**1. What are the exact math formulas for how the following is being done?**

DIVI Response: The formulas for the master nodes above are wrong. They should be done in a logical way, in proportion to the amount invested in them.

Perfect. There are still some options. You can achieve the same results by either altering the percentage chance of solving a block or by changing the reward or both. I would recommend the first as it is conceptually simplest and most in line with the spirit of the intention.

**2. Is this formula locked in or can it be changed?**

DIVI RESPONSE: The formula shouldn't be changed. Most of our investors understand the formula and are counting on this, and they've invested specifically to get their Master Node.

OK. Now that we understand that the previous formula was wrong and that the understood intent is correct, this is preferable.

Vaulting is easy enough to add as well. Our version of the 6-Tier Master document doesn’t mention vaulting. Is it possible to get access to more up-to-date documentation?

**3. Can it be immediately decided that the fork SHALL be from PIVX?**

DIVI RESPONSE: No I've heard from an expert that although PIVX was forked from Dash a year or so ago, now DASH's code is far superior. PIVX has extra features so the ideal situation might be to fork Dash and add the PIVX features we want, along with our own features.

Logical. What we need ASAP then is a list of PIVX features to be added to the current Dash.

**4. Can it be immediately decided that the ability for users to write smart contracts shall NOT be required for the Spring deadline?**

DIVI RESPONSE: Yes we think so, we never intended users to write smart contracts. However, some of the features may require smart-contract-like logic for some transactions, such as the vaulting, piggy bank feature, and half-escrow feature (the last one isn't in the WP)

We’re on the same page.

**5. EXACTLY what additional features SHALL be required for the Spring deadline?**

DIVI RESPONSE: We have a list of P0 and P1 features. The most important ones solve the core ease-of-use, security, and fear problems that everyone hates about bitcoin and other cryptos. This list is shown here

Excellent!

Sending a PIN with a transfer can be done simply by encrypting it with the receivers public key.

**6. EXACTLY which current PIVX features SHALL be required to be removed for the Spring deadline? In particular, I'm wondering about the Zerocoin privacy protocol that was added to PIVX in October. We could avoid this by grabbing/starting with the immediately prior version of the software. But, is there anything else that we need to immediately disable or remove?**

DIVI RESPONSE: The Zerocoin protocol is probably unnecessary since the previous method is good enough privacy for most situations. But, I'm not sure about hiding balances. Most people aren't going to want their balances to be public knowledge. Also, if we incorporate a strong privacy protocol that has the power to be abused by criminals, then we need to be able to use the governance system to disable it. Or another option is to only allow people to use it who have had their ID verified. Its fairly certain the governments will crack down on cryptos that don't have KYC when serious mass adoption starts to occur.

DIVI RESPONSE: Another issue about PIVX is that I've been told that the PIVX governance system doesn't work as well as DASH, but this needs to be researched better to confirm it.

OK. This question is partially OBE since it seems that what we will be doing is forking DASH and adding selected PIVX features but the thrust was meant to be ***what we need to do ASAP is to lock down the feature requirements for the Spring deadline***. Can it be immediately decided that Zerocoin is out? I believe that DASH implemented PrivateSend after the fork and . . . .