

Summary

The Intersect Constitutional Council votes that the budget info action, “defbf15b06092718adf4befeab982e03d2966b9caef93c19e470549ef75ea49#0”, to be unconstitutional.

Rationale Statement

In accordance with Article III Section 4, this “info” action is in connection with a proposed ecosystem budget and as permitted in Article IV Section 1, this proposal relates to the maintenance and future development of the Cardano Blockchain ecosystem.

The proposal meets the standardized and legible format requirements as outlined in Article III Section 5. The rationale contains a title, abstract, reason for the proposal and relevant supporting materials, meeting the minimum requirements of Article III Section 5.

Although the proposal meets the standards for a normal “info” action, that is to say that it provides a title, abstract, rationale and supporting links as well as a matching URL and hash of the off-chain content, it falls short in a number of areas as it pertains to a budget info action. A budget info action also needs to contain some additional content including information regarding the potential budget administrator (Article IV Section 2) and an allocation of funds requested for audits (Article IV Section 4). In addition to not providing more information with regards to the administrator, beyond simply naming Intersect, it has been raised in public forums that one of the projects listed as part of this particular budget (Starstream) has also publicly stated that they did not wish to have Intersect as their administrator. This raises concerns about the level of communication that has actually taken place between the proposer and the projects that they claim to represent.

Precedent Discussion

This proposal appears to have been submitted by the proposer, on behalf of other projects and as a sidecar to the current ongoing Intersect process. That is to say that it names Intersect as the administrator, as they are currently going through a broader budget process, but it has not sought permission from Intersect to do so. In failing to seek Intersect permission to be named here, it falls short of the requirement of appointing an administrator. Both parties should be actively involved in such a proposal or else it leaves the door open for anyone to simply name anyone in a proposal, without actual agreements in place.

It should also be noted that this is the first time that budget info action has duplicated budget proposals that were intended to be submitted elsewhere in another separate proposal. This poses a question regarding the duplication of

budget proposals and the constitutionality surrounding “double-dipping” treasury withdrawal requests. At this point in time, there appears to be no guardrails in the Constitution that would make this unconstitutional and as a result would be left to the discretion of the DReps.

Counterargument Discussion

Conclusion

The Intersect Constitutional Council concludes that this budget info action is unconstitutional. A budget info action should have the acknowledgement and permission of all those involved, especially when it could be linked to a future treasury withdrawal. Simply naming an administrator does not meet the Constitutional requirement of appointing an administrator if it is done so without their consent.

Internal Vote

- Constitutional: 0
- Unconstitutional: 5
- Abstain: 0
- Did Not Vote: 2
- Against Voting:

References

Authors

[{ “name”: “Intersect Constitutional Council” }]