

## Committee Category:

### DeFi Committee

Our focus is on making the proposal process straightforward for DeFi projects by providing a clear framework and support along the way. Our approach of engaging with proposers, performing solid due diligence & sharing qualified assessments, should help proposers make stronger proposals, facilitate decision-making for other delegates and strengthen the Op ecosystem.

We consider all kinds of DeFi applications and liquidity mining schemes to fall under this category.

Example proposals that would fall under this category:

- Perpetual Protocol: (Liquidity, Building) [\[GF: Phase 0 Proposal\] Perpetual Protocol - #7 by tiandao.eth](#)
- Paraswap: (Liquidity, Building) [\[READY\] \[GF: Phase 1 Proposal\] ParaSwap](#)
- Liquity: (Liquidity, Borrowing, Bridging, Building) [\[DRAFT\] \[GF: Phase 1\] Liquity](#)

We are interested in making the proposal flow straightforward and offer to be the go-to committee for DeFi proposals. We look forward to collaborating closely with the 2nd DeFi committee to share a similar assessment framework & offer proposers a similar experience.

So far, most proposals do not differ fundamentally as they include liquidity mining, builder and ecosystem incentives. Hence, we could split proposals in the following 3 simple ways

- Alphabetical: (A-M, N-Z; tbd)
- In alternating order (A, B, A, B; tbd)
- Small-size vs. large-size ( A < 450K Op < B; tbd)

In the future, we look forward to more active proposal guidance to achieve lasting Op ecosystem growth. This could benefit from committee expertise in different DeFi areas. tbd

- Committee 1: Derivatives, Trading, Liquidity & Asset management
- Committee 2: Lending, Stables, DEXs, Aggreagtors

## Proposed number of committee members

5

## Who will be the committee lead?

[@OPUser](#):- [Bio](#)

## Who will be the committee reviewers?(please link to bio and explain their involvement in Optimism to date)

1. [@Joxes](#):- [Bio](#)
2. [@MinimalGravitas](#):- [Bio](#)
3. [@Dhannte](#)

:- [Bio](#)

1. [@ScaleWeb3](#): [Bio](#)

Couple of proposals and ideas ([1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#) ) were submitted by the committee members during season 1, many of them received good feedback from the community and few of our recommendations were accepted by the Optimism Foundation which we really appreciate.

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

1. [@OPUser](#) -[Boardroom profile](#) - 100% participation - 0.53% of votable supply

2. [@Joxes - Boardroom Profile](#) 100% participation - 0.60% of votable supply
3. [@MinimalGravitas - Boardroom Profile](#) 100% participation - 0.62% of votable supply
4. @Dhannte
5. [Boardroom Profile](#) 100% participation - 0.41% of votable supply
6. [@ScaleWeb3 - Delegate Thread](#) feedback on all 4 voting cycles, voting participation only in first 2 cycles due to I1 multisig issue some delegates experienced. Redelegate scaleweb3.eth → superdelegate.eth! - 0.3% of votable supply still in scaleweb3.eth

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

1. [@MinimalGravitas](#) - RocketPool Node Operator, abstained from RocketPool proposal (both discussion and voting), will abstain from any future proposals regarding RocketPool.
2. @Dhannte
3. EthernautDAO, I'll abstain from any future proposals regarding EthernautDAO
4. [@ScaleWeb3](#) - We'll abstain from any future proposals regarding ScaleWeb3.

If additional conflicts of interest occur in the future we will abstain from votes and declare the potential bias in any relevant discussion.

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

Voting history can be verified for each committee member on Snapshot and voting rationale is mentioned in either their communication thread or on cycle closing thread.

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

Our decision-making framework can be seen in the following table. Some of the categories slightly overlap and decisions will likely never be fully quantifiable but we look forward to utilising the framework, making fair recommendations and offering other delegates good insights when making their own decision whether to follow our recommendation or not

[

1600×807 327 KB

](https://global.discourse-cdn.com/business7/uploads/bc41dd/original/2X/5/5995b26df9d6cc8743642081e4a22700186df20b.jpeg)

As the committee accompanies proposers through the proposal process, proposal quality should rise. It should be clear when proposals are ready to get committee approval. Nonetheless, projects decide whenever they wish to move from “Draft” to “Ready” and we offer our recommendation in the forum.

## **Please describe how the committee will operate:**

The committee will pick one lead reviewer per proposal but all committee members should engage in each proposal. The committee will collaboratively assess the proposal and give one recommendation in the forum. Currently planned workflow, communication channels and expected outputs are detailed below:

1. For us, open communication and transparency is important as can be seen in our season 1 voting. Our committee will continue this approach as we believe that it's one of the important pillars of sustainable DAO Gov.
2. We will have one “private” Discord channel for this committee to discuss internal processes, organisational improvements and launch of new proposal reviews.
3. Our committee will offer proposers a point of contact and open a Discord channel on the Optimism Discord Server that is readable for other users to give continuous feedback to the team responsible for the proposal.
4. Once the project wants to go from “Draft” to “Ready”, we will offer an official feedback within 3 days and share our formal recommendation according to our framework on the gov forum below the proposal and in our Committee thread.

5. At the end of each cycle, we will share our learning on the gov forum and at the end of season 2, we will share a report which will include season feedback and recommendation for next season.

This offers extensive support to proposers, insights to committee-proposal discussions as well as a public track record for accountability of committee and members.