## KUSAMA **Kusama - Treasury Proposal Audit** Funded by: OpenGovernance Proposal #67 **GRADE: Project name:** Kusama PaperCraft **Proponent:** ${\bf EiCEuCbWRzKxQb5KuurCqCmq3ypv42sjvRPPLTSZnogvcfc}$ **Above** 5 https://docs.google.com/document/d/1iA41Z0V4\_EL24WnWIADQIbLBZRZLvyDNsp1KsMQ7ZrU/ed **Proposal URL: A**verage Audit date: 14/03/2023 290 KSM **Kusama Treasury status:** 335,420 KSM Requested funding KSM/USD: **Requested % of Treasury:** 9300 USD 0.09% Average Score per Category Total Score per Category **Grade Criteria Legend** 1. Information 1. Information Excellent >=15 5.0 Above Average >5 8. Overall 2. Context 8. Overall 2. Context 2.5 Meets Criteria >-5 **Needs Improvement** -2.5 Unacceptable -5.Q 3. Problem 3. Problem 7. Team 7. Team **Score Criteria Legend** Excellent Above Average Meets Criteria 0 6. Deliverables 4. Proposal 6. Deliverables 4. Proposal **Needs Improvement** 5. Budget 5. Budget Unacceptable Above average proposal with clearly defined budgets, but needs improvements in presenting the problem statement for clarity and having a reporting system for progress **General Comments:** reports Score criteria Comments Description 1 0 -1 (explain reasons why score differs from default score 0) 1. Information Project description and category, requested allocation and referenda origin call clear Description is concise and gets straight to the point. Project category is specific. and accurate. Discussion topic open for a minimum period of one week. All the questions and concerns addressed and answered. Score 1 2. Context Project context and background presented in a clear terms which can be fully understood and assessed. Score 3. Problem The problem the proposal is trying to solve is explained in a clean and concise Problem statement not presented Score -1 4. Proposal Proposal solution is described with a sufficient amount of information. Similar projects or proposals listed and explained how they differ from this proposal Milestones to achieve the goals of the project are clearly defined. Milestone also accounted for possible delays. Milestones are split into the smaller detailed work tasks with deliverables, resources Timeline with tasks/activities listed in a chronological order is clear and accurate. Score 5. Budget Budget presented with hourly rates, number of active hours and categories, Budget is clear and transparent and broken down into direct cost categories. Budget costs are comparable to the similar treasury proposals. Aside accounting for hourly rates, the breakdown of tangibles that will justify the Final payment calculations and conditions are in line with proposed milestones. cost for materials were presented Score 6. Deliverables Key deliverables are clear and outline progress towards the proposed solution. Project objectives/success criteria is clearly defined with measurable targets where Awareness of known conditions that may affect the project schedule, milestones, ☐ ☐ ✓ ☐ Known constraints not presented determined budget or project timeline. Reporting process is defined to inform the community about the progress and Reporting process not presented current status of the project. Clear communication strategy - where, when, what and who is going to present the information to the community and other relevant parties. Score 7. Team Team members that will actively work on the project are introduced with all relevant Reputation from previous involvements in the Kusama/Polkadot grants/bounties/tasks/treasury proposals. Score 8. Overall It's easy to know what the proposal is all about by reading just section 2 of the proposal document General quality of the proposal content (i.e. can you make an educated opinion on the proposal in less than 5 minutes?) How important and valuable is the presented problem and proposal solution to the ecosystem. Promised work presents an above average ROI ,taking the defined budget into Promised work on defined budget presents a good ROI for community. Other remarks Score