1. *Defining dynamic uses in an immutable system:* Questions around the implementation and use of such programmed distributed systems by humans who are experts at making things work in an unintentional manner to adapt and respond to changing circumstances and contexts. How can DAOs better respond to or incorporate human behaviour? Raising questions of permanence and temporality, the debate ultimately asked how the syntax of smart contracts needs to be adapted to support dynamic contracts responsive to people's needs and the system's continuous functionality.
2. *Resolving disagreement and liability in a programmed system:* The purpose of distributed autonomous systems and smart contracts to replace trust, human decision-making and hackability through an immutable programmed system raised questions in terms of issues of disagreement, liability and ultimately the governance of who has the control and power to dissolve such issues. In other words, how do we design for resolving conflict with the structures of a distributed autonomous system? What rules and structures need to be programmed into a system and who programmes such decisions?
3. *Legal implications for society and programmers:* While we have discussed the tensions in the use and behaviour of DAOs in relation to human behaviour, we have yet to consider the wider societal and legal implications of the idea of future programmed businesses, systems and organizations. When considering the autonomous nature of such a system without one organization or group of people holding any legal responsibility, what are the implications for the design and programming of such smart systems? Questions were raised on the possibility that DAOs may currently be operating in a legal loophole, and asked what new possibilities and what legal precedents may or should DAOs adhere to. The implications of this may stretch beyond the future digital economy to HCI researchers and developers more broadly, where there is potential for legal responsibilities to fall to the programmer who developed a system rather than its users or stakeholders. This then poses questions around what legal expertise may be required in a future design team working on DAOs.

Overall the workshop and mapping activities fostered a very engaged debate attempting to understand the future social, economic and environmental implications of the design of such distributed autonomous systems, questioning who will benefit from an immutable autonomous system burdened with human flaws and technological immutability and if it may ultimately become a more controlling system than a liberating one.

Acknowledgements

Thanks are due to the HCI and design researchers who joined us and actively participated in the material engagement during this workshop, offering critical perspectives and raising important questions. This workshop was funded by the UK ESRC grant *After Money* (ES/N007018/1).

References

Aguirre, M. and Paulsen, A. (2017), 'Co-designing with relationships in mind: Introducing relational material mapping', *Form Akademisk*, 10:1, pp. 1–14.

Assume DAOs are interoperable and we end up with a network of DAOs + IOT, could we arrive at a point where automated decision making driven by non-experts results in Societal problems?

Who is held legally accountable? issue: legal gu

Accountability is fairly important

again. Accountability v. relevant for people building this tech.

(immutably Programmed systems)

highly relevant.

Define disagreement in a system

~~that~~ whose rules are based on the consensus of an honest majority

does raise issues of security.

I did think about this. See: original notes

very philosophi

reminds me of the t** revelation by L. Floridi at uni of Oxford.