

The Uniswap Grants Program is a potentially great vehicle for strategic deployment of funds into projects that benefit the community and protocol. But as most things regarding DAOs, the best way for something like this to be managed and evaluated is still unclear.

We should be thinking of the current Grants Program as an experiment that ours and others DAOs will learn from, hopefully as a successful case study. What is the decision making process within UGP? How are we evaluating the results of the funded projects? How can we minimize centralization in UGP? If centralization is inevitable, how can we increase accountability for people running the program and discretionarily deploying DAO funds?

As a builder of an analytics project for Uniswap (<https://revert.finance>), the Uniswap Grants Program has been rather unhelpful, not only in getting funds, but also on getting feedback for grant applications. We have applied three times, with a working and used analytics product, and didn't get funded but also received no feedback from the program, even after repeated requests for it.

Here's a simple idea:

Currently the Grants Program discloses what projects it funds, not doing so would seem preposterous. Perhaps we should think of not disclosing what projects are denied funding

equally as preposterous. The proposal is that every grant application denial gets published along with the reasons for the denial, unless the applicant decides to withhold the publication.

It would be great to read if the people selected by the DAO for these important roles are thinking in those terms about their responsibilities and their thoughts on this proposal.