But might need to be looked at again in future . There’s a draft process here DRAFT: process for starting a new ...

<p><u>Note:</u> there was also one objection suggesting that a new WG should be funded from the New Ideas budget; and there is also Treasury Policy WG's proposed "Slow Start" policy, which would restrict the amount a new WG can ask for.</p>		
<p><u>Do not want this Guild/WG to continue:</u> Related to the above, there were some objections that an extant WG/Guild should no longer exist. Should this be dealt with as part of the budget approval process, or should there be a separate process for it? Or should it be seen as an invalid objection?</p>	Q4 2024	No. Perhaps we need to think about a process for this, and under what circs it can be invoked.
<p><u>Work should be budgeted under another WG/Guild:</u> Raised in Q4 2024 for several WGs, but not since. Example: "This should be part of Education Guild" - but there was no evidence that the person objecting had actually asked e.g. Education Guild if they wanted this.</p> <p>Should this be a valid objection? If the work itself is deemed to be of value, does it matter where it is done? or should the people who want to do it be free to self-organise in the way they choose?</p>	Q4 2024	<p>No, as it's not been raised in the consent process for a while - altho there has been a suggestion of merging/ consolidating WGs.</p> <p>Do we need to discuss demarcation - what sorts of things "belong" to which WG? Or should we leave it to be raised ad-hoc?</p>
<p><u>Quarterly reporting:</u> Several objections for several different WGs that their quarterly reporting for the previous Quarter was not sufficiently clear and transparent - particularly, that it was not itemised in a sufficiently granular way.</p>	Q4 2024 Q1 2025 Q2 2025	<p>Should we track this for individual WGs, or discuss it in general terms? (There is no consensus on what the main problems are, so do we need to try and identify this?)</p> <p>Do we need some sort of standard or template?</p> <p>Is Governance the right place to discuss? If not, where?</p>

<p><u>Overall budget too high:</u> Several objections that a WG should reduce its overall budget. Common reasons given were either about current market conditions, and/ or because a disproportionately high budget makes the budget-lowering percentage unfairly high for all WGs.</p> <p><u>Note:</u> does this suggest there should be an overall budget cap? Or perhaps tiered caps, to reflect the fact that some WGs are always going to be more expensive than others? OR can we do this without a formal “cap” but just by saying a WG’s budget cannot be (for example) more than X% higher than the next-highest WG? And: should such caps only apply in times of low token price or other adverse market conditions?</p>	Q4 2024	no - we implemented budget caps for Q1 2025 onward, so this objection is no longer possible
<p><u>Use of WG reserves:</u> i.e. if a WG has an unspent surplus from a previous Quarter, they should spend this before asking for more.</p> <p><u>Note:</u> There’s broad agreement that if work has been assigned, but not finished, this is not actually a “surplus” and the money cannot be reassigned. Thi there are questions about whether there should be limits to this.</p> <p><u>Note:</u> See conversation in the Treasury channel in Q4 24 about Writers’ WG - https://discord.com/channels/909843832491896832/1150014268125753374/1291674268106493983</p>	<p>Q4 2024 (Writers’ WG)</p> <p>Q2 2025 (Marketing Guild)</p>	<p>Most of these kinds of objections come from Tevo as a Treasury issue. There seems to be some divergence between how Treasury sees the issue, and how the rest of the Program does.</p> <p>Do we need to discuss it in general terms, or related to specific WGs?</p>
<p><u>Overspend for specific budget items:</u> There were a number of objections that “XYZ specific task in this WG’s budget is too expensive”.</p> <p><u>Note:</u> Do we need a fixed price - or a range - for commonly-done tasks? If so, how will we address the fact that different WGs group tasks differently (e.g. sometimes meeting facilitation is a separate item; sometimes it is folded in to “WG</p>	Q4 2024 Q2 2025 (African Guild)	In Q2 2025 decision, there was a suggestion we discuss whether this is a WG autonomy issue or not - this would put the issue to bed.

management” or similar)? Or is this whole issue a “WG autonomy” thing, and WGs should be free to price tasks as they see fit?		
<p>Metrics: Several objections that a proposed budget line did not include sufficient detail on what would constitute “success”, or how it will be measured and what metrics will be used. Some of these objections demanded a great deal of detail.</p> <p>Note: perhaps some tasks don’t need pre-defined metrics, but are more exploratory and should be done in a more grounded-theory way.</p> <p>It also raises the question of whether, if we have metrics, we should also have specific targets?; and what would happen if the targets are not met?</p>	Q4 2024	?
Centralisation: objection to over-centralisation in a WG so that tasks such as submitting the budget can only be done by 1 person	Q2 2025 (Writers WG)	