

Hello Maker Community,

I was recently approached by a new community member, [@VeniceTree](#), claiming to have evidence of an operational security breach involving two Aligned Delegates, [@Navigator](#) and [@PALC](#).

Endgame Edge implemented a protocol to protect the sensitive information of the ADs. We requested the informant and the AD to create a secure communication channel so that the evidence could be presented and discussed between just the two of them. If it turned out that the informant's evidence was sufficiently persuasive, then the AD would have the opportunity to concede the operational security breach without the Governance Facilitator teams having access to the informant's evidence. If, on the other hand, the Aligned Delegates challenged the informant's evidence, then the Governance Facilitator teams would have to step in to review the evidence.

In this case, after reviewing the informant's evidence, both [@Navigator](#) and [@PALC](#) conceded the presence of legitimate operational security concerns. As a result, they chose to voluntarily step down from their roles as ADs.

Therefore, Endgame Edge has decided to derecognize both Navigator and PALC, effective immediately. We shared our decision with [@JanSky](#), who confirmed their agreement.

## Whistleblower Bounty

Per [Atlas 2.6.6](#), half of the ADs' buffer is to be allocated as a whistleblower bounty to the informant. However, a significant condition exists to the payment of this bounty.

Half of the AD Buffer can be confiscated and used as a whistleblower bounty in case an ecosystem actor responsibly provided useful information for determining that the operational security of an AD was compromised. GOV6 must specify sufficient safety mechanisms around the payment of the whistleblower bounty.

Endgame Edge interprets the key phrases "responsibly provided" and "safety mechanisms" in the light of the [Universal Alignment Assumption](#) - that is, "the underlying intent of rules always aims to serve human values and promote public benefit within a given context." [emphasis added]

Therefore, it is the position of Endgame Edge that, to qualify for the bounty, the informant must have secured their evidence ethically (for instance, using publicly available blockchain data). We do not make any representations as to the position of [@JanSky](#)'s Governance Facilitator team on this point.

One of the ADs has confirmed that the informant's evidence was not secured via unethical/illegal means. We are waiting to hear from the second AD. We will post an update below when the final decision regarding the bounty payout is made.

As mentioned above, the Atlas ([Atlas 2.6.5](#) and 2.6.6) mandates us to develop sufficient safety mechanisms around the payment of the whistleblower bounty. We interpret this requirement to mean that the bounty process should not be manipulated or exploited to cause harm to the DAO or the Alignment Conserver.

## Proposal for Community Discussion

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 decisionmaking 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.

## Conclusion

The informant has stated that they are continuing to gather evidence on more ADs. It is essential that all anon Alignment Conservers do their utmost to maintain the highest level of operational security. At a minimum:

- Do not connect your Ecosystem Actor wallet to a KYC'd service.

- Do not use your EA wallet casually, i.e., purchasing NFTs or interacting with dApps for personal reasons.
- Do not transact with an entity that can be traced to a known or reasonably suspected identity.

To conclude, Endgame Edge extends our deepest gratitude to both ADs for their invaluable contributions to MakerDAO.

Edit: I forgot to thank [@LongForWisdom](#). We collaborated closely on the development of this process prior to my facilitation role. His insights were indeed instrumental in shaping this process.