

Reading the proposals has been very educational and interesting. I can't really find any evaluation criteria, so I am curious how you all plan to evaluate proposals.

The OPerating Manual suggests that distributions "proactively incentivize future growth of projects and communities" which is pretty broad. The standard template questions narrow this down much further by specifically asking proposers to explain how their proposal will "incentivize usage and liquidity on Optimism".

I would plan to vote yes on proposals that can show a clear causal relationship between the OP token distribution and its impact on incentivizing usage and liquidity on Optimism. Good examples would be: bridges subsidizing gas to bridge to optimism; LP incentives; usage incentives generally; and I am particularly drawn to marketing activities to reach new users. I think it is OK to have a small percentage of tokens allocated to the core team/devs, security or even retroactive rewards for users of protocols that are native to Optimism. But the percentage should be small. It's not that I think that those groups/activities should not be supported – they obviously should. However, I don't think Phase 1 is the right fund to use for that purpose.

What evaluation criteria does everyone else plan to use?