



## Case #362 – “Turkish Delight”

### Facts of the Case

1. A storytelling submission was made for a Turkish language blog article posted on [kriptokoin.com](http://kriptokoin.com), a Turkish language crypto news site.
2. The article in English is titled, “Kleros Guide: What is PNK?” and covers the following topics:
  - Definition of what dispute resolution in general is, and what the PNK token is
  - Explanation of the juror selection process and incentivization system
  - Examples of notable cases – Case 302 in relation to reported Coronavirus deaths in July is cited
  - A run through of the Kleros ecosystem including in depth explanations of:
    - Curate
    - T2CR
    - Crypto Unlocked
    - Omen
    - Linguo
  - Highlighting Vitalik Buterin’s relationship with and endorsement of the project
  - Information regarding wider industry adoption – notably the EU Commission Horizon 2020 Blockchains for Social Goods Prize
3. At the time of writing the article has 574 views on the [kriptokoin.com](http://kriptokoin.com) site
4. The submission has been challenged on the following basis:
  - The article does not significantly expand the knowledge about Kleros
  - The article does not have 500 views (*at the time of the submission challenge*)

# Appeal

## Question 1 – Does the entry meet the criteria listed in the policy document?

### **Exhibit 1 – Kleros Storytelling High Impact Submissions – Policy Document**

Link: <https://ipfs.kleros.io/ipfs/QmRDOcGvUBzWixZKFHKFWV2Atnum1Ax41feS19UVHsnWh8/kleros-storytelling-high-impact.pdf>

### **1.1 Submission Criteria**

In the policy document (*Page 1*) it states that jurors should -

#### **Accept submissions that:**

- A) Is widely shared across social networks
- B) Has a significant audience on the platform it is posted
- C) Consist of the creation or active animation of a significant community related to Kleros or a Kleros dapp. Submission for the active animation of a community can be done each month
- D) Expand significantly the Kleros knowledge base (explaining the juror process, the flow and structure of dapps that integrate Kleros, the court process, etc).
- E) Led to the creation of dapps relying on Kleros or the integration of dapps to Kleros.

At least one of these conditions is required to qualify.

- (A), (B) and (C) require some form of quantitative subjective analysis to determine whether the article was “widely” shared, or had a “significant audience” on the platform it was posted.
- (E) in this case does not apply as there has not been a dapp created as a result of the submission.
- If we turn to (D), the content of the article compiles many aspect of the project – from the workings of the juror process, to incentives, even to case history. It also touches on the wider industry impact that Kleros has made thus far. When explaining dapps, it gives local audience specific examples – for instance it explains Omen in a way which uses local Turkish references for bets.

The question is – has the Kleros knowledge base been expanded significantly? I would argue it has in that it has had a lot of information compiled into a language written by a native speaker, with the intention to target other natives speakers of that language, and where that information had previously been unavailable in that source language.

The challenger states in their evidence that none of the information in the article is new, or cannot already be found on the Kleros site or blog. If you knew that the Kleros site and blog already existed, what benefit would you derive have from reading an article on Kleros?

The whole point is that the is written in a language that opens up Kleros to a whole **new** audience and is *targetted specifically at that audience*.

If submissions are to be rejected on the basis that information contained within them are available on the Kleros site and blog section, then I ask you this question: – *what is the point in a single community storytelling submission being made at all?*

## 1.2 Submission Examples

In the policy document it also gives examples in italic of each of (A) – (E) listed above.

For (D) the example is given as follows:

*Accept: A high quality article providing an in depth explanation of a dapp relying on Kleros.*  
*Reject: A 100 word article explaining your experience as a juror of a Kleros case.*

This is of course, and crucially, an **example**. In too many cases I have witnessed jurors using these examples as *strict objective criteria*, which is not what the definition of the word “example” means. If these were strict rules, they would be explicitly stated as such, this is however besides the point.

The key here is to evaluate whether the article within this case has some subjective essence of the example provided. I would argue that it indeed does. Not only does it offer an in depth explanation of the whole Kleros ecosystem, it also highlighted dapps that even I personally was unaware of up until this point – namely the discussion in relation to *Crypto Unlocked*.

Now of course this is anecdotal evidence, but if I, an active Kleros participant, reads about a dapp for the first time in an article intended to be read by those who do not know Kleros even exists, surely this provides weight to the argument that the article itself significantly expands knowledge of Kleros?

**I would therefore argue point (D) is met in this case and the submission should be allowed.**

*In memory of debug:*

