
Web3Privacy Now Constitution

Empowering people to be awesome

Tree <@tree.fail>

2025/08/08

Table of Contents

We are an Ecosystem for Impact	4
A Resilient Foundation	4
1. Overview	6
2. Intentional Do-ocracy	7
Our Framework for Effective Action	7
Our Evolution: Why “Intentional”?	7
Why Intentional Do-ocracy?	8
How It Thrives	8
Noncoercive Authority	8
Limitations	9
An Intentional Do-ocracy Is Not a...	9
Further Reading	9
3. Formal Proposals & The Veto Process	10
When is a Formal Proposal Needed?	10
The “Lazy Consensus” Process	10
The Steward Flag: Forcing Extended Consideration	11
The Objection and Veto Path	11
Why This Model?	12
The General Assembly & Legal Entity	12
4. The Stewards	13
The Responsibilities of a Steward	13
Powers and Limitations	14
Composition, Election, and Term	14
Accountability and Removal	15
5. Membership	16
Supporters	16
Members: The Core Contributors	16
Losing Membership	17
6. Recognized Ecosystem Projects	18
The Recognition Process	18

Merits of Recognition	18
7. Retroactive Contributor Rewards	19
The Process: Peer-Based, Reputation-Weighted Allocation	19
How the Calculation Works: A Step-by-Step Guide	20
Full-Featured Example	20
Why This Weighted Model is Essential	22
8. The Right to Fork: A Process of Cellular Division	23
The Distinction from a Recognized Ecosystem Project	23
The Legitimate Grounds for a Fork	24
The Process in Principle	24
9. Guidelines	25
Communication	25
Collaboration	25
Disagreement & Conflict	26
Contribution & Ownership	26
Technology & Tools - The Principle of Conviviality	26
10. The Legacy	27
11. Changelog	29

[DRAFT VERSION — FOR REVIEW ONLY]

This is a work-in-progress and does not yet represent the official, finalized constitution of Web3Privacy Now. Content and structures are subject to change. Please provide feedback and suggestions in the Issues or community channels.

We are an Ecosystem for Impact

Web3Privacy Now is the hub where education, connection, and innovation converge to advance digital privacy. We are a community-driven organization that translates complex research into engaging content, connects builders with collaborators, and provides a powerful network for aligned projects.

We exist to build a flywheel of progress. By fostering a transparent and collaborative environment, we create a self-reinforcing cycle: education inspires new builders, connections create stronger projects, and our collective support accelerates their journey. We provide the fertile ground where ambitious ideas are nurtured, tested, and scaled.

A Resilient Foundation

A core belief of Web3Privacy Now is that deliberate structure is not an enemy of freedom, but its necessary guardian. We recognize that “structurelessness” is a myth that inevitably conceals informal, unaccountable power structures. For a decentralized community to thrive, it must be consciously engineered to withstand conflict and stagnation. Hope and goodwill are starting points, not a complete strategy.

Our governance model is therefore built upon three fundamental acknowledgements—truths derived from observing the successes and failures of countless self-governing organizations:

- **“Common sense” is not common.** Principles must be made explicit, as our members come from diverse cultures and hold different assumptions.
- **Consensus is not always possible.** Passionate people will have conflicting goals. We need a clear and predictable process for making decisions when full agreement cannot be reached.
- **Inaction is the greatest risk.** An imperfect but clear process for solving problems is infinitely better than allowing them to fester unresolved.
- **Growth is not always success.** Since large groups can become bureaucratic, we consider an amicable split into smaller, more effective communities a feature of our evolution, not a failure.

This philosophy stems from the principle of Do-ocracy, evolved into what we call Intentional Do-ocracy—our framework for turning ideas into effective action.

The goal of this Constitution is to empower our community by making the “rules of the game” transparent and accessible to everyone. It is a system designed to stimulate collaboration and creative problem-solving, and you can download the latest version as a PDF¹ or ePub². It is, by design, a work in

¹<https://constitution.w3pn.org/w3pn-constitution.pdf>

²<https://constitution.w3pn.org/w3pn-constitution.epub>

progress. That is why this Constitution is hosted on GitHub³, enabling our community to continuously refine it and for other organizations to learn from our journey.

We, the members of Web3Privacy Now, establish this Constitution as a shared map for navigating our journey with purpose, principle, and passion.

³<https://github.com/web3privacy/constitution>

1. Overview

The core operating system of Web3Privacy Now is our unique model called **Intentional Do-ocracy**, detailed in Section 2. This framework empowers members by balancing freedom with a mindful process: from an initial **Dream**, through **Design** and **Action**, to a final **Reflection** on the outcome.

For actions that are irreversible or commit significant resources, a **Formal Proposal** is required (Section 3). This is our safety mechanism: a consent-based process where members can raise formal objections. To guard this process and our principles, Section 4 introduces the **Stewards**, who serve not as directors, but as impartial counselors and guardians.

Section 5 clarifies who has a voice in our governance, distinguishing between passive **Supporters** and active **Members**, whose governance rights are earned through contribution. To formally support the initiatives that emerge from our community, Section 6 introduces **Recognized Ecosystem Projects**, defining a clear path for them to gain official endorsement. To sustain our active contributors, Section 7 outlines our system of **Contributor Rewards**, a peer-based process that retroactively thanks Members for their valuable work.

As the ultimate guarantee of our resilience, Section 8 establishes **The Right to Fork**. This is our non-coercive process for enabling an amicable community split, ensuring we can evolve through stress rather than break under it.

To ensure all these interactions are smooth and constructive, we have a set of **Guidelines** (Section 9). These are not rigid rules, but a shared cultural understanding of effective and respectful behavior.

Finally, because the spirit of a rule is as important as its letter, **The Legacy** (Section 10) serves as the “cipher” to interpret our principles. To ensure this remains a living document, **The Changelog** (Section 11) provides a transparent and auditable history of its evolution.

2. Intentional Do-ocracy

Our Framework for Effective Action

DREAM -> DESIGN -> DECIDE -> ACT -> REFLECT -> (and back to DREAM)

Our model of Do-ocracy is built on a five-stage process that empowers effective, well-considered action. It's about owning an idea from start to finish.

- **Dream:** You are empowered to make things happen. If you have an idea, you have the agency to take the initiative.
- **Design:** Before you act, take time to think through the execution. For small tasks, this might take seconds. For larger projects, it might involve a sketch, a brief plan, or a chat with others.
- **Decide:** Commit to a course of action. For most things, this is a personal decision. For major initiatives, this might involve a Formal Proposal (see Section 3) to ensure alignment.
- **Act:** Do the thing! This is where the plan turns into reality.
- **Reflect:** Share your work. Announce what you did, why you did it, and what the outcome was. This act of public reflection is our primary tool for accountability. It prevents the hoarding of knowledge, makes decision-making transparent, and transforms individual action into trusted, collective wisdom. This builds trust, shares knowledge, and helps us all learn from both successes and failures. If a member raises a concern, engage with them to find a resolution.

This is the core of **Intentional Do-ocracy**: a structure where individuals are empowered to lead projects from idea to completion, and where the act of leading the work is its own justification.

Our Evolution: Why “Intentional”?

The classic “Just Do It!” model of Do-ocracy is a powerful antidote to the paralysis that plagues many organizations. We honor that spirit. However, experience shows that a purely reactive model can sometimes lead to a “Dream → Act” loop, where action is taken without sufficient planning or learning. This can result in wasted effort, frustration, and a failure to build collective wisdom.

We have deliberately evolved this model into what we call **Intentional Do-ocracy**. By explicitly adding the **Design** and **Reflect** stages, we aim to transform raw action into effective action.

- The **Design** step encourages thoughtful planning *before* execution, saving time and resources.
- The **Reflect** step ensures we learn from *every* outcome, turning individual actions into community knowledge.

This doesn't add bureaucracy; it adds mindfulness. It's how we ensure our community is not just busy, but productive, sustainable, and constantly improving.

Why Intentional Do-ocracy?

While valuable tools, relying solely on formal democracy or consensus for every action can lead to paralysis. A purely discussion-based model can suffer from several issues:

- It consumes significant time and energy that could be better spent building, educating, or campaigning.
- It creates bottlenecks where important problems don't get solved because the group cannot reach a perfect agreement. This is a critical failure, because **a good solution implemented now is often better than a perfect solution debated forever.**
- It can lead to diluted outcomes that are compromises nobody is passionate about, resulting in a lack of energy for implementation.
- It can empower voices that contribute opinions without contributing action, slowing down those who are ready to build.
- It encourages long feedback loops. Our work is inspired by modern development practices (like Agile) that stress the importance of short feedback loops and rapid iteration.

This is why we choose **Intentional Do-ocracy**: to empower action, while ensuring it is thoughtful and effective through our five-stage process.

How It Thrives

A healthy Do-ocracy emerges when the environment is right. We foster this environment through our culture:

- **Allow people to fail.** We must feel safe to try and fail. When failure happens, we treat it as a learning opportunity and help each other improve, rather than assigning blame. Our community gives everyone room to grow. (For more on this, research “blameless post-mortems” in the tech community).
- **Ask for help and help others.**
- **Trust each other by default.**
- **Focus on what we have in common**, not what we disagree on.
- **Recognize and amplify the work of those who contribute.**

Noncoercive Authority

It is a misconception that in a Do-ocracy, nobody is in charge. The people doing the work have authority over their specific projects. However, this power is noncoercive and temporary—it is lost when they stop contributing to that effort.

A do-ocratic example: W3PN has no formal event series. Alex posts in the community Discord, “What if we organized a ‘State of Privacy’ online summit?” (Dream). Others respond with ideas. Because this is too big for one person, Alex’s role shifts from “doer” to “project lead.” Alex’s responsibility is now to coordinate, not to do everything themselves. They draft a plan, outline needed roles (e.g., “Speaker Outreach,” “Technical Support,” “Marketing”), and invite volunteers in a new channel (Design & Decide). The team then runs the event (Act).

A new member might ask, “Why does Alex get to decide the summit’s platform? Who put them in charge?” The answer is: **the Intentional Do-ocracy put them in charge**. The very act of initiating and organizing the summit grants Alex authority and *responsibility* over it. They become the steward of that idea’s entire lifecycle, which includes ensuring the team works smoothly. If they later post a summary of what went well, they complete the cycle (Reflect).

Limitations

Some actions are too sensitive or irreversible for **Intentional Do-ocracy** alone. For these situations, refer to the sections on **Formal Proposals** (Section 3) and **Stewards** (Section 4).

In general, if an action commits significant community resources, is strategically irreversible, or affects core shared assets, it requires a Formal Proposal, not just individual action.

An Intentional Do-ocracy Is Not a...

- **Democracy:** In a democracy, everyone has a say in what gets done. In our system, everyone can do jobs that they think need to be done, **without requiring everyone’s input for every step**.
- **Meritocracy:** In a meritocracy, the “most qualified” people are selected for a job. In our system, whoever does the work gets it, regardless of their formal qualifications. Skill is proven by doing.

Further Reading

- The CommunityWiki has a thorough explanation of Do-ocracy⁴.
- Embassy SF shared their experience with Do-ocracy in a shared house⁵, which offers valuable lessons on co-living and co-working.

⁴<http://www.communitywiki.org/en/DoOcracy>

⁵<https://medium.com/embassy-network/an-evolving-doocracy-3a6123f9b170>

3. Formal Proposals & The Veto Process

This section defines the safety mechanism for irreversible or high-stakes decisions. **This is NOT a democratic voting system.** It is a consent-based process designed to ensure community alignment and prevent harm, without slowing down our core principle of Intentional Do-ocracy.

The default assumption is that a well-reasoned proposal should proceed. This process exists as a powerful “emergency brake,” not as a bureaucratic hurdle.

When is a Formal Proposal Needed?

You should initiate a Formal Proposal for actions that involve:

- **Committing significant community resources:** This includes spending funds from the main W3PN treasury.
- **Making fundamental changes to core assets:** Altering the W3PN brand, name, or primary mission.
- **Adopting official, long-term partnerships** with other organizations.
- **Amending this Constitution.**
- **Electing or removing Stewards.**

The “Lazy Consensus” Process

Silence equals consent.

1. **Discussion Phase:** The initiator socializes the idea in community channels, gathers feedback, and refines their plan. This aligns with the “Design” stage of Intentional Do-ocracy.
2. **Formal Proposal:** The initiator posts a clear proposal in a designated forum or channel. The proposal states: “I propose [ACTION], because of [REASON]. If there are no formal objections within 72 hours, this proposal will be considered approved.”
3. **Review Period (72 Hours):** The community has a 72-hour window to review the proposal.
 - **If there are no objections:** The proposal automatically passes. **Silence equals consent.** The initiator is empowered to Act.
 - **If there is an objection:** The process moves to the next stage.

The Steward Flag: Forcing Extended Consideration

For proposals that are particularly complex, contentious, or submitted at a time that may limit community review (e.g., during a major holiday), a Steward may force an extended review period. This is not a veto, but a procedural tool to ensure sufficient time for community consideration.

1. **How to Invoke:** During the initial 72-hour review period, any single Steward may post a formal declaration in the proposal thread, such as: “Steward Flag: This proposal warrants a longer discussion. The review period is hereby extended to 7 days.”
2. **The Effect:** The review period is immediately reset and extended to a total of 7 days from the time the flag was raised. The original 72-hour clock becomes void.
3. **Limitation:** A flag can only be used once per proposal. Its purpose is to extend time for discussion, not to indefinitely block a proposal. After the extended period, the proposal proceeds as normal.

The Objection and Veto Path

An objection is not a “downvote.” It is a formal declaration that you believe the proposal will cause significant harm to the organization or contradict its core principles.

1. **How to Object:** A member must formally state their objection in the proposal thread. An objection **must include a reason**. “I don’t like it” is not a valid objection. “I object because this violates our principle of X” or “I object because this will create Y unacceptable risk” are valid objections.
2. **Resolution Dialogue:** A formal objection triggers a dialogue. The initiator and the objector(s) are expected to discuss the concerns and attempt to find a compromise that resolves the objection.
3. **Escalation to Stewards:** If a compromise cannot be reached, either party can escalate the issue to the **Stewards**.
4. **The Stewards’ Veto:** The Stewards’ role is not to decide if they *like* the proposal. Their sole function is to act as guardians of the Constitution. They will review the proposal and the objection and make one of two rulings:
 - **Veto Upheld:** The Stewards agree that the proposal causes harm or violates the community’s principles. The proposal is formally **vetoed** and cannot proceed. This decision is final.
 - **Veto Overruled:** The Stewards find that the objection, while perhaps well-intentioned, does not relate to a core principle or a significant harm. They overrule the objection, and the proposal is **approved** to proceed.

This high bar ensures that the Stewards act as judges of principle, not as a typical board voting on strategy.

Why This Model?

This “Lazy Consensus” and veto model is superior to democratic voting for our context because:

- **It is efficient.** It defaults to action and requires zero effort if a proposal is sound and well-socialized.
- **It empowers doers.** It removes the need to lobby for “yes” votes and instead focuses on ensuring no critical harm is done.
- **It avoids bikeshedding.** It elevates objections from matters of taste to matters of principle, filtering out low-stakes disagreements.

The General Assembly & Legal Entity

If and when Web3Privacy Now operates under a formal legal structure (such as a foundation, association, or other entity), that entity will have its own legally-binding statutes. These statutes will govern specific formal procedures, such as the election of a board or the submission of annual reports. The processes in those official statutes will take precedence for any legally-required functions. This Constitution serves as our *cultural and operational* guide for everything else.

4. The Stewards

They hold the space, so the community can fill it.

Stewards are the guardians of this Constitution and the overall health of the Web3Privacy Now community. They are servant-leaders, chosen for their wisdom, temperament, and dedication to our core principles.

This is not a traditional board of directors. Stewards do not set strategy, dictate projects, or manage day-to-day activities. Their role is purely to fulfill two specific, critical functions: to act as impartial counselors in disputes and as guardians of our foundational principles and assets. They hold the space, so the community can fill it.

The Responsibilities of a Steward

A Steward's responsibilities are strictly limited to the following areas.

As Counselors: Conflict Resolution When a significant interpersonal conflict arises that cannot be resolved directly between members, it can be escalated to the Stewards.

- **Process:** The Stewards' role is to act as impartial mediators. They will listen to all parties involved and facilitate a constructive dialogue.
- **Goal:** The aim is not to assign blame or enact punishment, but to find a mutually agreeable path forward that allows constructive collaboration to resume.
- **Confidentiality:** Stewards are expected to handle all such matters with the utmost discretion and confidentiality.

As Guardians: Principle & Asset Protection This is the Stewards' second key function, which includes their role in Formal Proposals and Contributor Rewards.

- **Veto Authority:** In the Formal Proposal process, Stewards act as the final check. Their role is not to decide if they *like* a proposal, but only to determine if it causes significant harm or directly violates the principles laid out in this Constitution. If they find that it does, they can uphold a Veto.
- **Core Asset Management:** Stewards are the designated signatories and protectors of the community's core shared assets, such as the treasury, domains, and primary social media accounts.
- **Contributor Rewards Operation:** Stewards are the trusted, neutral operators of the Retroactive Contributor Rewards system (Section 6). This involves initiating each Funding Epoch, executing

the reputation-weighted calculation transparently, and ensuring the final rewards are distributed correctly.

Powers and Limitations

To maintain a true Do-ocracy, the limits of Steward power must be explicit.

Stewards have the power to:

- Mediate escalated interpersonal disputes.
- Invoke a “Steward Flag” on a Formal Proposal to unilaterally extend its review period.
- Uphold or overrule a Veto on a Formal Proposal.
- Execute transactions and manage administrative access for core assets, as explicitly instructed by either a passed Formal Proposal or by the operational requirements of the Contributor Rewards system (Section 7).

Stewards DO NOT have the power to:

- Dictate the mission or strategic direction of Web3Privacy Now.
- Initiate or shut down projects started under Intentional Do-ocracy.
- Spend treasury funds without the explicit approval of a Formal Proposal (outside of Contributor Rewards distribution).
- Influence the outcome of the Contributor Rewards calculation or allocate points within that system.
- Unilaterally remove a member (this would require its own Formal Proposal under extreme circumstances).

Composition, Election, and Term

- **Composition:** There shall be **three (3)** Stewards. This odd number prevents deadlocks.
- **Election:** Stewards are elected via the Formal Proposal process. Candidates must be active, trusted members of the community.
- **Term:** Stewards serve for a **one-year term**. To ensure continuity, elections can be staggered (e.g., electing 1-2 Stewards every six months). A Steward may serve multiple terms if re-elected, but no individual may serve more than two consecutive terms. After a one-term break, they are eligible for re-election.

Furthermore, it is a core responsibility of every Steward to actively mentor other Members in the workings of our governance, ensuring that knowledge is distributed and that a healthy pool of future Steward candidates is always being cultivated. A Steward's success is measured not only by their guardianship, but by how effectively they make their own role unnecessary.

Accountability and Removal

A Steward can be removed before their term is complete if they are acting in bad faith, are negligent in their duties, or are permanently unreachable. The removal of a Steward requires a Formal Proposal and must be approved by a **supermajority ($\geq 2/3$ ds)** of votes cast.

5. Membership

Being part of the Web3Privacy Now ecosystem can take many forms. We value all types of engagement, from financial support to active contribution. To ensure our governance remains clear and effective, we distinguish between two primary roles within our community: **Supporters** and **Members**.

Supporters

A Supporter is anyone who aids our mission, often through financial contributions, spreading the word, or participating in public events.

- **Role:** Supporters are the lifeblood of our sustainability and our link to the wider public. Their belief in our mission provides the fuel for our work.
- **Privileges:** Supporters are valued parts of our extended community. They typically get access to exclusive content, newsletters, and a designated role in our communication channels.
- **Governance:** Supporters do not hold formal governance rights or responsibilities.

Members: The Core Contributors

Membership is not a status that can be bought; it is a recognition of sustained, meaningful contribution. Members are the active drivers of our Intentional Do-ocracy, and only Members can participate in our governance and contributor rewards systems.

How to Become a Member The path to becoming a Member is a transparent process based on recognized contribution.

1. **Demonstrable Contribution:** The candidate must have a clear public track record of contributing to the W3PN mission. This is the most important requirement. Examples include, but are not limited to:
 - Successfully leading an initiative through the full **Intentional Do-ocracy** cycle (Dream → Reflect).
 - Making consistent, high-quality contributions to others' projects (e.g., code, design, research).
 - Actively and constructively participating in community discussions over an extended period.
2. **Public Nomination:** An existing Member must formally nominate the candidate in a designated public channel. The nomination must include a summary of the candidate's contributions, linking to specific examples of their work.

3. **Community Consent:** The nomination is open for a **72-hour review period**, following the “Lazy Consensus” model (see Section 3). If no formal objections are raised by other Members, the nomination is considered approved by the community. An objection should be based on a belief that the candidate has not met the contribution criteria or does not align with the community’s Guidelines.
4. **Steward Confirmation:** After the review period passes without objection, the Stewards perform the final administrative act of confirming the new status and updating any necessary roles or permissions.

Rights of a Member Once recognized, a Member has the full governance rights outlined in this Constitution, including the right to:

- Initiate projects under Intentional Do-ocracy.
- Create a Formal Proposal.
- Formally object to a proposal during the review period.
- Participate in the election of Stewards.
- Participate in the Retroactive Contributor Rewards system (both allocating and receiving points).

Responsibilities of a Member With these rights come responsibilities:

- To act in good faith and uphold the principles of this Constitution.
- To actively foster a healthy and collaborative environment.
- To use their governance rights thoughtfully and respectfully.

Losing Membership

- **Dormancy:** Membership is not lost due to inactivity. Once a member, always a member. An inactive member simply does not participate in governance until they choose to become active again.
- **Revocation:** In extreme cases of acting in bad faith, deliberately harming the community, or violating its core principles, a Member’s status can be revoked. This is a last resort and requires a Formal Proposal to be passed with a **supermajority (>=2/3rds)** vote.

6. Recognized Ecosystem Projects

Our Intentional Do-ocracy empowers any Member to start a mission-aligned initiative. This section creates a formal pathway for such initiatives to gain official recognition, ensuring they can be supported by the community's shared resources in a way that is fair, transparent, and scalable.

Recognition is not a requirement for an initiative to exist or operate. It is a formal status that creates a bridge between an independent project and the W3PN ecosystem's resources.

The Recognition Process

An initiative may be granted the status of a "Recognized Ecosystem Project" via the **Formal Proposal** process defined in Section 3.

The proposal must demonstrate that the project meets the following criteria:

1. **Mission and Cultural Alignment:** It directly advances the W3PN mission and operates in a manner consistent with the spirit of our Guidelines (Section 8).
2. **Alignment with Open Principles:** It demonstrates a good-faith commitment to transparency and open-source development, in line with the ecosystem's core values.
3. **Operational Independence:** It maintains its own brand and leadership and is not a shared asset of W3PN.

Merits of Recognition

Achieving "Recognized" status grants the project the following merits:

- **Access to Shared Resources:** The project is empowered to submit Formal Proposals to request support from the Web3Privacy Now community, which can include budget allocations from the treasury, amplification, or other operational support.
- **A Formal Pathway to Membership:** Membership in a Recognized Project is distinct from W3PN Membership. However, sustained, valuable work within a Recognized Project shall be considered **demonstrable contribution** when a candidate is nominated for W3PN Membership under the process defined in Section 5. This provides a clear path for a project's key contributors to earn a formal voice in our collective governance.

7. Retroactive Contributor Rewards

TL;DR: How Rewards Work

1. Once per quarter, we reward past work from a dedicated fund.
2. Every Member gives points to peers they feel created value.
3. Points from members who are *also* highly valued are worth more.
4. The fund is split based on these final, reputation-weighted scores.

To sustain our community, we must support our active contributors. This section outlines a process for retroactively rewarding **Members** for the valuable work they have already completed.

This system is not for funding future projects. Its sole purpose is to reward the valuable contributions of individuals, trusting them to continue creating impact. It acknowledges that while all Members are valued, the level of active contribution varies over time. A Member's influence in the allocation process is therefore directly tied to their recognized contributions within that Epoch.

We explicitly recognize that one of the most valuable contributions to this commons is the act of distributing knowledge and skill. Therefore, when allocating points, Members are strongly encouraged to reward activities such as mentoring new contributors, teaching others how to use our tools, creating clear documentation, and other work that reduces dependency and empowers the community to be more self-sufficient.

The Process: Peer-Based, Reputation-Weighted Allocation

The system operates in regular cycles, which we will call **“Funding Epochs”** (e.g., once per quarter).

1. The Funding Pool For each Epoch, a specific amount of funds is allocated to the Contributor Rewards pool, funded by the W3PN treasury or direct donations.

2. The Allocation Phase At the end of each Epoch, a short **“Allocation Phase”** (e.g., one week) begins.

- **Initial Allocation:** Every **Member** receives 100 non-financial “Allocation Points” to distribute. They privately allocate their points among their peers (you cannot allocate points to yourself).
- **Mandatory Justification:** To ensure allocations are based on contribution, not just friendship, a **brief, public justification MUST be provided for each allocation.** For example: “30 points to Alice for her research paper,” “50 points to Bob for managing the translation effort.”

3. Calculation and Distribution: The Reputation Weighting This is the crucial step that amplifies the signal from active contributors.

- **Step A: Calculate Raw Scores.** First, a “raw score” for each Member is calculated based on the points they received.
- **Step B: Calculate Allocator Weights.** The “weight” of each allocator is determined by their own raw score. This means allocations from members who were themselves highly recognized by the community carry more influence.
- **Step C: Calculate Final Weighted Scores.** The final score for each Member is recalculated using the weighted allocations. The points you receive from someone are multiplied by their allocator weight.
- **Step D: Distribute Funds.** Each Member can then claim a share of the Funding Pool proportional to their **final weighted score**.

How the Calculation Works: A Step-by-Step Guide

The key is a two-pass system. The first pass identifies who the community values. The second pass uses that information to give more weight to their opinions.

1. **The Raw Allocation Pass (Who is valued?):** We sum the points each person *receives*. This gives every Member a “**Raw Score**.”
2. **The Weighted Allocation Pass (Whose opinion matters more?):** We go back to the original allocations. The “power” of an allocation is multiplied by the allocator’s **Raw Score**. We calculate a “**Final Score**” for each Member by summing up the *weighted* points they received.
3. **Distribution:** The fund is distributed proportionally based on each Member’s **Final Score**.

Full-Featured Example

Let’s imagine a simplified W3PN with four active members.

- **Funding Pool:** 10 000 \$ for this Epoch.
- **Members:** Alice (core contributor), Bob (regular contributor), Carol (occasional contributor), David (inactive member).

Phase 1: Allocation and Raw Scores

- **Alice gives:** 100 points to Bob.
- **Bob gives:** 70 to Alice, 30 to Carol.
- **Carol gives:** 80 to Alice, 20 to Bob.

- **David gives:** 100 to Alice.

Recipient	Points From Alice	Points From Bob	Points From Carol	Points From David	Raw Score
Alice	(self)	70	80	100	250
Bob	100	(self)	20	0	120
Carol	0	30	(self)	0	30
David	0	0	0	(self)	0

Phase 2: Weighted Calculation and Final Scores We use the Raw Scores as weights for each allocation.

Allocation (From → To)	Points Given	Allocator's Raw Score	Weighted Allocation
Alice → Bob	100	250	$100 * 250 = \mathbf{25\ 000}$
Bob → Alice	70	120	$70 * 120 = \mathbf{8\ 400}$
Bob → Carol	30	120	$30 * 120 = \mathbf{3\ 600}$
Carol → Alice	80	30	$80 * 30 = \mathbf{2\ 400}$
Carol → Bob	20	30	$20 * 30 = \mathbf{600}$
David → Alice	100	0	$100 * 0 = \mathbf{0}$

- **Alice's Final Score:** 8 400 (from Bob) + 2 400 (from Carol) + 0 (from David) = **10 800**
- **Bob's Final Score:** 25 000 (from Alice) + 600 (from Carol) = **25 600**
- **Carol's Final Score:** 3 600 (from Bob) = **3 600**
- **Total Pool of Final Score Points:** 10 800 + 25 600 + 3 600 = **40 000**

Phase 3: Final Payout

Member	Final Score	% of Total Score	Payout (from 10 000 \$)
Alice	10 800	27%	2 700 \$
Bob	25 600	64%	6 400 \$
Carol	3 600	9%	900 \$

This result correctly rewards Bob the most, as his contributions were recognized by the most highly-valued member (Alice).

Why David's allocation had no impact:

Notice that while David allocated 100 points to Alice, her Final Score received 0 points from him. This is a core feature of the system. Because David was inactive and received 0 points himself, his "Allocator's Raw Score" was 0. The calculation ($100 * 0$) correctly gave his allocation zero weight. This demonstrates how the system automatically and transparently amplifies the signal from active, recognized contributors.

Why This Weighted Model is Essential

- **Amplifies Signal, Reduces Noise:** It gives more weight to the opinions of members who are "in the trenches" and have the most context. This effectively resists low-context "popularity contest" voting from less engaged members.
- **Ensures Influence is Earned, Not Held:** Power in this system is not static. It must be re-earned each Epoch through recognized work, creating a dynamic where influence directly follows recent, valuable contribution.
- **Creates a Virtuous Cycle of Merit:** Being recognized as a valuable contributor gives you a stronger voice in recognizing others. This reinforces and rewards expertise without creating a separate, exclusive class of "super-voters."

8. The Right to Fork: A Process of Cellular Division

In most organizations, a split is considered a catastrophic failure. We hold the opposite view: a fork is a mature and healthy response to the natural pressures of growth and change, making it a feature of a resilient ecosystem, not a bug. This section provides a constitutional escape valve, ensuring that our community can evolve through a graceful “conscious uncoupling” rather than a hostile divorce.

The entire process is guided by these core beliefs:

- **Individual Sovereignty Above All:** The ultimate choice to associate belongs to the individual member, not the collective.
- **Non-Coercion:** Freedom of association is paramount. No member will be forced to remain in a community they no longer align with, nor will a majority be able to vote to expel a minority.
- **Constructive Creation:** A fork is not an act of destruction, but a positive-sum act of creation. It allows new energy and vision to flourish without being constrained.

The Distinction from a Recognized Ecosystem Project

To maintain clarity, it is essential to distinguish a fork from the creation of a *Recognized Ecosystem Project* (as defined in Section 6). The two serve fundamentally different purposes.

Think of it this way: a Recognized Project is like **building a new house on the shared land** of our commons. A Fork is the act of **dividing the land itself to start a new, sovereign homestead**.

Feature	Recognized Ecosystem Project	Fork
Scope	An initiative <i>within</i> the W3PN community.	A division <i>of</i> the W3PN community itself.
Relationship to Commons	Draws from the commons (requests funding, support).	Divides the commons (takes a proportional share).
Sovereignty	Operationally independent but culturally aligned with W3PN.	Becomes a new, fully sovereign entity.
When to Use	When you want to build a specific tool, event, or research project under the W3PN umbrella.	When there is an irreconcilable difference in vision, culture, or strategy for the entire ecosystem.

In short, a project strengthens our commons; a fork creates a new one.

The Legitimate Grounds for a Fork

A fork is not a tool for resolving minor disagreements or for launching a new project. It is the appropriate path when fundamental, irreconcilable differences arise in one of three key areas:

- **When We Outgrow Human Scale:** When the community grows too large for high-trust, personal collaboration to remain effective.
- **When Visions Naturally Diverge:** When passionate members develop distinct strategies that are better pursued in parallel than compromised into a single, weaker path.
- **When Cultures No Longer Align:** When different working rhythms and values emerge that deserve their own optimized environments.

The Process in Principle

Given the philosophy above, our forking process is not a battle to be won, but a structured separation based on free choice.

The process begins when a group of members drafts a **Manifesto** for a new, distinct entity. This triggers a **Commitment Period** where every single community member individually and publicly chooses which of the two entities they wish to join.

The outcome is automatic and not subject to a vote or veto. The community divides based on the sum of these individual sovereign choices. Shared, divisible assets are then split proportionally to ensure a fair and equitable start for both communities. The Stewards' only role is to act as neutral facilitators of this process.

9. Guidelines

These guidelines are the principles that govern our collaboration and define our culture. While not rigid laws, they are enforceable standards. Direct and respectful conversation is the preferred method for addressing deviations, but a significant or systemic violation of any principle herein is a legitimate basis for escalating a conflict to the Stewards or initiating a Formal Proposal.

Communication

- **Assume Good Faith:** When reading a message, interpret it in the most generous way possible. If something is unclear, ask for clarification before assuming negative intent. In a global, text-based community, misunderstandings are easy; good faith is our default.
- **Critique Ideas, Not People:** We must be able to have robust debates about strategies, projects, and ideas. Focus your feedback on the work itself, not on the person who created it.
- **Public by Default:** To maximize transparency and learning, all work-related discussions should happen in public community channels. Reserve private messages for sensitive or strictly personal matters.
- **Be Clear and Explicit:** Our community is diverse. What is “common sense” to one person may be new to another. Avoid jargon where you can, explain your reasoning, and don’t be afraid to state the obvious.

Collaboration

- **Give Credit Generously:** If you build on someone’s idea or use their work, give them public credit. Recognition is the primary currency in our ecosystem.
- **Amplify Others:** Our collective success depends on mutual support. When you see a fellow member doing great work, share it, promote it, and celebrate it.
- **Ask for Help, Offer Help:** No one is expected to know everything. Asking for help is a sign of strength. Offering help when you can builds the connective tissue of our community.
- **Distribute Knowledge:** Ask for help to learn; offer help to teach. A healthy community actively resists the concentration of unique skills in a few individuals, as this creates hidden dependencies and informal power.
- **Cultivate Wholeness:** We encourage members to bring their whole selves to this work—their passion, their creativity, and their intuition. We strive to create an environment of psychological safety where authentic connection and vulnerability are valued alongside technical contribution.

Disagreement & Conflict

- **Disagree Constructively:** Disagreement is healthy and necessary for progress. When you object to something, do so respectfully and provide a clear reason. Suggest alternatives where possible.
- **Seek to Understand First:** Before you critique or object, ensure you understand the proposal. Ask clarifying questions. A simple “Can you help me understand why you chose this approach?” can resolve many conflicts before they start.
- **Direct Resolution is Preferred:** If you have an issue with another member, the first step should always be a direct and respectful conversation with them. The Stewards are a final backstop for serious conflicts, not a first resort.

Contribution & Ownership

- **Embrace the Full Cycle:** True contribution follows our model of **Intentional Do-ocracy**. It’s not just about doing the task (Act), but also about planning it (Design) and sharing the outcome (Reflect).
- **Hand Off Cleanly:** If you start a project and can no longer continue it, you are responsible for communicating its status. Either officially archive it or find another member to take ownership. Don’t leave “zombie” projects that confuse other contributors.
- **Leave it Better Than You Found It:** If you use a piece of documentation, a tool, or a process and notice a small way it could be improved, take a moment to fix it. This principle of continuous, small improvements creates immense value over time.
- **Define Roles on Team Projects:** If you initiate a project that is too large to complete alone, your first act is to define the needed roles and invite collaborators. A project without clear roles is destined for chaos, concentrates responsibility on a single person, and excludes others. Defining roles makes responsibility explicit, prevents burnout, and creates clear entry points for new contributors.

Technology & Tools - The Principle of Conviviality⁶

- **Transparent and Auditable:** Preferring open-source software over proprietary “black boxes.”
- **Privacy-Preserving:** Rejecting tools that exploit user data or rely on a surveillance-based business model.
- **Accessible:** Usable without requiring highly specialized, professional knowledge.
- **Decentralized or Self-Hostable:** Favoring federated, peer-to-peer, or self-hostable systems.

⁶“Convivial technology,” a principle from philosopher Ivan Illich, describes tools that enhance user freedom, creativity, and autonomy, rather than creating dependency. See *Section 10: The Legacy*.

10. The Legacy

This constitution did not arise in a vacuum. It stands on the shoulders of giants and is informed by the successes and failures of countless decentralized communities. This section serves as a collection of the core ideas and sources that shaped our thinking. It should be used as a “cipher” to better understand the principles behind our rules.

We are indebted to the following works and ideas:

- **The Tyranny of Structurelessness⁷** (Jo Freeman): This seminal essay is the philosophical cornerstone for why this constitution exists. It argues that there is no such thing as a “structureless” group—only groups with formal, accountable structures and those with informal, hidden, and unaccountable ones. This constitution is our explicit attempt to choose the former, ensuring power is accessible and accountable, not captured by a charismatic or socially-connected clique.
- **The Parallel Polis⁸** (Václav Benda): This provides both our guiding vision and our most important cautionary tale. We are inspired by the original 1978 essay’s call to build independent structures, but we learn from the failure of the modern Paralelní Polis project in Prague. Its collapse is a stark, real-world example of *The Tyranny of Structurelessness*, and a primary motivation for why this explicit, enforceable Constitution exists.
- **The Philosophy of Ivan Illich:** Philosopher Ivan Illich⁹ argued that systems often become *counter-productive*, creating dependency instead of fostering freedom. This core insight is the foundation for our *Principle of Conviviality* (Section 9), our commitment to choosing tools that empower users over experts. His work also provides the language for our mission: the fight to defend the digital *commons* from its enclosure by centralized forces. His essay *Silence is a Commons*¹⁰ is a crucial text for understanding this struggle.
- **The Cypherpunk Movement:** This movement’s core principle, famously declared in *A Cypherpunk’s Manifesto*¹¹, is that “Cypherpunks write code.” It champions direct action—using strong cryptography to build tools that enforce privacy and individual sovereignty, rather than merely asking for them from centralized authorities. This ethos of proactive building is a direct ancestor to our *Intentional Do-ocracy*, while its focus on creating defensive technologies informs our commitment to *Convivial Tools* (Section 9).
- **The Cathedral and the Bazaar¹²:** In his seminal essay, Eric S. Raymond contrasted two development models: the ‘Cathedral,’ built by a small, isolated group, and the ‘Bazaar,’ a decentralized

⁷<https://www.jofreeman.com/joreen/tyranny.htm>

⁸<https://parallelpolis.info/t/paralelni-polis-essay>

⁹https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ivan_Illich

¹⁰<https://www.inist.org/library/1982-03-21.Illich.Silence%20is%20a%20Commons.pdf>

¹¹<https://nakamotoinstitute.org/library/cypherpunk-manifesto/>

¹²<http://www.catb.org/~esr/writings/cathedral-bazaar/>

marketplace of ideas. This constitution is a deliberate rejection of the Cathedral model. Our *Intentional Do-ocracy* is the direct implementation of the Bazaar’s seemingly chaotic but highly effective philosophy of permissionless contribution and continuous peer review.

- **The Global Hackerspace Movement & Do-ocracy:** The culture of hands-on experimentation and peer-to-peer learning championed by hackerspaces worldwide gave rise to *Do-ocracy*, the governance model of empowerment through action. Our entire governance framework is built on this principle, along with the valuable critiques that helped us evolve it into our more mindful “*Intentional Do-ocracy*.” We are especially indebted to the *Hackerspace Blueprint*¹³, which masterfully codified this wisdom.
- **Teal Organizations**¹⁴: The overarching philosophy for the kind of organization we aspire to be. Coined by Frederic Laloux, this model champions *Self-Management*, *Wholeness*, and *Evolutionary Purpose* over traditional, rigid hierarchies, providing a formal language for many of our innate goals.
- **Protocol Guild**¹⁵: The inspiration for our contributor rewards model. It pioneered the philosophy of *funding people, not projects*, providing a way to sustain the creators of long-term public goods. Our *Retroactive Contributor Rewards* system (Section 7) is a direct implementation of this insight, rewarding past work to support the *source* of future value.
- **Modern Agile & DevOps Principles:** The concepts of “blameless post-mortems” and short feedback loops that inform our approach to failure, iteration, and continuous improvement.

¹³<https://hackerspace.design/>

¹⁴<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gcS04BI2sbk>

¹⁵<https://protocol-guild.readthedocs.io/en/latest/>

11. Changelog

This constitution is a living document, designed to evolve with the community it serves. This section provides a clear and auditable record of all ratified amendments, ensuring the history of our collective decisions remains transparent. For full details on any change, please refer to the linked proposal.

[Future Date] (Genesis)

Initial ratification of the Constitution.

2025/07/20

- Added a two-consecutive-term limit for Stewards (Sec 4) to promote rotation.
- Added non-coercive “Right to Fork” (Sec 8), to make organization more antifragile.
- Added “Principle of Conviviality” for tool selection to Guidelines (Sec 9).
- Updated Contributor Rewards (Sec 7) to explicitly value teaching and community support.
- Expanded “The Legacy” (Sec 10) with additional philosophical influences

2025/07/03

- Added Sec. 6 (“Recognized Ecosystem Projects”) to formalize support for community initiatives.