Reading through a few of these proposals, I've seen some start to move toward self-delegation, which is causing some confusion we should address.

I believe consensus is that self-delegation (when specifically included) is a valid ask, and yet some delegates are claiming that self-delegating is a blanket no and outright discouraging any

self-delegation.

This is a tough one because it's not like liquidity mining, for which we try to give rough value judgements because we'd rather not rely on too much on it, it's: can protocols self-delegate or no. And I think we should be definitive about whether doing so is something allowed.

If it is allowed, we can then discuss how much delegation is acceptable, how to manage held tokens for self-delegation, do these tokens need to also be earmarked for some other ask (and thus drawn down over time), etc.

We started to do this [in this thread](#) but it doesn't seem as though we collectively got somewhere solid.

In addition, right now the language in the [template](#) (shown below) is confusing:

The expectation is that token grants will not be self-delegated for use in governance.

The primary purpose of these token grants is to incentivize sustainable usage and growth of the Optimism ecosystem. If you plan to increase your voting power by delegating a portion or all of your grant tokens to your own protocol, or a closely affiliated party, this should be made clear in your grant proposal along with your reasoning.

Some people might take that first sentence to mean that token grants shouldn't be self-delegated, rather than that the default is that they are not. If we think they're allowed, we should be more direct and even perhaps include a field in the template.

Curious to hear people's thoughts - think this ought to be a settled matter soon before more protocols ask for this.