

MIP106: The Ecosystem Scope Framework

Preamble

MIP#: 106 Title: The Ecosystem Scope Framework Author(s): @rune Contributors: Tags: endgame, scope-framework Type: General Status: Accepted Date Proposed: 2023-02-06 Date Ratified: 2023-03-27 Dependencies: Replaces: Forum URL: <https://forum.makerdao.com/t/mip106-the-ecosystem-scope-framework/19691> Ratification Poll URL: <https://vote.makerdao.com/polling/Qmbndmkr#vote-breakdown>

Sentence Summary

The Ecosystem Scope Framework provides the core principles, rules and regulation regarding the Maker Ecosystem in the Endgame.

Paragraph Summary

MIP106 establishes the Ecosystem Scope Framework. This includes all the processes necessary for the broader Maker Ecosystem to function, by connecting and supporting each of the critical pieces so that they can properly work together, and ensuring that best practice for transparency, accountability and prioritization are used in the ecosystem. All rules for the Ecosystem for the DAO are contained in this framework, including the procedures of the Ecosystem Scope Framework Advisory Council.

Component Summary

MIP106c1: Preamble

Contains the Preamble to the Ecosystem Scope Framework.

MIP106c2: Scope Framework Articles

Contains the Scope Framework Articles for the Ecosystem Scope Framework.

MIP106c3: Responsible Facilitators

Contains details on the Responsible Facilitators for the Ecosystem Scope Framework.

MIP106c4: Scope Framework Articles Modification Subproposal Process

Contains details of how the Ecosystem Scope Framework can be amended.

Motivation

The Ecosystem Scope Framework is necessary to define the Scope as per the Maker Constitution.

Specification

MIP106c1: Preamble

The Ecosystem Scope Framework covers all the processes necessary for the broader Maker Ecosystem to function, by connecting and supporting each of the critical pieces so that they can properly work together, and ensuring that best practice for transparency, accountability and prioritization are used in the ecosystem. The Ecosystem Scope also covers the use of the DAO toolkit and ensures transparent access to all public data in the ecosystem are provided in a unified format. Finally the Ecosystem Scope covers all remaining processes and tasks that are not covered by other Scopes.

MIP106c2: Scope Framework Articles

1: The Ecosystem Advisory Council

1.1: The Ecosystem Advisory Council definition

The Ecosystem Advisory Council is a group of Ecosystem Actors that have been approved by Maker Governance through an MKR vote to carry out advisory work related to improving the content of the Ecosystem Scope Framework.

1.2: Ecosystem Advisory Council membership management

Members of the Advisory Council are directly approved by Maker Governance through a governance poll, and must fulfill specific criteria.

- 1.2.1:

The Responsible Facilitators must ensure that potential Advisory Council Members can apply to be approved by Maker Governance, using an open process with clear instructions.

- 1.2.2:

Advisory Council Members must be ecosystem actors that are not involved in any business activity that could result in a conflict of interest, either directly or indirectly. They must also have relevant skills for providing professional expert input on the content that the Ecosystem Scope is covering.

- 1.2.3:

The Responsible Facilitators must periodically, when it is relevant, review the Advisory Council Applications, and if they find applications that are suitable, bring them to a vote through an MKR governance poll. Approved Advisory Council Members are added to 10.2.3.1:

- 1.2.4:

The Responsible Facilitators may, if they deem it necessary, hold a vote to remove an Advisory Council Member. If an Advisory Council Member has not done any paid work for the Scope for at least 1 year, then the Responsible Facilitators can choose to remove them at will, if they deem it necessary.

- 1.2.5:

The current approved Advisory Council Members are recorded in the soft element 1.2.5.1

- 1.2.5.1:

□□□

Current list of Advisory Council Members:

- N/A

□□□

- 1.2.5.1:

1.3: Ecosystem Advisory Council projects and funding

The Advisory Council is paid on a project basis to do specific work that improves all or specific parts of the Scope Framework.

- 1.3.1:

Each Quarter, if they deem it necessary, the Responsible Facilitators must solicit proposals and find one or more suitable Advisory Council Members to perform a project that will result in output that can be used to improve the Scope Framework. This work output will be presented to the CVC Subcommittee Meetings as the starting point for the CVC Scope Framework Position Documents. As many CVCs as possible should be supported this way, prioritized by the Responsible Facilitators.

- 1.3.2:

In case an ambiguous, uncertain or challenging situation arises related to the Scope Framework, the Responsible Facilitator may approach one or more Advisory Council Members to perform a reactive project that aims to specify the language of the Scope Framework to take into account the specific situation. The Responsible Facilitator can then directly propose the change to the Scope Framework in a weekly governance poll, quickly resolving the challenge.

- 1.3.3:

The Advisory Council may not produce work output that is directly compatible with the formatting of the Scope Framework. In this case the Responsible Facilitator must either transcribe it themselves, or hire an Ecosystem Actor to perform the transcription. This role does not require preapproval by Maker Governance.

- 1.3.4:

The Responsible Facilitators may also produce advisory input on the content of the Scope Framework themselves, as long as it is focused on improving process and governance content. They are prohibited from providing unilateral input on expert subject matter content.

- 1.3.5:

The Responsible Facilitators have a budget available to pay for Advisory Council Projects per quarter. All spending must be limited to only what is deemed necessary and with a high probability of producing clearly measurable value, and this must be transparently be accounted for in a forum post at least a week before any transaction occurs.

- 1.3.5.1:

□□□

The Advisory Council project budget is as follows:

Quarterly Budget (DAI)

Method of Distribution

Maximum Limit (DAI)

0

Keg - streamed at a linear rate over 3 months

0

□□□

- 1.3.5.1:

2: The Implementation of the Ecosystem Scope Framework through Software

The Responsible Facilitators must in collaboration with the CVC Subcommittees, periodically review possibilities of integrating DAO toolkit innovation into the processes and content of the Scope Framework.

3: Governance process support

3.1: Governance process definition

Maker Governance uses various core governance processes to manage its core decision making processes, including the Endgame MIP process, CVC and Scope Framework modification processes, and CVC and Delegate processes. The Ecosystem Scope is only responsible for facilitating routine processes that clearly follow the rules and instructions of the Maker Constitution and the Scope Frameworks. As soon as something is ambiguous or is appealed, it is covered by the Arbitration Scope instead.

3.2: Pregame MIP Process

During the Pregame, while no new MIPs can be created, there are multiple process MIPs that are still active and can be used to make Sub Proposals. The Responsible Facilitators of the Ecosystem Scope must facilitate these processes and ensure they are followed according to the rules.

3.3: CVC internal governance processes

The Ecosystem Scope is responsible for tracking CVC internal governance proposals, CVC internal governance votes and resulting CVC Decisions. As the Responsible Facilitators track CVC internal governance processes, they must publish the activity to enable the broader community to follow

- 3.3.1:

CVC internal governance proposals are messages sent by a CVC Member that is cryptographically signed by their verified Ethereum Account.

- 3.3.2:

CVC internal governance votes are “for” or “against” messages sent by a CVC member that are cryptographically signed by their verified Ethereum Accounts.

- 3.3.3:

CVC Decisions are CVC internal governance proposals that have more “for” than “against” votes a week after they were proposed. There are several valid types of CVC Decisions. * 3.3.3.1:

New member addition or removal.

- 3.3.3.2:

CVC communication infrastructure moderation rights management.

- 3.3.3.3:

Ratification of quarterly CVC Scope Framework Position Documents, or CVC Governance Strategy Position Documents.

- 3.3.3.4:

A CD ban by the CVC.

- 3.3.3.5:

A CVC Split decision.

- 3.3.3.1:

New member addition or removal.

- 3.3.3.2:

CVC communication infrastructure moderation rights management.

- 3.3.3.3:

Ratification of quarterly CVC Scope Framework Position Documents, or CVC Governance Strategy Position Documents.

- 3.3.3.4:

A CD ban by the CVC.

- 3.3.3.5:

A CVC Split decision.

3.4: Arbitrary Scope Framework processes

Scope Frameworks contain various customized processes, often related to submitting governance proposals or modifying Active Elements. The Responsible Facilitators of the Ecosystem Scope are tasked with tracking and verifying that these processes are performed according to the rules. An action taken through a Scope Framework process is only valid if the Responsible Facilitators of the Ecosystem Scope have been correctly notified.

3.5: CVC support

The Responsible Facilitators of the Ecosystem Scope must ensure that the necessary infrastructure and services are available for CVCs to function as intended by the Maker Constitution, making participation in Maker Governance as convenient and streamlined as possible for CVC Members. A particular focus is the ease of transition from ordinary MKR holder to fully participating CVC Member.

- 3.5.1:

The CVC must have their own forums with categories for each of the Scopes to be able to collaborate in public on the CVC Scope Framework Position Documents and the CVC Governance Strategy Position Documents.

- 3.5.2:

CVCs must have the necessary support to hold quarterly CVC Subcommittee Meetings for each Scope. The meetings must be recorded and published on the Maker Forum.

- 3.5.3:

The Responsible Facilitators of the Ecosystem Scope must balance and prioritize the resource allocated to CVC support. If resources allocated to CVC support exceeds 50% of the total Governance Process Support budget, then the Responsible Facilitators must prioritize resources to focus on providing support to the CVCs that are most valuable to governance security. Governance security value is primarily determined by the size of the CVC, but also by the focus of the CVC - this means that smaller CVCs that introduce significant diversification benefits and increase voter choice must be prioritized

above their size.

3.6: Governance Process Support budget

The Responsible Facilitators of the Ecosystem have resources available to procure the necessary administrative support and services from Ecosystem Actors to assist in performing the duties contained in this article. When all duties cannot be fully met with the allocated resources, the Responsible Facilitators must thoughtfully prioritize and ensure that only the most critical processes and budgets are prioritized. Whenever the budget is used, its exact use must be reported clearly on the Maker Forum, and it can only be used to perform tasks described in this section.

- 3.6.1:

The budget for the tasks described in the Governance Process Support Article is defined in 3.6.1.1A

. The Active Element can be proposed to be modified urgently by the Responsible Facilitators using a weekly cycle governance poll, or through the standard CVC process. * 3.6.1.1A:

□□□

The budget available to fund Governance Process Support tasks is: * 0 Dai per quarter

□□□

- 0 Dai per quarter

□□□

- 3.6.1.1A:

□□□

The budget available to fund Governance Process Support tasks is: * 0 Dai per quarter

□□□

- 0 Dai per quarter

□□□

3.7: Designation of Governance Process Support Ecosystem Actors

The Ecosystem Facilitators can publicly designate Ecosystem Actors, including individuals, companies or Forum or Chat pseudonyms, as Governance Process Support Ecosystem Actors. This is done alongside giving them moderation rights and other forms of administration rights on the relevant communication channels. Governance Process Support Ecosystem Actors can make edits and process updates according to the various Governance Process rules, and can interact with the MIP process as defined in MIP0. For the purposes of MIPs or other Governance related documents, anything that applies to MIP Editors also applies to Governance Process Support Ecosystem Actors, as they replace the MIP Editor role.

4: Development and Standardization of the DAO toolkit

4.1: DAO toolkit definition

The DAO toolkit is a unified governance software system that is used to simplify, organize and standardize all of the governance processes and information of Maker Governance and the Scope Frameworks. Each Scope Framework must, over time, be implemented using the DAO toolkit as it is developed to make them interactive and make it easier for newcomers to understand how Maker Governance works.

4.2: DAO Toolkit Core Development

The Responsible Facilitators of the Ecosystem Scope must fund the development of the core underlying software and modules of the DAO Toolkit that is used to implement the Scope Frameworks as software.

- 4.2.1:

DAO Toolkit Core Development is funded through the budget defined in 4.2.1.1A

. This Active Element is modified using the standard CVC process

- 4.2.1.1A:

□□□

The budget available to fund Governance Process Support tasks is:

- 0 Dai per quarter

□□□

- 4.2.1.1A:

4.3: Standardized DAO Toolkit patterns

The DAO Toolkit must be developed and used across all of the Scope Framework to unify the user experience of all aspects of Maker Governance as much as possible.

- 4.3.1:

Similar concepts, items, modules and patterns that are implemented in DAO Toolkits for different Scope Frameworks, needs to be as consistent and easy to understand as possible.

- 4.3.2:

The Responsible Facilitators of the Ecosystem Scope must ensure that continuous processes are in place to detect, analyse and standardize repeating patterns that are implemented in the DAO Toolkit across the Scope Frameworks, and specify them in the subelements of this clause. * 4.3.1.1:

List of standardized DAO Toolkit patterns:

- 4.3.1.1:

List of standardized DAO Toolkit patterns:

4.4: DAO Toolkit best practice

The Ecosystem Scope must cover the general management and organizational design learnings that occur as the Scope Frameworks operate and implement the DAO Toolkit. The best practice for how to use it in a way that creates the best results and follows the spirit of the Maker Constitution must be documented in as much detail as possible, to make it possible to monitor compliance.

4.5: DAO Toolkit monitoring

The Responsible Facilitators of the Ecosystem Scope must ensure that the use of the DAO Toolkit by other scopes is continuously monitored and reviewed.

- 4.5.1:

The compliance with best practice and following of standardized patterns by other Scope Frameworks must be verified, and when failures to comply are found the Responsible Facilitators of the Ecosystem Scope must notify Maker Governance.

- 4.5.2:

The Responsible Facilitators must ensure there are continuous attempts to find new reusable patterns and organizational design learnings when monitoring implementation of new concepts of the DAO Toolkit.

5: Milestones and results reporting standardization

5.1: General guidelines on Milestones and results reporting of projects funded by the Maker Protocol

All funding of projects from resources provided by the Maker Protocol through the Scope Frameworks must report their milestone progress and results in a standardized way, eventually incorporating it into the DAO toolkit. All other Scope Frameworks must at minimum enforce the reporting and transparency requirements defined in the Ecosystem Scope Framework.

- 5.1.1:

It must be as easy as possible for Maker Governance to get an overview of the status and the success rate and probability of all ongoing and past projects.

5.2: Research and mitigation of transparency risks

The Responsible Facilitators must allocate resources towards long term research into the potential risks of transparency measures failing due to cultural or other issues.

- 5.2.1:

Maker Governance must have a current understanding available about how transparency and misalignment can manifest itself in the short term and long term.

5.3: Monitoring of milestone and results reporting

The Responsible Facilitators of the Ecosystem Scope must ensure that continuous monitoring of the reporting of milestones and results of project is occurring in a way that adequately mitigates the short term and long term risks of inadequate reporting and transparency.

6: Incubating Ecosystem Actors for SubDAOs

6.1: Incubating Ecosystem Actor definition

The Ecosystem Scope is responsible for incubating Ecosystem Actors alongside Incubating SubDAOs. Ecosystem Actors that are being prepared for the benefit of future SubDAOs are called Incubating Ecosystem Actors and are managed through this Article. While waiting for the incubating SubDAO launches, Maker Governance assigns Incubating Ecosystem Actors useful projects that can benefit the Maker Protocol, or work for developing protocols, products or services that can be adopted and are likely to be useful for the currently incubating SubDAO. This Article is particularly important during the Pregame, when 6 SubDAOs are simultaneously incubating.

6.2: DAO-level Objectives for Incubating Ecosystem Actors

The DAO Level Objectives for Incubating Ecosystem Actors determine the types of projects that Maker Governance will consider for Incubating Ecosystem Actors, and how they will be weighted on their potential to generate specific desirable results. Modifying the DAO Level Objectives is the area where Maker Governance has the most flexibility in shaping the Maker ecosystem in the long run in order to react to changes in the external environment. Each DAO Level Objective is given a priority weight between 1 and 5, which determines how big and how relatively important the objective is.

- 6.2.1:

Branding, marketing, user acquisition, user experience.

SubDAOs should have cutting edge, innovative and experimental solutions available to help them grow their userbase and their SubDAO Frontends. Incubating Ecosystem Actors that can build integrated userbase focused solutions should be preferred, in particular if they can provide metrics and milestones related to long term sustainable user retention, cost per user, and can operate with flexible budgets. Priority: 5.

- 6.2.2:

Referral marketing and revenue share systems

. Products that provide self-funded user acquisition such as referrals, revenue share and similar mechanisms should be considered. Priority: 3.

- 6.2.3:

Flexible smart contract development

. Smart contract development companies that can build the most basic solutions such as kegs, and can successfully submit secure governance actions to the Maker Governance Security Scope are critical for the sustainability of a SubDAO. They should be funded to ensure there is a redundant supply of smart contract development companies available for SubDAOs, so that they do not get bottlenecked even if a single supplier suddenly disappears. Priority: 5.

- 6.2.4:

Protocol development companies

. Maker should fund companies that develop smart contract protocols, and help them bootstrap Plug and Play Protocol business models to provide a large range of available products and services to users that can be further improved through the use of innovative and experimental frontend concepts.

- Frontend dev companies
- Branding/logo/design companies
- Growth hacking/viral marketing
- decentralized frontend security, infrastructure, speed, scaling

- Legal services
- Offramping, accounting and opsec
- Government relations
- Governance software, DAO toolkit, gamification
- Events and community building
- Scalable community management, moderating, cvc support, chat, forum, call infrastructure.

6.3: Incubation Proposal submission process

Ecosystem Actors can apply to become Incubating Ecosystem Actors by submitting a proposal to be processed by the Ecosystem Scope. To submit an Incubation Proposal, the Ecosystem Actor must make a post on the Maker Forum following the template provided in 6.3.1

, and comply with all requirements described in this section.

- 6.3.1:

Link to the Incubation Proposal template.

- 6.3.2:

Incubation Proposals must clearly detail their costs, both direct and indirect, and the results and benefits they provide to the Maker Ecosystem, in particular in relation to the DAO Level Objectives.

- 6.3.3:

Incubation Proposals must detail their headcount, team skillset composition, and reliance on third parties.

- 6.3.4:

Incubation Proposals must provide a clear timeline with detailed, granular milestones, and the KPIs to review at each milestone to determine whether to continue funding.

6.4: Incubation Proposal review process

The Responsible Facilitators of the Ecosystem Scope must use the Incubation Overhead budget to ensure the highest quality Incubation Proposals are thoroughly reviewed, and if applicable, funded through the Incubation budget by the Responsible Facilitators.

- 6.4.1:

Proposals should only be reviewed if there is available budget in the Incubation budget.

- 6.4.2:

Multiple factors should be considered holistically when reviewing Incubation Proposals, including the amount of remaining budget, the potential impact on the DAO Level Objectives, and, especially, whether Incubation Proposals can help alleviate the gaps that currently are in the DAO Level Objectives.

- 6.4.3:

All Incubation Proposals must be thoroughly reviewed in terms of their results reporting commitments and their mechanisms to ensure results and progress can be easily assessed while the project is ongoing. In particular very clear and thoughtful milestones connected to the provision of additional funding must be well reviewed and compared to alternatives. These transparency results must be made public, and Incubation Ecosystem Actors that do not have the highest levels of results transparency must be marked in advance with a clear justification for the reduced results transparency

6.5: Incubating Ecosystem Actor milestone review

Incubating Ecosystem Actors commit to predetermined milestones where they will submit their results and meet specific requirements before receiving additional funding.

- 6.5.1:

If a milestone results isn't met, funding for the Incubating Ecosystem Actor can still continue, but only based on a thorough assesment by the Responsible Facilitators. If the failure to meet the milestone was caused by a risk that was understood and

detailed as part of the proposal, and if there were already contingency plans in place in case the risk materialized, and it is generally a reasonable risk that was understood and accepted from the start of the project, then this should weigh in the favor of the Responsible Facilitators continuing to fund the Incubating Ecosystem Actor.

- 6.5.2:

In situations where Makers budget is constrained, only Incubating Ecosystem Actors that are clearly delivering on their milestones should have their funding continued, while those that do not meet their objectives and as a results are more risky, should have funding discontinued to preserve resources.

6.6: Current Incubating Ecosystem Actors

This section contains the Active Element where all the current Incubating Ecosystem Actors are recorded. It is important that all relevant information to understand budgets, results, milestones, and overall performance is available in the Active Subelement of each Incubating Ecosystem Actor.

- 6.6.1:

The list of Incubating Ecosystem Actors must follow the template contained in 6.6.1.1

for each recorded Incubating Ecosystem Actor.

- 6.6.1.1:

“”

- 6.6.1.1:

“”

- .x:

[Incubating Ecosystem Actor name and short description]

- .1:

[Budget information]

- .2:

[Deliverables and focus areas]

- .3:

[Team information, including headcount grouped by skillsets]

“”

- .1:

[Budget information]

- .2:

[Deliverables and focus areas]

- .3:

[Team information, including headcount grouped by skillsets]

“”

- 6.6.2:

The list of Incubating Ecosystem Actors and their current key terms and data is provided in the Active Element 6.6.1.1A

. The Responsible Facilitators of the Ecosystem Scope must update the Active Element and populate all the relevant real time information in the Active Subelement of each Incubating Ecosystem Actor.

- 6.6.2.1A:

□□□

In order to ensure that all Incubating Ecosystem Actor proposals for the Pregame are individually voted on by MKR holders a temporary rule is applied that only takes effect once, at the moment the Ecosystem Scope MIP is approved: Each Incubating Ecosystem Actors listed in this Active Element are subject to a Governance Poll asking MKR voters if they wish to individually approve the Incubating Ecosystem Actors budget and objective milestones, alongside the relevant information of the Incubating Ecosystem Actor. In the cases where a majority of MKR holders vote no in the Governance Poll, then the Incubating Ecosystem Actor is immediately removed from this Active Element.

List of Incubating Ecosystem Actors:

Ecosystem Actor Name

Budget Allocation

Ecosystem Actor Goal

Team Members

Phoenix Labs

347,100 DAI provided immediately upon a successful confirmation of the Incubating Ecosystem Actor in a Governance Poll.

17,000 DAI and 10 MKR per month for Developer Relations role

Deliver the Spark Protocol and maintain it for 12 months.

1 Business Development, 1 Smart Contract developer, 1 Developer Relations.

Viridian Protector Advisory Company

257,250 DAI provided immediately upon successful confirmation of the Incubating Ecosystem Actor in a Governance Poll.

85,750 Dai per month for full team.

Provide Protector Advisor work.

Business Development, Risk Analyst, Lawyer.

dewiz

150,000 DAI and 21 MKR per month.

General smart contract development and Collateral Onboarding Technical work (RWA focused).

5 Smart Contract developers.

Sidestream

70,912.5 DAI per month.

Full stack smart contract and frontend development.

3.5 FTE full stack developers.

□□□

- 6.6.2.1A:

6.7: Ecosystem Actor Incubation related budgets

The Responsible Facilitators of the Ecosystem Scope have two budgets available to support the tasks described in this section, the incubation overhead budget and the incubation budget.

- 6.7.1:

The Incubation Overhead budget is contained in 6.7.1.1A

and is modified through the regular CVC process.

- 6.7.1.1A:

□□□

The Incubation Overhead budget is:

- 0 Dai per quarter.

□□□

- 6.7.1.1A:
- 6.7.2:

The Incubation budget is contained in 6.7.2.1A and is modified through the regular CVC process.

- 6.7.2.1A:

□□□

The Incubation budget is

- 0 Dai per quarter
- Up to 0 MKR per quarter.

□□□

- 6.7.2.1A:

7: Incubating SubDAO community support

7.1: Incubating SubDAO community support overview

During the Pregame, the Responsible Facilitators of the Ecosystem Scope are tasked with incubating the communities for the 6 Launch SubDAOs, alongside the Incubating Ecosystem Actors that have potential to provide them with services. Incubation of communities focuses on communication, community building and cultural development.

7.2: Incubating SubDAO communication infrastructure

The Responsible Facilitators of the Ecosystem must deploy resources to set up and maintain high quality communication and community infrastructure for Incubating SubDAOs.

- 7.2.1:

Incubating SubDAOs require a SubDAO forum with a good user experience for both governance activities and community interaction.

—

- 7.2.2:

Incubating SubDAOs require a chat server for both governance activities and community interaction.

—

- 7.2.3:

Incubating SubDAOs can request support for high quality conference call capacity from the Ecosystem Scope, but this must only be provided if it is used at large scale commensurate with the costs and overhead of supporting it.

—

- 7.2.4:

The Responsible Facilitators of the Ecosystem Scope are tasked with maintaining administrator rights to the SubDAO communication infrastructure, and select community moderators among the most active and aligned community members. Forum polls and community consultations can be used to ensure that there is broad representation of the SubDAO community among the community moderators. In case of moderation disputes the Responsible Facilitators of the Ecosystem Scope must solve the dispute, or escalate it to the Arbitration Scope.

8: Ecosystem communication infrastructure

8.1: Ecosystem communication infrastructure management

The Responsible Facilitators of the Ecosystem Scope are tasked with maintaining an ecosystem wide forum and chat platform for SubDAO participants and Ecosystem Actors to interact with each other and discuss the Maker Protocol and ecosystem.

- 8.1.1:

An ecosystem forum for business proposals to SubDAOs, SubDAO partnerships and interactions, and casual conversation for the broader Maker Ecosystem.

- 8.1.2:

A chatroom, initially using discord, for broad discussion related to SubDAOs, Ecosystem Actors and Maker.

8.2: Communications infrastructure budget

The ecosystem communication infrastructure, as well as the CVC communication infrastructure and the Incubating SubDAO communication infrastructure budgets are covered in this section.

- 8.2.1:

The ecosystem communication infrastructure budget is contained in 8.2.1.1A

and is modified through the regular CVC process.

- 8.2.1.1A:

□□□

The ecosystem communication infrastructure budget budget is:

- 0 Dai per quarter.

□□□

- 8.2.1.1A:

9: Ecosystem Agreements

9.1: Ecosystem agreement definitions

Ecosystem agreements are novel partially binding decentralized agreements that can be made by SubDAOs and Ecosystem Actors. It involves making a formalized agreement and commitment from a single party or between two parties. This can cover for instance, binding revenue share deals (including plug and play protocol code with predetermined revenue share terms), binding commitments to pay a fee upon delivery of a specific work output (enabling milestone payments that also provide job security for the Ecosystem Actor).

9.2: Ecosystem Agreement Enforcement

The Responsible Facilitators of the Ecosystem Scope can enforce Ecosystem Agreements when terms are unambiguously breached by a single participating party through bundled Maker executive vote payloads to seize assets from SubDAOs, bundled Maker executive vote payloads to seize collateral from collateralized Ecosystem Actors, or by blacklisting uncollateralized Ecosystem Actors. Seized assets are used as remedy for the harmed party.

9.3: Ecosystem Agreement Standardization

Many types of Ecosystem Agreements are based on standardized terms and relationships, and to protect participants these types of Ecosystem Agreements will be standardized in the Ecosystem Scope. All agreements that fall under the definition of a standardized agreement have their terms automatically overridden by the standardized terms. Participants are also penalized for failing to follow standardized terms.

- 9.3.1:

List of standardized Ecosystem Agreement and their standardized terms: * 9.3.1.1:

Milestone-based payment

. This is a common type of Ecosystem Agreement where a SubDAO commits to pay an Ecosystem Actor a predetermined amount of value upon delivery of a specified work product, such as code or research output. If the work product is delivered properly, verified by the Ecosystem Agreement Enforcement process, and the SubDAO is forced to pay the committed amount.

- 9.3.1.2:

Plug and Play Protocol.

PnP Protocols are finished codebases of smart contract protocols that are easily adopted and included in SubDAO Decentralized Frontends. The original publisher of the codebase can tag the codebase as a PnP Protocol codebase by including in the source code PnP terms that describe terms such as a minimum protocol, and revenue share of the protocol fee. Any SubDAOs that adopt PnP codebases are forced to comply with the PnP terms.

- 9.3.1.1:

Milestone-based payment

. This is a common type of Ecosystem Agreement where a SubDAO commits to pay an Ecosystem Actor a predetermined amount of value upon delivery of a specified work product, such as code or research output. If the work product is delivered properly, verified by the Ecosystem Agreement Enforcement process, and the SubDAO is forced to pay the committed amount.

- 9.3.1.2:

Plug and Play Protocol.

PnP Protocols are finished codebases of smart contract protocols that are easily adopted and included in SubDAO Decentralized Frontends. The original publisher of the codebase can tag the codebase as a PnP Protocol codebase by including in the source code PnP terms that describe terms such as a minimum protocol, and revenue share of the protocol fee. Any SubDAOs that adopt PnP codebases are forced to comply with the PnP terms.

9.4: Ecosystem Agreement Enforcement overhead budget

The Responsible Facilitators of the Ecosystem Scope will have a small budget available to maintain the capacity to monitor, analyze and interpret Ecosystem Agreement disputes.

9.5: Ecosystem Agreement dispute resolution prices

When a party to an Ecosystem Agreement wants to resolve a dispute, they must pay for the work of analyzing and resolving the dispute under the Ecosystem Scope.

9.6: Ecosystem Agreement dispute appeal process

A party to an Ecosystem Agreement dispute can choose to appeal the resolution to a dispute made by the Ecosystem Scope to the Arbitration Scope, based on the Articles for handling Ecosystem Agreement Disputes detailed in the Arbitration Scope Framework.

MIP106c3: Responsible Facilitators

The Responsible Facilitators of the Ecosystem Scope Framework are defined in MIP113c2.6.1.2.1A.

MIP106c4: Scope Framework Articles modification Sub Proposal process

During the pregame the Scope Framework articles can be modified through the Monthly Governance Cycle using a MIP102c2 subproposal.