Committee category:

Optimism Tooling/Infrastructure Committee

In line with the recent introduction of governance committees, this committee will lend its expertise to review tooling-related proposals, delivering a summary, basic due diligence, a voting recommendation, and justification to Optimism Token House delegates and the community. This will provide relief and full-time expertise to Optimism Token House delegates who would otherwise duplicate some portions of this work.

We follow a quite wide definition of tooling, including but not limited to:

- Wallets and clients: [example proposal](#)

- Developer tooling

- Initiatives related to infrastructure (node operation, analytics and other services):[example proposal](#)

- Data management (analytics, explorers, etc.): [example proposal](#)

- dApps and interfaces of interest for Web3 users considered as tooling and that do not fall into DeFi and NFT categories: [example proposal](#)

- Off/cross-chain communication services such as oracles, bridges and liquidity networks (possible cooperation with DeFi committee): [example proposal](#)

We are a committee of five delegates, with a particular interest for Web3 tooling and a good understanding of what tools are needed to spur Optimism's continued ecosystem growth.

Our focus is on growing a key part of an ecosystem's success; tooling.

Disclosures:

This does not preclude Optimism Token House delegates from performing their own analysis or choosing to vote against the recommendation.

This does not preclude other committees from evaluating the same proposal if that proposal falls within multiple committee mandates.

Proposed number of committee members:

Five

Who will be the committee lead?

[Kris Kaczor](#) ([@krzkaczor](#))

Kris is one of the co-founders of L2BEAT, analytics and research website focused on Layer-2s. Before that, he was a contributor for MakerDAO and, more specifically, tasked with Maker's Layer-2 expansion. He is also busy building developer tooling for blockchain developers under the dEth project (TypeChain, dEth Code).

Who will be the committee reviewers?

[Joxes | DeFi LATAM](#)

([@Joxes](#))

Joxes is building DeFi LATAM and L2 en Español, both open communities on education and adoption about DeFi/Web3 and Ethereum's scaling solutions respectively. As representation of DeFi LATAM, their delegation consists of his role as a leader in addition with a dedicated team of contributors who work as a collective in their commitments at Optimism gov.

[Lefteris Karapetsas](#)

([@lefterisjp](#))

Lefteris has been in the Ethereum space since 2014, working on the EF's solidity language and C++ ethereum client. Involved in many projects since then he is now the founder of rotki, the opensource portfolio tracker that protects your

privacy.

[Lito Coen](#)

([@cryptotesters](#))

Lito leads growth at Hop.exchange, a multichain-bridge connecting Layer-2 solutions to Ethereum. He is also the founder of Cryptotesters, a vibrant community of Web3 enthusiasts with a focus on testing out new products and tools.

[Scott](#)

([@ceresstation](#))

Scott is the co-founder of Gitcoin, an internet-native community for building and funding digital public goods. He's also an active member of a variety of DAOs focused on public goods. Previously, Scott also helped with the Digital Public Goods Alliance and Ethereum Foundation Grants.

Please provide the voting history, voting participation rate and % of votable supply held by each committee member:

[Kris Kaczor](#) - 58.97% voting participation, 2.77% share

[Joxes | DeFi LATAM](#) - 100% voting participation, 0.60% supply

[Lefteris Karapetsas](#) - 100% voting participation, 3.87% supply

[Lito Coen](#) - 8% voting participation, 1.44% supply*

[Scott](#) - 86% voting participation, 3.25% supply

*Lito utilizes Gnosis Safe, which was not compatible with Snapshot's UI, resulting in missed votes until a solution was found.

Please disclose any and all conflicts of interest committee members may have:

All of us have hands-on experience building Tooling

. This makes us well informed to judge tooling related proposals but can also make us conflicted. Individuals having conflicts of interests with a given proposal will recuse themselves from a committee vote.

Please link to the voting history (with rationale) of each committee member:

Kris Kaczor - [Snapshot Profile](#) - Rationale [#1](#), [#2](#), [#3](#)

Joxes | DeFi LATAM - [Snapshot Profile](#) - [Communication Thread](#).

Lefteris Karapetsas - [Snapshot Profile](#) - Rationale [#1](#), [#2](#)

Lito Coen - [Snapshot Profile](#)

Scott - [Snapshot Profile](#)

Please outline the decision making framework the committee plans to use to make recommendations:

Our committee will offer a well-structured report for all those proposals related to and understood as tooling (as defined in the beginning of the proposal). Also we emphasise that such proposals must maintain a clear relationship with the goal for the growth of the Optimism ecosystem according to the [description of phase 1](#).

For it, our commitment is to address the most crucial questions for the understanding of the rest of the delegates and the community about the project involved and the approach of their proposal.

To achieve this, we will detail and weigh the following aspects qualitatively:

- Added value (good to bad

)

- Impact or expected usage (high to low

)

- Current Status [Development stage/¿Open Source?] (early to ready

)

- Amount requested (high to low

)

- Expenditure plan and distribution (appropriate to inappropriate

)

- Final Committee recommendation

All these points will be described with an explanation of the reasoning and details necessary to justify the weighting. As we know, tooling is a very broad topic so you can expect appropriate modifications or additional points if any proposal deserves particular criteria to be evaluated, identifying each risk point if any.

Additionally, all the relevant information and research about the project, its proposal and any needed context will be properly explained, so each delegate and community can have high guarantees of understanding and decision-making even if it is not their expertise.

Please describe how the committee will operate:

- We currently form a private telegram group where we coordinate our actions and responsibilities as a team.
- We are willing to maintain an open communication channel (on OP Discord) with the projects applying to the tooling category (if necessary), in which everyone can be guaranteed transparency in discussions and feedback prior to the issuance of the report with our recommendations.
- Within 5 business days, we will publish our report and recommendations once the proposal has reached a "Ready" state.
- We will maintain a Tooling Committee thread on Optimism's Governance Forum summarising our actions
- At the end of each cycle or when deemed necessary (depending on the volume of tooling proposals), we will provide additional feedback on our learnings and how to improve moving forward.