

Summary

Establish a prototype framework for consenting to goals, which is open, adaptable, distributed and cyclical. The output of the GOOSE is the opportunity for competitive submissions of short and medium-term goals consented to by the governance token holders; The success marker of the GOOSE will be when one-year

and three-year

goals aligned to the overarching DAO mission

and vision

are public for anyone to use.

Abstract

Every system has a genesis event. The first piece or module of a larger puzzle. This proposal is to jump-start a framework for an open goal-setting exercise which is adaptable, inclusive, distributed, and cyclical. The GOOSE is a simple means to agree on how to set goals and allows for future steps or modules to adapt to the GOOSE. The output of the GOOSE is an open competitive submissions cycle which results in short (one-year) and medium (three-year) term goals which are revisable on an annual cadence and which can be used by anyone to contribute to the DAO. The prototype is inspired by Bitcoin logic where the proposals are like blocks of ordered data and the token holders are like miners who will select the next truth. The GOOSE is the first module in an emerging framework and is limited to consenting to goals. Further steps, such as how to estimate progress made towards goals are left to emerge as separate modules.

The exercise sequence consists of a notice period followed by a proposal period. During the proposal period

any member of the Ethereum community interested in liquid staking can submit three-year and one-year goals which are demonstrably tied to the DAO's mission, vision and purpose. The end of the proposal period is followed by a consent period and snapshot vote to signal which proposal is consented to as a reference. The output of the GOOSE is a reference goals-matrix available to all potential creators, builders, or contributors wherever they may be and whatever they may do.

On a 12-month cycle the same sequence is repeated to review and update the reference matrix for currency and ongoing relevance.

Though they share a common sequence, there is a difference between the genesis jump-start exercise and the annual review exercise. The purpose of the genesis exercise (now) is a prototype to jump-start the GOOSE framework - to get goal-setting underway; the purpose of the annual review is a deliberate and measured iteration on the prior three and one-year goals considering achievements over the prior 12 months and/ or changes in the environment, to roll still-valid prior-year goals forward, or to retire some goal as appropriate, and/or to fill matrix vacancies that arise as an output of the review exercise; it is also the opportunity to review and amend the GOOSE itself.

The process is "open" because anyone can make a submission, "cyclical" because it is annual, "adaptable" because there is a change mechanism built-in enabling dynamic response to a change in environment, "inclusive" because the duration of the notice and submission periods are reasonable such that a motivated person can make a submission within the proposed periods, and "distributed" because it is both open and proposal selection and consent is made by token holder signal.

Motivation

DAOs are not companies. They have distinct advantages and challenges brought about by the different governance models. In particular, DAOs cannot rely upon conventional managerial tooling or processes for activities like goal-setting, or post-goal-setting resource allocation, or results assessments, due to the absence of centralized management relationships. Goal alignment across a diffuse set of actors is desirable to ensure that necessary improvements are made to the protocols, and no compromise to the existing protocols & products are made. To compensate for this, DAOs need alternative ways to achieve parallel outcomes.

A solution here is a means

to let different actors "swim in their own lane" but help orient themselves to "swim to the same destination" with minimal need for coordination between and among them.

One means to substitute for conventional management frameworks is to make goals (submitted by anyone) available as public reference information. The reference can then be used locally to orient the decision-making by distributed actors while maintaining their independence across the creation, building and contribution process. Here goals aligned with "Vibes" (Mission, Vision and Purpose) serve as an ultimate filter for things to do. Long-term DAO [mission/vision/purpose has been articulated](#). Adopting one and three-year goals connected to the mission/vision/purpose will provide an easily understood reference point from which the diffuse participants of the DAO can orient to without intervention. Concurrent with this, consenting to goals annually will lower governance costs through less frequent requirements to vote.

This proposal does not address steps beyond consenting to what the reference goals are and how to review and update them. However, as a quasi-proxy for the “will” of the DAO, there is an incentive for projects and contributors to use the signal which is: If you’re an individual/organization/entity or team that is aligned with the reference goals and can reasonably demonstrate so, there may be a higher chance of being allocated funds from the treasury than if you propose for funding outside of the reference matrix. Making proposals outside of the reference matrix is not however closed and leaves open an onramp to respond to unexpected opportunities as they arise, however good goals will normally be resilient to dynamic changes.

Benefits

For the DAO

- Removes topical paralysis and enables faster and easier governance decisions
- Attracts developers/contributors
- Aligns “what’s funded” with clear goals & principles and reduces resources spent on unaligned things
- Attracts better talent
- Fosters open debate, thought leadership, and an idea of meritocracy

For Contributors

- Facilitates decision-making in diffuse, decentralized groups
- Encourages innovation, the development of new features, and the replacement or improvement of existing features within the software suite
- Establishes the DAO as a reliable open trustworthy partner
- Helps Independent contributing groups make better decisions
- Helps build a healthy community around inventions

Drawbacks

- Potentially increases the time and effort to develop and make submissions
- Potentially slightly reduces the capability to respond to unknown unknowns

Specification: Guided Open Objective Setting Exercise

The GOOSE consists of:

1. Genesis jump-start cycle
2. September 1st post on forum
3. September 7th snapshot vote; all other steps depend on the proposal being approved by the DAO
4. September 14th start of the 30-day submission period
5. October 14th submission period closes
6. October 14th start of the discussion period
7. October 26th, snapshot vote on the submitted proposals

Note: The duration of the notice, submission, and discussion periods in Genesis are constrained by the DAO voting cycle with the vote on GOOSE proposals scheduled on October 26th.

1. The Review Cycle
2. Yearly
3. 14-30 days notice and information sharing period
4. 30 days submission period

5. 7-14 days discussion period (depending on the Lido DAO voting cadence)

Notice period

The Notice period is a period of not less than 14 days where the DAO Ops workstream communicates to the community the timing of each of the relevant periods and explicitly communicates when a 30-day window will open and close to receive submissions.

Submission period

The Submission period is a 30-day window to make open submissions in their final form as an indivisible whole, encompassing complete one and three-year goals, including their role-related rationale. Including the rationale for “why” the goal is related to the mission vision purpose will enable discussion to remain focused and orderly by offering clear easily understood explanations.

The Discussion (and update) period

The Discussion period is a period not less than 10 days where comments and modest feedback can be incorporated into the proposals by the authors if they so choose to revise their submissions. For example, an author can amend their submission to substitute goals (mix and match) based on community feedback.

Vote

It would be both unreasonable and unmanageable to vote on individual goals. A single proposal as submitted or amended by the author wins. The “mix and matching” of goals from different submissions is possible but is captured in the discussion period. Under the current governance mechanics, this means the winner submission requires 50%+ of the voted tokens and no less than 5% of all governance tokens on any single option.

It is worth noting here that no method is proposed to limit or screen the number of proposals that can be submitted in the Genesis exercise. A process for narrowing the number of submissions for efficient use of resources is left for future review.

Exercise ownership

The GOOSE owner is the DAO operations workstream ([@DAO_Ops](#)).

Cadence

The cadence for the GOOSE is annual beginning the first year after Genesis with a 30-day notice period.

Review Cycle

As noted above, the sequence: notice, submission, discussion, and vote, remains the same as Genesis, however, the content of the review cycle is not the same content as the one-time genesis. The review cycle is open, anyone can make a submission. The difference is the outcome is a revised goals matrix that accounts for the passage of time. The submissions will identify which goals are still valid and/or which goals should be struck in light of any changes in the operating environment or progress made. Where vacancies exist there is an opportunity to introduce new 3-year and 1-year goals tied to the mission, vision, and purpose.

Using this method the GOOSE will be an evolving iterative product of the collective experience and wisdom of the DAO, Ethereum participants and contributors. The longer-term goal of the GOOSE would be to see a competitive plurality of submissions and potentially a bounty for the best submission.

GOOSE review

The GOOSE as outlined in this proposal will be open for review to capture any lessons learned on the same annual cycle.

Collateral observations

Future steps (solving a different problem) around execution and implementation frameworks are recommended to socialize the data for execution and implementation evaluation which can give feedback into the Revision cycle.