[WARNING:]

This post is potentially flame-bait. It is not intended to be flame-bait. However, I am struggling to find language suitable to express my disgust without being flame-bait-ey. Please read with caution and reply constructively.

[/ WARNING]

I popped into the KEPLR web-app this week and was presented with several SCRT network governance proposals.

On most I voted NWV. Why? Because the on-chain text description of the proposed governance action was uselessly brief.

I believe proposals should appear on-chain:

1. sufficiently verbose to make me interested enough to come view the details here in the forum; or to determine that I am not interested enough to come here (in which case I should either allow my validator(s) to vote on my behalf, or vote Abstain.); and

2. sufficiently verbose that if this forum should disappear - for any of about 12 million possible reasons - an historical reviewer can still understand the basics of what was being voted on.

I consider "sufficiently verbose" to be, basically, a three-to-five sentence elevator-pitch at a minimum! Preferably, a proposal is at least two paragraphs of explanatory text and an overview bullet list of the effects of the proposal. And a link to this discussion forum.

If your on-chain text doesn't meet "sufficiently verbose," it therefore is SPAM in my opinion and should be voted No With Veto.

So, for you people making proposals: When that proposal appears on-chain for voting, if the on-chain text is two sentences and a link here, then I will vote NWV; and I encourage every other individual voter - and validators - to do the same.