## **Feedback regarding Authority Set Application Process - Round #1**

## **MazdaMiota - 2018-04-28**

Thank you guides for all your hard work. I know you were under insane time constraints and couldn't necessarily undergo the process exactly as you'd like, but for whatever it's worth here are some thoughts on how the process could be modified in future rounds:

1. I think guides should include a little blurb with each score with some reasoning behind the score, especially if factors outside of the exact application were considered. For example it could mention that David Chapman has been a tireless supporter since Factom's inception, or give some bullets for why MultiCoin was rated low. I realize this would take a lot more time and would be unreasonable to have assumed for round 1, but I think it would help the community.

2. I think one issue with the whole process is that technical network administrative ability is being lumped in with promotion of and support of the protocol. It seems to me that are more optimal and stable long term outcome is that nodes are generally voted for and run based on stability and geographical and architectural diversification and not what good works they are doing outside being a host. The grant fund or other mechanisms should directly compensate people furthering the protocol, whether that's through development or providing business leads or whatever. That seems more efficient and transparent in my opinion.

3. I don't know exactly how it could be updated, especially since the protocol is set, but choosing an efficiency rating doesn't sit very well with me. It's almost like a soft bribe, in that give more to the grant fund and we'll score you higher. I think a better solution would be to have a portion of the 73K factoids automatically go to a grant fund of some kind to further the protocol, while the rest can go to node operators to use however they see fit. In the long run, after lots of money has been made and community goodwill has gone, I think this would be more stable.

4. In future rounds I would consider removing the automated scoring for the technical piece. I think it made sense given how little time you had to say 8 cores = x points, 1 gbit = y points, etc. Going forward I think you'd want to keep it open, similar to the other 65 percent of the score, so that you could reflect complexity like that an application is running a dedicated server while most others are using AWS, or that even though someone only has 4 core servers they have much more redundancy.

That's it. Just wanted to get my thoughts down. Thanks for your work and good luck rolling out M3.