

Reading the Results

First-order stuff that's immediately visible. Results that I find especially insightful or surprising are **in bold**.

Starts	Responses	Completion rate	Average time to complete
192	59	30.7%	42:51

- Responses from 23 countries with a very long tail (after USA and Chile)
- 64% prefer English, **13% prefer Spanish**, also a long tail here but not nearly as long as geography (in other words, there were a lot of respondents in a lot of countries for whom English is the preferred language)
- Only 3% don't identify as a member of the community (18% not sure)
- Mode of 1 yr membership in community, median of 2 yrs.
- Very broad spread across roles
- Also broad spread across experience levels
- Only 10% are in paid roles - the **vast majority are hobbyists or still learning**
- 54% hold STX tokens; around half hold BTC, same for ETH
- Around a third each consider themselves members of a. Bitcoin community, b. Ethereum community, and c. no other community
- Wide response to number of Blockstack dapps used; 78% consider themselves users of Blockstack dapps
- **Vast majority of dapp projects are self-funded (92%)**
- Wide array of participation in different sorts of community events
- Wide array of primary resources for learning about the community: chat apps on top, followed by blog and forum
- Strong alignment on mission/vision (open-ended answer)
- Reasonably strong rating on how well Blockstack is delivering on the mission (avg. 5/6)
- Strong alignment on values too (but less strong than on vision)
- Half have not participated in governance yet; majority (58%) want to; 27% are unsure
- Majority each want to participate in forum/chat, working group calls, and **reviewing SIPs**
- One third each on obstacles to participation in governance: yes/no/not sure. Biggest obstacles are lack of time (50%) and **lack of understanding about Blockstack or its governance (44% + 26% = 70% total)**
- Reasonably high trust in core developers (avg. 4/5)
- System of government: **46% prefer plutocracy**, 33% democracy, 21% technocracy
- Half don't understand on chain governance; 31% support it, only 7% opposed
- Roughly even split on role of tokenholders: 32% not sure, 30% binding voting, 25% signaling
- **Not very strong understanding of the mission of PBC:** 3.1/6 average rating, but most do care about its mission (4.6 avg rating). Mixed trust of PBC: 4.0 average. 3.8/5 on output or productivity of PBC. **3.7/6 on transparency in decision making.**

- Broad array of areas people think PBC should be active, but **much less in app mining and treasury management.**
- **77% maybe or yes in support of a new entity; only 7% opposed.**
- Most would prefer a non-profit foundation or association. Preference for this entity to be more involved in governance, grants, and treasury management, and less in core development.
- **58% support a “tax” or “ecosystem fund”** to fund it. Broad support for an array of responses here.

Things to Consider

Second-order stuff that requires some deeper analysis.

- Stakeholder groups - do we feel we have a handle on which of these exist? Are they represented?
 - By definition, it's hard to know what's missing. There may be community/stakeholder subgroups that the survey failed to reach. Given the tiny percentage of STX tokenholders reached by the survey (~0.01%), I suspect this is the case.
 - In particular, the survey responses are almost by definition biased in favor of those who have a more active role in the Stacks ecosystem - e.g., active in a working group, or an app team - than those who are passive, such as many STX tokenholders.
 - We should consider other channels for discovering stakeholders, and make sure that future surveys are more representative - it will require more work to reach groups that are less active, or who were prevented from responding to the survey for another reason.
- What about geographical and linguistic considerations?
 - It's very difficult to measure these things in a survey like this, since we didn't get a large enough number of responses or a representative sample of the entire ecosystem/community. In particular, it's not surprising that the majority of respondents prefer English and are based in the USA.
 - We should consider how to increase responses from a more diverse set of stakeholders for future surveys.
 - The relatively large number of responses from Chile, and Spanish speakers, suggests that Latin America is a high potential geography both for governance and for the Stacks ecosystem more generally. It would be good to release more content and to hold more events in Spanish, targeted at this community.
- The group who said their biggest obstacle to participation in governance is lack of understanding (70%) represent a high potential group that we can maybe help overcome these obstacles and become more active in governance.
 - The fact that someone took the time to complete the survey is a strong indicator that they're interested in (or at least curious about) governance. It's not surprising that the majority of these people feel they have a lack of

understanding as governance is not well defined and may be a new concept to them.

- How do we communicate with this group to better understand their concerns, give them the resources they need to educate themselves (both about governance and about the Stacks ecosystem), and activate/enfranchise them in governance?
- Even without their becoming more involved in governance, how can we communicate with this group and learn more about their hesitation to participate, and how we can help overcome this?
- We should invest more in education!
- Which channels/touchpoints are most important to community members and what does this mean for governance?
 - The most popular resources are chat-based channels (Discord/Telegram/WeChat) and the Blockstack blog. To date, most of our communication about governance has been on the forum (third most popular), and on GitHub (seventh). The working group does use Discord to communicate, but this isn't very visible to those who hang out in other Discord channels, or on Telegram/WeChat.
 - We could do a better job communicating our work on chat channels, and on the blog (already a work in progress).
- What do the responses about the role of token holders, system of governance, and on chain governance mean?
 - There seems to be majority support for ideas such as on-chain governance and token-based voting, although a sizable percentage of respondents aren't sure or don't care.
 - It would be good to better understand why so many respondents (62%) either don't care, don't feel informed enough about, or chose not to respond to the question about on-chain governance. It's likely that understanding about and awareness of this issue is low.
 - Given the support for the idea, it would make sense to draw up specific proposals for on-chain governance/token-based voting to continue the discussion. Could we, e.g., hold a non-binding token-based vote on a straightforward, relatively non-contentious issue as a test?
- What do the results regarding PBC (and setting up another governance entity) mean for the role of PBC, and the Foundation, going forward? Does PBC need to change its communication strategy?
 - Based on the results of the survey, it seems like PBC does have something of a communication challenge. Trust in and perceived productivity of PBC is medium-high, but understanding of its mission is middling.
 - How important is it that the community understand PBC's mission, and how can PBC better communicate this mission to the community?
 - The launch of the Foundation offers an opportunity for PBC to redefine, and restate, its mission vis-a-vis the Foundation, and to gain trust in the eyes of the community by handling responsibility over initiatives, such as treasury management and App Mining, to the Foundation to be operated transparently and with more community oversight and participation.

- What are the implications for funding of the Foundation, economic policy, and governance initiatives more generally?
 - The broad array of responses to the question of how to fund the Foundation suggests that respondents aren't sure and/or are open-minded to different funding models. The majority (60%) support a Zcash-style tax or ecosystem fund. This idea should be developed and a formal proposal should be written and presented.
 - It would also be interesting to further explore the question of the common good in the Stacks ecosystem. Given high support for an ecosystem fund, we can infer that respondents support this idea. It would be interesting to drill deeper and explore more specific ways these funds could be deployed: in addition to infrastructure work, there's funding ongoing Foundation operations, education, events, grants/bounties/App Mining, etc.
 - One implication for governance initiatives more generally is that, given the tiny sample size reached by this survey, we may need to either change our tactics, or else expect only a very tiny turnout in governance initiatives. Note that this problem is shared across the blockchain space, especially where a large set of actors hold tokens passively as an investment. We should consider consequences for the perceived legitimacy of the governance working group as a result, and we should maximize transparency so that even those who "missed the memo" have a way to get up to speed.
 - The proposal did not go deeply into questions of active vs. passive fiscal and monetary policy. This is something that could be explored in future research.
- What about App Mining, grants, and treasury management more generally?
 - These are all things that most respondents felt that PBC should be *less* involved in, and that the Foundation *should* be involved in. It's an exciting opportunity for the Foundation to take the lead on these initiatives, and to establish trust and legitimacy in the eyes of the community by doing so transparently and with community input.
 - The working group and the Foundation should collaborate to draw up a specific set of proposals, and these should be shared for community comment and contribution. We could consider doing future surveys (or non-binding votes) that are focused specifically on these initiatives.
 - The proposal did not go into the details of App Mining. Exploring the details of how such a program could be designed and operated is an avenue for future research.
- There is strong alignment on mission, vision, and values.
 - This is a promising sign, and it's testament to the foundational work done by PBC and the rest of the community over the past few years. It's a strong foundation upon which to build governance initiatives going forward.
 - We should seize this opportunity and attempt to record these principles in a set of [founding documents](#) for reference. This is also a straightforward initiative that is easy for any interested community member to contribute to.
 - These principles should be an important part of the brand: of the entire Stacks project and ecosystem, of the Foundation, and of the governance working group.

Thoughts and Analysis

Overall I don't find most of the results too surprising. The most surprising result for me was the proportion (58%) who support a "tax" or ecosystem fund. The rest of the results confirmed my existing feelings and suspicions after being a part of the community for a few months.

The percentage of dapp projects that are self-funded (93%), compared to those that have received some form of grant (14%), stood out to me, although the overall sample size was small (only 14 total responses). This suggests that there could be even more value than I previously thought in an expanded grants, or App Mining, program.

Something else that stood out to me is that the degree of understanding of, and trust in, Blockstack PBC was medium high. A greater proportion of respondents wanted to establish a non-profit foundation or association (~77%) than feel a high degree of trust in PBC (~47%). The overwhelming vote in support of establishing a non-profit foundation/association speaks to the opportunity that the Foundation has to quickly build trust and legitimacy in the eyes of the community and to secure a permanent place for itself in the ecosystem.

Another thing that surprised me is how difficult it was to get more responses to the survey. There are over 300,000 STX tokenholders, and we only managed to reach around 0.01% of them in this survey. This speaks to several facts: that the vast majority of token holders are passive token holders or are not yet active in the ecosystem, that even among active community members and ecosystem participants, governance is intimidating or not interesting, and that we a lot of work to do to make governance more "user friendly" and approachable. Governance could definitely have better UX (even this survey took, on average, 43 minutes to complete!).

I am of two minds about this: on the one hand, the more (and greater diversity of) participants, the better; on the other hand, you cannot force people to care or to participate, and maybe it's okay that overall participation is low at this stage. Maybe it's okay that there's something of a barrier to entry, because it appeals most strongly to those who are willing to make an effort and show some "proof of work."

We had > 50 respondents but only ~10 people have been really active in governance to date. What do we make of this? How do we activate the rest of the respondents?