

Vote Rationale

This document is automatically generated from the CIP-0136 JSON file attached to the vote.

Governance Action ID: gov_action1fzatpjn3e3r09mjzzfptznef9wxg8q4a5uraq04xvfjyhmfzhzfsqqgfc9h

Summary

I highly appreciate Fabian's dedication, and think a tribute is appropriate, but would favour a different approach.

Rationale Statement

I highly appreciate Fabian's dedication, commitment and his contributions to keep community members informed and safe. He deserves every bit of tribute and I support an ecosystem-wide gesture to honour his memory.

However, I believe this newly found default to name every hard fork after recently deceased community members for tribute is not an effective, or thought-through convention. Hard Forks, and especially era-changing ones, are widely communicated outside of our ecosystem, carry systemic weight and serve as marketing tool. Deceased community member tributes are only recognizable within the community and carry no such weight in the wider blockchain world, and are just confusing to outsiders without the context that's only readily available within Cardano. Moreover, in this context, I think it is less elegant and fitting than the tradition we had so far - namely: mathematicians and computer scientists - which underlines what Cardano stands for: academic prowess. Secondly, in extension to this new naming scheme.. We do not want to "Who passed away recently" when we are getting close to a Hard Fork. This seems like a very morbid and odd convention.

Nevertheless, I believe tribute and naming standard can co-exist:

- Name intra-era hardforks that do not carry blockchain ecosystem-wide weight, and get communicated widely after community members for tribute. Passed, or Living.
- Name era-changing hard forks conventionally after mathematicians and computer scientists - in line with what Cardano stands for.

In this spirit, I'd vote for naming the next HF Dijkstra, like the era it rings in and unfortunately vote against this GA.