

Community Advisor Guide

The purpose of Community Advisors is to:

1. Provide a perspective that helps voters make good, informed decisions regarding which proposals to fund.
2. Provide proposers with feedback that helps their ideas be more [impactful](#), [auditable](#) and [feasible](#).
Community Advisors achieve this by reviewing proposals based on the given [review criteria](#). They will then provide a [numerical score](#) and an explanation (rationale) of the score. Please refer to the [Guiding Principles section](#).
3. There will probably be more Proposals than a single person can **thoughtfully review** in the time allotted. The quality of the reviews is of paramount concern. It may be wise to review the proposals that really speak to you first, and then consider others, if you have the time and desire.



Community Advisor Requirements

To be eligible for Community Advisor (CA) role a candidate must answer 'yes' to all of the following statements:

- I volunteer to serve as a CA.
- I am a member of the Cardano community.
- I will attend or watch all town hall meetings.
- I must familiarize myself with the CA Guidelines.
- I did not submit a funding proposal for the Current Fund/Challenge.
- I am not affiliated with any proposing team in the Current Fund/Challenge.
- I must already be a member in Ideascale, and agree to the CA agreement form for each Fund, as it becomes available.
- Committed to provide a fair and thoughtful review

Timeline

Each Funding Round will provide a 7 day window for CA Reviews. This will be followed by a 5 day ["Review of the Reviewers"](#) phase.

Scoring Criteria

- The rationale for scoring **must be provided**. This allows voters to understand all considerations, help proposers learn how to improve for future funding rounds, and

establish the legitimacy of the assessment. It is important to note that any **assessments without a rationale will be filtered out and the community advisor will not be eligible for rewards.**

All reviewers will be asked to provide a score of 1-5 for how much they agree with each of these statements regarding each proposal, as well as the rationale behind the score given:

Impact:

This proposal effectively addresses the challenge. Each challenge will have a new set of criteria to address. It is crucial that community advisors give feedback which focuses the proposal towards the challenge itself. While an idea might be impactful on its own it must align with the goals of the community. For many challenges, a proposal with impact will contain the following:

- A problem which needs to be solved.
- A community which would benefit from the launch of this proposal.
- An ability to scale to address future challenges.

Feasibility:

Given the proposing team's experience and plans, it is highly likely this proposal will be implemented successfully. You should be able to find this information within the proposal.

Suggested criteria:

- Relevant experience of proposer.
- Whether there's a team or an individual proposer.
- Implementers already committed or not.
- Sensible plan and budget for the task described.

Auditability:

This proposal provided me with sufficient information to assess progress in attaining its stated goals.

- Roadmap and milestones
- Definition of success is clear (e.g. metrics or KPIs appropriate to this challenge)
- Clear understandable description of problem and solution
- Challenges and risks have been considered

Score Meaning

The 1-5 scores mean the following:

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly agree

For each statement:

- CAs must explain their rationale for a score given. The evaluations and rationale provided must be transparent, so voters can understand all considerations. It is

important to note that any assessments without a rationale will be filtered out and the CA will not be compensated.

- CAs must ensure they include additional information or improvements needed for proposers to gain a higher score in future rounds.
- Once a review is submitted, it can be edited until the review window closes.

Please direct any further questions to [Telegram CatalystCommunityAdvisors](#)

The review has been completed. What happens next?

Review the Reviewer Process

This is a self correcting process which precedes the Ballot Submission phase and provides guidance to the Voting Committee.

1. CA's finish reviewing.
2. An anonymized CSV containing all reviews will be passed for peer review by veteran CA's who will filter out substandard reviews.
3. Proposers will also be invited to report substandard reviews.
4. Experienced CA's decide which reported reviews should be excluded.
5. A Catalyst admin removes the results of step 4 and any blank reviews from final published reviews.
6. A list of all removed reviews will be published and a retrospective to review the process for the next fund will be held.

Ballot Submission

- The review score and a link to the proposal's URL on the Ideascap innovation platform will be visible from the Catalyst Voting app.
- All rationales provided by CA's will be attached to the original proposal in Ideascap.

Anonymity:

Identity of the CA will be kept anonymous in Ideascap. However, despite our best efforts and testing, there's always a small risk, because of the nature of Ideascap being a 3rd party tool, and anonymity being an experimental feature, that the CA's identity might become known. Please make sure you understand that risk before reviewing proposals.

Community Advisor Incentive

Goal of incentives is to assure reviewers provide a thoughtful and fair review to all proposals, and that each proposal will receive at least three reviews.

Therefore:

- A total of 5% of the challenge fund amount will be allocated as incentive to community advisors.

- 4% will be allocated as rewards for reviews.
 - 1% will be allocated to incentivize those reviewing the reviews.
- After peer-review by CA's, if it can be determined that a review is:
 - given from a biased perspective.
 - clear that the proposal was not read through by the community advisor.
 - clear that the selection criteria and review guidelines were not applied or understood by the community advisor.
 - lacks clear articulation of the rationale for the assessment in a constructive way.

Then the community advisor will not be eligible for incentives and will receive a warning.
- Out of the eligible reviews, for each proposal on the ballot, three reviews will be randomly selected from all reviewers of the proposal to receive an incentive. That means if a proposal received 5 reviews, 3 reviewers out of the 5 will receive an incentive.
- Incentives will be distributed evenly between all reviews that are randomly selected.
- In order to receive the incentive the community advisor will be asked to add a valid shelly payment address in Ideascap.
- Rewards will be sent along with proposer rewards at the start of the execution phase for the Fund.

Community Advisor Guiding Principles

- Misunderstandings are more likely than malign behaviour (see [Hanlon's Razor](#)). Whilst it is easy to assume that proposals, messages or activities you don't understand or disagree with come from negative intentions... it is more likely that you (or they) are misunderstanding something about each other; the proposal; or the challenge/context. Find clarity and common ground before wasting your energy.
- Separate the idea from the proposal. A proposal is just a document and an expression of an idea. A great idea can still have a poor proposal that is either not expressing the idea appropriately, or needs more assistance/collaboration/resources to reach its full potential. Proposers might want feedback on both, but be clear about what you are discussing.
- Advisors are here to advise, not collaborate (mostly). We are walking a fine line on this one, but keep in mind that the advice provided may be coming from experts that are trying to help proposers write better documentation, assess risks or build teams. That isn't the same as having passion for the idea, so proposers should not get down-hearted when receiving comments in Ideascap that just "seem negative" and the commenter isn't joining in the team.
- Advisors are here to advise, not be gatekeepers. Advisors should always remember that when writing advice... and proposers should always remember that when reading it.

The Project Catalyst team thanks all our community advisors for helping build the future of Cardano!