## KUSDMD **Kusama - Treasury Proposal Audit** Funded by: OpenGovernance Proposal #67 **Auditor: Thomas GRADE: Project name:** RMRKv2 Integration in KodaDot - Kusama's NFT Infrastructure **Proponent:** Damsky-DpRVpDe4kDnZSjnZZ1WHb4WegAsRVBhUvfbEGxymMo6PA1a**Meets Criteria Proposal URL:** https://kusama.polkassembly.io/referenda/220 Audit date: 18/06/2023 Kusama Treasury status: 3102 KSM 282810 KSM Requested funding KSM/USD: Requested % of Treasury: 71,994 USD 1.10% Average Score per Category Total Score per Category **Grade Criteria Legend** 1. Information 1. Information Excellent >=15 5.0 >5 Above Average 8. Overal 2. Context 8. Overall 2. Context 2.5 >-5 Meets Criteria **Needs Improvement** >-15 -2.5 Unacceptable 3. Problem 7. Team 3. Problem 7. Team Score Criteria Legend Excellent Above Average 0 Meets Criteria 6. Deliverables 6. Deliverables 4. Proposal 4. Proposal **Needs Improvement** Unacceptable 5. Budget 5. Budget KodaDot intends to receive funding for the partial completion of integrating RMRKv2 into the KodaDot platform, which allows for new and improved features such as (but not limited to): EVM support, enhanced UX, greater opportunity for cross-chain integration and more. Completed milestones for retroactive payment include: basic **General Comments:** integration of RMRKv2, debugging and testing. Funding for future milestones include: marketing campaigns promoting a new and improved KodaDot platform (with RMRKv2 integrated), added features, and final deployment. Score criteria Comments Description 0 1 -1 (explain reasons why score differs from default score 0) 1. Information 1.1 Project description and category, requested allocation and referenda origin call clear and accurate. 1.2 Discussion topic open for a minimum period of one week. All the questions and concerns addressed and answered. 0 Score 2. Context Project provides social media links showing interest and community opinion on 2.1 Project context and background presented in a clear terms which can be fully KodaDot integrating RMRKv2, which promotes credibility that this updated understood and assessed. integration is desired by the community as well as the KodaDot team. Score 1 3. Problem KodaDot is currently using an old version of RMRK which does not have EVM support and other new features that are otherwise included in RMRKv2. By 3.1 The problem the proposal is trying to solve is explained in a clean and concise implementing RMRKv2, KodaDot hopes to foster a more robust NFT community on the Kusama ecosystem. Score 4. Proposal 4.1 Proposal solution is described with a sufficient amount of information. Proposal mentions the existence of similar projects in the ecosystem as well as key differentiators that separate KodaDot from other similar projects, but perhaps 4.2 Similar projects or proposals listed and explained how they differ from this a precise example or case-study comparing and contrasting exact, key differences proposal would be helpful in showcasing the KodaDot and its differentiators. 4.3 Milestones to achieve the goals of the project are clearly defined. Each milestone include details such as expected completion, description and 4.4 Milestones are split into the smaller detailed work tasks with deliverables, deliverable. Beyond this, the completed milestones indiviudally have detailed resources and description. reports as well as github links to the completed deliverable. 4.5 Timeline with tasks/activities listed in a chronological order is clear and accurate. 5. Budget Budget is defined and split based upon milestones already completed (retroactive payments for milestones 0-3) and payment-upon-completion for future milestones, more detail can be provided on what the funds go towards beyond just "\$72,000 5.1 Budget is clear and transparent and broken down into direct cost categories. for development". A breakdown of what these payments went or are going towards specifically (suhc tools, hardware, software subscriptions, man-hours, etc.) would help readers understand precisely how the funds are distributed. 5.2 Budget costs are comparable to the similar treasury proposals. 5.3 Final payment calculations and conditions are in line with proposed milestones. Score 6. Deliverables 6.1 Key deliverables are clear and outline progress towards the proposed solution. 6.2 Project objectives/success criteria is clearly defined with measurable targets where possible. Proposal document does not acknowledge potential setbacks/roadblocks that 6.3 Awareness of known conditions that may affect the project schedule, milestones, could occur in the development, bug-finding or marketing phases of future determined budget or project timeline. Individual milestones (both completed and upcoming) have detailed reports 6.4 Reporting process is defined to inform the community about the progress and externally linked outlining the key objectives, issues and resolutions. current status of the project. Members of the KodaDot team are actively engaged in Polkassembly, Twitter, 6.5 Clear communication strategy - where, when, what and who is going to present Polkadot Forum and occasionally on AAG. the information to the community and other relevant parties. 0 Score 7. Team 7.1 Team members that will actively work on the project are introduced with all relevant information. 7.2 Reputation from previous involvements in the Kusama/Polkadot Members of the KodaDot team have submitted treasury proposals in the past for grants/bounties/tasks/treasury proposals. the KodaDot project. 0 8. Overall 8.1 General quality of the proposal content (i.e. can you make an educated opinion on the proposal in less than 5 minutes?) 8.2 How important and valuable is the presented problem and proposal solution to the ecosystem. 8.3 Promised work on defined budget presents a good ROI for community. The proposal provides detailed documentation about what KodaDot is and what they've done by providing links to different partners (Manta, SubstraKnights, GraviDAO, and more) they work with and how the partners they work with support the overarching mission of KodaDot (to create an inclusive and sustainable NFT) 8.4 Other remarks community on Kusama). This strengthens the credibility of the KodaDot project and team as this showcases that there are other notable community members that use KodaDot and solidifies their importance in the community.

1

Score