📝 Notes

Aug 13, 2025

Meeting Aug 13, 2025 at 16:59 CEST

Meeting records Transcript Recording

Summary

Paul Glavin introduced a community governance mechanism with conviction voting, using customizable funding and signaling pools, and discussed various voting weight systems and proposal collateral requirements. Participants like Jack Gale and Netrim explored different funding strategies and the mechanics of collateral tokens and voting. Additionally, Kenechukwu Eze and Jack Gale addressed the Nosis VPN project, proposed changes to Nosis ETH impacting governance power, and the critical need to renew and compensate the delegate program for continued community engagement.

Details

- **Community Governance with Conviction Voting** Paul Glavin introduced a governance mechanism using conviction voting, which allows for community-based decision-making with various customizable pools. These pools, whether for funding or signaling, can have unique purposes, parameters, and funding criteria, all utilizing a conviction voting element. Paul Glavin noted that the SAFE ecosystem uses its SAFE token as the staking token, allowing members to stake any amount to influence their voting weight in different pools (00:00:00).
- **Funding and Signaling Pools** Paul Glavin elaborated on two types of pools: funding and signaling pools (00:02:38). The funding pool provides low-friction funding for builders on the SAFE platform, as exemplified by a live proposal for updating owners across networks (00:00:00). Signaling pools, which do not have funding attached, are used for identifying ecosystem pain points and for

community admin elections, allowing for a democratic process to update signers (00:02:38).

- **Custom Voting Weight Systems and Implementation** Paul Glavin detailed custom voting weight systems, including a quadratically weighted builder's fund with an allow list for voting, and other systems like one-token-one-vote or fixed voting weights for all community members (00:03:51). They noted that while the setup has a learning curve, the end-user experience for voting on proposals is simple. Paul Glavin suggested replicating the existing community structure for Nosis, using the GNO token as the governance token, and funding a general pool (00:02:38) (00:05:06).
- **Proposal Collateral and Funding Strategy** Jack Gale inquired about the cost associated with signaling, to which Paul Glavin clarified that there is no cost, but a custom collateral deposit is required for proposals, which is returned upon execution or cancellation (00:06:24). Netrim and Jack Gale discussed the possibility of having different funds for different purposes rather than a single general fund, with Paul Glavin confirming that more granular funds with specific eligibility criteria would be beneficial for clarity. Jack Gale highlighted that dedicated funds might attract more applicants, and Paul Glavin suggested a model where a main funding pool could fund other specific sub-pools within Nosis (00:07:35).
- **Collateral Token and Voting Mechanics** Netrim asked about the choice of XDAI as the collateral token for the SAFE example, to which Paul Glavin clarified that the collateral token is always the network token for simplicity in the MVP product (00:08:35). Paul Glavin further explained that voting does not involve a transaction; instead, governance weight is calculated based on stake, the pool's voting weight system, and the number of active participants (00:09:32).
- **Pilot Funding and Community Engagement** Paul Glavin indicated that the SAFE ecosystem's pilot is funded with $40,000, with some funding streaming in over time to throttle availability. This amount is deemed sufficient to fund five to ten initiatives for a pilot, allowing for evaluation of what works and what does not (00:11:56). Kenechukwu Eze suggested proposing this model on the forum as a "temp check" to gauge community interest and discuss funding specifics (00:13:11).
- **Nosis VPN Project and DAO Representation** Kenechukwu Eze highlighted the Nosis VPN project, which seeks to appoint a DAO representative to its board, with

Jack Gale currently being the only indicated interest (00:14:28). Jack Gale clarified that the role involves a one-year commitment as a formal capacity position within Seldon's corporate documents, primarily to represent the DAO, rubber stamp items, and raise issues (00:15:26).

- **Nosis ETH Changes and Governance Power Balance** Kenechukwu Eze and Jack Gale discussed proposed changes to Nosis ETH, including the potential introduction of a GIP allowing Nosis Limited to make certain changes arbitrarily without governance. While acknowledging resource savings and security benefits for critical changes, Jack Gale expressed a desire to closely examine how this would affect the balance of power between the DAO and Nosis Limited (00:17:31). Kenechukwu Eze agreed on the need for a balance, suggesting that critical changes could be fast-tracked, but non-urgent changes should still go through the DAO for formality (00:18:32).
- **Delegate Program Renewal and Compensation** Jack Gale and Netrim emphasized the importance of renewing the delegate program, which was initially designed to solve the quorum problem and has succeeded in that aspect (00:19:38). Kenechukwu Eze highlighted the need for fair compensation for delegates to ensure consistent engagement, as non-compensated delegates may not be able to justify the time commitment required (00:21:58). A proposal for delegate compensation, including potentially rewarding highly engaged delegates retroactively, is expected to be shared in the coming weeks, ahead of the program's official end on October 15th (00:23:07).

Suggested next steps

- [ ] Kenechukwu Eze will share the proposal for delegate compensation and engagement in the coming weeks, targeting September first week for discussion.
- [ ] Kenechukwu Eze will scope out and put up a proposal on the forum, possibly as a temp check, regarding the funding question.
- [ ] Jack Gale will look at the new GIP that will include mechanisms for limited to be able to make changes arbitrarily and without having to go to governance.
- [ ] Paul Glavin will post a proposal in the chat.

Please provide feedback about using Gemini to take notes in a short survey.

📖 Transcript

Aug 13, 2025

Meeting Aug 13, 2025 at 16:59 CEST - Transcript

00:00:00

Paul Glavin: You can create a community with any governance token as the staking token. And then there's modularance pools um both funding and for signaling and so each of these pools can be set up with its own uh purpose and parameters and uh funding criteria and all that. Um and then gardens is our our mechanism that we pioneered is conviction voting. So all of them use a conviction voting element. Um so this is the safe ecosystem. Um safe has um it's safe token as the staking token. As a as a a member you can stake any amount of tokens and depending on the voting weight system in each pool that'll uh influence your voting weight in each pool. And so uh what we set up for the safe guardians uh community is three different pools. one funding pool that's kind of a general purpose builder fund. And so when you go into the pool, you can see uh how the pool works, the eligibility criteria, and this is essentially just offering low friction funding for builders of on the safe platform, uh who have an idea for something that they want to build that would be integrated into the platform, um to request funding for it and then get support from the community.

00:01:22

Paul Glavin: Um so this funding pool has been live and funded for like three days. So it's got one proposal now. This is a proposal to um for u updating owners across networks on on safes. Um so this is like an example of a type of build proposal that a funding pool like this could fund. Um, but I think maybe in the Nosis ecosystem, something more broad that could cover growth and marketing and adoption and kind of community building. Um, it might be a good idea to include that in the scope. Um, but this just gives a sense of what what a proposal looks like. And um, you can also see the so there's there's three markers on your on the uh kind of status of the proposal. There's the threshold, which is how much conviction the proposal needs to pass. Uh there's support, which is the amount of voting weight that's supporting that proposal. And then there's conviction, which is slowly growing over time to meet support. Um and that basically just creates a time delay in between when a proposal is supported and when it's actually executed.

00:02:38

Paul Glavin: um that that way the community can all see what's going to happen with proposals before they're executed, giving them time to change their support if they don't agree with how that support is being um distributed or also disputing the proposal. Um which is the the like final protection. If if there's an abusive proposal or someone thinks that that there's like a fundamental issue of the proposal going against the covenant of the community um then you can dispute it and then it goes into arbitration. Um right now that's just with a safe that you select as the arbitration safe account for that pool. Uh so that kind of uh shows you the the security measures in a a governance pool. Um and and yeah, so that that's how that's how a funding pool works. Once once the conviction reaches the threshold, then anyone can execute the proposal and it goes to the beneficiary set in that pool. Um in this community, we also have two signaling pools. Uh there's no funding attached to these. So uh here's one just identifying pain points in the ecosystem.

00:03:51

Paul Glavin: So there's no proposals on this yet, but people could say things that they think are are not working well in on the safe platform. Um, and then there's also a election of the admin in the community. Um, so this would probably also be a good idea for the NOSA safe. this basically allowing the community to update the signers on the admin safe for the community so that you have a democratic process for replacing those people if if they're not participating or um or being a a positive contributor to to the community. Um, so yeah, the I think like the easiest way to do this would just be to essentially replicate this community and then um all of the funding that Nosis might want to approve could just go directly into the fund and then that would be open funding for the community to govern and for people to create proposals for. Um, and then of course GNO token on Nosis chain uh would make the most sense as the governance token for the community. Um, and then the last thing that I didn't really touch on was those custom voting weight systems.

00:05:06

Paul Glavin: So you can see the builder's fund is quadratically weighted. Um, and the the because you need silver protection for that, we have um we have an allow list for who can vote in that and in the safe ecosystem. That's the top 50 leaderboard on the snapshot for the community. Uh so the addresses that have been the most active in governance and then also people that received a safe guardians ecosystem token allocation which were all of the applications um from people like gardens um that uh were were rewarded with safe for um for for participating in the ecosystem earlier. Um, and then there's the other voting weight systems are uh unlimited, which is just one token, one vote, no civil protection needed. And then there's also fixed where everyone in the community has the same voting weight. So you get a lot of options for for how you want to set up um governance. And yeah, it's a pretty powerful tool. It's it's still kind of uh primitive and a little user unfriendly and uh we have to work a lot with communities that are setting it up because um it's there's definitely a a learning curve and high friction for getting set up.

00:06:24

Paul Glavin: But uh for the end user it's pretty simple. Um you can go into these pools and stake tokens to get voting weight and then vote on proposals just like you do on any other governance platform in web 3. Um, so yeah, I I think like the simplest proposal is just uh replicating this and then requesting funding to just directly add into the the funding pool.
Kenechukwu Eze: Yeah, I think I think great.
Paul Glavin: Yeah.
Kenechukwu Eze: I think question from Jack first before natural
Jack Gale: Yeah, I had a couple of questions. Um, hope that's okay. Um, first of all, with the signaling, um, can I just check is it kind of there's no kind of cost attached to it. It's just kind of, well, I guess maybe the gas cost, but it's just kind of, yeah, to get impressions from people of what they which way they lean, which way their conviction goes.
Paul Glavin: Right. There's so yeah, there's no cost. Uh there is a a collateral um and you can custom set the collateral for for each pool and that's an amount that you're you're

putting as a deposit when you create the proposal.

00:07:35

Paul Glavin: And for signaling pools, generally that's super low because there's not a lot of risk associated with the pool because there's no money to steal. So that's just like a protective measure. You get that money back when your proposal is canceled or executed. Um, and then a person who would dispute a proposal would also put down a collateral and the the loser of that dispute would be the one that loses their deposit.
Jack Gale: And is it only the elected guardians who are able to post signaling proposals? or um to funds or is anyone able to Amazing.
Paul Glavin: Yeah, anyone in the community can create a proposal.
Jack Gale: Okay. Um and then with the um actual proposals themselves um the way you seem to have done it with safe is that there's just one kind of fund and then any kind of um like proposal can be put forward to that and it doesn't need to have any particular purpose. But do you sometimes do it where you have kind of different funds for different purposes? So we might have one for governance analytics, one for infrastructure, that sort of thing.

00:08:35

Paul Glavin: Right. Exactly. Yeah. Yeah. And the more granular you can get, the better because it just makes it easier to understand whether a proposal is a good fit and should pass um if you can be more specific on the eligibility criteria and what that funding is supposed to do. Um, so yeah, that's that's definitely a good approach.
Jack Gale: Yeah, that's great. Um because I was just thinking in line with kind of Kenna's proposal and then also the um governance analytics um temp check that we posted. Um there's just like a lot of kind of individual areas where we would be trying to kind of rustle up some support. But just having a general open fund, we might find that it's hard to attract people to to go for it. Whereas if we say, you know, we've allocated 10 E to this specific area and this is really what we're looking for, it might be easier to get applicants. So that's that's super interesting and flexible. Thank you for explaining.

00:09:32

Paul Glavin: Yeah. Yeah.
Kenechukwu Eze: Yeah.
Paul Glavin: One thing quickly that comes to mind on that, it um you could you could create a a funding pool that the purpose of it would be to fund other pools. Uh and then people could essentially propose a section uh within Nosis that should be funded and then um yeah set up a funding pool for that purpose and then fund it from the initial pool. That would be an option.
Kenechukwu Eze: Yeah, I think that's very helpful. So, up next is Netra. I'm so sorry for the wait. Um um it's Yep.
Netrim: No, please. No, no worries, Kiny. Uh, no. I was just going to ask Paul since this is um obviously going to tackle treasury allocation and obviously this will need to be enacted by us. How first why you vote with safe on your example obviously, but why did you decide the collateral to be X die? Is that because it's the gas token? Or wouldn't it make sense if you're voting with something to also post the same collateral?

00:10:39

Paul Glavin: Um yeah, so the the collateral token is always the network token. Um that was I think just simplicity on the MVP of the product. Um but to clarify, you're not voting with your your governance stake.
Netrim: Okay.
Paul Glavin: you you have a governance stake in the community and then as you activate your governance in different governance pools, it's calculating how much weight you have in that pool uh based on your stake, the voting weight system of that pool and how many other people have activated their governance. So, um yeah, you're not there's not a transaction when you vote in the way that some other governance platforms have.
Netrim: Okay. Okay. Okay. And in regards to sizing, how do you envision? I mean because we would need to be able to provide the funding obviously for these initiatives. So do you have a size inside uh on what you think would be an interesting number? So interesting enough to have the pilot and at the same time interesting enough on the other side for whatever builders or signaling you want to actually go forward with.

00:11:56

Paul Glavin: right? Yeah. the in this safe ecosystem. Uh it's this pilot is $40,000 and you can see three ETH is in the builder fund already and then the rest of that funding is streaming into the fund over time to kind of throttle the the amount of funding that's available over time. Um so I think easiest thing to do would just be to replicate that and um yeah I 40k is you know depending on the scope of the projects there's you know maybe maybe five or 10 initiatives that you could fund with that amount of money. So that feels like enough for for a pilot and and to see what's working and what's not working and how to make it better.
Netrim: Yes, I think it does. But obviously that can also be part of the discussion on the out on the pilot itself, right?
Paul Glavin: Rain. Yeah. Yeah. And I'm and I'm less familiar with the um like the the funding mechanism of of Nosis, like how much funding you can request and what the um yeah, what kind of variables there are for that.

00:13:11

Netrim: I don't think we have a um I don't think we have enough history of this kind of independent funding to actually say ah yeah this is a good number to be honest looking at the history of all the gips ever approved I I would say yeah we don't have enough information So it will be something either you propose or you actually leave it open-ended and the community discusses what would be an interesting number to have.
Jack Gale: And I think if you put up 40K and then people shout about it, it's not a problem to reduce it to 20K, right? So, um, yeah, it's just open for discussion.
Netrim: Yeah.
Paul Glavin: Yeah, that makes sense.
Kenechukwu Eze: Yeah, I think I think generally this is pretty um this this is pretty self-explanatory and pretty helpful and it's the fact that it's already being done at in noises eos um you know sub ecosystem entity is also a very good um indication of where it's going. So like from my end like I'll just propose that maybe you take some time maybe scope it out and put it up on forum.

00:14:28

Kenechukwu Eze: Um maybe to lessen the pressure pressure you could call it a temp check and just like see what people think um about it. Um so you could either put the funding question or not put that in but generally like we would just like encourage this um to go up on the forum to just see where people's heads is at. Um, so just picking up from where we left off, another proposal I wanted to highlight was was this the the NOS VPN project. So they're looking to appoint like a a DA representative I guess to sit on the board. So far the only person that has indicated interest is Jack Gale. So if anybody else is interested, they should please indicate and also please just read through I think this is a really good proposal and a really good read and just generally to just benefit from your comments and just highlighting everything that's going on in the ecosystem personally. But I think this is a really important proposal that should be read. Um so if you haven't looked at it, please go and look at it.

00:15:26

Kenechukwu Eze: Does anybody have any thoughts um on this proposal specifically? Go ahead, Jack.
Jack Gale: I just wanted to mention that I reached out to um Seb to speak a little bit about what would be involved in this um just to make sure that it wasn't you know going to have unforeseen difficulties or conflict of interest or anything like that for myself. Um and uh they were able to clarify a few things which were helpful. Um, so with it being a one-year appointment, um, they are looking for a delegate. Um, but they were happy that if there's if the delegate program doesn't continue or if there's an election and somebody loses their delegation, they would still continue in the same role if they would go for this position. Um, so whoever wants to have this position, it would be a full year's commitment. Um, they are also intending to um, put a name in um, before going to GIP129 to vote. Um, so unless I think there's several people who really want it and there's competition, um, I think they're just hoping to get a get it locked down and get it published.

00:16:27

Jack Gale: Um, and then, um, the kind of role will actually be fully entrenched within

Seldon's um, corporate documents. So, it is a kind of formal capacity role, but they made very clear that it's not like a it's not like you're an operating director making decisions about the direction of the the whole company and the project. you're more there to represent the DAO, rubber stamp things, raise issues, um, and yeah, make sure things are formally vetted.
Kenechukwu Eze: Yeah.
Jack Gale: Um, so hopefully that's some helpful clarification. And if anyone else wants to, I'm sure Seb is keen to answer any more questions.
Kenechukwu Eze: Yeah, that's really helpful because they have a lot of insight um into that but like yeah at least now like there's a bit more clarity wish more people on the call so we could talk about it some more but yeah apart from that the only other proposal is the changes to Nosis ETH I think it's pretty self-explanatory um you know please read it um thank you for providing your comment already but you make sure to read this does anybody have any thoughts on this proposal

00:17:31

Jack Gale: Um, one thing is that they I said this in the comment but they um suggest that they would like to introduce another GIP which will include um mechanisms for notice limited to be able to make these kinds of changes arbitrarily and without having to go to governance obviously that would be a you know a big saving resources um to not have to delay things for governance um but it is something where you know that slightly changes
Kenechukwu Eze: Yes. Good.
Jack Gale: the balance of power between the DAO and uh most limited so it's something that I want to look at um quite closely when it comes out and I just wanted to flag to everyone in case it's of Rest.
Kenechukwu Eze: Yeah. Yeah. From my perspective, I I see it as sometimes that changes that are critical. So another like we usually call them like fasttrack proposals like if you look at it a one and the rest of them. So like if it's a if it's critical to be fixed and the change just needs to be enacted to ensure the security of the protocol obviously it makes sense to just enact it immediately then give the dm motor once it's safe to do so within a reasonable amount of time.

00:18:32

Kenechukwu Eze: So I think that kind of balance could be fair. But if it's a nonurgent change, um yeah, I don't see any need why it doesn't need to like at least go through the doubt for formality sake even if everybody's going to ratify it in the first place. But yeah, apart from that, I think like this this is a basically like straightforward proposal. Fortunately, there's not a lot of activity um going on here. The only other proposals I would highlight are um the governance analytics proposal temp check. Um nothing else much really um on the proposal front. Something I wanted to ask about is there anything you guys think should be happening? Any proposals you think that should be coming up? Anything that should be proposed that is not currently being proposed? um whether it has funding attached to it or any breast practices that you're not currently seeing being enacted at the nurses that could help move things further.
Jack Gale: Um, one thing that you mentioned last last time we met met Ken was um about uh a renewal for the delegates program and what that would look like and how it would be a bit of a change.

00:19:38

Jack Gale: um would just love to see that kind of as far in advance as possible of it kind of going up on the forum so we can kind of make sure that it aligns with the delegates expectations and we're ready to go into that process quite actively. Um but yeah, I agreed with everything you were saying last time, so I'm I'm interested to see that when it's ready.
Kenechukwu Eze: Yeah, sorry. Please go ahead. Natural.
Netrim: No, no. I'm just going to uh go with Jack on that one. For sure. We need to have a delegate uh proposal. The the remember that the delegate program was ambition to solve the quorum problem and that part worked as intended. Then we can discuss if all the deleates were able to actually have the time uh commitment and and so on to be able to participate actively. But from a quorum perspective, that one works. So that's one of the things we for sure need to uh have. I'm talking we as a as a community, you know, we as KPK uh for sure.

00:20:43

Netrim: The other things that are going to happen just so everyone is on the same page. One of them is the let's call it continuation of the cashback program for Nosis Pay. This is being finalized internally by Nosis. Uh the proposal should hit the forum hopefully tomorrow. And last but not least is um one of the things that's related actually to GIP130 the NOS ETH issue which has implications for the governance community. Basically snapshot maintenance. That one is also something that has been discussed many times. Uh the the NOS guild did two proposals about it. Uh they were not uh approved by the DAO, but it's something that will need to happen.
Kenechukwu Eze: No, thank you. Thank you so much for the update. Yeah, really glad to hear regarding Yeah, the nurses pay cash back is very important. As a nurses pay card user myself, I'm glad to hear that um that's going to keep going forward. So, yeah, that um I think those updates are really helpful. I think with the delegate program just establishing a fine balance.

00:21:58

Kenechukwu Eze: Um I don't know if you remember Metum when we spoke about delegate program initially the issue was I I highlighted which we have seen to be true is when you're not compensating delegates you're not able to enforce punitive measures in in in um in a very good way. So from our end we've been tracking um delegates. in terms of who votes, who communicates their rational, maybe not your rationale thread, but even like in the original proposal um already. So just tracking who votes and who at minimum communicates their rationality in whatever form and you know some delegates do that really well, some don't. Some start well, but sometimes there's an inconsistency on doing that. So like weighing that in terms of how we're going to engage with delegates going forward, delegates do need to be compensated to be able to compel any form of engagement properly called. Um so like we have really good very experienced delegates um already part of this program but then they don't show up simply because maybe in their mind they cannot justify the time expense um for being here for being on the forum for commenting on every proposal for giving feedback or maybe even coming up with a proposal of their own.

00:23:07

Kenechukwu Eze: So like establishing what is fair compensation um for delegates considering the main thing that is being demanded of is that you vote.
Jack Gale: Come here.
Kenechukwu Eze: most delegates have been doing that well and that you provide feedback on proposals. These are the two main things. So on my end, we've been thinking a lot about like the um how well to compensate delegates effectively and what to do when you know they fall below that. So like we'll be sharing that proposal in the coming weeks. Um it's not yet because the delegate program started in April. So it will be officially elapsing in October. October 15th is when the six1 trial would officially end. So yes, so it will be ending in October.
Netrim: Correct.
Kenechukwu Eze: So we would be surfacing that long before then to just align um on in terms of like compensation for delegates because delegates do need to be compensated. Um another thing wanted to weigh is like as rewarding delegates who have been well engaged throughout this process better. So not just saying okay everybody now gets fl compensation.

00:24:07

Kenechukwu Eze: Now looking maybe looking retroactively which delegates like clearly stood out clearly did their work um better than others as a way of encouraging that kind of participation going forward. So yeah like we'll be surfacing that as soon as we can but it's essentially important because we're glad like now we have governance is a little bit more active than it used to be. So trying to build on that um will be very um exciting. So we'll put that up on we'll share it with you here with everybody here once it's ready. um maybe possibly we'll start with the telegram chat and then before bringing it on this call before um putting it up on the forum but yeah it's well ahead so just target October this program lapses in October so renewal um proposal should come probably September first week then we can start debating on that yeah yeah thank thank you guys so much um for taking the time um this is definitely an compensated call.
Jack Gale: Sounds great.
Kenechukwu Eze: So, I appreciate whatever time we can get. Um, so if there's no other questions on anything else and we could end it early.
Jack Gale: Sounds good. Thank you so much. I appreciate it.
Paul Glavin: Thanks for thanks for organizing, Keen. The these these calls and the the

the reminders and notifications in the chat are really helpful to stay on top of this.
Kenechukwu Eze: No problem. Thank you.
Paul Glavin: Appreciate it.
Kenechukwu Eze: Thank you very much. Thanks, guys. So, Paul, hopefully you can get a proposal up at some point. Um, we'll be rooting for you.
Paul Glavin: Sounds good. Yeah, I'll post it up in the chat.
Kenechukwu Eze: Thank you guys. Bye guys.
Paul Glavin: All right. See you guys.
Kenechukwu Eze: Bye

Transcription ended after 00:25:51