Fund 8 vCA analysis

1. Summary 1
2. General – who stands out like a sore thumb??? 4
3. Deviation Analysis 5
4. Draft proposals - Are vCA's reading the assessment properly? 5
5. How are Challenge setting proposals reviewed? 7
6. How much attention is paid to proposer flags 8
7. Evidence of favouring a specific assessor 9
8. Evidence of spreadsheet method copy/paste 10
9. Evidence of collaboration between vCA's 10
10. Decoy CA's 10
11. Does size matter? 11
12. What was I thinking??? 11
13. old v new vCA's 12
14. word clouds 12

1. Summary

- Active vCA's : 85
- Total assessments:

Excellent	421
Good	7034
Filtered out	3562
Total	**11,017**

- Reviews: 89,829 - (see caveat below) excluding JKO
- vCA's with less than 200 reviews : 16 (these will not be rewarded, their reviews will be counted)

JULIE FRAGA
jon depinet
Gustavo Pugliese
Larba Nadieba
Antonio Pesqueira
Patrick Roncato
Miguel Saldana
Michael Harrison
Sean Taylor
Njål Munthe-Kaas
matthew jones
Kornel Gajewski

Nuell Colton
Piotr Styła
Petter Wennerström
Joey Chessher

- vCA tool vs spreadsheet method
  63 vCA's used the vCA tool, 22 used the spreadsheet method

vCA tool	Spreadsheet
Afia Owusu	Alejandro Torales
Alain Mwenemwen Lutala	Allison Fromm
Aldion Ka	Bruno Mateus
Alex Pestchanker	Dimitri Fernando
Alex Teixeira	Ilija Radeljic
Alexandru Rau	Jeremiah Baani
André Diamond	Joey Chessher
Andreas Sosilo	John Kasimba Omolo
Antoine Gagne	John Wellesz
Antonio Pesqueira	Jude Ben
Athanasios Stefanopoulos	Linden Mikus
Awura Adwoa	Łukasz Kaźmierczak
bernardo rollemberg	Maury Shenk
Brad McAnuff	Michael Harrison
Brett Kanode	Naveed Urmani
Chalan Jeevandas	Njål Munthe-Kaas
Darlington Wleh	Nuell Colton
Elhadji Kebe	Omre Urmani
Eligio Morales	plamen petkov
Eric Helms	Richmond Oppong
Faizul Radzali	Rodolfo Miranda
Federico Bartoli	Vladimir Pekic
gabriel botega nunes dos santos	
Gaetan Chevallier	
Gagan Bharadwaj	
Giampiero Di Dieco	
Gustavo Pugliese	
Henry Uzuwe	
Jeeshan Hegde	
jon depinet	
Jonathan Postnikoff	
Josi Esteves	
JULIE FRAGA	
Kornel Gajewski	

Kuldeep Adhikari	
Larba Nadieba	
Leonard Delunas	
Lester Mata	
Linus Ellström	
Livia Albuquerque	
Lorenz De Broe	
Marc Buschlüter	
matthew jones	
Matthias Matthijs	
Matthias Sieber	
Michal Macko	
Miguel Saldana	
mike jarmon	
Patrick Roncato	
Petter Wennerström	
Piotr Styła	
Prashanth Soordelu	
Raghuram A	
Rodrigo Pacini	
Sean Taylor	
Sebastian Pabon	
Simon Sällström	
Simon Umbdenstock	
Spencer Hao	
Steven Sevic	
Tomi Astikainen	
Tomislav Kovacicek	
Yoram Ben Zvi	

Actions performed on csv files provided in the vCA aggregated file

1. Rename each csv to match the name in the Veteran Community Advisors tab
2. Add a column to show the vCA name (taken from the file name)
2. Merge all files into one sheet (NB we had to remove special characters from file name as the script didn't read them properly, something to look at next time)
3. In columns proposer_mark, excellent, good, filtered out replace TRUE or 1 with 'x' and FALSE or 0 with ' ' (the vCA tool output TRUE/FALSE/0/1 instead of x's)
4. Remove blank reviews (if E/G/F are all blank)
5. Remove spoiled reviews, ie. if someone has given more than one rating to an assessment). (This will only be for the people who used the spreadsheet method)
6. Remove invalid reviews:
    - Where vCA is also a proposer in the challenge
    - Where a vCA has reviewed their own assessments (any proposals where a vCA wrote assessments as a CA, they can NOT assess their own assessments)
    - For this Fund there is one exception, one vCA who reviewed a high volume (2000+) of assessments in challenges in which they are a proposer. These have been discarded.

- So overall the community file we have to work on has c400 extra reviews than the one IOG will use

Point 6 is not possible as the community doesn't have access to the CA info.
Recommendation: the csv files have all invalid reviews removed before the aggregated file is handed over to the community.
Actually applying these above processes centrally before data is issued would be better. It would save multiple people taking copies of the csv's and creating their own databases or copy/pasting between spreadsheets.

2. General – who stands out like a sore thumb???

John Kasimba Omolo marked 9835 all good and no feedback given
Pointed out by Alexandru Rau with support from other vCA's
https://discord.com/channels/946921942143885342/949662037368254474/963868477897183304
His deviation is 0.19 so would be eligible for 100% of his rewards

This is Johns Fund 7 file (E:102, G 4770, FO: 451)
https://drive.google.com/file/d/1rxXMNx7Z0cYYon-x8nB64ku3ckUOQhLL/view?usp=sharing
In Fund 7 his deviation was 0.18 so didn't stand out for further scrutiny. So possibly he learned that middle of the road is safe. In a fund where there was lots of filtering, this does look like an outlier.

John's reviews have been discarded by IOG. He may challenge this.

Recommendation: make the vCA feedback field mandatory (as suggested after Fund 7). It will slow vCA's down, we will know what triggered the vCA to mark something as excellent/good/filtered out. It should improve quality and provide learning points for all in future funds.

- update vCA tool to autofedback to CA's
- allow a longer period of time for CA and vCA work.This should increase both quality and quantity. eg some vCA's spend all their time focussing on removing poor assessments and so don't get to the good ones.
- (or even rethink the whole fund process as suggested by some people and have an ongoing review/iteration cycle for proposals.

3. Deviation Analysis

This is a community build script - Developed by Alex Teixeira used and refined in Fund 6 & 7. Executed by Victor Corcino in Fund 8
https://github.com/Rabiolas/vCA-Data-Analyses

<AWAITING RESULTS>

Note: the official results will be issued by IOG based on their own analysis.

As a heads up i have performed a deviation analysis in a spreadsheet on data sets including and excluding John Omolo. This analysis is not official, if you spot an error please let me know.

https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1HvyvZg6EZ0CqNwjZZm42fWsYyUgytb84/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=100195976565248751977&rtpof=true&sd=true

see tabs vCA Deviation - ALL and vCA deviation - no JKO
Looking at the no JKO tab there are 2 people who will receive zero rewards and a further 8 who will have a 25% rewards slashing and a further 5 who are on the boundary (so when the official IOG analysis comes out they might swing over to the -25% group or they might improve their average)
Looking at the top 2 they went heavily in favour of giving excellent. I presume they will challenge.

4. Draft proposals - Are vCA's reading the assessment properly?

How are vCA's dealing with assessments of proposals that are clearly in draft or incomplete.

https://cardano.ideascale.com/c/idea/401505 - Medical Research based ADA
Impact, Feasibility and Accountability sections are incomplete – this should have not made it to assess.
Three assessments stand out. The overall consensus was good but some vCA's marked as filtered out (no feedback given)

- 40-401505
  - Gagan Bharadwaj
  - Jeremiah Baani
  - Josi Esteves
  - Lorenz De Broe
  - Simon Umbdenstock

- 639-401505

    - Gagan Bharadwaj
    - Josi Esteves
    - Livia Albuquerque

- 160-401505
    - Livia Albuquerque

Note there was one other assessment that was marked a good (1413-401505).
This CA was mostly filtered out for copy/paste activity. vCAs' filtering out were:
Alexandru Rau
John Wellesz
Simon Umbdenstock
Vladimir Pekic

https://cardano.ideascale.com/c/idea/399713 - **MinConnect**

All sections need more work.
One assessment stands out. Consensus was good but some vCA's marked as filtered out (no feedback given)

- 309-399713
    - Jeeshan Hegde
    - Simon Umbdenstock

https://cardano.ideascale.com/c/idea/399479 - **The ADA Cafe Grows Cardano**

One assessment stands out. Consensus was good but some vCA's marked as filtered out (no feedback given)
639-399479

- Livia Albuquerque

https://cardano.ideascale.com/c/idea/398975 - **Organised Linkedin of professionals**

very little detail in the proposal (should not have made it to assess)
a number of assessments stood out where the consensus was good but vCA's marked them as Filtered out, without explanation.

- 1193-398975
- 1828-398975
- 309-398975
    - Gagan Bharadwaj
    - Livia Albuquerque
    - Prashanth Soordelu
    - Simon Umbdenstock

https://cardano.ideascale.com/c/idea/402083 - **Catalyst Live**

very little detail in the proposal (should not have made it to assess)
One assessment stands out. Consensus was good but some vCA's marked as filtered out (no feedback given)

- 774-402083
    - bernardo rollemberg

- Chalan Jeevandas
- Gagan Bharadwaj
- Josi Esteves
- Simon Umbdenstock

We see the same names repeated multiple times and its very difficult to understand their thought process without any feedback.
Did they read the proposal and the assessments in detail?
Are they seeing something others are not?
Should they be challenged?

5. How are Challenge setting proposals reviewed?

https://cardano.ideascale.com/c/idea/396613 - **Grow Africa, Grow Cardano**
One assessment stands out. It was poorly written and looks like it was assessing this as a 'normal' proposal.
36 vCA's reviewed (34 filtered out, 2 good)

vCA's giving Good
1042-396613

- Jude Ben
- Linden Mikus

Did they read the proposal and the assessments in detail?
Are they seeing something others are not?
Should they be challenged?

6. How much attention is paid to proposer flags?

There were 1108 assessments flagged by proposers.

Rating	Count of reviews	%
Excellent	253	2.10
Good	2847	23.58
Filtered out	8973	74.32
	12037	

See tab – **Proposer Mark - no JKO** for full breakdown
https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1HvyvZg6EZ0CqNwjZZm42fWsYyUgytb84/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=100195976565248751977&rtpof=true&sd=true

I don't know what to make of these stats!!!! My brain hurts ☺
 brain re-engaged…

Looking at vCA who reviewed 300+ flagged assessments and filtered out 90+%
Could be genuine but no way of understanding the vCA's rationale
Note: this is a significant improvement on what we saw in Fund 7.
At a vCA level 80% of reviews marked a flagged assessments as filtered out.

Fund 8

Row Labels	Count of excell	Count of goo	Count of filtered_c	Total	% Filtered (vC	Consensus (filtered)	% filtered (consensus)
Chalan Jeevandas		1	482	483	99.79%	473	97.93%
Jeeshan Hegde		2	372	374	99.47%	366	97.86%
Michal Macko		10	986	996	99.00%	869	87.25%
Richmond Oppong	16	26	611	653	93.57%	587	89.89%
Simon Umbdenstock	4	25	427	456	93.64%	427	93.64%

Fund 7 (there were 777 flagged in total)

Row Labels	Count of vC	Count of Filtered Oi	% filtered	Filtered out (consensus)	% FO (consensus)
Simon Umbdenstock	777	733	94.34%	700	90.09%
Michal Macko	777	750	96.53%	700	90.09%
Dimitri Fernando	777	735	94.59%	700	90.09%

Conclusion so far, Proposer flags are more likely to be filtered. We knew this from previous funds.

Now, looking at instances where proposers have flagged an assessment & the consensus was excellent. We find 2 assessments.

1193-398095 E:7, G:4 , F:1

Feedback from proposer: (looks positive, no indication that proposer thinks the assessment should be filtered out)
Thanks for your feedback:
Impact: You grasped the idea very well.
Feasibility: The assumption is that a minimum of 20 videos may need to be created. The team also indicated that the research done in the first month will be used to establish the best way to support the community that is onboarded.
Auditability: The assumption is that the team provides stats through the regular report back when the proposal is funded. Additional stats suggested will be considered in the design thinking session to be help to refine the execution plan for this proposal. THANKS :)

One vCA marked this as filtered out. No feedback given

- Jude Ben

57-398592 E:4, G:1 , F:2
Feedback from proposer: : (looks positive, no indication that proposer thinks the assessment should be filtered out)
Thank you very much for the comments, they were very thorough and necessary to help in the development of the proposal. We really believe that various concepts of digital currencies, blockchain and decentralization should be done very early for children, as they are already inserted in this context with digital games, applications, youtube and etc.

We will pay special attention to the details of the schedule, activities x technical hours of work and deliverables.
The auditability point needs to be improved to deliver greater transparency and help in monitoring the project with more objective, practical and real numbers. We count on your support in approving this proposal, your comments will be taken for an exhaustive discussion.

Two vCA's marked this as filtered out. No feedback given

- Prashanth Soordelu
- Simon Umbdenstock

Need to find instances where proposers are flagging assessments just to get them filtered and see how vCA's reacted

Recommendations:

- Reconfirm flagging process with proposers – only flag if you think it should be filtered (ie doesn't align with the guidelines) else leaving feedback (positive of negative) is fine just don't flag it
- Make vCA feedback mandatory

7. Evidence of favouring a specific assessor

< WIP>

8. Evidence of spreadsheet method copy/paste

Covered by section 2? May be others

Jude Ben – E:49, G:3971, FO:261 – also flagged in section 10
Jemeriah Baani – E: 639, G:758, 635 – also flagged in section 10
(with these stats will probably fall foul of the deviation analysis too)

9. Evidence of collaboration between vCA's

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1AYbC06XePJP_sVJZ5DWHu-ENEa2V5MYzY3piHYRknjU/edit#

10. Decoy CA's

z_assessor_1920

This CA was created by John Wellesz as a decoy to see if vCA's are paying attention.
It was a deliberate poor assessment. All vCA's should have filtered it out.

Impact assessment:

The experience given in the description of the words existing inside the text of the proposal account for a large experience in writing left and right.
Only the center is left abandoned and this is unforgivable hence my 1 star rating for the feasibility, as a centered individual I'm left feeling on the side of the road after reading this directed proposal. Nonetheless there is no doubt that this proposal will reach a successful end by reaching its goal by failing to be funded. A success would cause quite a disarray in terms of hope for humanity. It has been shown that covid19 was causing similar damage as the eiseimer disease in the brain. If this proposal was to be funded or this assessment rated as excellent or good enough by a large consensus of Catalyst OGs then it would mean that humanity is brain damaged beyond hope**. It is important to remind a vCA that rating this assessment as being useful would forfeit their reward and their reputation.** Even though this excellently written assessment is long it is not respecting the guidelines... To whom the hell am I writing to?

16 reviews (1 excellent, 2 good, 13 filtered out)

- John Kasimba Omolo (marked it as "Good")
- Jude Ben (marked it as "Good")
- Jeremiah Baani (marked it as "Excellent")

z_assessor_1855 and the following proposals were decoys created by Tomi Astikainen

Collatz conjecture in C# (proposal 404817)
https://app.ideascale.com/t/UM5UZBwxV
E: 0, G:1, FO:10
John Kasimba Omolo was the only vCA to mark this as good

Research into left pendulum swings (proposal 404809)
https://app.ideascale.com/t/UM5UZBwxN
E: 0, G:2, FO:10
John Kasimba Omolo and Jude Ben marked this as good

11. Does size matter?

Overall result show similar trend to what we saw in Fund 7
There are 986 assessments with less than 600 characters. Of these 10 were good, 0 Excellent, 976 Filtered out.
The smallest Good assessments was 368
Recommendation: increase minimum length of assessments from 150 to 350(???) characters.

At 1500 characters we see a definite shift towards good
See tab – **length** for more details
https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1HvyvZg6EZ0CqNwjZZm42fWsYyUgytb84/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=100195976565248751977&rtpof=true&sd=true

Row Labels	Count of excellent	Count of good	Count of filtered_out		Excellent	Good	Filtered out
(1)150-500	53	1091	16854		0.29%	6.06%	93.64%
(2)501-1000	189	4031	12567		1.13%	24.01%	74.86%
(3)1001-1500	437	6951	6264		3.20%	50.92%	45.88%
(4)1501-2000	717	7585	3200		6.23%	65.95%	27.82%
(5)2001-3000	2144	11054	3191		13.08%	67.45%	19.47%
(6)3001-4000	2206	4548	1579		26.47%	54.58%	18.95%
(7)4001-5000	1281	1433	658		37.99%	42.50%	19.51%
(8)5001-6000	544	507	409		37.26%	34.73%	28.01%
(9)6000+	967	516	251		55.77%	29.76%	14.48%

For a breakdown by vCA, See tab – **vCA by length**
https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1HvyvZg6EZ0CqNwjZZm42fWsYyUgytb84/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=100195976565248751977&rtpof=true&sd=true

further analysis required

12. What was I thinking???

This is probably one of the most important analyses for individual vCA's to review and learn from.
Should the vCA have done something different?
Should the rest of the community acted differently?

See tab – **vCA - no JKO**
https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1HvyvZg6EZ0CqNwjZZm42fWsYyUgytb84/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=100195976565248751977&rtpof=true&sd=true

Look for instances where vCA = excellent , consensus = filtered out.

- filter column B by your name
- Filter column R (excellent) = x
- Filter column AA (Agg result) = Filtered out

If you are left with any assessments try and work out what's going on in your head and/or others heads.

Repeat for (vCA = Filtered out, consensus = Excellent)

- filter column B by your name
- Filter column R (Filtered Out) = x
- Filter column AA (Agg result) = Excellent

13. old v new vCA's

< WIP>

14. word clouds

< WIP>