Audit Report

Core Unit Name: RWF-001

Audit ID: 2022-09-RWF-001

Audit Cycle: 2022-09/1

Audit Result: Approved with comments

Audit Date: 11-08-2022

Submission Date: 10-27-2022 Facilitator contact: @will

Core Unit Clarification Received on Date:



Approved with comments

MIP40c3-SP38: https://forum.makerdao.com/t/mip40c3-sp38-real-world-finance-core-unit-mkr-compensation-rwf-001/10447

MIP40c3-SP61: https://forum.makerdao.com/t/mip40c3-sp61-modify-core-unit-budget-real-world-finance-rwf-001/13152											
WF-001 Auditor Flow: https://forum.makerdao.com/t/rwf-001-auditor-flow/12900											
Audit Question					Audit Assessment	Core Unit's Clarification	Immediate CU Action to improve transparency report	Medium Term CU Action to improve transparency report			
Audit Questions to the Structure of the transparency report and consitency with MIP40c3-SP61.					Note The RWF-001 has submitted a budget modification MIP40c3-SP61 on March 14th, 2022 and it was ratified on March 28th, 2022.						
Are the sections in the transparency report in the right order: Actuals, Forecast, MKR vesting and $_{0.1}$ Transfers?	~				Yes.						
Does the actual section include breakdowns per Budget Category, Forecast, Actuals, Difference and $_{\rm 0.2}$ Payments?	~				Yes.						
Does the budget forecast cover 3 months with summary and budget category breakdown?	~				Yes.						
Does the budget forecast summary and breakdown contain the quarterly budget caps for comparison?	~				Yes.						
Does the budget forecast summary contain the Global/total budget cap?	~				Yes.						
Are the budget forecast categories in the transparency report the same as in the MIP40c3-SP61?		~			RWF added the Due Diligenge cost category to the table. Expenses related to DD will be covered by the contingency buffer.						
Is the Multi-sig operational wallet setup the same as described in the RWF-001 Auditor Flow?					No: eth address eth:0x068c9dBDd1a5e82839413849301D40Ad018df88c was added to the RWF-001 Operational Wallet and a request to change the signer policy from 2 to 1 was created.	Facilitator explained that the new address was a mistake as he was handling another multisig and made the request in the wrong multisig.					
Is the RWF-001 operational wallet controlled by more than 1 signer?	~				Yes, the RWF-001 operational wallet has a current policy of 2 out of 3 signers						
Has the RWF-001 operational wallet received the funds requested in the last Budget Statement?	~				No. The RWF-001 operational wallet has sufficient funds.						
Is the Multi-sig auditor wallet setup the same as described in the RWF-001 Auditor Flow?	abla	П			Yes: RWF-001 Auditor Wallet quorum (2:2) Controlled by the RWF-001 Core Unit team Address: 0x96d7b01Cc25B141520C717fa369844d34FF116ec Signers: Accountant Role Wallet 0xA2A855Ac8D2a92e8A5a437690875261535c8320C Auditor Role Wallet 0x82d357e224949acDbe173a5b8A81600C32ea86e6						
Has the RWF-001 auditor wallet receive the funds from the protocol in September 2022?					No. The auditor wallet received 744,732.74 DAI on August 9th, 2022 from the operational wallet due to excess of funds. https://etherscan.io/tx/0x06ff3afc935e0d618f250c5cf35c10b68677637f5949 9cfcd30e8ce5b5df3e15						
Audit Questions to Transparency Report - Section 1. Last Month Actuals -											
Is the actuals budget category breakdown the same as in the MIP40c3-SP61?	~				Yes. The Due Diligence cost category is added to this months actuals.						
is the transparency report actual's forecast the same as the last published forecast for the same month? 1.2	~				Yes.						
Are the differences between forecast and actuals explained in the transparency report?	\checkmark				Yes.						

Audit Report

Core Unit Name: RWF-001

Audit ID: 2022-09-RWF-001

Audit Cycle: 2022-09/1

Audit Result: Approved with comments

Audit Date: 11-08-2022

Submission Date: 10-27-2022

Facilitator contact: @will Core Unit Clarification Received on Date:

 $\underline{Transparency \, Report: \, https://github.com/makerdao-rwf001/transparency-reporting/blob/main/monthly-budget-statements/2022-09.md}$

Approved with comments

Needs action before approval

MIP40c3-SP39: https://forum.makerdao.com/t/mip40c3-sp39-modify-core-unit-budget-rwf-001/10543 MIP40c3-SP38: https://forum.makerdao.com/t/mip40c3-sp38-real-world-finance-core-unit-mkr-compensation-rwf-001/10447

MIP40c3-SP61: https://forum.makerdao.com/t/mip40c3-sp RWF-001 Auditor Flow: https://forum.makerdao.com/t/rw		01/131	<u>52</u>					
Audit Question					Audit Assessment	Core Unit's Clarification	Immediate CU Action to improve transparency report	Medium Term CU Action to improve transparency report
Are the RWF-001 actual expenses within the montly	approved MIP40c3-SP61 buget cap?	~			Yes.			
Are the RWF-001 actual expenses within the Global/	total MIP40c3-SP61 budget cap?	~			Yes.			
Has the RWF-001 Compensation fees any significant of the RWF-001 Compensation fees and the RWF-001	deviations between forecast and actuals?	~			Yes, the forecast for September 2022 is 138,000 and the actual expense is 85,839.74 which gives a positive difference of 52,260.26.	The RWF-001 explains in the budget statement that this deviation is due to "Grantees onboarding under lower FTE."		
Has the RWF-001 Professional Services any significan	t deviations between forecast and actuals?	~			Yes, the forecast is 59,005.00 and actuals is 4,988.14 this gives a positive difference of 54,016.86.	RWF-001 explains in the budget statement that the difference is due to "Variable legal costs not incurred."		
1.8 Has the RWF-001 Real-world structures fees any sign	ificant deviations between forecast and actuals?	~			No.			
Has the RWF-001 Payment fees any significant deviat	ions between forecast and actuals?	Z			Yes, the payment fees forecast is 400 and the actual expense is 168 which gives a positive difference of 231.66.	Difference due to "Accountable fees is discounted from balance."		
Has the RWF-001 Gas fees any significant deviations 1.10	between forecast and actuals?	~			No.			
Has the RWF-001 Software Costs any significant devi	ations between forecast and actuals?	~			No.			
Has the RWF-001 Travel Costs any significant deviation	ons between forecast and actuals?	~			No.	"Actual travel costs not spent."		
Has the RWF-001 Due Diligence any significant deviation 1.13	tions between forecast and actuals?	~			Yes. the forecast is 5,000 and the actual expense is 2,250, this gives a difference of 2,750.	RWF-001 explains in the budget statement that the difference is due to "DD visits actuals below forecast."		
Has the RWF-001 presented the correct calculation of	of amounts for the actuals, forecast and difference?	V			Yes.			
Has the RWF-001 any budget category that seems inc	consistent and needs further investigation?	~			No.			
1.16 Other Observations		V			No.			
Audit Questions to Transparency Report - Section 2. I								
Does the transparency report display the summary o budget categories?	f the MIP40c3-61 approved caps for both total and	~			Yes.			
Are the monthly and quarterly budget caps (both tot	als and per category) the same as in the MIP40c3-61?	V			Yes.			
Are the monthly forecast totals within the MIP40c3-6	51 monthly budget cap?	V			Yes.			
2.4 Is the quarterly forecast within the bounds of the M	IP40c3-61 budget caps?	~			Yes.			
Other Observations		~			No.			
Audit Questions to Section Transparency Report - Sec	ction 3. MKR Vesting Overview -							
Has the RWF-001 indicated the number of FTE in the	transparency report's MKR vesting overview?	V			Yes.			

Audit Report

Core Unit Name: RWF-001

Audit ID: 2022-09-RWF-001

Audit Cycle: 2022-09/1

Audit Result: Approved with comments

Audit Date: 11-08-2022

Submission Date: 10-27-2022 Facilitator contact: @will

Core Unit Clarification Received on Date:

 $\underline{Transparency \, Report: \, https://github.com/makerdao-rwf001/transparency-reporting/blob/main/monthly-budget-statements/2022-09.md}$

Approved with comments

Needs action before approva

MIP40c3-SP39: https://forum.makerdao.com/t/mip40c3-sp39-modify-core-unit-budget-rwf-001/10543 MIP40c3-SP38: https://forum.makerdao.com/t/mip40c3-sp38-real-world-finance-core-unit-mkr-compensation-rwf-001/10447

MIP40c3-SP61: https://forum.makerdao.com/l/mip40c3-sp61-modify-core-unit-budget-real-world-finance-rwf-001/13152										
RWF-001 Auditor Flow: https://forum.makerdao.com/t/rwf-001-auditor-flow/12900										
Audit Question				Audit Assessment	Core Unit's Clarification	Immediate CU Action to improve transparency report	Medium Term CU Action to improve transparency report			
Has the MKR vesting overview the same FTE comparing it to the MIP40c3-SP38?	~			*Budget cap is estimated on 7 FTE at 80 MKR/FTE. Current estimate FTE calculation is based on 5.7 FTE.						
Are the MKR vesting dates the same as in the MIP40c3-SP38?	~			Yes.						
Has RWF-001 changed the MKR amounts comparing it to the MIP40c3-SP38?	~			Yes. The current RWF-001 Budget has a total of 1,379 MKR, the approved budget cap is 1,680 MKR.						
Has RWF-001 explained the MKR change in the transparency report?	~			Yes, the MKR differences are due to FTE changes.						
Has RWF-001 Auditor wallet Received the July 2022 MKR bonus amount from the protocol?	~			Yes. The auditor wallet received 38 MKR on September 10th, 2022.						
Audit Questions to Transparency Report - Section 4. Transfers -										
Are the payments from the operational wallet the same as in the actual section payments?	~			Yes. The payments in the budget statement is 92,960 DAI and the trx. from the operational wallet is 92,960 DAI on Oct. 13th, 2022.						
Does the RWF-001 operational wallet balances match the transparency report current balance in the calculation made for the new transfer? 4.2	~			Yes, the RWF-001 operational wallet balance is 482,915.32 DAI. https://gnosis-safe.io/app/eth:0xD1505ee500791490DE8642353BA6A5b92e 3550F7/transactions/history						
4.3 Are the values in the RWF-001 Auditor wallet table correct?	V		_ c	Yes.						
Does the RWF-001 Auditor wallet balance match the transparency report auditor current balance?	V		-	Yes.						
Has the RWF-001 auditor wallet enough funds to be sent to the RWF-001 operational wallet?	~			Yes.						
Other Observations 4.6		2 () c	Facilitator added a new eth address to the operational wallet and changed the signer policy from 2 to 1 eth:0x068c9dBDd1a5e82839413849301D40Ad018df88c	Facilitator explained that this was a mistake and that the added address should be removed.					