

ANO Election Research Group - Recommendations

Background

The ANO application process has served us well, but there are challenges with the existing process:

- We do not signpost the ANO requirements sufficiently well
- There are duplicate and redundant questions
- Assessing the responses has been very time consuming for the guides
- A large proportion of the marks are based on subjective assessments
- It can be difficult to draw objective conclusions

Since late January 2019, the “ANO Election Research Group” has worked to improve the ANO application and assessment process in preparation for the upcoming ANO Election.

This document summarizes the hopeful outcome of this work and the engagement with the guides, while also covering and recommending improvements to two major areas: Application and Scoring.

Revisions to improve the clarity of ANO application questions by:

1. Revising the introduction to better explain the ANO role and the expectations of an ANO
2. Grouping of the questions into specific categories
3. Having a balance of closed and open questions
4. Consolidating the results so that applicant performance can be visualised and easily compared, enabling appropriate searching questions to be asked
5. Including the responses to the ad-hoc questions into the assessment in a structured way.

These proposed changes have been included in the spreadsheet

https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1O7_eKDPgGDRdslztCWmPDmgbEYCUrEvpkKTEavO919s/edit?usp=sharing which has been circulated to the guides and is currently under review.

Revisions to the scoring process.

Doc 001 defines that Standing Parties (currently Guides and ANO's) will participate equally in the ANO Election process. This is a significant and ambitious step.

We, as a community, are (by design) diverse, and so backgrounds, experiences, and competencies vary greatly. Attempting to replicate what experienced and dedicated guides have often taken a considerable amount of time and effort to do is not straightforward.

Creating a scoring system which enables each question to be marked on a scale (such as a 0 - 10 scale) which has descriptors for each step on the scale has a lot of merit. However, the options of either making it transparent to applicants which is in the spirit of the community, but increases the possibility

of gaming or restricting the knowledge of it to existing ANOs and guides, gives us a dilemma.

Given that this will be the first time that ANOs have scored new applicants, it will be quite demanding of an ANO's time. In addition, certain aspects of an application may not be familiar to all ANOs, such as the technical questions, for example. One option that has been explored is vote delegation to the guides; this has certain attractions and would allow ANOs to participate as they wish. Unfortunately, it is not consistent with our drive for decentralisation.

We therefore propose to break the move to full involvement by the standing parties into a number of steps. The first step is to give current ANOs a partial but still significant involvement in the ANO selection process.

Given their experience and track record, it is proposed that 40% of the vote, which because of its technical nature requires specialized knowledge, be decided by the Guides and Testnet Administrator.

The remaining 60% of the vote, covering all the other factors, would fully and equally involve all current standing parties. These factors are currently defined as Human Determinable Factors and Node Reliability Considerations such as the maintenance team.

To support the standing parties and promote evaluation consistency, a set of prospective ANO assessment Guidelines will be developed.

Next steps

We plan to move forward with the approach described in the four (4) steps below. Please note that the community will be included in any and all decision-making processes going forward.

- 1) Create a single-use ANO application round document (akin to our last Grant round document).
- 2) Create all the working documents such as ANO Application Form, Guidelines, Scoring Sheets, Results Summary (a draft of a revised version of [Doc 252](#) is attached, it will show the scoring categories and the responsibilities for them; currently it also cross references sections and questions)
- 3) Create a spreadsheet detailing the required changes to Doc 001
- 4) Amend Doc 001 with agreed changes in accordance with Doc 002 (the document ratification/amendment process).

We aim to conclude this within one month, and this requires us to be decisive and unified in our approach. We look forward to working with the guides and the community to achieve this in time for the next ANO election round.