Q3 Aligned Scope Proposals - Composable AVC

[Composable AVC](#) focuses on making sure as much of the output of DAO operations can be reused as possible. We want to make information accesible, and sharing easy. Founded by jokecouncil members, we're a neutral AVC with a penchant for efficiency.

Governance Scope (MIP 113)

3.2: Guideline for Aligned Scope Proposal Submissions

3.2.1

To ensure informed decision making and alignment with the Atlas and AVC Positioning Documents, the following guidance is delineated:

Motivation

: The reason for submission must be stated, ensuring alignment with Atlas requirements is achieved.

Anticipated Outcomes

: Each proposal should be clear and self-contained, including all necessary details and references, without assuming the reader's knowledge of expertise.

Potential risks and mitigants

: All identified risks and their mitigation strategies must be documented. Accessibility and detailed recordkeeping are to be prioritized for future reference.

A special focus on resilience should be given wherever possible. Downloadable frontends should be furnished with hashes to make verification possible. Or on-chain deployments with verified addresses should be used.

Consultation

: Parties who might have an expert opinion on the topic are to be tagget using "@" in forum posts to encourage collaborative discussions and better alignment with Atlas guidelines.

3.2.1.1

The Governance Facilitators may request additional details or clarification on Aligned Scope Proposals being submitted. This can happen if the motivation, anticipated outcomes, or potential risks and mitigants are deemed necessary by the Governance Facilitators without being sufficiently articulated or apparent.

If a proposal does not meet the stipulated criteria, it may be halted by the Governance Facilitators for a period of up to 90 days from the date of the proposal. In such cases, the Governance Facilitators must provide justification and reasoning for their decision.

This period can and should be used by the proposal authors to address concerns and mitigate issues.

3.2.1.2

The Governance Facilitators may require that all pertinent questions raised in the forum are addressed. If the responses are deemed insufficient, the proposal may be halted by the Governance Facilitators for a period of up to 90 days from the date of the proposal. In such cases, the Governance Facilitators must provide justification and reasoning for their decision.

Support Scope (MIP 106)

2.2 AVC Internal Process Support

2.2.1.6

If AVCs invite experts and guest speakers tooling and processes must be in place to allow other governance participants to learn from these experts in the most efficient way possible. The aim of these tools should be to make sure that:

1. Experts don't need to repeat their presentations to multiple AVCs

2. AVC members who could not attend a presentation can come up to speed as quickly as possible

3. Governance participants and facilitators can track and evaluate the performance of paid experts as efficiently as possible

3.2 Standardized DAO Toolkit Patterns

3.2.3 Pattern sharing

The Support Facilitators must surface identified patterns on a public portal that is easy to search and to follow. Ideally patterns are suggested where applicable so that the DAO reuses as much of the hard won knowledge as possible and continues to iterate upon what works instead of starting at zero again and again.

4.1 Governance Artificial Intelligence Tools

4.1.6 Summary generation

Generate TL;DRs and summaries of relevant presentations and meetings. Ideally in a fashion that allows viewers to drill down into more detail at will, up to and including the actual spoken or written sentences that are the basis of the summaries.

This should be available for AVC meetings, expert presentations and proposals. These summaries can and should be interlinked to give daily, weekly and monthly summaries of governance activities that provide a good, top-level view, while allowsing governance participants to drill down into as much detail as required.

5.4 Budget reporting

5.4.1 Budget reporting schemas

In order to make budgets as comparable and tracking budgets as automateable as possible, budget reportings should follow a defined schedule and adhere to a DAO wide schema. Support Facilitators should develop this schema in dialogue with ecosystem actors and governance requirements.

The schema should be published prominently and should be easy to adhere to and to understand. Ecosystem actors should be required to fill out reporting with as much transparency, honesty and good will as possible. Should ecosystem actors be found to manipulate budget reports in order to hide expenses or make performance appear better than real, they shall be required to ammend the reporting within 30d, with a 10% of budget penalty.

Should the reporting fraud reoccur, the ecosystem actors shall be immediately offboarded.

6.2

6.2.3 SubDAO composability

subDAOs should work on and develop a common stack where developments and improvements are easily shared and built upon. Aragons DAOstack, or Moloch DAO, as well as Zodiac Tools for Safes are some examples of a tech and tool stack that is shared and improved by many DAOs. Support Facilitators can decide whether to build upon an existing stack or focus on development of a Maker specific stack.

The important aspect of this clause is the focus on composability and efficiency through reuse of shared components, where every subDAOs improvement feeds and furthers every others operations.

Protocol Scope (MIP 107)

5.1 Protocol Scope Education

The Responsible Facilitators must continue to develop content that can bring newcomers up to speed and encourages innovation to the protocol. As an example, a beginner friendly repository that introduces basic MakerDAO concepts in a sandbox for smart contract developers could be developed.

The purpose for Protocol Scope innovation is to encourage competition between smart contract developing EAs to ensure Maker Core and subDAOs get the best value and the highest security.

Special focus should be placed on educating smart contract developers on the necessity of rigorous documentation, well documented work flows and open and resuable architectures.

5.2 Protocol Scope Innovation

To encourage and foster innovation ecosystem actors working on the protocol scope should be paid an additional 10% premium to run experiments to optimize safety, gas efficiency or composablity of MakerDAO core and subDAO smart

contracts.

These experiments need to be documented in detail and published so that other ecosystem actors can easily learn from and build upon the experiments of others.

7.1 Research Resources

The Protocol Scope should include a budget for research grants that foster the development of alternative clients for subDAOs or their underlying technology. Rigorous data analysis with a quarterly report publishing the findings should give governance participants insights into the distribution of clients for subDAOs and if vendor lock-ins or singular points of failure are being established.

As part of the grants given out recipients should be tasked with promoting and incentivizing the use of their front ends, so that users are aware of their choices and have less risk of default-path dependency.

Stability Scope (MIP 104) - opensky & twblack

5.1.4 (amendment) Arranger report and stress tests

Stability Facilitators should develop a standardized reporting framework and procedure that has to be followed by every arranger. Arrangers who submit non-standard reporting or don't follow publication guidelines and deadlines should be penalized.

The reporting should contain a top-level summary that makes it easy for governance participants and MKR holders to glean the performance of the collateral, the arranger fees, and the health of the underlying assets.

Stability Facilitators should develop and continuously improve reporting tools and standards so that arrangers are easily comparable. Facilitatating competition and a race to the best available rate for services (in terms of price for safety). Stability facilitators should strive to constantly stress test the arrangers on the rigor of reporting alongside easily accessible summaries (+ openly verifiable data) for MKR holders.

Some criteria to monitor include:

- Cash balance.

- Cash income over the reporting period.

- Market value of publicly traded equities, ETFs, and mutual funds.

- A valuation for illiquid or privately traded assets. This should utilize a valuation from a reputable third party with relevant expertise.

- CUSIPs, date of purchase, date of maturity, coupon, cost basis, and face value of all publicly traded securities in the portfolio.

- DAI inflows from the Maker protocol during the reporting period.

- Total on-chain repayments to the Maker protocol and next anticipated payments.

(note; comment - taken from GFX's post[here](#).

) (An [amendment from GFX has been posted](#) from the initial thread, should those pass they encompass all of the changes in MIP 104- 5.1.4 of this scope proposal.)

10.1 SubDAO Economic Resilience Model Development

Stability Facilitators must ensure that SubDAOs work in cohort with Advisory councils on Economic Resilience Models. These models should focus on reusablity, standardization, and composability. This will include setting up tools and processes to allow for adequate risk monitoring and subDAO performance (or lack thereof). By utilizing an auditable process for tracking results, and reporting subDAOs will be more transparent (git-like or an openly accessible dashboard E.g., blockanalytica or Dune analytics). Advisory council members should aim to add a process for tracking ideas, improvements, and performance of goals within the modelling framework.

SubDAOs must ensure that hard won lessons are conveyed to others so that every part of the whole structure supports every other.

Accessibility Scope (MIP 108)

2.1. Brand Identity (amendment)

The procurement process for third party brand professionals must be transparent and impartial. Accessibility Facilitators must show engagement with multiple vendors (preferably at least 3) before one is hired to create a new brand.

In addition, any significant personal connections (eg. family member, spouse, or business relationship) with vendors must be disclosed.

5.1. Accessibility Campaigns (amendment)

All subDAOs should be beholden to the same compliance standards for accessibility (E.g., lighthouse scores above 90%). Rather than siloed entities, there should be a concerted effort to make subDAOs contextually portable each focused on a different accessibility requirement (language, visual aid, etc). However in the instance where growth is limited by one of these factors, a sub-entity may form with the specific focus of bringing targeted campaigns to other entities

Some criteria may include:

- Community surveying for alternative languages and translation (on a quarterly basis)

- Meetings should be accessible in text form (whether hosted as text-based forums which can be translated or a copy of the recording as transcripts)

- Quarterly accessibility meetings with representatives from all subDAOs

7.1. Easy Governance Frontend Requirements

Governance frontends must be displayed in a central location and maintained by all subDAOs, AVCs and other entities. There should be considerable coordination effort to make it easy for new entrants, whether MKR holders, ecosystem actors or otherwise to find and leverage these front ends.

Some requirements may include

- Frontend updates published to forum monthly

- Frontends not documented or updated each quarter should be deprecated unless otherwise noted by publishing entity

- Tooling lists should be shared among AVCs and subDAOs on a monthly basis to maintain the ability to coordinate across groups