==

What? & Why?

==

The foundational principle behind creating the Decentralized Contribution Reward Network (DCRN) is to encourage high-quality involvement in Uniswap Improvement

.

The primary way to do that is to facilitate both part-time and full-time quality voluntary engagement

of contributors through an Open Network.

This initiative's main goal is to create an infrastructure that fosters building

and to grow the Community of Uniswap builders

.

If successful, DCRN could function as a magnet for active Uniswap contributors who are eager to collaborate

. If it does, it could become a giant help center

for everything Uniswap related, from development to adoption.

Once functional, DCRN can:

1. Help Uniswap Community with Proposal development from start to finish

2. Incentivize deliberation in Governance forum discussions

3. Hire a set of professional auditor teams to verify that Proposals are safe

4. Hire professionals from outside to consult on, improve, and help execute the Community's suggestions.

5. Provide feedback on contributors activity, including microgrant rewards for sporadic contributions

6. Distribute reward grants to successful pro bono projects on top of Uniswap

7. Create and support an Auditors Network to check token contracts added to Uniswap, identify scammers, and warn the Community.

8. Etc.

==

How?

==

1. DCRN Internal Reward Procedure.

First and foremost, DCRN is an Open Network

: everyone can become part of it.

[

DCRN Internal Reward Procedure

800×550 57.1 KB

](https://global.discourse-cdn.com/business6/uploads/uniswap1/original/2X/d/d27e730eff8374e1f939204f33d4f0f7b1b9333a.jpeg)

At the end of each month, all contributors submit a reward application.

This application summarizes their input they deem valuable

and provides links to prove it.

The Reviewers Network

examines the applications and assigns the rewards: UNI + Voting power in DCRN's decisions.

The idea is: Quality contributions rule the Network

.

There is one principle, though, that needs to be universally accepted by the applicants:

Participants make their contributions voluntarily

and agree to receive no rewards

if that is the Reviewers Network's decision.

There is a cap

on how much UNI + Voting power an individual contributor can receive. It is defined in relation to the benchmark reward.

100% of the benchmark reward is what Reviewers receive for their work.

As a result of their contribution's evaluation, participants can receive between 0% and 300%

of the benchmark reward. The reward system allows for composability. For example, a reviewer can also develop an app and provide consultations in the developer network's channel.

Example: Alice

Alice has been active in Uniswap Discord community chat support and posts her application:

'Last month, I was providing chat support full-time, correctly answering 1000+ questions on Uniswap Discord + I've helped to update the FAQs.

My self-proposed reward is 1500 UNI.'

Three Reviewers are randomly chosen to review Alice's application. They verify the quality and relevance and that according to the guidelines, 1500 UNI is the right reward for this type of activity.

Alice receives her UNI when one of DCRN's multisig addresses distributes monthly rewards. Benchmark was set at 3000 UNI, so she is also granted 50% voting power in DCRNs decisions for the next month

DCRN needs to be inclusive, so voting power resets every month

.

Participants can still mention their previous contributions to get cumulative effects, but it will be up to Reviewers to decide the weight of those.

We also need to introduce a minimum threshold to qualify for a reward. Otherwise, the Network can get spammed with applications for small contributions from multi-accounts.

==

II. DCRN's Governance

==

The Network functions appropriately if its members participate actively in DCRN's governance processes. This applies both to internal and external reward distribution processes.

Internally, the guidelines for the Reviewers Network need to be set and refined continuously. It is also helpful to define what directions of contributors' work are considered more promising.

Both internal policies and external fund distributions need to be approved by the overwhelming majority

of the Network's voting power.

The vote is anonymous, and the results are hidden before the procedure is over. No additional token is needed.

[

DCRN Voting System

800×550 62.7 KB

](https://global.discourse-cdn.com/business6/uploads/uniswap1/original/2X/e/e1db5513e6a601e243afc442e1166d43239dd6c8.jpeg)

When a proposal reaches the stage of voting, DCRN participants have four options to choose from:

a) YES

b) NO

c) NEUTRAL

d) NOT SURE

The system's key feature is that the minority has the right to veto and delay the decision

. If we define the consensus as 70% approval, and more than 30% of the voting power rejects the proposal, the request is denied.

'Not Sure' means that voters have not formed a strong opinion yet. It signals that there is a need for an additional discussion.

'Neutral' means that the voters have formed an opinion and decided to abstain from voting actively

. It brings an entirely different signal to the table than not voting: it approves all three possible scenarios.

==

DCRN is a distribution network that encourages the collaboration of participants with different views. It is not a political party, and its treasury funds should never be used to vote.

DCRN has a watchman: it's the Uniswap Governance. If the Network transforms into something it's not intended to be, UNI holders can cease its funding.

Having a watchman allows the opportunity for the Network to be somewhat decentralized from day 1.

==

Thank you for reading.

I will follow up with specifics on the Reviewers Network processes, the benchmark reward, and on the way to bootstrap DCRN soon.

If you find the ideas interesting, please share (retweet, medium it).

Cheers

Do you approve the creation of DCRN?

- Yes

- No

- Neutral

- Not Sure

0

voters

Would you like to participate in the Testnet phase?

- Yes

- No

- Neutral

- Not Sure

0

voters