

Executive Summary

Over the past seven weeks or so, we have been running a rough training program for potential candidates to replace GovAlpha.

Initially, we had eight candidates, four of which we are including as options in an onboarding vote as reserve facilitators.

A very

brief evaluation of the included candidates is provided here, and in more detail later in the document.

LeBateleur

- Strongest candidate overall
- If there were only a single replacement, we would be most comfortable with LeBateleur.
- Shows great judgment and thorough consideration of outcomes in exercises.
- Biggest weakness is technical literacy.

VoteWizard

- Second strongest candidate
- Great communicator
- Has above average Maker context due to work as an AD
- Judgement is average but shows good improvement.
- Would likely improve significantly given experience in the role.

DAOMasons

- A group candidate new to Maker.
- Show good judgment and analysis skills.
- Strong technical literacy.
- Held back by a lack of any Maker context.
- Show great potential for positive engagement with Maker in the future.

JanSky

- Strong Maker context and knowledge of endgame.
- Weak on judgment and reliability.
- Active communicator, though not always effective.

GovAlpha's preferred outcome is that LeBateleur and VoteWizard both be voted reserve facilitators.

We consider it wise to approve more than one candidate as reserve governance facilitators, as this is both more sustainable for the candidates, and provides redundancy to MakerDAO.

General Notes on Training

The training period began around the start of July, with candidates that had responded to public requests.

The following strategies were used to both train and evaluate the candidates.

Important criteria for the governance facilitator role were identified as:

- Judgement
- Communication
- Reliability

- Maker Context
- Technical Literacy

Executive Exercises

Exercises consisted of looking at recent executive contents sheets and drafting the executive copy for those contents. Candidates were provided with links to the relevant content sheets, the templates, and the governance repository.

The goals here were:

- Get an idea of how the candidates would handle limited direct instruction.
- Evaluate the candidate's grasp of Maker-specific context.
- Evaluate the candidate's written communication skills.
- Evaluate the candidate's technical literacy.
- Give the candidates experience and feedback on writing executive copy.

Feedback was provided on these exercises to help the candidates address issues and provide direction as to which information and outcomes should be considered in the Governance Facilitator role.

Note that candidates were encouraged to view feedback on other candidates' exercises once they had completed theirs, and compare their output to the 'official' executive copy produced by GovAlpha.

Polling / Situational Exercises

Exercises consisted of a hypothetical forum thread in some way linked to polling. The task for candidates was to determine their response to the situation, draft forum responses, and draft poll copy for any polls implied by their response.

The exercise materials can be found in the [community GitHub repository](#).

The goals here were to:

- Understand how deeply candidates are considering the hypotheticals.
- Evaluate the candidate's judgment in the face of uncertainty.
- Evaluate the candidate's written communication skills.
- Evaluate the candidate's grasp of Maker-specific context.
- Give candidates experience and feedback on writing poll copy.

Again, feedback was provided on these exercises to help candidates identify and improve in areas of weakness.

Note that candidates were encouraged to view feedback on other candidates' exercises once they had completed theirs.

Interpretation Exercise

A single exercise in which candidates were tasked with identifying and resolving ambiguity in scope/atlas text, and communicating their application of the text to several hypothetical situations.

The exercise materials can be found in the [community GitHub repository](#).

The goals here were to:

- Evaluate the candidate's ability to produce unambiguous scope text.
- Evaluate the candidate's judgment in the face of uncertainty.
- Evaluate the candidate's written communication skills.
- Give the candidates experience with interpretation in the face of ambiguity.

As with the other exercises, feedback was given such that candidates could identify areas for improvement.

One-on-One Meetings

Candidates were also encouraged to seek multiple one-on-one meetings with [@LongForWisdom](#) in which they were free to

communicate questions, concerns or ask for advice.

The goals here were to:

- Support the candidates more thoroughly in their training, given the hands-on nature of other strategies.
- Evaluate the candidate's spoken communication skills.
- Evaluate the candidate's general progress.
- Perform a general gut check on the candidates based on their questions, concerns, and focuses.

Technical Overview

Candidates were encouraged to attend a group meeting in which we ran through the technical structure of the Maker protocol at a high-level, and went into more depth around the technical design of the Maker protocol's governance system.

The goal here was to try to ensure that candidates possessed a base level of technical literacy in the event they were selected for the role. At the least, that they know enough to ask the right questions, and where to find additional reference material if they are faced with a situation outside of their experience.

Walkthrough Videos

Candidates were provided with walk-through videos covering the deployment of polls and executives.

The goal here was to try to ensure a base level of familiarity for those that may end up in the role.

Shadowing

Candidates were invited to shadow the weekly 'GovOps' call that takes place between GovAlpha and the technical teams responsible for producing executive votes. The goal here was to familiarise candidates with that part of the executive vote construction process.

Vote Candidates

LeBateleur

Criteria

Evaluation

Exercises Completed

6/7

Judgement

Very good

Communication

Very Good

Reliability

Very good

Maker Context

Average

Technical Literacy

Below Average

Exercises

Exercise

Status

2023-07-12 Executive #1

[Completed](#)

2023-07-17 Polling #1

[Completed](#)

2023-07-26 Polling #2

[Completed](#)

2023-07-26 Interpretation #1

[Completed](#)

2023-08-02 Executive #2

[Completed](#)

2023-08-07 Polling #3

[Completed](#)

2023-08-07 Polling #4

Not Completed

Exercises were completed with a high standard of effort. We believe LeBateleur came to this process attempting to get as much experience and value out of it as possible.

Commentary

LeBateleur was the most promising candidate we had as part of the training program. They showed good judgment and serious consideration of the hypotheticals posed in the exercises.

They were usually very effective at communicating, both as part of the exercises and in both written and spoken communications with [@LongForWisdom](#). They made the evaluation of their judgment very easy due to clear communication of their thought processes and considerations in their responses to the exercises.

They were very reliable, completing exercises in a reasonable timeframe as they were released. They communicated well in advance that they likely would not have the time to complete the final two exercises before the cut-off date, and we were able to mitigate the issue by targeting a less in-depth response to the third polling exercise. We don't believe we saw a single case of an obvious mistake caused by a lack of self-review.

LeBateleur's Maker context is likely only average. This is one of those areas that is a little tricky to evaluate in a short period since some areas just don't come up in the time you have available. That said, gaining any missing context is just a matter of time and effort. We view this as much less of an issue than a deficit in the prior three criteria.

LeBateleur's most obvious area of weakness is technical literacy. We were however encouraged by the speed in which they adopted git and Github, a program they had no previous familiarity with. Given their ability in other areas, we have no doubt they can mitigate this weakness effectively if given the chance.

If LeBateleur were to become the only governance facilitator after GovAlpha departs, we would be comfortable with the future of governance facilitation at MakerDAO.

VoteWizard

Criteria

Evaluation

Exercises Completed

7/7

Judgement

Average, shows improvement

Communication

Very Good

Reliability

Above Average

Maker Context

Above Average

Technical Literacy

Good

Exercises

Exercise

Status

2023-07-12 Executive #1

[Completed](#)

2023-07-17 Polling #1

[Completed](#)

2023-07-26 Polling #2

[Completed](#)

2023-07-26 Interpretation #1

[Completed](#)

2023-08-02 Executive #2

[Completed](#)

2023-08-07 Polling #3

[Completed](#)

2023-08-07 Polling #4

[Completed](#)

Exercises were completed with a high standard of effort.

Commentary

Overall, VoteWizard is a promising candidate to become a reserve facilitator.

Votewizard showed good judgment in some exercises, though initially, we don't think they considered the elements and outcomes of the exercises as deeply as they could have. That said, we think they made a real attempt to engage with the later exercises more deeply and showed improvement.

On the communication criteria, we think VoteWizard exceeded all of the other candidates. They have been unfailingly positive, even in the face of criticism. They have actively communicated their takeaways from each exercise after reading feedback. In the cases where communication was a required part of exercises, they have given high priority to contacting or responding to relevant entities to address concerns or seek additional information.

The reliability criteria were more or less considered in two main parts:

1. Has the candidate engaged with the training process consistently?
2. Has the candidate missed what we would consider 'obvious' errors in exercise responses?

VoteWizard did very well at the first, but was inconsistent on the second, making several mistakes that could have easily been rectified by a review of their work. Having raised this as an issue, we are confident VoteWizard has recognized the importance of self-review and reliability in this role.

VoteWizard has an above-average level of Maker context thanks to their work as an Aligned Delegate. While their context doesn't seem to stretch back before this work, they appear to have picked up a lot of information in what was a relatively short time.

VoteWizard's technical literacy also appears to be good, given their familiarity with GitHub and demonstrated familiarity with technical subjects.

If VoteWizard were to become the only governance facilitator after GovAlpha departs, we would have some concerns in the short term but believe they would quickly gain experience, and become a valuable part of MakerDAO.

DAOMasons

Criteria

Evaluation

Exercises Completed

7/7

Judgement

Good

Communication

Above Average

Reliability

Above Average

Maker Context

Very lacking

Technical Literacy

Very Good

Exercises

Exercise

Status

2023-07-12 Executive #1

[Completed](#)

2023-07-17 Polling #1

[Completed](#)

2023-07-26 Polling #2

[Completed](#)

2023-07-26 Interpretation #1

[Completed](#)

2023-08-02 Executive #2

[Completed](#)

2023-08-07 Polling #3

[Completed](#)

2023-08-07 Polling #4

[Completed](#)

DAOMasons completed all the exercises with a high level of effort, however, completion of the exercises was weighted heavily to the final weeks of the training period.

Commentary

DAOMasons is a group of three individuals that opted to go through the training exercises as a group. DAOMasons is a strong candidate, held back by a lack of familiarity with Maker.

As a group, DAOMasons showed good judgment across the exercises, they clearly have some level of experience with governance in DAOs. They've been able to show a strong understanding of the potential consequences of their actions in the hypothetical situations that make up the polling exercises.

Worth highlighting is that we were very impressed by their rewrite of the ambiguous portion of the governance scope as part of the interpretation exercise, to the point where we consider it superior to what we would have produced.

Their communication was also excellent in almost all cases. The one case where it wasn't very effective took place outside of the exercises when speaking to GovAlpha. This one case had a large negative impact on their engagement with the training exercises and is the reason for the weighting towards the end of the training period noted above. However, DAOMasons were quick to rectify the misstep once it had been recognized, and successfully recovered, to the point where we have no serious concerns in this area.

Our consideration of DAOMason's reliability was also skewed by the incident mentioned above. However, again, outside this incident, the group showed themselves to be very consistent with the quality of their exercises and avoided making any easily-fixable mistakes.

DAOMasons have very little knowledge of Maker, both as a protocol, a DAO, and historically. This is a significant issue in the near-term only

. We believe DAOMasons have shown a strong desire and ability to mitigate this weakness further if given the chance.

If DAOMasons were to become the only governance facilitator after GovAlpha departs, we would have significant concerns in the short term. However, given time and support, we believe they could fill the role very effectively. Long-term, with the right support, we think DAOMasons could be a huge asset to MakerDAO.

JanSky

Criteria

Evaluation

Exercises Completed

7/8*

Judgement

Below Average

Communication

Average

Reliability

Below Average

Maker Context

Good

Technical Literacy

Above Average?

Exercises

Exercise

Status

2023-06-28 Executive #0

[Completed](#)

2023-07-12 Executive #1

[Completed](#)

2023-07-17 Polling #1

[Completed](#)

2023-07-26 Polling #2

[Completed](#)

2023-07-26 Interpretation #1

[Completed](#)

2023-08-02 Executive #2

Not Completed

2023-08-07 Polling #3

[Completed](#)

2023-08-07 Polling #4

[Completed](#)

JanSky completed one additional exercise before the official start of the training period because we began engaging with them earlier than the other candidates. The exercises were completed with a reasonable level of effort. Completion of the exercises was weighted towards the end of the training period.

Commentary

We are conflicted on the decision to include JanSky as a candidate for reserve facilitator.

Jansky has shown below-average judgment in the exercises, engagement with GovAlpha, and public engagement on the Maker forum before the start of the training period. They have shown some improvement in the later exercises, but there is still an opportunity for growth here. If the responses to the exercises had come more evenly across the training period, there would have been more time to consider feedback and avenues for improvement.

JanSky's communication is fairly average. They've done a bad job in multiple cases communicating with GovAlpha privately, and haven't effectively communicated their reasoning in many of the exercises, which makes it difficult to effectively evaluate their suitability for the role. JanSky's communication in exercise responses has been inconsistent, they continue to use an LLM to disguise their phrasing and word choice, which has also hurt the effectiveness of their communication. However, JanSky has been very active in their communication with GovAlpha over most of the training period.

Several of JanSky's exercise responses have also been unreliable. In several cases missing or misunderstanding key information in the exercise materials in a way that other candidates did not. Further, they were absent and out of contact for three weeks of the seven with no prior communication. However, they have avoided making any very obvious mistakes in their exercises that would have been caught in a self-review.

On the positive side for JanSky, they have demonstrated a good understanding of Maker and the historical context of the protocol and the DAO. This is to be expected given that it's been claimed they have prior history working with or on Maker. It's clear that they have spent a great deal of time engaging with the endgame plan. Further, they have been present in some of the AVC meetings since becoming active under this identity.

It's a little unclear how technically literate JanSky is. They are familiar with git and have shown an understanding of the general workings of the Maker protocol. However, they have demonstrated a misunderstanding of some technical details around how the Maker protocol works internally.

If JanSky were to become the only governance facilitator after GovAlpha departs, we would have concerns in both the short and long term.

Exercise Sheet

A sheet with links to all the exercises can be found [here](#).

Final Words

We would like to sincerely thank all of the candidates for their engagement with this process. The Governance Facilitator role is not an easy one, and it deserves far more time and thought spent on a training program than we were able to provide. We appreciate your patience with the ad-hoc nature of the program and hope that you were able to gain some value out of the time spent, even if ultimately unsuccessful.