Archivists Notes, Dec 04, 2024

Cardano Constitutional Convention

This document contains three sets of notes for Dec 04.

Authors, in order of the notes provided below: Jungi (Oscar) Hong, Lorenzo Bruno, Ha Nguyen

---

Convention Session Notes

- **Session Name: Constitutional discussions**
- **Date: 4th December 2024**
- **Time: 9:50am ~ 16:00pm(GMT-3)**
- **Location: Buenos Aires**
- **Archivist Name: Jungi (Oscar) Hong**
- **(If available) Link to recording: N/A**

---

1. Key Takeaways

(Briefly outline the primary points or ideas discussed during the session. Highlight any actionable insights or critical information.)

- **Article 4: The Cardano Blockchain Budget** was the most actively discussed topic and underwent significant changes in content.
- There was a strong emphasis on the need for continuous improvement, and concerns about centralization were notably high. However, during the "temperature checks," there was no overwhelming consensus on most points.
- Provisions that were vague or open to interpretation elicited particularly sensitive reactions from participants.
- However, in some discussions, the focus was more on the interpretation of English words rather than the core content and mechanisms of the constitution.

2. Conclusion

(Summarize the overall message or decisions made during the session. Include any next steps or outcomes.)

- **Structural Edits**
    - Definitions were moved to an appendix (e.g., terms like ADA owner, voting states, CC, and DReps).
- **Article 1 Updates**:
    - Tenets were refined, focusing on fair contribution recognition, consent for data handling, interoperability, value preservation, and equitable treatment.
    - Temperature checks determined whether further discussion was needed.
- **Article 4**
    - The name "The Cardano Blockchain Budget" was changed to "The Cardano Blockchain Ecosystem Budget."
    - Replacing "Cardano Blockchain Ecosystem" with updated terminology across sections.
    - Proposal to clarify "Drep script" usage, particularly for auto-abstain options in voting.
- **Definition of Budget**
    - Ensuring budget amendments follow the same process as the budget process itself.
- **Treasury Withdrawals**
    - Proposal to restrict staking or delegation of funds held in trust.
- **Administrators for Budget**
    - Suggested minimum of two administrators instead of the current "one or more" requirement.
- **Voting outcome**
    - **73 Epochs vs. 12 Months**
        - Voted to change the timeframe for budgetary reviews from "12 months" to "73 epochs."
    - **Retention of "Time to Time" Phrase**
        - Decision to keep this phrase in the final text for clarity.
    - **Operations Inclusion**
        - Reinstated the term "operations" with additional clarifications to define its context.

3. Q&A

(List the questions asked during the session and their corresponding answers. Include the name of the speaker who provided the answer, if available.)

- Question 1: Is the budget discussed in Article 4 intended for individual entities or the entire community?
    - Answer: It's intended to apply to the entire community.
- Question 2: (About fluctuation)The Cardano community is expected to request the necessary budget at least once annually, but ADA prices fluctuate continuously. Therefore, it seems very challenging to set a baseline amount in fiat currency or USD for

the annual budget. How can the necessary annual budget be established in fiat currency or USD?

    - Answer: The community can request a certain amount of ADA sufficient to cover fiat costs from various vendors performing the required work. To ensure community members can plan for a year or more of operations, there will be two treasury withdrawals of substantial sums to cover these costs over a specified period.
    - These treasury withdrawals allow fiat currency to be held in the bank, ensuring the necessary budget can be executed as needed.
- Question 3: Most organizations have a defined fiscal year with a clear start and end date. However, the Cardano draft constitution seems to suggest that we have our own budget, but the start and end points are unclear. Simply stating that it will be implemented on an annual basis is very ambiguous. Additionally, the definition of the "Cardano Blockchain Budget" is not clear. While the process of managing treasury funds mentions the need for an audit, how can the Cardano Blockchain interact with this process?
    - Answer: Section 1 expects that at least one budget will be proposed annually. However, it does not exclude the possibility of proposing smaller, more frequent budgets or budget amendments as needed. The intent of Section 1 is to ensure that an anticipated budget is available annually to avoid situations where no usable budget exists. Ultimately, the budget cycle depends on how the community decides to manage it.
- Question 4: What happens once the money is received by the Economic Development Holding? There is currently no community-elected board member or seat on that holding. Additionally, there’s nothing in the Constitution preventing this entity or Intersect from using the money to vote or from staking and using the rewards. How is this addressed?
    - Answer: This concern is outside the scope of the Constitution. The Constitution does not govern entities or their actions. Such issues pertain to the Intersect process or external governance mechanisms, which are separate from Article 4.
- Question 5: Should the term "operations" be retained in the budget section, and should the net change limit be more explicitly included?
    - Answer: The inclusion of "operations" in the budget section requires a consensus decision. Regarding the net change limit, it is already mentioned in **Article 4, Section 3**, so there is no need to add it redundantly. However, participants are encouraged to review its placement for clarity.
- Question 6: What is the long-term intent for the budget and treasury withdrawal process?
    - Answer: The long-term goal is to implement a distinct governance action separate from the current INFO action process for budgets and treasury withdrawals. Currently, INFO actions are being used because they require a protocol fix post-constitution.
- Question 7: How does the constitutional committee interact with the budget and treasury withdrawal process?
    - Answer: The constitutional committee's role is to determine the constitutionality of proposed budgets or treasury withdrawals. If a budget or withdrawal aligns with

the constitutional guidelines, it is deemed constitutional and can proceed. This additional step is specific to budgets and treasury withdrawals, distinguishing them from other INFO actions.

- Question 8: Clarifications on definitions.
    - Answer: need to synchronize definitions across the document for operational consistency.

---

4. Points to Address

(List any follow-up items or action points with the names of individuals responsible for addressing them.)

- **N/A**

5. Sentiment Check

(Record the overall mood or tone of the session, focusing on how the audience reacted to the discussion. Note whether the sentiment felt positive, negative, or neutral. Include insights on the types of questions asked—were they enthusiastic, critical, or neutral? This helps capture the emotional atmosphere surrounding the session.)

- **(It was neutral and somewhat lukewarm compared to the other agendas.)** Articles with no substantive changes (Articles 2, 6, 8, and the Preamble) were generally accepted with overwhelming "Yes" votes.
- **(There were some negative reactions and confusion.)** Frequent temperature checks and real-time amendments created confusion among delegates, particularly in distinguishing the implications of "Yes" and "No" votes.
- **(There was highly enthusiastic participation. Rather than being neutral, the focus was on expressing individual opinions.)** Structural changes, including definitions and guardrails, received significant feedback.
- Articles reflecting participatory governance (Articles 1 and 3) sparked debate about inclusivity, transparency, and the balance between decentralization and efficiency.

6. Additional Notes

(Add any other observations or context that might be relevant for the final document.)

- There was feedback indicating that the ongoing temperature checks caused significant confusion during the constitutional amendment process.
- Some delegates are highly knowledgeable about the Cardano ecosystem, while others may not have the same level of expertise. As a result, a process that involves real-time edits followed by prompting votes may struggle to elicit accurate opinions and decisions effectively.

- There is an opinion that the budget process outlined in Article 4 should specify that third-party audits must be conducted by auditors selected from a list of third-party auditors defined by the community.

Sign-Off

- Signed off by: Nicolas Cerny
- Date of Completion: 2024-12-16

Meeting Notes - Kenya - Dec 4, 2024

Convention Session Notes

- Session Name:
- Date**: 4th December 2024**
- Time**: 3pm (GMT+3)**
- Location: **Nairobi**
- Archivist Name: **Lorenzo Bruno**
- (If available) Link to recording:

Notes

- The chair in BA summarised the proposed changes from the Day #0 discussions
- Temperature check on ‘do we need an additional discussion on article 1’, yes means we are good to move on, no means we are not good to move on
    - Question from Nairobi: do we need a majority or a consensus?
- Temperature check on ‘do we need an additional discussion on article 2’, yes means we are good to move on, no means we are not good to move on
- Temperature check on ‘do we need an additional discussion on article 3’, yes means we are good to move on, no means we are not good to move on
    - Question from BA: are we voting on article 3 as a whole?
        - Answer: yes
- Temperature check on ‘do we need an additional discussion on article 4’, yes means we are good to move on, no means we are not good to move on
    - Question from BA: clarification about art 4, it says there is a cardano annual budget which is required, but in conversation after the workshop it was suggested there isn’t an annual budget for the entire community but instead there should be a budget for individual organization
        - Answer from Joel: it is intended to imply to the entire community

[break to allow people to properly review this article]

- Temperature check on ‘do we need an additional discussion on article 5’, yes means we are good to move on, no means we are not good to move on
- Temperature check on ‘do we need an additional discussion on article 6’, yes means we are good to move on, no means we are not good to move on

- Temperature check on ‘do we need an additional discussion on article 7’, yes means we are good to move on, no means we are not good to move on
- Temperature check on ‘do we need an additional discussion on article 8’, yes means we are good to move on, no means we are not good to move on
- Temperature check on ‘do we need an additional discussion on appendix 2, framing notes and definitions’, yes means we are good to move on, no means we are not good to move on
- Temperature check on ‘do we need an additional discussion on the pre-amble’, yes means we are good to move on, no means we are not good to move on
- Discussing article 4, cardano blockchain budget:
    - Nairobi comment from Daniel from Ho Ci Min City: Cardano community is expected to propose not less on an annual basis, we cannot have it just on an annual basis considering the fluctuation of ADA.
        - Answer from Lloyd: the reason for an annual budget is to by able to plan for the work to be handled by the suppliers, and there is a need to have enough fiat money in the bank to pay that suppliers
    - Nairobi comment from Ubio from lagos Nigeria: concern in section 1, cardano has a budget year, what is this budget period? Is 2025 the budget year? For most organizations that is not true
        - Answer from Joel: the intent of section one is to recommend to have at least one, but it doesn’t preclude to have more than 1. About the role of the CC, refers to the process to review if the proposals are constitutional, so to have an on-chain process
    - BA comment Luca from vienna: the budget for operations needs to be defined more, and we should include that is operations first and opportunities second
    - BA comment from Patrick: we are building a decentralized governance, why are we introducing any centralization responsible for the oversight for the whole budget process, I recommend using a smart contract
    - BA comment: section 1 article 4, the cardano community is excepted to propose, what is the threshold for this proposal, can we make it more explicit (answered by Lloyd, is in the guardrail). Also, ‘non-less then’ could be interpreted either way. Third point, the ongoing ops and future development, ops is already covered by SPOs so budget is not needed for operation of the network
    - BA comment from Jose: a couple of concerns about budget process outside of the constitution once the money is received by the CDH, nothing in the constitution prevents the CDH or intersect to user that money to vote or stake
        - Answer from Lloyd: that is not in the purview of the constitution, you are talking about Intersect process
        - Follow-up:’ The treasury shall require an allocation of ada …’ This should be done by a listed 3rd party auditor chosen by the community
    - BA comment from Nori, Geneva: Why was the word operation required as that wasn’t discussed? It says blockchain and not the ecosystem, as SPOs are already rewarded

        - Answer from Joel: there was a lot of input from the CF which is based on the consultation they did. We took their language and put it into our version, that is how it got there
    - Ba comment from Lucas, Buenos Aires: how are we dealing with the treasury as a whole? One withdrawal vs multiple smaller ones? We as a constitution we should be thinking about this. Are we going to make investments as a treasury? Do we prefer vendors who are going to hold data or vendors who are going to sell data straight away? Also we should include the net limit on the body
    - BA comment from Martin Bulgaria: he seconds the point about the net change limit
    - BA comment from Antonio Rio: suggestion about the ada fluctuation, probably you get the conversion into a stablecoin
    - BA comment from Zach: I have a problem with section 1, 'we should remove the words 'from time to time'
    - BA comment from Mark from London: in sec 1, we say 'THE Cardano blockchain' budget, we make it look like one and centralized, we could change the wording to make it look more decentralized
    - BA comment from Ken: a budget is in place and at that moment treasury GA can be done. We should allow something to go through an info action first outside of the budget process. Should we add then 'and subsequent amendments' to allow additions to the budget
    - Danielle (secretary) provided a summary
        - Clarification from Joel: the budget process-long goal is to implement a new GA for it. The info action process is an interim process. On the other points, the intention is to have multiple budgets, so if there is a need to adjust the wording that can be done
    - BA comment from Bastian: we should prohibit the institution that receives the annual budget from voting with the annual budget and delegating to an SPO as well
    - BA comment: the auditors should be paid directly from the treasury
    - Nairobi comment from Maureen: I feel the constant temperature checks are too much and it's confusing, we are not sure what are we voting on
    - The room will do a temperature check on each of the items discussed to decide if we want to get them revised or not
    - Temperature check about the word 'operations' - art 2 section 4. Should the addition of 'operation' be kept in the draft?
    - The secretary requires clarification on the proposed changes to the net change limit > clarification is to add a reference from the article to the guardrail
    - Temperature check about removing the words 'from time to time'. Do you want to keep the words from the time?
        - BA comment from Adam Rush: in contracts, from time to time, means you look at things when necessary. So changing it will open a big discussion

- BA comment from Nathan from Australia: it is very difficult to address these changes without being able to see the actual change we are making. We should give Danielle an opportunity to write them
- BA comment from Mark: the budget should not be delegated to DReps as well as SPOs
  - Answer from Joel; should we also prevent to actively managing the ada to generate revenue for Cardano
- Nairobi from Ubio: proposal to do a temperature check on an annual basis, the language seems blurred, could we make it on an epoch basis

[lunch/dinner]

- BA question: art 4 sect 2, proposal to add more than one administration for the treasury funds
- BA comment from Adam Rush: about adding more than one admin, if you don't have people that can step up then you are in a constitutional crisis
- BA question from Patrick: we do not need to specify that we require an administration in the constitution
- BA comment: the term 'from time to time', from comments from the live stream, 'from time to time' means that is permitted more than once, so it should be left
- BA comment from Luca: can we please note everything down so that we hear a comment about it? My comment about the operation was not considered as I suggested to have it further refined it
- Joel and Danielle presented the proposed changes to Article 4
- BA question for Joel: would it be constitutional to have a separate budget that is specific for something like marketing?
  - Answer from Joel: yes
- BA question: because now it is possible to have several budgets per year, let's assume one is 75% of the net change limit what if you have another one that brings it over the net change limit
  - Answer: it is in another section and such budget will not be approved by cc because the content is not constitutional
- BA question: acting as the cc, such budget are expected to cover not less than a 12 month period, does that sentence not get into a loop?
  - Answer from Joel: the reason why there is a suggestion for a 12th months is that we recognise we need to provide stability to the ecosystem following the direction of the tenets. But it is up to the community to define the length of a budget
- Nairobi question from Port Louis Mauritius: comment about participants acting in the Cardano community, when we read the definition of Cardano community, anyone who even supports the community is a community, how do you determine who is part of the community? I don't think you can have a very fixed definition, otherwise anyone can claim to be part of it. Second, we talk about participants in the Cardano community, although this is not defined, so who does fall under this definition. Furtherly, 'from time to time' we should maintain it

    - Answer from Joel: when we go through the appendix we can look at the definition of the Cardano community. But let's remember we did not want to create any type of membership, this language allows anybody to propose a budget
- Nairobi question for Ubio from Lagos Nigeria: reading from the proposed text, the section related to length, I think the use of the 12-months period is not consistent with the timing in the constitution, where everything else is in epoch, why it is not here too? If we define a certain amount of epochs we can put in brackets (approximately 12 months) also giving us flexibility. It is more in line with the spirit of the constitution
- BA comment from Jose: during the process, there has been a lot of input, so he provided context from the consultation and initial draft
- BA question from New Zealand: first, we agreed with the sentiment around operation here that it should stay but properly defined, also 'from time to time' should remain, and the line about multi budgets should be 'and/or'. I propose also splitting this into more than one section
- Nairobi question from Cameroon: the title of this article is a bit awkward (reading from telegram chat). I think that the Cardano blockchain budget sounds a bit awkward since it is a decentralised system, the proposal is to have something like Cardano treasury, or we should add another section for the treasury
- Temperature check on the revised text for article 4
- Objection to vote results
- Danielle to share the proposed changes, summary report
- Temperature check about adding a definition of budget
- Temperature check on further restrictions of treasury withdrawals
- Temperature check about requiring more than one administrator for the Cardano Budget
- BA comment from evangelos: both native and non-native speakers, we are confused about how to use the yes and no on the second vote
- BA comment: art 3 sect 2, there is an overlap between the 3 bodies
- BA comment from Andrew from Georgia: sect 1 art 4, concern about bloat in the language and in the budget. Georgia wanted the budget to be only for the reasonable maintenance of the chain, governance, and auditing. Also, we do agree the title should be changed to Cardano Treasury
- BA comment from Mark London: can we vote separately on SPOs and DReps delegation
- Nairobi question from Ubio: what's the position of things about epochs for replacing the 12 months?
- Danielle addressed the question
- Comment from Adam Rush: perhaps we need to have a re-vote about the three articles that Danielle has written down like the epoch. Read each items one at a time
- Temperature check on 'Should we refer to 73 epochs as the period vs 12 months?'

- BA question for Zach: if we do recognize it as epochs that should be added to the definitions as well
- Temperature check on ‘Should we keep time to time?’
- Temperature check on ‘Should we keep operation in section one and add further clarification on what entails?’
- Temperature check on ‘Should we rename article 4?’ [not run]
- BA question from sidney: the term budget is consistent within section one so if we change to treasury we would need to change it in the article and also budget is easier in more languages
- BA comment: it is a better process to vote on every proposed change
- BA comment: when we talk about development it should not be just tech development
- BA comment from Mark: does this prevent thing like Catalyst to be funded as it seems to focus just on governance specific items?
    - Answer from Joel: potentially it could
- BA question: renaming the article to ‘treasury’ if we do so we’ll need to add other info about the treasury
- BA question from Nori: we should change it Cardano Ecosystem not just blockchain
- Nairobi question from Darlington: second on the ecosystem, can we do a menti on this?
- Nairobi comment from Maureen: My issue was with the world blockchain, so if we are changing it to ecosystem I am good with that
- Temperature check on ‘should we change the title to Cardano ecosystem budget?’
- BA comment: throughout the whole constitution we refer to Cardano blockchain ecosystem, we should stay consistent to the definition we should keep the word blockchain
- Danielle requested a clarification

[break]

- Review of the revised Article 4
- BA question: why do we need to be delegated to a DRep at all? Can we have an enterprise address?
    - Answer from Sam: treasury withdrawal can only go to stake addresses and can’t go to payment addresses
- BA question: What is an administrator?
    - Answer: We have a definition in section 2
- BA comment: you only need to vote on delegate to DRep if you want to withdraw on staking reward
    - Answer from Adam Rush: treasury withdrawal goes to your stake address
- BA question from Nathan: why do we have a definition in the text of the constitution where we said this should be separate?
- BA question: we voted to have the word ‘operation’ back, but the content has not been added

    - Answer from Danielle: because now this is the ecosystem budget we made decision to not clarify it but in the definitions
- Temperature check ‘Is article 4 sufficient as it stand or should be have further discussions?’
- Open questions about definitions in Appendix 2
    - Nairobi question from Maureen Cameroon: since we have been adding definitions, maybe it is not a good idea to add them to the definitions. Suggestion is to get a temperature check if we should add definitions to constitution
    - Nairobi question from Darlington Kenya: We should check the definitions
    - Nairobi question from Charan India: the definitions will define what is in the constitution, so we need to work more on deciding what the definitions are, so it makes sense not to add them right now
    - Nairobi question from Kavinda: we need to ensure they align with the broader topic, for example, the definition of ada doesn’t seem complete to cover also for its governance role, we need to address this inconsistency. I recommend doing another temp check to decide whether to keep them in or leave them out
    - Nairobi question from Ubio Nigeria: most of these definitions were given by CF which refers to their government, they don’t seem to fully align to our document.
    - Point of clarification from Joel: we took inspiration from CF but we did not include anything that wasn’t relevant and made the needed changes, so made sure they worked for our constitution. Appendix 2 will be recirculated
    - BA question from Jose: concern is the fact in appendix 2 the cc may consider appendix 2. We should not allow them to use them or not
    - BA question: I would suggest reconsidering a middle ground to leave them in but lower the barrier to change them
    - BA question: it would make sense, and it would be a great onboarding mechanism, it would be great to accept proposals of definition for the Cardano constitution like the process to change the constitution
    - BA question from Lee: the part that defines SPO, but it describes them as the operators of the block, there is a lot of SPO as a service, we need to add this in
    - BA question from Nathan Australia: I want the definitions to be read by mums and grandma, I propose that we move the definitions into a separate doc like a dictionary but still to change them you need an info action
    - BA question from Nadia: by changing the meaning of the words you can change the meaning of the constitution so the definitions should be in there

Summary

Key Takeaways

- The session focused on the discussion and revision of **Article 4** of the Cardano constitution, particularly around budgeting processes, definitions, and structural consistency.
- Significant debate occurred over terminology, such as *"from time to time," "operations,"* and whether to rename *"Cardano Blockchain Budget"* to *"Cardano Ecosystem Budget"* or *"Treasury."*
- Discussions included the implications of using **epochs** versus **calendar years** for budget periods and the need for a decentralized and transparent governance structure.

2. Conclusion

- The group made progress on revising Article 4 and reached general agreement on several points, though further clarity is needed in specific sections.
- Proposed changes will be consolidated and circulated for review by Danielle.
- Key outcomes included recognizing the need to better align language and definitions with the decentralized governance model.

3. Q&A

- **Question:** Should the budget be annual or tied to epochs?
  - **Answer:** Joel suggested a 12-month period for stability but agreed that epochs could be an alternative.
- **Question:** Should we redefine "Cardano Community"?
  - **Answer:** Joel highlighted the importance of inclusivity, avoiding fixed definitions to allow broad participation.
- **Question:** Can we ensure treasury oversight without centralization?
  - **Answer:** Suggestions included using smart contracts or community-chosen auditors.

4. Points to Address

- Clarify and finalize definitions in **Appendix 2**, including "Cardano Community" and budget-related terminology.
- Align **epoch-based timelines** with other sections of the constitution for consistency.
- Revise **Article 4** to reflect updated terminology and processes.
- Decide whether *"operations"* should remain in the draft and provide detailed clarification if so.
- Review the consistency of budget administration proposals to ensure decentralized management.

5. Sentiment Check

- The tone was generally collaborative but occasionally contentious, especially around terminology and governance structure.
- Participants expressed confusion over repeated **temperature checks** and sought clearer voting mechanisms.
- Sentiment leaned towards a desire for inclusivity and decentralization, with ongoing concerns about the practicality of proposed changes.

6. Additional Notes

- Appendix 2 definitions will need broader community feedback and may be separated into a distinct document for easier management.
- Future discussions should prioritize clear voting processes and concise summaries to minimize confusion.

Meeting Notes Convention Day 1 Discussion - 20241204 - Kenya - Ha Nguyen

---

Convention Session Notes

- **Session Name: Convention Day 1 Discussion**
- **Date:** December 4, 2024
- **Time:** 2:30 (GMT +3)
- **Location:** University of Buenos Aires, Buenos Aires, Argentina & Nairobi, Kenya (Hybrid Session)
- **Archivist Name:** Ha Nguyen
- **(If available) Link to recording:** **https://www.youtube.com/live/tIVawNkP-Io?si=Z9MQ4KVC9WWMt505**
- **Chairpersons:** Lloyd (Buenos Aires), Mercy (Nairobi)
- **Co-Chairpersons:** Eric (Buenos Aires), Reshma (Nairobi)
- **Secretary:** Danielle

---

1. Key Takeaways

(Briefly outline the primary points or ideas discussed during the session. Highlight any actionable insights or critical information.)

- The session emphasized the **pivotal role of the Cardano Constitution** in defining governance structures and shaping the blockchain ecosystem, with potential global impact as a governance model.
- Key discussions included **terminology refinement**, **structural adjustments**, and **content revisions** to enhance clarity, inclusivity, and consistency.
- Budgeting mechanisms, particularly **flexibility in treasury management** and restrictions on fund usage, were debated to ensure alignment with governance principles.
- **Article 4 was renamed** “Cardano Blockchain Ecosystem Budget” to better reflect its scope and align with existing terminology.
- Delegates broadly supported the creation of **companion documents**, such as a "Memorandum of Interpretation," to provide further clarity and adaptability for governance processes.

2. Conclusion

(Summarize the overall message or decisions made during the session. Include any next steps or outcomes.)

- **Articles 1 through 4** were thoroughly reviewed, with emphasis on the **budgetary mechanisms and terminology** in Article 4.
- Delegates approved the **renaming of Article 4**, while unresolved issues, such as the definition of "administrators" and processes for budget amendments, were tabled for future discussion.
- A central focus was the placement and flexibility of definitions, with proposals to move them to a companion document for easier updates.
- The session concluded with plans to revisit pending points in the next meeting, ensuring inclusive and thorough deliberation before finalizing the Constitution.

3. Q&A

(List the questions asked during the session and their corresponding answers. Include the name of the speaker who provided the answer, if available.)

Question 1

Asked by: Maureen
Country Represented: Nairobi, Kenya
Question: Will including definitions in the Constitution make it harder to amend the document in the future? Should definitions be removed?
Answered by: Danielle
Response: Definitions are currently included to ensure clarity. However, the proposal to remove them or place them in a companion document will be considered in future discussions.

Question 2

Asked by: Darlington
Country Represented: Nairobi, Kenya
Question: Will definitions be reviewed to remove redundancy or unclear terms?
Answered by: Danielle
Response: Yes, reviewing definitions for redundancy and clarity will be a priority in subsequent sessions.

Question 3

Asked by: Evangelos
Country Represented: Nairobi, Kenya
Question: What is the significance of the phrase “from time to time” in Article 4?
Answered by: Evangelos (self-proposed)
Response: The phrase provides legal clarity and flexibility for recurring actions.

Question 4

Asked by: Nathan
Country Represented: Perth, Australia
Question: Should definitions be included in the Constitution or moved to a separate document?
Answered by: Nathan (self-proposed)
Response: Definitions should be moved to a separate document amendable through input actions to avoid constitutional amendments.

Question 5

Asked by: Maureen
Country Represented: Nairobi, Kenya
Question: Should Article 4 be renamed for clarity, as “Cardano Blockchain Budget” feels misaligned with the decentralized nature of the blockchain?
Answered by: Mercy
Response: Yes, the name was updated to “Cardano Blockchain Ecosystem Budget” to align with existing definitions.

Question 6

Asked by: Unnamed Delegate
Country Represented: Nairobi, Kenya
Question: Why is delegation to a DRep necessary when enterprise addresses without staking keys could ensure no voting occurs?
Answered by: Technical Expert
Response: Staking keys are required for delegation based on the design of the blockchain.

Question 7

Asked by: Shaheena
Country Represented: Port Louis, Mauritius
Question: Is the definition of "community" too broad? Should it avoid fixed criteria for clarity?
Answered by: Joel
Response: Definitions were designed to maintain inclusivity. Proposals must pass several layers of review, including a 51% DRep vote, ensuring broad representation without rigid membership criteria.

Question 8

Asked by: Patrick
Country Represented: Nairobi, Kenya
Question: Should "administrator" roles be included in the Constitution, or could they be defined in budget proposals?
Answered by: Danielle
Response: Administrators ensure oversight and prevent centralization. Their inclusion provides essential checks and balances.

Question 9

Asked by: Ubio
Country Represented: Lagos, Nigeria
Question: Are definitions from the Cardano Foundation appropriate for the new Constitution?
Answered by: Joel
Response: Definitions from the Cardano Foundation were used as a starting point but were modified to align with the Constitution's unique context and goals.

Question 10

Asked by: NG Martinez
Country Represented: Aotearoa, New Zealand
Question: Should "operations" be retained in Article 4? Should the phrase "from time to time" remain?
Answered by: NG Martinez (self-proposed)
Response: Both terms are important. "Operations" ensures clarity about responsibilities, while "from time to time" preserves flexibility.

Question 11

Asked by: Charan
Country Represented: Bangalore, India
Question: Should we dedicate more time to ensure definitions are clear and aligned with the Constitution?
Answered by: Danielle
Response: Yes, refining definitions is a critical priority, and future sessions will focus on this issue.

Question 12

Asked by: Unnamed Delegate
Country Represented: Unclear
Question: What is the definition of an “administrator”?
Answered by: Esther
Response: An administrator can be a position, a smart contract, or another entity. This provides flexibility while maintaining oversight.

Question 13

Asked by: Unnamed Delegate
Country Represented: Unclear
Question: Are staking rewards required for treasury withdrawals?
Answered by: Technical Expert
Response: Treasury withdrawals go directly to the rewards address and do not require staking rewards; therefore, no DRep delegation is necessary.

Question 14

Asked by: Unnamed Delegate
Country Represented: Unclear
Question: How will budgets exceeding net change limits be handled?
Answered by: Danielle
Response: Such budgets will not be approved as they violate constitutional limits.

Question 15

Asked by: Unnamed Delegate
Country Represented: Unclear
Question: Can multiple short-term budgets be proposed within a year?
Answered by: Danielle
Response: Yes, short-term budgets are allowed if they align with community decisions and constitutional limits.

<u>Others comment</u>

Others Comment

Comment 1

Commenter: Esther
Country Represented: Unclear
Comment: Administrators can be a position, a smart contract, or another entity. The goal is to ensure flexibility while maintaining oversight.

Response by: Lloyd
Response: This flexibility is essential. The oversight process for Treasury funds can be managed by individuals, contracts, or systems, as decided by the community. The aim is to prevent scenarios where someone gains unchecked control over funds. By specifying "one or more," we ensure the process is inclusive while maintaining appropriate safeguards.

Comment 2

Commenter: Alan
Country Represented: Unclear
Comment: While having "more than one" administrator ensures broader participation, it could lead to delays if two individuals are unavailable. The community can address this issue through processes like net change limits rather than constitutional changes.

Response by: Lloyd
Response: Thank you, Alan.

Comment 3

Commenter: Patrick
Country Represented: Nairobi, Kenya
Comment: Is it necessary to specify administrators in the Constitution? Couldn't this be defined within budget proposals? Adding more layers might unnecessarily complicate Treasury withdrawals.

Response by: Lloyd
Response: Thank you, Patrick. This is exactly what we are debating today—to determine consensus on this issue.

Comment 4

Commenter: Evangelos
Country Represented: Greece
Comment: The term "from time to time" ensures actions can be performed multiple times when needed. Removing this phrase would reduce flexibility.

Response by: Lloyd
Response: Thank you, Evangelos. We appreciate your community's input.

Comment 5

Commenter: Luca
Country Represented: Unclear
Comment: It's crucial to document all comments and suggestions, even those not directly discussed, for further review. This ensures that everyone's input is acknowledged.

Comment 6

Commenter: Shane
Country Represented: Unclear
Comment: There have been concerns about adding overly complex elements to the Constitution. At the very least, hearing a response to these comments would be helpful, rather than simply stating a point without follow-up.

Response by: Lloyd
Response: Regarding the suggestion to remove the word "operations," I believe it should not be removed but further clarified. The budget should focus on maintaining and developing the blockchain, as well as administering, managing, contracting, and auditing the Cardano budget. This ensures that the primary purpose of the budget is to keep the blockchain operational.

Comment 7

Commenter: Delegate from Georgia
Country Represented: Georgia
Comment: Expressed concern over language bloat, proposing to limit the budget strictly for maintaining and managing the chain rather than broader purposes. Suggested renaming the article to "Cardano Treasury" for clarity.

Comment 8

Commenter: Nathan
Country Represented: Perth, Australia
Comment: Proposed avoiding a separate definitions section by integrating definitions directly into the relevant text for simplicity and clarity.

Comment 9

Commenter: Bastion
Country Represented: Unclear
Comment: Highlighted the need for consistency in discussions around the terms "operations" and "administrator," as these terms are integral to the article and must align with any changes in definitions.

Comment 10

Commenter: Darlington
Country Represented: Nairobi, Kenya
Comment: Supported retaining definitions but called for a review to refine redundant or unclear terms.

Comment 11

Commenter: Charan
Country Represented: Bangalore, India
Comment: Emphasized the importance of refining definitions to ensure alignment with the Constitution and suggested dedicating more time to deciding on clear definitions.

Comment 12

Commenter: Amenda
Country Represented: Sri Lanka
Comment: Pointed out discrepancies in existing definitions, such as ADA being defined solely as a blockchain's native cryptocurrency without highlighting its governance role. Suggested considering a companion document for definitions.

Comment 13

Commenter: Jose
Country Represented: Unclear
Comment: Discussions around budgets often involve contentious issues due to their financial nature. Historical context and earlier drafts emphasized decentralization and permissionless access, highlighting the importance of community decisions.

Comment 14

Commenter: Max
Country Represented: Unclear
Comment: Suggested creating a "Memorandum of Interpretation" as a companion document to provide formal processes for interpreting constitutional terms.

Comment 15

Commenter: Nadia
Country Represented: Unclear
Comment: Recommended including specific contexts for Cardano's use cases in definitions to prevent misunderstandings.

4. Points to Address

(List any follow-up items or action points with the names of individuals responsible for addressing them.)

- **Article 4 Revisions:**
  - Define processes for budget amendments.
  - Restrict treasury funds from staking or delegation.
  - Require at least two administrators for budget oversight.

- **Definitions in Appendix 2:**
    - Review terms like “community” and “administrator.”
    - Decide placement—within the Constitution or in a separate document.
- **Future Deliberations:**
    - Finalize unresolved points, such as definition consistency.
    - Develop mechanisms for ratification and communication with the broader Cardano community.

5. Sentiment Check

(Record the overall mood or tone of the session, focusing on how the audience reacted to the discussion. Note whether the sentiment felt positive, negative, or neutral. Include insights on the types of questions asked—were they enthusiastic, critical, or neutral? This helps capture the emotional atmosphere surrounding the session.)

- The session was **constructive and collaborative**, with robust debates on terminology, budgeting mechanisms, and governance.
- Delegates showed **enthusiasm and commitment** to clarity, inclusivity, and sustainable governance.
- Discussions reflected a balance between **critical analysis** and **practical solutions** for long-term sustainability.


Article III. Participatory And Decentralized Governance
CONSTITUTIONAL
CONVENTION 202

6. Additional Notes

(Add any other observations or context that might be relevant for the final document.)

- Delegates highlighted the need for cultural and linguistic inclusivity, suggesting translating the Constitution into multiple languages for broader accessibility.
- Proposals to create companion documents, such as a “Memorandum of Interpretation,” were well-received for providing additional context and flexibility.
- The session ended with an agreement to address unresolved points in the next meeting, ensuring all voices are heard before finalizing the draft Constitution.

Sign-Off

- Signed off by: Nicolas Cerny
- Date of Completion: 2024-12-16
