**A Summary of Feedback on Governance (by 17:00 GMT +8, May 23, 2018)**

**Files are ordered. The capital letter stands for the topic:**

A = Arbitration, B = BP Agreement, C = Constitution, O = Other Suggestions

**The number is only for convenience when you refer to a specific feedback**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Section | Feedback # | Reply # |
| Arbitration | 1 | 1 |
| BP Agreement | 7 | 6 |
| 1 |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |
| 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 7 | 1 | 1 |
| 8 |  |  |
| 9 | 1 | 1 |
| 10 | 1 |  |
| 11 |  |  |
| 12 |  |  |
| 13 |  |  |
| 14 |  |  |
| 15 | 1 | 1 |
| Constitution | 13 | 1 |
| Article I - No Lying | 1 |  |
| Article II - Property Rights | 2 |  |
| Article III - Arbitration | 1 | 1 |
| Article IV - Voter Independence | 2 |  |
| Article V - No Owner or Fiduciary | 1 |  |
| Article VI - 10% Ownership Cap |  |  |
| Article VII - Agreement to Penalties | 2 |  |
| Article VIII - Block Producer Agreement |  |  |
| Article IX - Establishes Arbitration Forums | 1 |  |
| Article X - Arbitrator Standards |  |  |
| Article XI - Developers and Smart Contract Licenses |  |  |
| Article XII - Multilingual Contracts |  |  |
| Article XIII - Developers responsible for non-Member access |  |  |
| Article XIV - No Positive Rights | 2 |  |
| Article XV - Default Arbitration Forum Named |  |  |
| Article XVI - Amendment | 1 |  |
| Article XVII - Choice of Law |  |  |
| Other Suggestions | 1 | 0 |

**Latest Update**

**Proposal A-1 [From:** Celu (Blockgenic)**] 20:37 GMT+8**

On a technical implementation level - for BPs - how does enforcing an arbitration ruling to reverse a transaction look like?

**Reply A-1 (1) [From:** Mao (EOSREAL)**] 13:00 GMT+8**

According to my understanding, if parties involved in the case agree this case be heard at one arbitration forum, and the arbitration forum ordered the transaction should be reversed, the arbitrator shall officially pass the order to those parties and all 21 BPs, and 21 BPs shall follow the order to reverse the transaction.

**Proposal B-1 [From:** Josh Kauffman (EOS Canada)**] 1:50 GMT+8**

**Agreement - 4**

What is the definition of "good" transactions? (could even just add an asterix and define below)

**Reply B-1 (1) [From:** Mao (EOSREAL)**] 13:00 GMT+8**

How about using words as below: to only add "beneficial to EOS system" transactions? I don’t think a too precise definition is beneficial since we could not cover everything. Is there any better suggestion? There is some vagueness here.

**Proposal B-2 [From:** Josh Kauffman (EOS Canada)**] 1:50 GMT+8**

**Agreement - 5**

What is the definition of "good" transactions? (could even just add an asterix and define below)

**Reply B-2 (1) [From:** Mao (EOSREAL)**] 13:00 GMT+8**

How about using words as below: to only add "beneficial to EOS system" transactions? I don’t think a too precise definition is beneficial since we could not cover everything. Is there any better suggestion? There is some vagueness here.

**Proposal B-3 [From:** Josh Kauffman (EOS Canada)**] 1:50 GMT+8**

**Agreement - 6**

Define "bad".

**Reply B-3 (1) [From:** Mao (EOSREAL)**] 13:00 GMT+8**

The same problem. How about using words as below: "malicious to EOS system" transactions?

**Proposal B-4 [From:** Josh Kauffman (EOS Canada)**] 1:50 GMT+8**

**Agreement - 7**

Can different BPs choose different mechanisms? Or a single mechanism should be agreed upon?

**Reply B-4 (1) [From:** Mao (EOSREAL)**] 13:00 GMT+8**

I agree to use a common agreed mechanism. Maybe only use FIFO? You can offer other opinion.

**Proposal B-5 [From:** Josh Kauffman (EOS Canada)**] 1:50 GMT+8**

**Agreement – 9.iv**

Shouldn't it be up to the Arb Forums to ensure that an Arb is in good standing before they can be assigned to a case? Why should BPs have to ensure they are in good standing?

**Reply B-5 (1) [From:** Mao (EOSREAL)**] 13:00 GMT+8**

I agree with that. This one shall be taken out. Any different ideas?

**Proposal B-6 [From:** Josh Kauffman (EOS Canada)**] 1:50 GMT+8**

**Agreement – 10**

If (for example) I see that my account is acting oddly, would there be a free and quick method to freeze my account to avoid further issues? Let's say I have 10 EOS in my account, and it costs 50 to create an arb order, will I have no ability to free the issue?

**Proposal B-7 [From:** Josh Kauffman (EOS Canada)**] 1:50 GMT+8**

**Agreement – 15**

If the point of this was to say that a single entity cannot own more than %10 of two BPs, it doesn't read that way to me. Reads more like I cannot swap 10% of my business entity with another BP.

**Reply B-7 (1) [From:** Mao (EOSREAL)**] 13:00 GMT+8**

That’s a problem. This point worth more discussion.

**Proposal C-5 [From:** Josh Kauffman (EOS Canada)**] 0:21 GMT+8**

**Article II – Property Rights**

I agree that the word sacred should be changed. I also think that it should include that the utility of the property cannot be userped either. Example: If an exchange is holding custody of a token, and they use that token to vote in whichever way that they see fit, they have not had the property change hands. but they have violated its right to be voted by the actual owner of the token.

I would also change "or by a lawful Arbitrator's order" to something along the lines of: "by a valid ruling by an Arbitrator, in accordance with Articles 9 and 10"

**Proposal C-6 [From:** Josh Kauffman (EOS Canada)**] 0:22 GMT+8**

**Article III – Arbitration**

I think something along the lines of "If a dispute between 2 or more members of the EOS blockchain cannot reach an agreed resolution on their own, those members agree to binding arbitration through one of the Arbitration Forums recognized by the EOS platform." Trying to use this as a chance to show that they should be resolving themselves, and then Arbitration should be last resort.

**Reply C-6 (1) [From:** Mao (EOSREAL)**] 13:00 GMT+8**

Always encourage them solve between themselves, before bringing to arbitrator.

**Proposal C-7 [From:** Josh Kauffman (EOS Canada)**] 0:25 GMT+8**

**Article IV – Voter Independence:**

The phrase "anything of value" should be qualified in someway. If someone offers me access to an exclusive dApp, or a private tool, some may argue that there is no value attached as it could not be bought with money. So value should be understood as money, access, exposure, etc. Remove the possibility for someone to argue what is of value and not.

**Proposal C-8 [From:** Adam Zientarski (EOS Detroit)**] 23:19 GMT+8**

**Article IV – Voter Independence:**

Has there been any further discussion around eosDAC and whether this is vote buying or not? The reason I ask is because they gave away something with value, and if you look at communities, like the EOS Reddit community, there are many who want them to become a BP because of the expected increase in the price of their eosDAC. I've been out of the discussion around this trying to keep up with everything but was wondering if someone knew what the general sentiment was. It's a monetary incentive though. It's really not any different than standing outside of a voting location in person and handing out money to people who are walking by to go vote.

I mean more of the concern though is I guess why we're having this discussion. If we decide that it's okay, we might want to change the way that's worded. I mean, there's a lot of discussion around whether it's okay or not, but if we're going under the assumption that it's okay, I think the way it's written contradicts it.

**Proposal C-9 [From:** Josh Kauffman (EOS Canada)**] 0:25 GMT+8**

**Article V (No Owner or Fiduciary) + Article VI (10% Ownership Cap)**

We should try to combine these two. They are directly related, so we should put them together. Unless there is something I am missing (for why they are currently separated)

**Proposal C-10 [From:** Josh Kauffman (EOS Canada)**] 0:28 GMT+8**

**Article VII (No Owner or Fiduciary)**

This can be roled into one of the Arbitration articles I think. We should also figured out a way to combine all articles that deal with Arbirtation.

**Proposal C-11 [From:** Josh Kauffman (EOS Canada)**] 0:28 GMT+8**

**Article IX (Establishes Arbitration Forums)**

I agree with the sentiment, but one question I have is: If 2 parties want to reach an agreement before going thru Arb process, could they speak to an Arb unofficially, who may be able to offer an opinion/receive a small fee for their thoughts. This may prevent smaller cases that don't need Arb Process, to still get some bit of a helping hand if needed. But there would probably need to be a public recognition of that Arb who did some 'work on the side' if this were included.

**Proposal C-12 [From:** Josh Kauffman (EOS Canada)**] 0:59 GMT+8**

**Article XIV (No Positive Rights)**

Don't personally see the need for this to be an article in the Const. This shold fall under design principles in my opinion. If, as a community, we want to include and add articles that positive rights, and we all agree, then that is our right. Perhaps we would want to obligate users to have to do something.

**Proposal C-13 [From:** Josh Kauffman (EOS Canada)**] 0:59 GMT+8**

**Article XVI (Amendment)**

If we're holding the BP Agreement and the Arb Agreement to the same standards as the Const. articles, then why are we breaking them out into separate docs? I thought the point was to make it easier to change and amend things as needed. This negates that.

Further, I think some more thought needs to go into the proposal requirements: If an amendment is ratified, it costs 100EOS to the person who proposed it? If they have thought up a public good, why should they also have to pay? This will force all of this to go through the Worker Proposal fund I bet

**Proposal O-1 [From:** Celu (Blockgenic)**] 20:37 GMT+8**

Like developer docs do we have a 'go to' repository for getting started on governance? Both for people who want to understand governance in general and for those who want to know the specifics of initiating an actual arbitration. Also a guide focused towards developers on how to put together the recardian contract associated with the smart contracts that they might be writing... Possibly an overall governance wiki/guide that could have sections focused for the different target audience. So far the different sections/target audience I can think of are,

i) general intro to governance (for total newbies)

ii) Ricardian contracts for smart contract developers

iii) how to initiate an arbitration (for end users)

iv) for bps - how to implement an arbitration ruling

Just thinking out loud...of course the categories could be organized better but just some initial thoughts...

**History Feedback**

**Proposal C-1 [From:** Todor Karaivanov (SFEOS)**] 15:00 GMT+8**

**Article I - No Lying:**

I don't approve of this article in its current form. It can lead to a lot of accusations and mud-slinging, with people calling on this article to prosecute others. It is almost impossible to prove that someone has knowingly said a lie, especially if the scope is all communication. I would prefer an approach similar to the one taken by CAcert:

<http://wiki.cacert.org/AssuranceHandbook2#CAcert_Assurer_Reliable_Statement_-_CARS>

I don't think that we can change this article in a meaningful way to support this approach. This is more relevant to users with special permissions, such as arbitrators and BPs, so it should probably be moved to the BP agreement / arbitrator agreement. I suggest removing this article from the constitution.

**Proposal C-2 [From:** Todor Karaivanov (SFEOS)**] 15:00 GMT+8**

**Article II - Property Rights**

I disapprove of the word "sacred". It has religious connotations and, in my opinion, has no place in a governance document. I would suggest replacing it with another word, such as "inviolable".

**Proposal C-3 [From:** Todor Karaivanov (SFEOS)**] 15:00 GMT+8**

**Article VII - Agreement to Penalties**

I would suggest giving more clarity to this text, stating explicitly that members agree to suffer the penalties. Suggestion for new text:

Each Member agrees to conform to penalties imposed upon them for violations of the Constitution or any other governing documents relevant to their role. These penalties may include, but are not limited to, fines, account freezing, and reversal of transactions.

**Proposal C-4 [From:** Todor Karaivanov (SFEOS)**] 15:00 GMT+8**

**Article XIV - No Positive Rights**

I believe this article is a contradiction. Users that have special permissions on the blockchain do have positive rights - for example, arbitrators have the right to impose penalties on others. The article itself doesn't serve any specific purpose and can only be used to dispute other governance documents. I suggest removing this article.