Question-Answer with Emma-Jane MacKinnon-Lee

Are you passing the walkaway test?

Not yet.

A protocol only counts as infrastructure if it continues to function when key humans disappear. Not step back. Not take a break. But disappear.

For DIGITALAX, the remaining gap is simple to name: operational dependency. Some parts still assume an active maintainer for coordination, code, upgrades, and treasury execution. That's normal for an early protocol pioneering and unbundling a new industry, but it's also the exact failure mode the walkaway test is designed to expose. So the target state is explicit:

- Contracts and permissions that do not rely on a persistent operator
- Treasury mechanics that can execute via transparent, constraint-driven flows instead of human discretion
- Upgrade paths that are either fully bounded (hard limits, timelocks, social escape hatches) or intentionally removed where ossification is the safer outcome
- Interfaces and comms that are replaceable surfaces, not single points of failure
- Clear guarantees about what keeps working if builders go dark

I really like Vitalik's post about this for Ethereum: it must be possible to "ossify if we want to". Not freezing innovation, but removing the requirement that innovation must continue for the system to remain valid and usable.

That's the focus now: build the next contracts + infrastructure so the protocol can run without ongoing stewardship, and without anyone needing to ask permission to keep shipping, trading, producing, or earning.

The engineer walks away into the dark forest and the system keeps running.

Ethereum goes hard.

DIGITALAX goes hard.

Web3 Fashion goes hard.

This is the gwei.