

Coinsider Tokenomics Rubric	Date:	Project Name: Coin/Token Ticker:
Date Founded:	Founder Name:	Total Fundraised (optional):

- **This Tokenomics Rubric is NOT financial advice! And while tokenomics are important to consider under the broader Fundamental Analysis umbrella, there are other factors to consider as well when analyzing projects.**
- For each aspect, find the best or closest answer that applies to the project's token/coin.
- Bullet points under each rating represent "OR" (so only 1 answer needs to apply, unless otherwise specified).
- If none of the given answers apply, then pick a 1-5 score using your best judgment according to the following generic scale:

1 point	2 points	3 points	4 points	5 points
Extremely bad	Bad	Neutral (not good, not bad)	Good (enough)	Extremely good

- If any element is not relevant or is unknown to the specific project/token, then fill in "N/A" instead of a score (unless the rubric tells you to score unknown elements differently).
- ***This rubric is intended to be used for tokens/coins that have already launched, so do not use it to evaluate pre-token or pre-launch projects.***

Guideline:

1. Write down the score for each element by multiplying the points with the given multiplier (M).
2. Add up all the Scores for each section (= Z).
3. If no question in the section was an "N/A" (all questions have a score), then Y is 10. If 1 or more questions were answered with "N/A" then subtract the Multiplier (M) numbers of those "N/A" answered questions from 10 to get the number Y.
4. Calculate the Total Section Rating with the formula: Z / Y and fill in the result in the designated box (use at least 1 decimal).
 - a. The Section Rating result should be a number between 1-5. If it is not, a calculation error has been made and you need to find & correct the error, and then re-calculate.
5. Then proceed to fill out the results of each section in the final results table and follow the instructions that are described there to calculate the correct Final Tokenomics Rating.

Section 1: Token Utility

Points:	1	2	3	4	5	Score
Necessity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No token required Token can be used alongside other (payment) methods, but there are no discounts or benefits for using the token to access the protocol Token requirement is unknown 	Token can be used (WITH a discount) for features (gas, services, etc), but it is not required; other coins can be used as well.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tokens are required, but for limited scope of features (gas, services, etc) Or choose 3 in other scenarios where you feel “neutral” (neither good nor bad) about the token requirement. 	Tokens are required for most (important) features (gas, services, etc), but not all	Token is required to access protocol (gas, services, etc)	M = 4
						(example: if you choose 5 points, then the score is $5 \times M = 5 \times 4 = 20$) Score = Points x M: _____
Exclusive Features	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Token grants NO access to exclusive, optional features or services within the ecosystem 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Token grants access to optional features or services within the ecosystem, but they are not exclusive to token holders Token grants limited access to minor optional features or services within the ecosystem 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Token grants access to exclusive optional features or services within the ecosystem, but the benefit for token holders is only average 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Token grants access to optional features or services within the ecosystem, but you don't think it's enough to grant 5 points for this aspect. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Token grants access to exclusive, optional features or services within the ecosystem These features bring very high monetary benefit and/or profit potential 	M = 1
						Score = Points x M: _____

Section 1: Token Utility

Points:	1	2	3	4	5	Score
Discounts & Benefits ⚠ Choose “N/A” if there are NO products, services or features within the project’s ecosystem on which discounts could be given. (This does not absolve governance tokens or gas tokens, if theoretically some discounts/benefits could exist)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are NO discounts or special benefits for using the token over other forms of payment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are NO discounts or special benefits for using the token AND there are NO other forms of payment than the token itself There are discounts or special benefits for using the token over other forms of payment (but discounts are less than 20%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are discounts or special benefits for using the token over other forms of payment Discounts of more than 20% for essential features 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are discounts or special benefits for using the token over other forms of payment Discounts of more than 30% for essential features 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are high discounts or special benefits for using the token Discounts of more than 40% for essential features 	M = 1
						Score = Points x M: _____
Staking & Mining	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NO staking 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staking is possible but extremely high barrier to entry for validators and no delegation possible. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staking is possible and generally accessible for most people either as validator or delegator AND/OR Medium staking yield 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staking is possible AND easily accessible ⚠ Choose 4 IF the answer results in 1, 2, or 3 for the aspect of staking, BUT there is (also) a PoW mining algorithm used for at least 50% of consensus 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staking is possible AND easily accessible AND the “Necessity” aspect in this section resulted in a score of 4 or 5. 100% PoW mining AND accessible for the majority of users (either directly or indirectly). 	M = 3
						Score = Points x M: _____

Section 1: Token Utility						
Points:	1	2	3	4	5	Score
Governance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not a governance token 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Choose 2 if you estimate that the situation is in between the scenarios in 1 and 3. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Governance token, but governance model allows only very limited influence from token holders to affect the governance process. Choose 3 if your stance on the governance model for the token is neutral (neither good nor bad) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Choose 4 if you feel the situation is in between the scenarios described in 3 and 5. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Governance token and governance model gives very broad power and influence to token holders Token has fair distribution (whales/team don't have full control) AND participating in the governance process is frictionless and simple. 	M = 1
						Score = Points x M: _____

Totals of Section 1: Token Utility			
		Y = 10 OR (10 MINUS sum of “M” that you put “N/A” for, if any): _____	Total Score (Z):
		Token Utility Section Rating (Z / Y): _____.	

Section 2: Supply & Market Cap

Points:	1	2	3	4	5	Score
Max supply vs Circulating supply Calculate: Circulating Supply / Max Supply (x 100%) If Max Supply is infinite, then calculate: Circulating Supply / Total Supply (x 100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0-20% of supply is in circulation Circulating supply and/or max supply are unknown/unverifiable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 20-40% of supply is in circulation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 40-60% of supply is in circulation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 60-80% of supply is in circulation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 80% or more of supply is in circulation 	M = 3
						Score = Points x M: _____
Vesting Schedule + Token Unlocks of supply	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More than 30% supply increase due to vesting/unlocks within 12 months + inflation Vesting schedule/token unlocks are unknown More than 20% of total supply COULD theoretically get unlocked within 12 months 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 20-30% supply increase due to vesting/unlocks within 12 months + inflation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10-20% supply increase due to vesting/unlocks within 12 months + inflation Choose 3 if for other reasons your stance on Vesting Schedule and/or Token Unlocks is neutral. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less than 10% supply increase due to vesting/unlocks within 12 months + inflation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None (all tokens are fully unlocked and distributed), meaning: circulating supply equals total and/or maximum supply) In case of PoW mining AND there is no vesting schedule + no token unlocks AND: no pre-mine (fair launch), no “insiders allocation”, no staking, etc. 	M = 2
						Score = Points x M: _____

Section 2: Supply & Market Cap

Points:	1	2	3	4	5	Score
Distribution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More than 60% of supply is held by top 100 addresses (excluding exchange addresses) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 40-60% of supply is held by top 100 addresses (excluding exchange addresses) Current distribution cannot be accurately determined, but you estimate that the distribution is highly centralized. MINUS 1 point if INITIAL distribution was more than 40% allocated to insiders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 20-40% of supply is held by top 100 addresses (excluding exchange addresses) Current distribution cannot be accurately determined, but you estimate that the distribution seems neutral (neither good nor bad). MINUS 1 point if INITIAL distribution was more than 40% allocated to insiders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10-20% of supply is held by top 100 addresses (excluding exchange addresses) Current distribution cannot be accurately determined, but you estimate the distribution seems fairly decentralized MINUS 1 point if INITIAL distribution was more than 40% allocated to insiders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less than 10% of supply is held by top 100 addresses (excluding exchange addresses) MINUS 1 point if INITIAL distribution was more than 40% allocated to insiders 	M = 1
						Score = Points x M: <hr/>
Inflation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High perpetual NET inflation (more than 6% per year) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Currently high perpetual NET inflation (>6%), but each year the inflation percentage decreases Temporary high inflation, BUT demand is reasonably expected to exceed the inflation by orders of magnitude MINUS 1 point if the inflation model & schedule can be changed by governance at a whim 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less than 6% NET inflation AND gross inflation will drop to zero in the near future. BUT this leaves the ecosystem economically unsustainable (no other revenue sources) MINUS 1 point if the inflation model & schedule can be changed by governance at a whim Choose 3 if your stance on the inflation model is neutral (neither good nor bad) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less than 2% NET inflation. MINUS 1 point if the inflation model & schedule can be changed by governance at a whim 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Zero or negative inflation AND other sources of revenue can sustain the ecosystem. AND the probability of the inflation model & schedule being changed is extremely low or non-existent. 	M = 1
						Score = Points x M: <hr/>

Section 2: Supply & Market Cap						
Points:	1	2	3	4	5	Score
Market Cap Growth Potential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FDV of the #2 ranked project on Coingecko divided by FDV of coin, gives a result of less than 7 Volume / market cap ratio is lower than 0.0001 (because this is a red flag) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FDV of the #2 ranked project on Coingecko divided by FDV of coin, gives a result of less than 23 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FDV of the #2 ranked project on Coingecko divided by FDV of coin, gives a result of less than 70 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FDV of the #2 ranked project on Coingecko divided by FDV of coin, gives a result of less than 200 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FDV of the #2 ranked project on Coingecko divided by FDV of coin, gives a result of more than 200 	M = 2
						Score = Points x M: _____
Token Unit Bias	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coin's unit price is higher than \$1,000 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coin's unit price is between \$100 - \$1,000 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coin's unit price is between \$1 - \$100 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coin's unit price is between \$0.10 - \$1.00 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coin's unit price is lower than \$0.10 	M = 1
						Score = Points x M: _____

Totals of Section 2: Supply & Market Cap			
		Y = 10 OR (10 MINUS sum of "M" that you put "N/A" for, if any): _____	Total Score (Z):
		Token Utility Section Rating (Z / Y): _____	

Section 3: Economic Incentives

Points:	1	2	3	4	5	Score
Staking & PoW Mining Rewards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no staking or mining rewards. It is unknown what the funding mechanism for staking rewards is (or a questionable explanation is given) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are staking or mining rewards, but the funding mechanism is unsustainable Lower than average mining reward 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less than market average staking rewards, but the mechanism is sustainable Average mining rewards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher than average staking rewards AND it's sustainable for the foreseeable future (a least 5 years) Higher than average mining rewards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Top 5 staking rewards, sustainable for at least 5 years Average or higher than average mining rewards but higher than average hashrate (there is competition for mining this coin) 	M = 4
						Score = Points x M: _____
Burn Mechanisms (or Buyback & Burn)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No token burns 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less than 25% of fees get burned Less than 25% of total supply will ever get burned. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 25-50% of fees get burned Less than 50% of the total supply will ever be burned 100% of fees will be burned BUT there is no other way to generate revenue (not economically sustainable) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More than 50% of fees get burned AND there is a sustainable mechanism in place to generate revenue for the ecosystem. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100% of fees get burned AND there is no limit on the amount of supply getting burned AND there is a sustainable mechanism in place to generate revenue for the ecosystem. 	M = 2
						Score = Points x M: _____
Transaction Fees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less than 10% of transaction fees flow back into the ecosystem in a way that benefits token holders (Treasury, Insurance and/or Liquidity Pools, "Dividends", etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less than 30% of transaction fees flow back into the ecosystem in a way that benefits token holders (Treasury, Insurance and/or Liquidity Pools, "Dividends", etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 30-50% of transaction fees flow back into the ecosystem in a way that benefits token holders (Treasury, Insurance and/or Liquidity Pools, "Dividends", etc.) If there is no system of transaction fees (and thus technically N/A); then rate 3 points. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50-75% of transaction fees flow back into the ecosystem in a way that benefits token holders. (Treasury, Insurance, Risk and/or Liquidity Pools, "Dividends", etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More than 75% of transaction fees flow back into the ecosystem in a way that benefits token holders. (Treasury, Insurance and/or Liquidity Pools, "Dividends", etc.) 	M = 1
						Score = Points x M: _____

Section 3: Economic Incentives

Points:	1	2	3	4	5	Score
Ecosystem Growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is NO capital allocated towards growth and marketing AND there are NO regular events/activities, like airdrops, that require using or holding the token. AND there are NO token incentives and/or grants for developers to build on the platform 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is capital allocated towards growth and marketing AND/OR there are regular events/activities, like airdrops, that require using or holding the token. AND/OR inconsequential amounts of capital are allocated for token incentives / grants for developers to build on the platform 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is capital allocated towards growth and marketing OR there are regular events/activities, like airdrops, that require using or holding the token. OR there are token incentives and/or grants for developers to build on the platform (only 1 out of these 3 apply) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is capital allocated towards growth and marketing AND/OR there are regular events/activities, like airdrops, that require using or holding the token. AND/OR there are token incentives and/or grants for developers to build on the platform (at least 2 out of these 3 apply) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is capital allocated towards growth and marketing AND there are regular events/activities, like airdrops, that require using or holding the token. AND there are token incentives and/or grants for developers to build on the platform 	M = 1
						Score = Points x M:
Transaction Tax (penalties on selling)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2% or more transaction tax 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1-2% transaction tax Minus 1 point IF at least 50% of this transaction tax is NOT being burned 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0-1% transaction tax, BUT the tax is NOT being burned 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less than 0.1% transaction tax, AND 100% of the tax is being burned. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No penalties on selling, nor any form of transaction tax (other than regular network fees) 	M = 1
						Score = Points x M:

Section 3: Economic Incentives						
Points:	1	2	3	4	5	Score
Sustainable Business Model	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no business model behind the token that could drive demand There is no business model known that could drive demand for the token 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a business model that can drive demand for the token, BUT it is unsustainable and there is risk of collapse of the business model within 2 years. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The business model to drive demand for the token is unsustainable, but this will certainly not cause issues within 5 years. You estimate that the sustainability of the business model is neutral 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The business model to drive demand for the token is strong but unsustainable long term, but will not cause issues within 10 years. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a strong AND sustainable business model to drive demand for the token. 	M = 1
						Score = Points x M: _____


Totals of Section 3: Economic Incentives			
		Y = 10 OR (10 MINUS sum of “M” that you put “N/A” for, if any): _____	Total Score (Z):
		Token Utility Section Rating (Z / Y): _____.	

Section 4: Market Metrics & Liquidity						
Points:	1	2	3	4	5	Score
Accessibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Token is not listed/tradable on any exchange (DEX or CEX). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only listed on a few obscure DEXs More exchange listings are expected within 1 year, but is unknown/unconfirmed: +1 point 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Listed on obscure DEXs and a few obscure CEXs Strongly expect future exchange listings with top 10 crypto exchanges by trading volume within 1 year: +1 point 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Listed on popular DEXs and a few medium sized CEXs Confirmed future exchange listings for top 10 crypto exchanges by trading volume, within 6 months: +1 point 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Listed on about every exchange including the largest ones (CEXs and DEXs) both inside and outside of the US. 	M = 2
						Score = Points x M: _____
Trading Volume	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less than \$1 million in trading volume More than 100x away from bitcoin's trading volume AND there is suspicion or shadiness around the validity of measurement of the trading volume or it can't be verified. In all cases where there seems to be clear fraud with trading volume 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More than 100x away from bitcoin's trading volume BUT at least listed on 1 major CEX that accounts for more than 40% but less than 60% of the coin's total trading volume 75-100x away from bitcoin's trading volume, but its trading volume is estimated to be highly suspicious 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 75-100x away from bitcoin's trading volume Apart from the measurements, for other reasons, you find this metric to be neutral (not good, not bad) for this coin. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 30-75x away from bitcoin's trading volume 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less than 30x away from bitcoin's trading volume 	M = 2
						Score = Points x M: _____
Volume / Market cap Ratio	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Volume / Market cap Ratio is lower than 0.0001. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Volume / Market cap Ratio is lower than 0.001. Unconfirmed supply: MINUS 1 POINT 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Volume / Market cap Ratio is between 0.001 and 0.01. Unconfirmed supply: MINUS 1 POINT 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Volume / Market cap Ratio is between 0.01 and 0.05. Unconfirmed supply: MINUS 1 POINT 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Volume / Market cap Ratio is higher than 0.05. Unconfirmed supply: MINUS 1 POINT 	M = 2

Section 4: Market Metrics & Liquidity

Points:	1	2	3	4	5	Score
						Score = Points x M: _____
Liquidity: Liquidity Pools & Market Makers (see screenshot below)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are NO liquidity pools or market makers to ensure that buying the token is easy and that selling does not have a significant impact. Lowest of +2% Depth or -2% Depth on #1 Exchange is lower than \$100k 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> You estimate that this token's particular situation is between 1 and 3. Lowest of +2% Depth or -2% Depth on #1 Exchange is between \$100k - \$1M 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are liquidity pools or market makers but not enough to ensure that buying the token is easy and that selling does not have a significant impact. Lowest of +2% Depth or -2% Depth on #1 Exchange is between \$1M - \$5M 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If you estimate that this token's particular situation is between 3 and 5. Lowest of +2% Depth or -2% Depth on #1 Exchange is between \$5M - \$10M 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are ample liquidity pools or market makers to ensure that buying the token is easy and selling does not have a significant impact Lowest of +2% Depth or -2% Depth on #1 Exchange is higher than \$10M 	M = 2
						Score = Points x M: _____


Finding Liquidity:



The screenshot shows the Coingecko website's Bitcoin Markets page. A red arrow points to the '-2% Depth' column for the top exchange, Binance, which has a value of \$13,413,051. The table lists the top 5 exchanges by volume.

#	Exchange	Pair	Price	Spread	+2% Depth	-2% Depth	24h Volume	Volume %	Last Updated	Trust Score
1	Binance	BTC/USDT	\$38,784.13	0.01%	\$23,562,142	\$13,413,051	\$1,616,845,657	6.89%	Recently	
2	OrangeX	BTC/USDT	\$38,813.98	0.01%	\$24,469,283	\$23,881,890	\$358,571,475	1.53%	Recently	
3	Hotcoin Global	BTC/USDT	\$38,784.07	0.01%	\$20,372,802	\$21,162,880	\$472,894,600	2.02%	Recently	
4	Coinbase Exchange	BTC/USD	\$38,778.07	0.01%	\$16,246,068	\$9,489,425	\$616,370,759	2.63%	Recently	
5	Kraken	BTC/USD	\$38,776.60	0.01%	\$9,244,004	\$9,570,140	\$144,682,507	0.62%	Recently	

Source: Coingecko.com

Section 4: Market Metrics & Liquidity						
Points:	1	2	3	4	5	Score
Liquidity Pool Incentivization  Put "N/A" for this aspect if the token doesn't require its own liquidity pools (e.g. L1 gas tokens)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Liquidity providers are NOT incentivized with trading fees, LP tokens, yield farming incentives, and/or other rewards to ensure the availability of assets for trading and investment. The funding of any existing liquidity incentives lasts less than 6 months. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is little incentivization for liquidity providers in the form of trading fees, LP tokens, yield farming incentives, and/or other rewards to ensure the availability of assets for trading and investment. The funding of the majority of these rewards lasts between 6 months to 1 year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Liquidity providers are incentivized with trading fees, LP tokens, yield farming incentives, and/or other rewards to ensure the availability of assets for trading and investment. The funding of the majority of these rewards lasts less than 2 years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Liquidity providers are incentivized with trading fees, LP tokens, yield farming incentives, and/or other rewards to ensure the availability of assets for trading and investment. The funding of the majority these rewards lasts at least 2 years more 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Liquidity providers are incentivized with trading fees, LP tokens, yield farming incentives, and/or other rewards to ensure the availability of assets for trading and investment. The funding of the majority of these rewards lasts at least 5 years more 	M = 1
						Score = Points x M: _____
Pump & Dumps?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chart shows massive manipulation (pump and dumps) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Token has a low to medium volume/liquidity profile and has been victim to pump & dump schemes in the past (more than 2 years ago), but is on a path to improve its reputation in this regard. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low volume/liquidity token, but no clear signs of pump & dump schemes in the charts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Medium volume/liquidity profile, AND low future risk to fall victim to pump & dump schemes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Healthy volume/liquidity profile AND no signs of pump & dump activity in the charts 	M = 1
						Score = Points x M: _____

Totals of Section 4: Market Metrics & Liquidity			
		Y = 10 OR (10 MINUS sum of "M" that you put "N/A" for, if any): _____	Total Score (Z):
		Token Utility Section Rating (Z / Y): _____.	

Section 5: SWOT ANALYSIS

- Identify the **biggest Strength, Weakness, Opportunity & Threat** (in your opinion) of the project and describe each of them in a few words.
- Then give it a rating (1-3 or 3-5) and the weight of importance in your assessment (1-5) and finally calculate the score ($C = A \times B$) for each element
- The aspect you choose can be from the above sections, but could also be a point that has NOT been mentioned in the previous sections (random example: "token's track record"). It can be a section as a whole (e.g. "Token Utility"), or a smaller element (e.g. "Necessity"). As a general guideline a whole section should then be given a higher weight of importance than a smaller element, but either way you can choose the weight according to your own judgment.
- You can even choose other fundamental points that are not strictly part of tokenomics, as long as you can make a reasonable case that it influences token demand or tokenomics. Random examples: Strength: "strong hype/buzz for coin" or Threat: "could be classified as a security"
- The Section Rating result should be a number between 1-5. If it is not, a calculation error has been made and you need to find & correct the error, and then re-calculate.

Explainer for Rating **biggest Strength & Opportunity**:

3: Even though this is the greatest strength or opportunity, you are neutral on this element (other strengths or opportunities are less impressive)

4: This best strength or opportunity is good but not exceptional

5: This best strength or opportunity is exceptionally good

Explainer for Rating **biggest Weakness & Threat**:

1: This biggest weakness or threat is extremely bad

2: This biggest weakness or threat is bad but not extremely bad.

3: Even though you find this the biggest weakness or threat, you are neutral on this element (other weaknesses or threats are less alarming)

Assigning Weight Factor: 1 = low importance, 2 = slightly important, 3 = neutral on importance, 4 = important, 5 = extremely important

STRENGTH	A: Rating (3-5)	B: Weight Factor (1-5x)	C: Score (AxB)	WEAKNESS	A: Rating (1-3)	B: Weight Factor (1-5x)	C: Score (AxB)
OPPORTUNITY	A: Rating (3-5)	B: Weight Factor (1-5x)	C: Score (AxB)	THREAT	A: Rating (1-3)	B: Weight Factor (1-5x)	C: Score (AxB)
Add up all Scores of C: _____ Add up all Weights of B: _____				SWOT Analysis Section Rating (total of C / total of B):		_____.____	

Coinsider Tokenomics Analysis Results

Calculate the Final Tokenomics Rating in these 5 steps:

- 1. Fill in the Section Ratings of each Section in the column “SR” (at least 1 decimal)
- 2. Multiply each Section Rating with the number in the column “Multiplier”
- 3. Fill in the result of this calculation in the column “Result after Multiplier” (at least 1 decimal)
- 4. Add up the total of all the results from the column “Result after Multiplier” and write this number for the result of “T” (at least 1 decimal)
- 5. Divide the number found at “T” by 8 and this will be your Final Tokenomics Rating (round off to 1 decimal). This number should be between 1 and 5; if it is not, then a calculation error has been made somewhere and you should find & correct the error, and then re-calculate.

Section #	Section Rating (SR)	Multiplier	Result after Multiplier	Name of Section	
Section 1:	____.____	x2 =	____.____	TOKEN UTILITY	
Section 2:	____.____	x1.5 =	____.____	SUPPLY & MARKET CAP	
Section 3:	____.____	x1.5 =	____.____	ECONOMIC INCENTIVES	
Section 4:	____.____	x1 =	____.____	MARKET METRICS & LIQUIDITY	
Section 5:	____.____	x2 =	____.____	SWOT ANALYSIS	
Totals:			T = ____.	Final Tokenomics Rating (T / 8):	____.

Result Scale of Final Tokenomics Rating:

- 1 = Extremely bad tokenomics
- 2 = Bad tokenomics
- 3 = Tokenomics are neither good or bad (neutral)
- 4 = Tokenomics are good enough, but not exceptional
- 5 = Tokenomics are exceptionally good

