

Committee Proposal Template

- Committee category:

Our committee has been formed with the main purpose of reviewing any proposals related to decentralized finance. Upon review we will provide a standard risk assessment, growth assessment as well as a summarized version of each proposal along with a voting recommendation for Token house delegates and voters. The aim of our committee is to relieve delegates and voters who may not be savvy or interested in defi from the burden of making uninformed decisions. As per the recommendation of the Optimism foundation two decentralized finance committees are recommended, as of writing we are the second proposed committee.

Its worth noting there will be a clear overlap in the two committees, it would be efficient if relevant proposals are distributed fairly and if possible equally throughout the season.

- Proposed number of committee members

Our committee consists of five members

- Who will be the committee lead

?

Doug

- Doug has been following the development of optimism since late 2018, when governance launched he became a delegate. He has been involved in the decentralized finance sector since its inception, since then he has contributed to various projects such as Risk harbor, Deus, Wing Finance, Flamingo finance and Ontology.
- Who will be the committee reviewers

?

Jack Anorak

- Jack is a founding member of Velodrome and Information Token, where he primarily contributes to defi strategy, investments, and general management. He came to crypto in 2017 by way of prediction markets and has been involved in a wide range of DeFi projects since 2020.

Solarcurve

- Contributor at Balancer DAO and advisor to BeethovenX. These two projects recently deployed on Optimism in a 50/50 partnership. I've been a member of the Balancer community since before the token launched and was an active on-chain DeFi user during the '18-'19 bear market and ever since so I have a strong working knowledge of most DeFi applications.

MasterMojo

- MasterMojo has been involved in the DEFI space since 2019, and the crypto space since 2017 as a trader/investor. He currently is one of three Synthetix Ambassadors for the Synthetix DAO where they perform governance activities/proposals, Dao2Dao relations, protocol integrations, community outreach, & growth strategies, he co-produces a community ran newsletter for Lyra Finance, has hands on experience in all aspects of Ethereum DEFI, including being an Optimism OG.

Matt

- Matt is a long term SNX community member and SNX Core Contributor since November 2021 for Comms/Marketing. He is also one of the three SNX Ambassadors that has helped to promote Optimism and Optimism projects through weekly Twitter Space Calls, project integrations, community outreach, and also lobbies for SNX across all of DeFi by pushing for governance proposals and other important issues.
- Please provide the voting participation rate and % of votable supply held by each committee member

:

- [Jack Anorak](#) - Voting weight 0.4%, participation 0% (new delegate)
- [Solarcurve](#) - Voting weight 0.78%, participation 100%
- [MasterMojo](#) - Voting weight 5.95%, participation 0% L2 multisig issue
- [Matt](#) - Voting weight 5.95%, participation 0% L2 multisig Issue
- [Doug](#) - Voting weight 0.93%, voting participation 100%

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

Jack Anorak

- team member of Velodrome, which is likely to touch almost every protocol applying for grants. However, Velodrome's centrality to Optimism makes it such that its success is tied directly to the growth of the entire layer; therefore, its interests are broadly aligned with the objectives of the Collective.

Solarcurve

- very close relationship with Balancer/BeethovenX.
- Please outline the decision making framework the committee plans to use to make recommendations: (this may include proposal scoring metrics and/or other frameworks)
- Risk Rating determined by 6 factors, before rating all projects start with 10 Points those points are deducted using the guide below.

1

- Has the project lost user or operational funds in an exploit? If yes -2 points

2

- Has the project been around longer than a year? If not -2 points

3

- Is the team reputable? If not -2 points

"The definition of this factor is flexible and quorum will be required among the committee to decide this".

4

- Does the proposal encourage or promote L2 outflow? If outflow -2 points

5

- Does the project offer bug bounties? If not -1 point

6

- Has the project conducted audits? If not -1 point
- Growth Rating is determined by 5 factors, before rating all projects start with 10 growth points. These points are deducted using the guide below.

1

- Does the project have significant L1 or L2 users? If not -2 points

2

- Does the project have an appropriate TVL? If not -2 points

3

- Does the project have active socials with engagement? If no -2 points

4

- Will grant funds onboard/reward new users? If not -2 points

5

- Will the project be matching incentives? If not -2 points
- Please describe how the committee will operate: (general workflow, communication channels, expected outputs, etc.)

We will start our discussions in our public committee channel where we will work to establish a risk assessment along with a growth assessment after this we will provide a summary of what the proposal offers along with our voting recommendation. This will be done transparently for every proposal. Our committee voting recommendation will take into account other metrics such as number of tokens requested, usage of grant funds and other related metrics.

Risk/growth assessments include a score along with statements highlighting interests/concerns if applicable. We are using these assessments to fairly compare proposals to one another.

[Phase 1 Committee Formation Proposal Template](#) Link to proposal template.