Context

- Why: https://gov.uniswap.org/t/retroactive-airdrop-excludes-proxy-contract-users-e-g-dharma-matcha-etc/1222/22

- How: https://gov.uniswap.org/t/application-for-retroactive-proxy-contract-airdrop-for-projects-apps/3221

- Code: https://github.com/dharmaprotocol/excluded-uni-airdrop-users

Preface

- We have compiled sets of users excluded from the retrospective airdrop due to the proxy contract issue from projects integrated into Uniswap, and validated programmatically that their submitted users were indeed unfairly excluded due to technical oversight.

- In summary, there are two rough cohorts of project-types who are affected: application integrations

, and DEX aggregators

. Given that these two cohorts have very different sizes and vey different end-user characteristics, we are separating our proposal into two sequential phases — first for the application integrations, second for the DEX aggregators

- We divide these cohorts on the basis of how easy it is to programmatically hook a trading bot into them, as this is a proxy for what portion of these cohorts risk representing multiple addresses per end-user. If an application is clearly tailored towards programmatic usage (i.e. it exposes an API on its landing page), it falls in the DEX aggregator camp

. If it does not, it falls in the application integrations

camp.

- Our personal opinion is that both cohorts were likely unintentionally excluded and ought to be compensated by this proposal;

however, we recognize that the two cohorts engender very different debates around whether or not they ought to be compensated, with quite different magnitudes of impact on UNI holders. We do not want to conflate the two into a singular vote, and risk jeopardizing both on account of the other.

Phases

PHASE ONE: Application Integrations — 12,600 accounts

Project Accounts Argent 3418 (27.13%) DeFi Saver 890 (7.06%) Dharma 2833 (22.48%) eidoo 301 (2.39%) FURUCOMBO 57 (0.45%) MEW 4278 (33.95%) Nuo 740 (5.87%) Opyn 79 (0.63%) rebalance 4 (0.03%)

PHASE TWO: DEX Aggregators — 26,598 accounts

Project Accounts (overlapping %'s) 0x 1772 (6.66%) 1inch 4924 (18.51%) DEXAG 465 (1.75%) Kyber 23933 (89.98%) Totle 718 (2.70%)

What Happens Now

- We have deployed a MerkleDistributor contract that commits to the Phase One

cohort. https://etherscan.io/address/0x6a9929d29b7488517d383358a847c95a5d1d6d76#code

- The proposal we want to submit would look as follows:

- targets: ["0x1f9840a85d5aF5bf1D1762F925BDADdC4201F9841"] (UNI)

- values: [0]
- signatures: ["approve(address,uint256)"]

- calldatas: [0x00000000000000000000000006a9929D29b7488517D383358a847c95a5D1d6d7600000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000042b42f28d278eee000000] (address: 0x6a9929D29b7488517D383358a847c95a5D1d6d76 (phase one merkle dropper, amount: 5.04M UNI)

- In summary, it would be granting 5.04m UNI approval from the community treasury to the MerkleDistributor contract for Phase 1.

- If this proposal passes (and no subsequent proposal nullifies it), on October 17th any third party will be able to transfer 5.04m UNI into the MerkleDistributor contract. At this point, users in the Phase 1 cohort will be able to withdraw 400 UNI each from the MerkleDistributor contract.

We now need to amass at least 10M UNI delegated to an address in order to submit a proposal to vote. There are two ways we can make this happen:

- Delegate to Dharma at 0x7e4A8391C728fEd9069B2962699AB416628B19Fa

. We are very active participants in Compound's governance, have sufficient technical acumen and resources to develop proposals securely, and have basically our entire business on the line as "skin in the game". We think we're a great party to delegate to

- Perhaps most

efficient & quick would be if supportive UNI holders delegate to the Univalent delegation (yuni.finance), and request they put the proposal to a vote.

I would not recommend users do this until we receive assurance that the Univalent delegation would be interested in putting the proposal up for a vote. Note that proposing != voting for — Univalent could kindly help us get this proposal live and vote against it if they so pleased! Can folks please help get in touch with Andre, Tarun, Kain, and Stani to see if they're interested?

. We can likely help push them over the 10M line.

I expect aspects of this proposal to be contentious, so I'll leave the community with a last note, copy-pasta'd from the original post I shared in this forum:

I will note to the community that this vote sets a cultural precedent as to how the protocol treats not only its direct users but also developers who take entrepreneurial bets building on Uniswap. The status quo has unfortunately punished our users and eroded our reputation with them — future builders will heed the signal and precedent set by how the Uniswap community addresses this.

Let the discussion begin!

-N