

1. Standard Proposal Scaffold

2. Supporting Argument and Evidence

[illegible][illegible][illegible][illegible]

Evidence rule: Every factual claim in §2 must cite at least one evidence item by id. Claims without evidence citations are marked [UNVERIFIED] by the review Steward and may cause the proposal to fail the review checklist. Do not paraphrase evidence — link to the source so voters can inspect it directly.

Required when the decision class is treasury-allocation with a total amount exceeding the max_single_disbursement threshold defined in c9-resource-allocation-framework, or when any proposal spans more than 90 days.

4. Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure (Required for All Proposals)

Every proposer must complete this section. The governance steward verifying the proposal is responsible for cross-checking the declaration against the voter registry before the voting period opens.

```
conflict_of_interest:
  proposer_financial_interest: <yes | no>
  proposer_financial_interest_detail: >
    <Required if yes: describe the financial relationship and how it was handled.
    If no: "None.">
  related_party_voters: >
    <List any voters who have a direct financial or personal relationship with
    the proposer or with the beneficiary of this proposal.
    If none: "None identified.">
  recusal_required: <yes | no>
  recusal_detail: >
    <Required if yes: identify who is recused and from which vote.>
  no_self_vote_applicable: <yes | no> # yes if decision_class is retroactive-reward
```

Self-vote prohibition: For retroactive-reward proposals, the nominee's voting address must be excluded from the tally before counting. The milestone reviewer confirms the exclusion before publishing results.

5. Contract-Change Supplement (Required for contract-change Class)

In addition to all sections above, a contract-change proposal must complete this supplement.

```
contract_change_supplement:
  artifact_affected: <canonical id of the artifact being amended>
  amendment_type: <MAJOR | MINOR> # per the artifact's change-control rules
  old_text: >
    <Exact current text being replaced – copy verbatim; do not paraphrase>
  new_text: >
    <Exact replacement text – copy verbatim>
  impact_statement:
    consumers_affected:
      - id: <canonical id of consumer artifact>
        impact: <how this change affects it>
      - ...
  migration_plan: >
    <How in-flight governance processes relying on the prior version are handled.
    Must address: open proposals, active milestones, running agents.>
  required_sign_offs:
    - role: Technical Lead
      signed: <yes | pending>
      date: <ISO 8601 or "pending">
    - role: Legal/Compliance Reviewer
      signed: <yes | pending>
      date: <ISO 8601 or "pending">
  advance_notice_date: >
    <14-day advance notice required per c9-decision-rights-matrix §3b.
    Date notice was published: <ISO 8601>>
```

6. Proposal Review Checklist

Before a proposal enters the voting queue, a designated review Steward (not the proposer) applies this checklist. Proposals that fail any blocking item are returned to the proposer.

#	Check	Blocking?	Pass Criteria
1	Proposer eligibility verified	Yes	Proposer meets token threshold and role requirements for the stated decision_class
2	Title is answer-first, ≤ 12 words	No	Advisory; return if misleading
3	decision_requested.action is specific and executable	Yes	Action must be implementable without further interpretation
4	Executor and Accountable match c9-decision-rights-matrix	Yes	Both roles must match the matrix row for the stated class
5	Voting period respects minimum review period	Yes	voting_period_opens is ≥ minimum for the decision class
6	All factual claims cite evidence items	Yes	No [UNVERIFIED] claims in §2; all evidence URIs resolve
7	Conflict-of-interest disclosure complete	Yes	All fields populated; recusal_required reviewed
8	Milestone plan present if required	Yes	Required for amounts > max_single_disbursement or duration > 90 days
9	Contract-change supplement complete	Yes	Required if decision_class: contract-change; all sign-offs present or dated "pending" with a plan
10	Treasury impact within tranche ceiling	Yes	Proposed amount does not exceed tranche ceiling or push treasury below reserve floor
11	No self-vote risk unmitigated	Yes	If retroactive-reward, nominee exclusion mechanism confirmed with voting platform

7. Worked Example — PP DAO Infrastructure Proposal

Proposal: AI Inference Hardware Refresh at Point Preserve

proposal_id: pp-dao-prop-2026-003
decision_class: treasury-allocation

title: Fund AI inference hardware refresh at Point Preserve
submitted_by: technical-lead-role
submission_date: 2026-02-01
review_period_opens: 2026-02-01
voting_period_opens: 2026-02-08 # 7-day review period for treasury-allocation
voting_period_closes: 2026-02-15 # 7-day voting window

summary: >

Allocating \$52,000 (illustrative) from the infrastructure tranche to replace aging on-site AI inference hardware will reduce per-request latency by ~40% and cut cloud-inference costs by ~\$14,000/yr. Disbursement is milestone-gated across three tranches. Execution authority rests with the Treasurer.

decision_requested:

type: approve

action: >

Disburse up to \$52,000 (illustrative) from the PP DAO infrastructure tranche to procure and install AI inference hardware at 725 J D Miller Road by 2026-06-30, per the milestone schedule below.

amount_if_financial:

currency: USD

amount: 52000 # (illustrative)

tranche: infrastructure

timeline:

execution_start: "within 7 days of veto window close"

execution_deadline: 2026-06-30

executor_role: Treasurer

accountable_role: Treasurer

veto_holder: Founding Steward Council

veto_window_days: 2

problem_statement: >

The current inference server (installed 2023, illustrative) cannot handle simultaneous guest-demo and campus-member workloads; P99 latency exceeds 8 seconds. Cloud overflow costs ran \$22,000 in 2025 (illustrative).

proposed_solution: >

Replace with a purpose-built inference node that handles 4× concurrent sessions at < 2-second P99. Surplus capacity can serve EcoGuardian.AI sensor-inference tasks, reducing cloud costs below \$8,000/yr (illustrative).

alternatives_considered:

- option: Continue cloud-only

description: No hardware capex; scale cloud instances

reason_not_chosen: Cloud costs project to \$28,000/yr by 2027 (illustrative); no long-term cost improvement.

- option: Lease colocation

description: Rent rack space in a regional data center

reason_not_chosen: Eliminates on-site AI campus demo differentiation; travel latency to site is comparable.

evidence:

- id: E1

type: data

description: 2025 cloud inference cost report

uri: "s3://pp-dao/evidence/2025-cloud-cost-report.pdf" # (illustrative)

confidence_band: high

- id: E2

type: document

description: Hardware vendor quote, 2026-01-28

uri: "s3://pp-dao/evidence/hw-vendor-quote-2026-01-28.pdf" # (illustrative)

confidence_band: high

conflict_of_interest:

proposer_financial_interest: no

proposer_financial_interest_detail: "None."

related_party_voters: "None identified."

recusal_required: no

recusal_detail: "N/A"
no_self_vote_applicable: no

Milestone plan:

ID	Deliverable	Evidence	Amount	Reviewer	Deadline
M1	Hardware ordered and delivered to 725 J D Miller Rd	Delivery receipt + asset tag	\$18,000 (illustrative)	Site Manager	2026-03-31
M2	Infrastructure operational; load test passed	Benchmark report, Technical Lead signed	\$22,000 (illustrative)	Technical Lead	2026-05-15
M3	90-day uptime ≥ 99.5%	Monitoring dashboard export	\$12,000 (illustrative)	Technical Lead	2026-08-15

Reversion: any unspent tranche reverts to unallocated pool 30 days past its deadline.

8. Review Period by Decision Class

Decision Class	Minimum Review Period	Minimum Voting Period
treasury-allocation	7 days	7 days
contract-change	14 days (+ 14-day advance notice = 28 days minimum)	7 days
working-group-charter	5 days	5 days
membership-change	7 days	7 days
parameter-update	14 days (+ 14-day advance notice)	7 days
retroactive-reward	5 days	5 days
platform-partnership	7 days	7 days
emergency-ratification	0 days (immediate)	24 hours

Usage Notes

Fill the proposal scaffold completely before submitting for review. Incomplete proposals waste reviewer time and reset the review clock. The review checklist in §6 is the acceptance gate; the proposer should self-certify before submitting. All financial figures, URIs, and dates used in examples are (illustrative) — replace with verified values before a live proposal.