

Changes to vPA Guidelines in Fund9

Please take a moment to view these suggestions for changes to the F9 vPA Process.

The suggestions culminated in the Wednesday, June 20th ATH, having been: informed by previous funds' sensed issues and outcomes, contributed to by open community input over the past fund, discussion via comments in the vPA Guide and group discussion during today's ATH.

This document includes suggestions for Fund 9 (black copy) and suggestions for adaptations which will not take place in F9, but will receive further consideration for F10 (red copy).

There is still much room for improvement to the process, and some of those improvements need work beyond the scope of this fund's opportunity. The working group's intention in developing these suggestions was to maintain positive improvements, address any gaps that have shown to or could enable counterproductive behavior that does not agree with the guidelines, and encourage growth and opportunity for all parts of the process.


While time is short between now and the start of the vPA process (Friday Jul 22nd), the working group opens the document for any additional input or constructive comment, which would be helpful to gain still broader input on this and future funds. Thank you!

- General edits to [Veteran Proposal Assessor Guide - Fund9 \(open for comments\)](#)
 - vCA to vPA terminology fixes
 - Rearranged existing information for better flow and clarity
 - Fixed typos and grammar
 - Several rephrasings of existing information to add clarity or make more concise
 - Added language that highlights the need for vPAs to consider proposer flags carefully before agreeing or disagreeing
 - Removed vPA Petitions Process and migrated to its own documentation:
[Draft New vCA RP & Petitions Overview](#)
- General edits to [Fund9 - vPA Eligibility & Incentives Requirements \(open for co...](#)
 - Fixed typos and grammar
 - A couple of edits to existing information to add clarity

vPA Guide and Eligibility Doc

Suggestions for changes in Fund 9.

vPA eligibility requirements

- **Replace:** “you must have been a PA in the (2) most recent funds” with “you must have been a PA or vPA in the (2) most recent funds”
 - May increase number of vPAs
 - Expected to be a small iteration
 - Gives equal weight to recent PA and vPA contribution
 - Do we rollback to requiring only one fund for eligibility
 - Issues for why the vPA role was restricted in Fund 8 still exist
- **Add:** “AND you must have less than a 51% filter-out rate on assessments you have done as a PA in the (2) most recent funds”
 - Decreases the number of vPAs by an estimated 11.4%
 - Somewhat reliable datapoint
 - May also require a sample size requirement
 - Can be iterated up or down easily to throttle vPA eligibility
 -  Filterout rate as a vPA requirement

Establish cap on number of vPA reviews made

- **Add:** “There should be a maximum ceiling (c) for receiving vPA rewards, above which no additional rewards will be paid out. This is established in order to ensure that the vPA rankings are performed in a sufficiently thorough and thoughtful manner allowing for the fair judging of Proposal Assessor assessments. In the current fund, the maximum threshold value is set at 5,000 reviews.”
 - May limit the impact of bad actors
 - May reduce incentives for good actors
 - Must be considered alongside other suggestions that may limit vPA productivity

Rewards slashing adjustment to formula (strengthen case for the 70% vs X% in time for for petitions process)

- **Add:** “(and only if there is a clear consensus $\geq 70\%$ majority, if there is less than 70% majority, all vPAs are rewarded).”
 - Changes the slashing of rewards from a majority decision to a consensus decision
 - Introduces iterative change to a process that showed significant need of improvement in Fund8
 - Need data to estimate results vs. current outcomes
 - Continue discussions on bonus, big picture

vPAs must provide rationale (Table – keep current guidance that this practice is encouraged, research tools that might be able to help iterate the PA-vPA feedback loop in a meaningful way)

- **Add:** “Every time vPA decides to FO an assessment, they MUST provide (a short but meaningful) rationale.”
 - If limited to only FO could continue current increase in incentives to push all reviews towards “good”
 - If expanded to all reviews, may reduce vPA productivity, both good and bad
 - Risk of increasing “noise” in data

- Possibility of improving PA/vPA feedback loop
- Should a character limit be considered
- Should we have a limited set of tags + "other"

vPA eligibility requirements (Table – requires more research on positive impact)

- **Add:** "AND have done at least (1) Excellent assessment in the previous funds." (no clear positive impact)
 - Significant decrease in number of vPAs
 - Excellent assessments are an unreliable datapoint
 - Could improve the excellent assessment datapoint over time
- **Add:** Proof of Life requirement (Fund 10 at the earliest)
 - Requires a lot of additional resources
 - May not be enforceable without better tools

vPAs conflict of interest (Table – work on clarifying overall "conflict of interest" statement to account for all roles and process for Fund 10)

- **Add:** "vPAs can NOT review any assessments for proposals where the vPA assessed as a PA."
 - Currently this practice is allowed
 - May prevent malicious behavior against other PAs
 - May eliminate a source of educated reviews based on deeper knowledge of the proposal
- **Add:** "You can only review assessments if you have not performed any action (Proposer, PA) in THAT Challenge Setting" <<- needs rewording ??
 - See the PA restrictions
 - cannot assess their own proposal
 - cannot assess proposals in the same Challenge Setting
 - cannot assess a proposal in which they are a mentor, team member.
 - Side-effects: vPA will be limited in their assessment eligibility to be determined by their actions as a Proposer or PA.
 - Side-effects: Removes ability of vPA to manipulate the outcome of their proposal and the Challenge Setting in which they have a proposal.

Incentivized flag review (Tabled)

- **Add:** vPAs evaluation of assessments with proposers flag will have 2 x weightage for rewards and . Weightage for evaluation with more than 10 vPA assessment will be 0.2.
 - May be a way to concentrate vPA effort on analyzing proposer flags
 - May create attack vector on rewards pool
 - There appears to already be a lot of attention on proposer flags so may be unnecessary risk