Celo Governance Call #6

April 8, 2021

Overview

- <u>Key Document:</u> <u>Governance Working Group - Living Doc</u>. See this footnote if the link doesn't work for you[1].
- <u>Purpose of Call:</u>
    a. We continued to discuss the tensions in the governance process identified before Call #5 (See page 3 for a summary).
    b. We discussed <u>Issue #5051</u>, which would make it possible for Approvers to un-approve proposals if they catch an error/issue after approving a proposal.
- <u>Next Steps:</u> See next steps in-line below.

Summary

Discussion of Governance Tensions

We covered 3 more tensions that have been identified in the governance process:

1. <u>CGP Process Specification:</u>
    a. We briefly discussed several documents that could help make the governance process clearer.
    b. **Next Steps:**
        i. Yaz Khoury set up a private Governance Working Group Discord channel as an asynchronous forum for these governance improvement conversations.
        ii. Asa Oines, Yaz Khoury, and Will Kraft will sync in the new channel on these documents.
2. <u>Resolving the inconsistency between proposalID and CGP Numbers:</u>
    a. We discussed several ways to resolve the inconsistency. See <u>this GitHub Issue</u> for details on two potential options.
    b. **Next Steps:** Yorke Rhodes created the ticket linked above for two of the options discussed, and Asa Oines will create a ticket for the third.
4. <u>The community needs more CGP editors:</u>
    a. CGP editors essentially check out pull requests and make sure they're consistent with the template, and we'd like to have more of them, especially from outside cLabs.
    b. Time commitment depends on the number of proposals but is not too significant.
    c. **Next Steps:**
        ■ Elizabeth Barnes and Ronan[2] will become CGP editors.
        ■ It would be nice to have 4 editors, with as many from outside of cLabs as possible, so others can contact Yaz Khoury if interested.

---

[1] https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ZuYdwh4ZFtiEvXaE7Ow6NhKjBvLwjn-M_-ryDBuPZLM/edit#

[2] I did not catch Ronan's last name.

Discussion of Issue #5051: Allow governance approver to revoke an approval ([Link](#))

- The period for Approvers to approve CGPs requires a fast turnaround, and there's no ability to unapprove if an Approver figures out there's an issue later.
- There seemed to be general agreement that this is a good idea, but I had to jump off the call before the discussion ended.
- **Next Steps:** Ticket will be discussed further in Discord.

Governance Tensions

All of the bullet points below were listed on the Github Issue, and this section just breaks them up into categories and adds bullet summaries.

Governance Proposal Quality

- Need More Process Documentation: Governance and CGP process not as specified as CIP Process. See Cosmo's [example](#).
- Proposal Completeness:
  - CGPs with missing sections or underspecified.
  - Never post proposals until they are fully specified, including code verification procedures.
- Aim for Standalone Doc: Try to make CGP text reasonably stand-alone, giving the gist even to readers who don't follow the links. (But do provide the links for further context and community discussion.)
- Include Audit Reports: Ensure Audit Reports are publicized prior to submission.

Related to Governance Roles

- Proposal Editors: Need more CGP editors.
- Approver Timing: Coordination with approvers needs a more specified Verification process.
  - Provide timely push notifications to approvers (when proposals are posted and as expiry approaches), to give them time to review
- Community Input: Proactively seek community input on proposals before they're posted. In particular, seek non-cLabs input on proposals that involve privileges to cLabs or cLabbers.
- Code Verification Documentation: Document the proposal code verification procedure. Make sure many non-cLabbers know of it and have successfully invoked it. (Sufficiently many to really catch problems, if they arise.)

Organization & Clarity

- Create CGP Repo: Move governance to its own repository outside the current repo to separate CIP and CGP processes.
- Too Many Numbers: Need to resolve inconsistency between proposalID and CGP Numbers.
- Associating CGP Parameters w/ a CIP: CGP governable parameters need to be tracked down in the CIP process.
- Fix CLI for Governance: celocli governance:view is difficult to understand and fails to helpfully parse some proposals.