UPDATE

: [Optimism Foundation has provided an important update for the next steps of governance](#) with an approach similar to that proposed in this proposal but with a broader scope for the next iteration. We'll move on to this soon.

Author Name

: [@AxlVaz](#) [@NicoProducto](#) [@Joxes](#) (DeFi Latam & Optimism Español [non-official])

Summary

The idea of this proposal is to improve the voting process

step by step, and to align more and more the community, delegates and protocols with the vision of Optimism

. If this process has good results, it can be repeated every several cycles to continuously improve until we have an optimal system for all parties.

This proposal intends to let [cycle #2](#) finish and then establish a discussion period to improve the governance process related to [Phase 1](#)

before continuing with next cycles.

In these terms, we can discuss timing and procedures or come up with another proposal that tries to improve the phased voting processes. Our ideas, formally below

.

Introduction

[Phase 0 has ended](#) and [Phase 1 is about to come to an end](#) Approximately [50 days](#) have passed since the proposals for the different protocols in this governance were initiated. During this period of time 55 proposals have been analyzed and corrected, [25 from Phase 0](#) and 30 [from Phase 1](#), which demands a great deal of time for the participants and delegates of this governance. During this process we have surely all ([@OPUser](#)) [thought about](#) how to [improve the process](#) for the next phase and better filter the proposals from the assigned protocols.Even this kind of topics are discussed in the discord channel, check out [@linda](#)'s [comment](#).

Surely some of you must have been exhausted after spending hours analyzing each proposal and debating them in this forum.

A pause for phase 1

From the [DeFi Latam community](#) and [OptimismESP](#) we propose to pause the voting process to make an analysis of Phases 0 and 1 among all the delegate representatives, and after that propose the necessary changes to improve the following voting.

Objectives:

- To enable delegates and token holders to improve the phase 1 process.

- Increase order and efficiency among the different actors: proposers, delegates and community.

- Increase the number of proposals encouraged on quality and not just quantity, allowing governance to accumulate experience and adjust development times accordingly.

Development:

1. Once Phase 1 cycle #2

has been voted and finalized. Stop the following voting cycles.

1. Within 15 days the delegates or any collaborator together with the community, has the possibility to submit to the forum a [DRAFT] with a maximum of 5 detailed and justified changes with the proposed improvements for the following votes.

2. Debate each [DRAFT] in the forum and pass to [READY] the proposals with the approval of at least 3 delegates randomly chose. Deadline 3 days.

3. Vote in Snapshot the [READY] proposals, in this case the voting time should be much shorter, we believe that with 1 week to vote these proposals is fine.

4. Apply the rule changes for the next Voting Cycle.

5. If this process is successful, apply it every 2 Voting Cycles until it is no longer necessary to propose changes.

Clarifications and recommendations:

- Changes can be less than 5 but cannot exceed this amount. This is to be concise and more precise in the proposals.

- The changes have to be applicable in the next round of voting so they have to be simple changes and not so radical (these should have another treatment). Examples of changes: have a quota of maximum 20 protocols per phase, put a ceiling of OP token to the grants (maximum 5M), that the protocols that have to approve the proposal previously in their governance have it approved in their governance to avoid changes in case the Optimism governance approves them, etc.

- Surely some delegates or collaborators would have or share the same ideas during this process. It would be a good practice to combine one or more similar proposals so that when we get to the Snapshot there are not so many similar proposals.

- In case there are two or more opposing modification proposals on the same topic, we can move to contrast them in a new instance in the forum (new post for example) to finalize the discussion. We hope that delegates will collaborate in improving the draft proposals and reduce the work through decision via Snapshot.

We hope that our proposal will bring a positive discussion with new ideas and feedback in order to improve the governance process related to Phase 1 and leaving a precedent for future implementations. Stay Optimistic.