

Catalyst Working Groups

Host Evaluation

Integrating AI Responsibly to Scale-up a Secure, Transparent and Fair Decentralized Governance

Catalyst Working Group Team

- Host City: Online
- Date of Event: 22 June
- Lead: Sonny Dhamayana
- Data Collector: Yan Tirta
- Scribe: Yan Tirta
- Luma Link: <https://lu.ma/hgjldf6k>
- Video Link: <https://youtu.be/qKUc3-gyeKE>
- Presentation Materials:  Presentation Materials
- Full Transcript (text only):  Presentation Transcribes
- Full Transcript (text and video): <https://bit.ly/CWG-ResponsibleAI>
- Miro Link (password catalystwg2024): <https://miro.com/app/board/uXjVK9LxbI0=/>

Leadership teams will summarize the workshop's outcomes and gather participant feedback.

Produce a report on the workshop and submit it to the Catalyst team.

- **Scribe Notes:**
 - Proposal categories; many instances where proposals do not even take a look at those categories
 - Proposal categories; challenge team coordinators were felt effective in educating what proposers need to prepare when they choose a specific category
 - Proposal categories; guidance by challenge team coordinators is something that proposers look for
 - Proposal categories; description of the categories allows multiple interpretation by proposers rendering it difficult to strike a definitive line on what should be achieved

- Ethics in Catalyst; there perhaps should be a headline on what you should not and what you should do as a code-of-conduct
- Ethics in Catalyst; need to strike a balance in maintaining the individuals autonomy in participation and the structure of what is being participated
- Ethics in Catalyst; one way would to provide individuals paths to directly participating in defining elements in the structure that is being participated
- Ethics in Catalyst; there needs to be definition of what role are and what needs to be achieve by the community when brainstorming contributions to Catalyst
- Implementation of Ethics; previous iterations where pointed out as pathways to ethics building where there was a specific moment in Catalyst where the community can have discussions with the proposers (pre-review stage)
- Implementation of Ethics; pre-review stage seeing it that it has values in indirectly enforcing ethics perhaps should be incentivized
- AI Ethics; having an AI that is trained on previous funds would be beneficial for proposers when formulating a problem statement for it is based on past learnings therefore creating a clear progression chart
- AI Ethics; having this trained AI will also allow similar projects to learn from one another or collaborate with one another therefore avoiding double fundings/repetition of efforts
- AI Ethics; there is a common level-up in participation of entities such as Catalyst where an individual might outgrow the entity and seek something else but through this AI new people can take benefit from this. Everyone can then reference this LLM
- AI Ethics; having a tool that utilizes LLM trained on data from all previous funds but curated to speak with users under the pretext of community advisors or mentors. This pointers leads onto the need of new roles
- New Roles; mentorships although has its values there is a danger of it transforming into a new gatekeeping process. Especially if it is compensated, innovation would then be capped to these gatekeepers
- New Roles; need to be careful with mentorships so it does not position itself as know all be all but rather more of a reciprocity. Where both mentors and proposers learn from one another. Enforcing mentorships does creates ethical SOP but also limits innovation
- Voting Process; it is overcomplicated. Voting for the council was a more hassle free process. The method of voting only through mobile is also questioned
- Voting Process; when there is an error, the need to use QR codes hinders ease of participation. Can it not be just simply connect and disconnect your wallet?
- Voting Process; simplification, no need of a specific date where all you need to do is connect your wallet with minimum 500 ADA you will most likely increase participation
- Onboarding Process; mimic DeepFunding's onboarding process to ensure participants understand each process. It involves using the Andamio, cocooned in an entity called DeepFunding Academy, where participants involvement is gamified

- Onboarding Process; this DeepFunding Academy timeline is open and has its own Discord community where individuals can interact with one another
- Onboarding Process; DeepFunding Academy is somewhat like Catalyst School. Though the goal is to become funding independent and more of community driven hence more sustainable
- Onboarding Process; Catalyst School is role based. For example: Do you want to become a reviewer? Do you want to submit a proposal?
- Onboarding Process; should there be a differentiation between onboarding and education. Educating is more towards sharing information about what you are joining into. While onboarding is more towards answering the specific needs to the individual asking questions on
- Onboarding Process; this could then be expanded to have specific events with clear cut goals of onboarding based on the context in the pointer above. Therefore one can map their proposal journey from ideation to final output
- Onboarding Process; this specific onboarding event can also serves as a platform for similar ideas to either collaborate and compete for funding therefore eventually leading up to increase of proposals quality
- Onboarding Process; open collaboration has its risk involving open IP hijacking. Can be battled through the use of a royalty system though this is more of a long term solution
- Onboarding Process; mentorship can be utilized as a tool to combat future threats including AI by as a collective finding solutions to battle the misuse of or to integrate AI
- Voting Competition; should everyone compete in the same pool or should there be a specific pool dependent on the role/size/traction in the ecosystem
- Voting Competition; taking example entities that have their own liquidity pool where their holders are incentivized to vote on proposals that support their cause. Should new entities need to compete with established entities?
- Voting Competition; it boils down to the essentials of that funding entity. Are you competition based or a collaboration? Catalyst as is, is a competition base. Where proposals compete for funding during a certain timeline
- Voting Competition; by choosing a collaboration base it would allow voting based on staking weight. This nudges the proposal to continuously prove themselves until they are worthy enough to receive funding when the stake target is achieved. Proposals that fails to engage with the community can then be shuffled down, similar to a CIP
- Voting Competition; the nature of Cardano community is collaborative, having a competitive structure such as voting for fundings is contradictive towards the natural tendency of the community. That is one of the reason Catalyst has not been working out too well
- Confidence in Catalyst Process; the use of AI has caused confusion and unclarity. It has embedded a level of questioning on what is the actual standard that is being used in the Community Reviewer process

- Confidence in Catalyst Process; having an ecosystem that fosters growth mindset will allow further acceptance of the Catalyst Process, whether that be the use of AI or further enhancing the L2-like processes. Growth mindset is something that can be learned if the ecosystem allows it
- Confidence in Catalyst AI Process; reputation building has its dangers for not all individuals has the same level of virtue. The solution to this is having an open standard. Where the decision of the modeler is transparent, therefore if we are not achieving the intended results, as a community we can then alter the architecture of it to fit the community needs
- Confidence in Catalyst AI Process; by having this AI transparent implies that you have an algorithm that is extendable, reversible, that you can fork and somebody else can test it. Somebody else can put it into an environment and check it in other contexts and see if they can learn something there
- CWG effectiveness; it does not feel the scope of discussion is being fully explored for we are finding it as the discussion happens. There is a sense of misalignment between how to achieve and what to achieve
- CWG effectiveness; understand Catalyst intent is to find what is the most relevant and feasible upgrade to the system/process but funneling open discussions leaves many open-ended points
- CWG effectiveness; there should be a focus on a specific topic and not generalization. Allow the discussions on this specific topic to go deep and resulting in clear actions and mindful constructs
- CWG effectiveness; there should be more emphasis on decentralization. Catalyst although are approaching the community, the solutions are developed internally or by a certain select few which almost feel the ask for input from the community is disingenuous
- CWG effectiveness; Catalyst feels distanced from the community and not by choice but rather by design, where there are specific mandates that need to be achieved by Catalyst
- CWG effectiveness; the intent is understood that Catalyst needs these types of events to clarify findings that can only be clarified by experiencing it for themselves. This though is limited for the Catalyst team is limited therefore the feedback is more of documents findings than direct discussions
- CWG effectiveness; introducing knowledge management, a part of this workshop's presentation, would allow continued growth of knowledge gained from these types of workshops. Where through the use of AI this can be achieved
- Catalyst, Deep Funding and other Incubators; in theory collaborating between these entities to learn what works and what not works would be beneficial for all parties but what you have is the following: you can put your feedback, the feedback goes into IOG, and then we hear nothing about it. It's like a black box
- Catalyst, Deep Funding and other Incubators; discussions are between Catalyst themselves and not with the community. Leaving a sense of not belonging and questionable motives. Feedback is essential to not only achieve a sense of belonging but also understanding the choices taken in moving forward

- Catalyst, Deep Funding and other Incubators; the current process of Catalyst feedback amounts to huge data loss. CWG is an attempt to stipend that data loss which is admirable
- Group Insights/Discussions on the CWG Main Topic; to battle the current abuse of AI, it is still viable to use hyperlinks and further encrypt using RAR or ZIP file and images to counter the use of pure LLMs such as ChatGPT. Underline the wording pure LLMs
- Group Insights/Discussions on the CWG Main Topic; findings above though can be counteracted by individuals who use services that have already integrated LLM fine tuning and RAG. Such as the findings from Wolfram
- Group Insights/Discussions on the CWG Main Topic; two proposals have already used this method, one from Spain and one from Japan. Reviews of these proposals can be a dataset for Catalyst to learn and perhaps expand further the use of this simplistic approach
- Group Insights/Discussions on the CWG Main Topic; explore whether this low-hanging fruit solution can be used on one category though it needs to be noted the development of AI is exponential. What might be effective this round, next round will most likely be ineffective
- Group Insights/Discussions on the CWG Main Topic; identified two questions/topics to further in-depth with the main speaker as following: (1) The use of AI can solidify a proposal's problem statement, by creating a database where we can cross-check whether there is a duplication of efforts. Efforts here meaning proposal submission. (2) Clarifying that AI can inform human decision rather than replacing it, where it is balanced between confidence scoring and perception of value.
- Group Insights/Discussions on the CWG Main Topic; Catalyst AI is not picking up on findings of Pol, such as AI generated reviews. It also is not picking up on nesting reviewers. A nesting reviewer is an individual that has multiple IDs.

- **Key Findings:**

- Ethics in Catalyst; there perhaps should be a headline on what you should not and what you should do as a code-of-conduct
- Ethics in Catalyst; need to strike a balance in maintaining the individuals autonomy in participation and the structure of what is being participated
- Implementation of Ethics; pre-review stage seeing it that it has values in indirectly enforcing ethics perhaps should be incentivized
- AI Ethics; having an AI that is trained on previous funds would be beneficial for proposers when formulating a problem statement for it is based on past learnings therefore creating a clear progression chart
- New Roles; need to be careful with mentorships so it does not position itself as know all be all but rather more of a reciprocity. Where both mentors and proposers learn from one another. Enforcing mentorships does creates ethical SOP but also limits innovation

- Voting Process; it is overcomplicated. Voting for the council was a more hassle free process. The method of voting only through mobile is also questioned
- Onboarding Process; should there be a differentiation between onboarding and education. Educating is more towards sharing information about what you are joining into. While onboarding is more towards answering the specific needs to the individual asking questions on
- Voting Competition; by choosing a collaboration base it would allow voting based on staking weight. This nudges the proposal to continuously prove themselves until they are worthy enough to receive funding when the stake target is achieved. Proposals that fails to engage with the community can then be shuffled down, similar to a CIP
- Confidence in Catalyst Process; having an ecosystem that fosters growth mindset will allow further acceptance of the Catalyst Process, whether that be the use of AI or further enhancing the L2-like processes. Growth mindset is something that can be learned if the ecosystem allows it
- CWG effectiveness; introducing knowledge management, a part of this workshop's presentation, would allow continued growth of knowledge gained from these types of workshops. Where through the use of AI this can be achieved
- Catalyst, Deep Funding and other Incubators; discussions are between Catalyst themselves and not with the community. Leaving a sense of not belonging and questionable motives. Feedback is essential to not only achieve a sense of belonging but also understanding the choices taken in moving forward
- Group Insights/Discussions on the CWG Main Topic; to battle the current abuse of AI, it is still viable to use hyperlinks and further encrypt using RAR or ZIP file and images to counter the use of pure LLMs such as ChatGPT. Underline the wording pure LLMs
- Group Insights/Discussions on the CWG Main Topic; explore whether this low-hanging fruit solution can be used on one category though it needs to be noted the development of AI is exponential. What might be effective this round, next round will most likely be ineffective

Community Vote:

- **What went well?**
 - General discussion took place on Catalyst
- **Even better If? What could be tweaked or changed?**
 - Allow more freedom of the host to determine the structure of the CWG
 - Expand from pre-identifying what needs to be discussed and allowing the hosts to show to Catalyst what needs to be discussed

- **Were there any challenges, hurdles or problems?**
 - Structure of the Miro did not allow freedom to focus on the topics pre-identified by the host team
 - Structure of the Miro was heavily focused on gaining feedback on Catalyst, an act that has been done by numerous pockets of the community hence rendering this CWG potentially duplication of effort
 - Structure of the Miro was repetitive and too rigid, there were too many instances of voting that needed to take place, where it could be more siphoned down into only one or two instances of voting

- **What key ideas came up in the discussions that were not stated in the questions provided?**
 - The need to create a low-hanging fruit AI based code-of-conduct to battle the abuse of AI in Catalyst governance that can be directly implemented such as the use of hyperlinks and images