

Hello Maker Community,

Recently, [@VeniceTree](#), came forward with evidence suggesting a breach of operational security involving an Aligned Delegate, [@0xDefensor](#).

In line with the [protocols](#) established by Endgame Edge for such situations, we set up a secure channel for communication between VeniceTree and 0xDefensor. This allowed the evidence to be presented and discussed privately. Our procedure dictates that if the evidence is convincing, the AD in question has the opportunity to acknowledge the breach voluntarily, without the Governance Facilitator teams needing to access the evidence directly. However, if the AD disputes the evidence, the Governance Facilitator teams would intervene to review it.

Upon review of the evidence provided by VeniceTree, 0xDefensor disputed the findings and requested that the Governance Facilitators conduct a review. Following an exhaustive investigation, we asked 0xDefensor to provide us with evidence to support their claims. Unfortunately, after further discussions, we concluded that it was impossible to prove that 0xDefensor was not associated with a doxxed identity without revealing their personal information. Consequently, 0xDefensor voluntarily opted to proceed with the derecognition process, acknowledging that, according to the wording of the Atlas, the activities highlighted in the evidence provided by the reporter meet the criteria for "significant suspicion" of an operational security breach.

Consequently, Endgame Edge has made the decision to derecognize 0xDefensor as an Aligned Delegate, effective immediately. [@JanSky](#) and [@ldr](#) from the other Governance Facilitator team participated in the investigation process and are in agreement with the decision reached.

0xDefensor has informed us that their profile will remain active on the forum, email, and Discord for any inquiries. This ensures that the lines of communication remain open for the community to seek clarifications or further engage with 0xDefensor regarding their contributions and the transition process.

Whistleblower Bounty:

As per Atlas [Atlas 2.6.6](#), part of the AD's buffer is designated as a whistleblower bounty to the informant, under specific conditions. We believe that these conditions have been satisfied, but we will provide confirmation in a subsequent post.

Reiterating a Proposal for Community Discussion shared previously

We want to propose for community discussion one such safety mechanism. The DAO could hire a security advisor firm/consultant as a Scope Advisor. (This could fall under the Governance Scope and its requirement for Governance Security processes.) Their task would be to thoroughly analyze the security needs and risks of the Alignment Conservers and develop ever-evolving Operational Security "Best Practices."

With an explicit framework of agreed-upon Best Practices, all anon Alignment Conservers have a known target to meet. Further, the existence of an objective framework of Best Practices equips the Governance Facilitators to easily determine when a breach of opsec best practice has occurred. The explicit framework removes the risk of the Facilitators inappropriately inserting subjective bias into the decision-making process.

The Security Scope Advisor could also assist in reviewing an informant's evidence to evaluate its validity/quality. The Security Scope Advisor could ensure that the methods used by the informant to secure the evidence were ethical. (All communications, evidence and data shared with the Security Scope Advisor would be under confidentiality protection). Finally, such an Advisor would have specialized expertise in opsec and associated matters that Governance Facilitators lack.

We offer this idea as a jumping-off point for further discussion.

We are thankful to 0xDefensor for their contributions to MakerDAO and the significant value they have added on the journey towards the endgame