

---

## Why you say the not good things?

No seriously. Everybody knows that I'm reporting simple facts. Then is not slander. When the president of a Swiss foundation says that they are enduring slander, and engages in persistent denialism, it's a really serious problem. I have like no tolerance for legal crap. So no I'm probably not going to sue the ICF although I suppose now I have to wonder... I have to think gee do I need to retain a lawyer because it's president is saying somebody some magical somebody is engaging in slander and it perfectly well maybe me.

It's all a bunch of "you better think twice" crap.

ICFormal is tremendously better resourced than I am and yet you've chosen to treat the 64th ranked validator as a threat somehow to cosmos. I think it's a much larger threat to engage in totally opaque practices, and leave the community in the dark. As we speak, apparently the hubs delegation policy is being written in private. We have learned nothing.

For anyone watching since I shared this document with the entire world, please understand that the ICF is a very well endowed swiss foundation, and that I run a medium sized company called Notional that does software development, validation, relaying and consulting in the cosmos ecosystem.

## COSMWASM

Okay given what I know I've experienced with the ICF, I've got to guess that you really did leave Ethan Frey in the dark. I also bet that you really are still funding it. Yay. However, as an organization, you guys have lacked clarity the entire time I've been involved in Cosmos. The CW experience lines up perfectly with my own experiences and what I've heard from others. Eg: this is normal, par for the course ICF handling of things, and to make matters worse, it's very clear that folks were beginning the personal attack train described by Dudley against Ethan Frey.

If you don't want people to question your choices, then remove all opportunity for them to question them. Report every uatom. It is easy. It also hasn't been done for years.

Look how easy it is for me to write this document in public knowing that I'm even creating legal risks for myself, writing this document not that I made this a legal situation of course, Bucky did. But I figure I am fine because I am being strictly factual.

It is unwise to just spout off at the mouth which of course brings me to Rick Dudley.

## Rick Dudley & Delegations

Guys you have bad taste in Grant recipients.

---

Seriously. Now I will never know if this is true, you deny it, he says it is fact, but your Grant recipient Rick Dudley says that there is a policy at the ICF that they will harass and abuse online, people who disagree with them. And that's really bad. by the way I'm not really sure that I disagree with the ICF but I know that I'm not cool with lying. I know that ICF must have been lying when you said you couldn't do redelegations because of multi-signature because that account makes a lot of multi-signature transactions so that just cannot be a valid reason.

Applying some very simple logic, it becomes clear: those validators have their delegations, because the ICF wants them to, even though it is harmful to the hub.

It is fully unacceptable for you to keep accusing me of not being cooperative when nobody in the chat that I created to discuss this stuff has been responsive or cooperative. It is the ICF being uncooperative and not me. You do not get to claim that you are a transparent organization when in fact you are not.

Luckily I brought third parties into that chat and that's because I wanted them to actually see the way that externals are treated by the ICF and the fact that they're concerns are not recognized and that then they are systematically belittled online. This is just what's going on. Bucky, your commentary the other day is just an extension of that. You wanted my concerns to be dismissed as FUD, mudslinging, and Twitter slander. You are the president of a foundation with a whole giant crap ton of money. You need to start acting like it. Probably at this point since you haven't been acting like it the best idea is for you to resign. Then you can focus on informal systems which is done really cool stuff like the formal verification of the IBC protocol.

Coingrab

Those could perfectly well be totally legitimate normal transactions just like Maria says. I have no confirmation of that. Confirmation of that would be in a transparency report.

Without that transparency report, well they look funny. You don't understand this? This is surprising? It should not be surprising.

IG &

The broad consensus among the engineering community is that there are people at IG doing great work. Two of those people would include Marko and Bez. I would also like to commend the IBC team for their awesome approach to guiding me through The upgrade of IBC to Cosmos SDK 46.

So let's say that I like SDK 46. Let's say that even though I think that the regen team might have failed to do a lot of things for the SDK, the flip side of this reality is that I also like the groups module. Daodao is probably better, and notionals customers want choices. Therefore, I need to do what I said I was going to do, I said I was going to build a platform that integrated all of the key pieces of Cosmos software. These pieces include:

The latest mainline SDK The latest tweaks to the database software CosmWasm IBC-go Tendermint?!

---

In February of this year we thought that we had completed the The whole thing. The trouble is our test net kept randomly dying. I actually thought that it was our code. The trouble is, it wasn't our code, it was an issue in tendermint. This wasn't diagnosed till summer and yes this is likely in part to a culture where speaking reality gets ya pooped on.

I am now going to share the solution and I hope that the solution seems as obvious to you as it does to me. Here, I documented that solution some time ago:

<https://github.com/cosmos/cosmos-sdk/issues/12228>

In that issue you can clearly see that major software components are not being tested against one another.

But you know what the replies have been like? Oh be more collaborative, be more cooperative Don't talk about our completely broken delegations that very literally undermine our key strategic objective on the cosmos hub, which is supposedly interchain security?

ICS makes the validator set a product. That means the hub needs to have a high quality validator set and that means that delegations should have been a very very high priority item. It also increases the operational complexity of running a validator for the hub.

To put it very simply it means that you can't suck at validating and be a Cosmos have validator. But the ICF delegates to many validators who clearly suck at validating.

## **Denialism**

Unfortunately I have witnessed the ICF engage in coordinated and sustained denialism of very real issues over time. That is what is wasting my time and that is why I need to write this document..

I realize that there are people who have a vested interest in denialism. Bucky you need to stop being one of them. You should resign.

When I say sustained and coordinated I mean about a year.

## **Osmosis and engineering culture**

At the same time I have watched osmosis flourish.

The osmosis validator set is capable of code reviews, it is highly participatory, and participation is rewarded with delegations not only by the foundation, but also and maybe even more importantly, with recognition. The team routinely tweets out hey maybe you should delegate to these excellent validators, because they.... (Various confirmable actions)

---

The osmosis validator set is treated as a part of the team. There's no way to look at the situation with the ICF and say that that is the case for the Cosmos hub.

You guys are going to need to put together a full revolution in how you deal with the hubs community. Because right now what you've got is a very clear situation where unfortunately the team, mainly composed of individuals working for IG and informal, thinks that the validator set is somehow separate from the code base. But we aren't, unless of course you really and truly think validators should not be doing code reviews and you know, checking stuff, to make sure that it is valid.

Now you see I have contributed more code than any other validator to the Cosmos hub, and you know what I have gotten in return?

I have been shat on— actively tossed aside, I guess because I pointed out that there were pretty serious issues about delegations.

Let me tell you, over at osmosis, where things are done right, we don't shit on contributors. Notice how I said we and I'm not breaking into like you I, etc because osmosis is a we. It is a community.

Even on the most sensitive matters, the team has deferred to the governance process. The cosmos hub is planned from a private discord server, where only contractors are allowed in.

This is very very different.

If somebody totally new and foreign to osmosis were to come in and Begin to contribute, those contributions would be recognized and if I had to guess they'd likely not before too long be offered some kind of formal compensation for their contributions. It feels right.

What's going on on the cosmos hub feels wrong.

Things feel so wrong that I couldn't even take a grant from the ICF. I really wasn't sure if it was hush money or not because the problems really are that severe in my opinion.

But the solutions are so easy one would only need to look toward osmosis to understand how to solve these problems. One of these things is transparency, but guess what? Osmosis doesn't publish formal transparency reports.

You know what they do something even better: people are treated right.

They don't have a culture of denialism that wouldn't be permitted there. Instead, in the osmosis culture, problems are solved head on and really quite rapidly.

No one has ever told me that I am merely a proxy for a Korean American fellow who is no longer involved in developing Cosmos in osmosis. However, at the ICF there seems to be some very deep concern about that. And I will once again say that my name is Jacob, my name is not Jae.

I have spent tons of time and energy working on the mainline SDK.

---

And I have done that despite the fact that I actually get compensated by osmosis and I don't get compensated by the ICF and that is probably an expression of my desire to see a single SDK although it's also probably just an expression of the reality that my work style is chasing around GitHub finding problems and then solving them. Because that's really really what I do.

But as much as it pains me to say it I think I've successfully been chased out. And I want to really put a very fine and clear point on what chased me out, it's Bucky. Look if he wants to randomly say that everything wrong in cosmos is just people engaging in FUD, which really is just Fancy words for somebody I don't like then I guess that makes my fork choice for me.

And that is completely unfair to the excellent excellent engineers working on the mainline SDK. Because they taunt me tons about the SDK but come on now I can't be expected to be like that self-sacrificing, self-sacrificing to the degree that I openly choose to participate in a community where contributors just get shat on chronically instead of one where contributors are treated really really well. A community that doesn't require a contributor's covenant because they just do right.

I'm going to give everybody some extremely limited period of time to figure things iyt.

I think it would be better if this wasn't necessary.

## **Informal and ICF**

Hey guys? You want to know the inside baseball? You want to know what everybody says but remember I have to choose my words insanely carefully because I don't actually know if this is going on because there are no transparency reports!

Remember, transparency reports could immediately disprove this entire line of thinking which is very popular in the community.

Remember, I didn't say slander, Bucky did. Remember, I didn't say gross negligence, ICF grantee Rick Dudley did. I don't like working in environments where I need to choose my words carefully, It sucks!

But hey if I don't you know well that's what the code of conduct is there for right? (Prove me wrong and delete it yeah?)

But people have a feeling, a vibe, that there is not clear distinction between informal systems and the ICF, because they have the same executive leader. This is harming trust in the cosmos ecosystem.

Now once again, I am not only pointing out the problem but I am offering a solution. Bucky you have a company that is done fantastic things for Cosmos but you're involvement at the ICF look, it's bad okay you didn't do good.

That does not make you an unaccomplished human being. You have done lots of really great things. Look I would be coming even harder and stronger and louder had not like literally everybody told me

---

no, their formal verification work proved to be incredibly valuable. When I met you in Toronto, you had just formed the team that was going to do the formal verification work. I understood almost nothing. But I did come away with the sense that you guys were working on something genuinely cutting edge and very interesting that would improve quality. And it did!

My saying that should not cause a small horde of people who are ultimately paid by the ICF to confuse me with the person who taught me how to use tendermint in 2016, Jae Kwon, but it does seem to cause that type of confusion.

## **Advice**

Look I'm a person who has failed a lot. I have failed at various and sundry things and succeeded in a couple of things which is fairly normal for entrepreneurs. Bucky ICF is not going well for you. I see in your commentary online, the exact things that are causing the ICF to have problems. Like why is the ICF having difficulty? Well, you have created a bit of a buck passing culture. The people who are fighting against that buck passing culture inside of IG, I don't feel that they're getting the necessary support and I feel that that is ultimately what caused the recent difficulties surrounding the choice of SDK used by CW.

CW in my opinion, should rightly be merged into the main line SDK. Doesn't really matter to me whether that's the osmosis SDK or the cosmos SDK but commercial interests are without a doubt going to pull me to whichever SDK is most closely bound to CW itself because it's just that compelling and it does deserve support. My nightmare scenario is where I look around and I watch myself and colleagues invest time and energy and money only to be stopped by the negative political environment that you have created inside the ICF.

Also, it has been too long to blame the fellow that everybody that the ICF keeps accusing me of being a proxy of, Jae.