



VOTE
NO

GOVERNANCE ACTION REVIEW

CARDANO BLOCKCHAIN ECOSYSTEM CONSTITUTION V2.4





GOVERNANCE ACTION TECHNICAL SUMMARY

Governance Action Title	Cardano Blockchain Ecosystem Constitution v2.4
Governance Action Type	New Constitution
Governance Action ID	91a79f5c934b7c91e3027736d565080c2b66 11fb8484b1156fdf16121fcfb410#0
Legacy Governance Action ID (CIP-105)	gov_actionljxne7hynfd7frcczwumd2eggp s4kvy0msjztz9t0mutpy870ksgqqp6vp3p
Autor	-
Governance Action Submission Date	18th Dec 2025
Governance Action Submission Epoch	601
Governance Action Expiration Date	19th Jan 2026
Governance Action Expiration Epoch	608
Proposal External Link	<u>Abstract on GovTool</u>
Governance Action Metada Link	https://most-brass-sun.quicknode- ipfs.com/ipfs/bafkreieyuknozbtewyurfqo agvplvykadn6a4u6wglupavdz46bbsnnl6e
Anchor Hash	b368bdad83c727bbfe86425575233fb914eb 76d05d89497f7790cf007fd95f52



SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION	1
GOVERNANCE ACTION REVIEW	2
VOTE RATIONALE	5
CONCLUSION	6
REFERENCES	7
SIGNATURE	8



INTRODUCTION

Governance Action Summary

This proposal submits Cardano Blockchain Ecosystem Constitution v2.4 as a constitutional amendment. It removes non-binding “expectations” and “encouragement” clauses, eliminates the Budget Info Action mechanism, and removes the constitutional obligation to create a CC Code of Conduct, with the stated goal of simplifying governance and removing redundant mechanisms. It also unifies terminology and adds definitions (e.g., Active Voting Stake, DRep, SPO, Net Change Limit, Treasury Withdrawal Recipient) to reduce ambiguity.

In addition, it strengthens formal requirements for governance actions by requiring that any document hosted via URL be immutable, ensuring proposals cannot be altered after submission. After the removal of the Budget Info Action, accountability requirements are shifted into Treasury Withdrawals, including audit and oversight safeguards. In the transition from v2.3 to v2.4, three specific wording changes are reverted back to the v1.0 wording following formal objections raised by EMURGO.

About Agora

Agora is an independent initiative focused on improving the quality and decentralization of decision-making in the Cardano ecosystem. It brings together research, education, and community advocacy to foster a more transparent, informed, and accountable network.

Agora Research Bureau is its analytical arm, organized into two branches: Agora Research Voltaire, which analyzes governance actions and on-chain voting, and Agora Research Catalyst, which evaluates funding proposals and milestones.

This report was produced by Agora Research Voltaire to promote transparency and accountability in Cardano’s decentralized governance.

Agora publishes open-access reports with clear rationale and critical assessments — complementing the on-chain vote metadata submitted by Agora as a registered Voltaire dRep, and offering context to support informed participation and public scrutiny.



GOVERNANCE ACTION REVIEW

UPSIDES

There is no principled objection to several substantive elements, including the removal of the Budget Info Action. The position is pragmatic: when budgeting via Info Action functions mainly as a signaling and coordination layer, the same coordination can be performed more efficiently off-chain (e.g., via Ekklesia), while constitutional-level accountability should be concentrated where execution and irreversible effects actually occur, namely in Treasury Withdrawals. This concentrates scrutiny on actions that move funds, reduces redundant governance layers, and aligns obligations with the execution surface. On this specific axis, the direction is acceptable and desirable.

Support is also given to the requirement that proposal documents referenced by URL must be immutable. In governance terms, this is a baseline integrity safeguard: it enforces a stable review target, prevents post-submission edits that could alter meaning without explicit resubmission, and strengthens verifiability for dReps and external auditors. A fixed, immutable reference improves trust, reduces dispute space, and makes accountability enforceable because the reviewed text remains the executed text.



GOVERNANCE ACTION REVIEW

DOWNSIDES

For a constitutional amendment with high institutional impact, the minimum requirement is not “good intentions” or a well-written summary, but auditable comparability between versions. When attempting a manual verification of Constitution v1.0 against v2.4, a serious issue becomes evident in the supporting material: the v1.0 → v2.4 diff/check file is misaligned and confusing, with sections out of order and enough editorial noise to make identical passages appear as additions/removals. This defeats the primary purpose of a diff, which is to provide fast and reliable scope detection, enabling dReps to identify what actually changed without re-reading the entire document line-by-line.

From Article 3 onward in the original text, the changes appear more substantial: rewrites, deletions, and structural rearrangements. That pattern normally increases the need for a high-quality diff, clear anchors, and moved-block tracking. Instead, the current artifacts push reviewers into manual searching across a long text, increasing time cost and raising the probability of false positives, fatigue, and error. Under these conditions, responsible due diligence is not realistically supported at scale.



GOVERNANCE ACTION REVIEW

RISKS AND CONCERNS

A clear institutional risk is created: erroneous decisions driven by poor auditability, and incentives for shortcuts (heuristics, reliance on third parties, voting by fatigue). When the primary verification artifact fails, review behavior predictably shifts away from evidence-based comparison and toward trust proxies, selective reading, or procedural minimalism.

This risk is amplified by a recurring accountability gap in the ecosystem, where many votes lack rationale and rationales are often superficial when present, reducing the chance that errors are caught and publicly corrected.

A methodological problem also exists: editorial changes (grammar/style/formatting) were bundled together with conceptual changes. In a constitutional text, bundling dramatically increases review complexity because it obscures signal with noise, reduces scanability, and makes it harder to isolate substantive amendments from cosmetic edits. The expected standard would be to separate cosmetic edits from substantive changes, provide section-by-section documentation, and include explicit mapping of moved blocks so reviewers can validate continuity and intent without reconstructing the document structure manually.



VOTE RATIONALE

VOTE
NO

A constitutional amendment cannot be endorsed under a process where the core comparability artifact (the v1.0 → v2.4 diff) fails. The vote is NO on methodology and auditability grounds, not necessarily on disagreement with the substance of the changes.

Reconsideration (a potential YES) would be conditional on a re-submission that meets minimum verification standards, including: (1) canonical text versions with stable structure, (2) a section-by-section diff with anchors and moved-block detection, (3) explicit separation of editorial vs conceptual changes, and (4) a granular, verifiable changelog. Without this, transparency, adequate scrutiny, and responsible decision-making cannot be assured.



CONCLUSION

The vote is NO due to methodology and auditability failure: comparability between v1.0 and v2.4 is not verifiable with the provided materials. The substance includes acceptable directions, but there is no operational basis to endorse a constitutional amendment without a reliable, verifiable diff.



REFERENCES

Cardano Blockchain Ecosystem Constitution v2.4 (PDF)

<ipfs://bafkreih62pydt57supou6dn5lqbf5klr7xu4xi2rrs7tl3thaufigmvo24>

List of changes from v1.0 to v2.4.pdf

<ipfs://bafybeihsv7crutk4xrwut5p5fdvgeum45hioazn2dldnqk2ljiv7sp3oda>

List of changes from v2.3 to v2.4.pdf

<ipfs://bafybeibu2v7l6z3k5jhhdztv74fcrlaedxwdwtxu2ogwudykyfjjfreppu>



SIGNATURE

Disclosure Statement

The author declares no relevant affiliations, partnerships, or incentives related to the Governance Action discussed in this report.

About the author

Independent insights and research on Cardano Governance Actions and Catalyst proposals. Focused curation and public rationale for dReps and delegators.

Our social media and repositories



Scan to access
our main hub



[X](#)



[Telegram](#)



[YouTube](#)



[Github](#)



[Gitbook](#)



[\\$agora.cardano](#)

