One of the most common – if not the

most common – friction points in Maker governance since the beginning is over the lack of dissemination of information. Upon the winding down of the Maker Foundation, the decentralized MakerDAO attempted to address this with several core units, most notably GovComms, GovAlpha, Growth, and SES. Their mandates or voluntary activities involved communications about governance actions and spending to the community and public (GovComms and Growth especially), as well as building repositories of reference materials, historical records, and records (GovAlpha and SES especially).

Since the restructuring of the DAO in March, most of these sources of information have been discontinued, deprecated, or reduced in scope. There is no longer a weekly call to be updated on recent governance actions and risk parameters, GovComms no longer exists to provide summaries of governance and forum activity, GovAlpha and others are no longer provide regular translations, etc. Adding to this, it has occasionally been difficult for AVCs, delegates, and community members to get information even when directly requested. This sometimes leads to disagreements, heated exchanges, and mistrust that are entirely avoidable if everyone was operating with the same information. To the extent information could not be divulged publicly, understanding a specific reason would avoid the impression information requests were being ignored or information purposefully withheld from Maker governance.

One area where Maker could increase its transparency is in figured out a way to meet information requests that would have previously been covered by a variety of Core Units or repositories of documents. Something similar to the FOIA (Freedom of Information Act) requests of US government agencies would make information requests less contentious and increase trust through a neutral process. For those not familiar, FOIA allows anyone (even non-residents and non-citizens) to request copies of documents from the US government, subject to some exclusions like national security and ongoing law enforcement investigations. They are also authorized to charge a reasonable fee if the expenses in complying with the information request are large (typically >2 hours of effort or >100 pages of documents) But each FOIA information request must

be either met or denied (with an explanation why) within a reasonable time period. If a request is denied, there is also a process for a single appeal (which often works).

We'd like @Aligned_Delegates and @AVC_Member to consider what a standardized process could be for MakerDAO's facilitators and ecosystem actors to receive and reply to information requests. In general, we would think it would looks something like:

- Provide a designated place (forum, email, discord, something else?) for submission of information requests

- Provide a limited time period to either provide that information or deny citing from a list of exclusions, after which a penalty of some kind is incurred

- Provide a (very short) list of exclusions that are not subject to requests, such as the personal information of a contributor or analysis of information rather than copies of information

- Provide an anti-spam measure to avoid very large requests

- Provide a limited, but available, appeals process for a requester to appeal a denial if they disagree that an exclusion applies

This is just brainstorming and not an advocation for specific mechanisms, but we think having a standardized process that ensures requests receive a response is necessary for AVCs and delegates to perform their required functions. Providing a process would smooth out information asymmetries not just between AVCs/delegates and facilitators/ecosystem actors, but also between AVCs and delegates, where some individuals may be more skilled at ferreting out information or able to rely on personal networks amongst contributors to procure information.

Having a formalized process would also ensure that requests are received

by facilitators and ecosystem actors since nonresponse can be common when relying on more casual methods like asking on a forum thread. While answering on forum threads would still be encouraged, they would have a "safe harbor" of knowing they are only compelled to answer information requests submitted to a single, designated place.