

For the first two months, the rate of distribution for the liquidity mining program is 10 million UNI per month. For the first year, the governance assets vault will be receiving 14.33 mil UNI/month, so there's an opportunity for continuation.

This topic is meant to give us an initial idea of what's the community sentiment is.

1. Should the liquidity mining program be continued at all?
2. Yes
3. No
4. Not sure

0

voters

1. In comparison to the initial liquidity mining program, should we:
2. Increase the budget
3. Keep the budget as it is
4. Reduce the budget
5. Not sure

0

voters

1. When it comes to the pools that participate in liquidity mining program, should we:
2. Keep them as they are
3. Change them
4. Not sure

0

voters

1. If we were only to restructure the existing pools, should we:
2. Keep them as they are (4 pools, even split, uneven APYs)
3. Make one shared pool with even APYs
4. Make one shared pool and replicate the current APY ratios
5. Make one shared pool with different APY ratios
6. Other
7. Neutral
8. Not sure

0

voters

If you'd like a deep dive into the implications of one shared pool system, here's [the topic](#).

1. Presently UNI tokens that are locked in liquidity pools are not allowed to vote. Should we include UNI/ETH pair to the liquidity mining program?
2. Yes, add it as soon as possible.
3. Yes, but only after we allow pooled UNI to vote
4. No

5. Neutral

6. Not sure

0

voters

1. Should we include anything other than ETH, USD, UNI, BTC to the liquidity mining program?

2. Yes

3. No

4. Neutral

5. Not sure

0

voters

1. Should we add USD-USD pairs to the program?

2. Yes, on even terms with other pairs

3. Yes, on worse terms than other pairs

4. No

5. Neutral

6. Not sure

0

voters

Cheers.