📝 Notes

Nov 25, 2025

Meeting Nov 25, 2025 at 17:57 EET

Meeting records Transcript Recording

Summary

John Kennedy shared their vision for Arbitrum's future in web3 gaming, aspiring to build the "Steam of web3 gaming" by leveraging their extensive industry experience and focusing on community building and doubling down on investments. John Kennedy, Michael Chang, and Dan Peng supported transparency in financial reporting, although Michael Chang noted that some information must remain confidential to protect portfolio companies, while Dan Peng discussed the challenge of balancing internal VC information requirements with presenting digestible oversight information to the DAO and the council.
JoJo proposed a temporary extension of the Delegate Incentive Program (DEP) as a contingency should the new Rewarding Acting Delegates (RAD) proposal fail before December 11th, which Ministro del dólar agreed should be a last-minute option. Raam At Arbitrum presented the new RAD proposal, designed to be more objective and to reward delegates for casting votes and publishing rationale on proposals, which Raam At Arbitrum further detailed, including budget denominations and a minimum voting power threshold of 200,000 ARB.
JoJo and Tamara Benetti discussed strategies for managing budget volatility, including potentially converting part of the treasury to USD, while AlexQ cp0x and Paulo Fonseca raised concerns about potential gaming of the system due to the payout cap, with Paulo Fonseca also emphasizing the need for clear criteria for an acceptable "rationale." Furthermore, gi0rgos highlighted the importance of increasing DAO revenues and requested specific guidance for delegates on how their actions can

contribute to revenue generation, and Raam At Arbitrum announced that the new cohort from the security council elections is officially in play.

Details

Notes Length: Standard

- **John Kennedy's Vision and Role for 2026** John Kennedy, who focuses on go-to-market, operations, and strategy, shared their vision for 2026, leveraging their background as a former head of product at AWS Game Tech and experience running a venture-backed startup (00:01:21). Kennedy believes Arbitrum has a major opportunity in web3 gaming, which has seen a recent dip, and aims to help ride the coming wave by creating a persistent platform and community, aspiring to build the "Steam of web3 gaming" (00:02:21). They plan to dig in with portfolio companies to form a community, help bring them together, and double down on investments with effort as well as money, which is an area the council could focus on in the next term (00:07:54).
- **Transparency and Financial Reporting** Cameron asked whether the Arbitrum Governance Foundation (AGV) would commit to publishing financial statements and providing an annual audit and holding table, which are standard expectations for Limited Partners (LPs) in a fund. John Kennedy, Michael Chang, and Dan Peng all expressed support for transparency, while Michael Chang noted that some information must remain confidential to protect portfolio companies and prevent competitors from accessing sensitive data (00:03:44). Michael Chang also mentioned that the level of oversight from the DAO is already much greater than in many billion-dollar funds (00:05:55).
- **Balancing Information Sharing with the DAO** Dan Peng discussed the challenge of balancing the asymmetric information required by internal VC teams with the need to present digestible and responsible information to the DAO and its representatives, which includes the council. They highlighted that the council acts as oversight and proxies for the LPs, and designing the best way to share information is an ongoing process, as this VC program is one of the first of its kind in the DAO space (00:05:55).
- **Temporary Extension of the Delegate Incentive Program (DEP)** JoJo introduced a proposal for a temporary extension of the previous DEP, focused on voting incentives (TRX), as a contingency plan if the new RAD proposal (Rewarding

Acting Delegates) does not achieve consensus or fails to pass a vote by the deadline of December 11th (00:09:53). JoJo clarified that the extension is intended only to "buy time" and is not meant to compete with or serve as an alternative to the RAD proposal, and they would only put the extension to a vote if the RAD proposal fails (00:12:23). Ministro del dólar agreed that the extension should be a last-minute option but encouraged feedback on the RAD proposal, which they view as having a superior design due to its tie to activity and greater flexibility compared to the current DEP design (00:13:27).

- **Overview of the Rewarding Acting Delegates (RAD) Program** Raam At Arbitrum presented the new RAD proposal, which resulted from feedback gathered after the failure of the DIP 2 program (00:18:06). Key changes include the exclusion of contributor rewards and the peer assembly, the use of USD denominations for the budget, and a design that is far more objective. The program aims to reward delegates for casting votes and publishing rationale on proposals, with objectives including increasing active voting power and reducing voter apathy (00:19:29).
- **RAD Program Mechanics and Budget** The RAD program defines five types of proposals with specific budgets and delegate payout caps, ranging from $15,000 for on-chain constitutional proposals to $5,000 for off-chain temperature checks (00:21:37). Delegates must have a minimum voting power of 200,000 ARB to be eligible for rewards. Payouts are calculated relative to each delegate's share of voting power, the remaining incentive budget, and the payment cap, and they are issued in ARB but denominated in USD (00:22:47).
- **Discussion on Budget Denomination and Potential Gaming of the System** JoJo suggested that the DAO consider splitting the budget between ARB and USD, converting part of the treasury to USD to manage volatility, and then buying back ARB on the open market for distribution to mitigate selling pressure (00:26:18). Tamara Benetti noted that the Foundation is aware of this concern and is considering using revenue for DAO programs instead of selling ARB at its current price (00:29:06). Tekrox questioned the 200,000 ARB minimum voting power threshold, to which Raam At Arbitrum responded that lower thresholds would result in minimal rewards, potentially failing to incentivize voting (00:30:17).
- **Concerns Over Civil Activity and Rationale Requirements** AlexQ cp0x and Paulo Fonseca raised concerns about potential gaming of the system and "civil activity" due to the payout cap per delegate, suggesting that token holders could split their ARB to multiple compliant accounts to maximize incentive rewards

(00:32:12) (00:35:44). Raam At Arbitrum maintained that the compliance process monitors for civil activity and noted that delegates with the minimum voting power receive significantly less than those who can meet the payout cap, which should disincentivize people from gaming the system (00:34:39) (00:42:47). Paulo Fonseca also emphasized the need for clarity on what constitutes an acceptable "rationale" to be rewarded, arguing that a lack of criteria could lead to low-effort, "stupid" content (00:35:44).

- **DAO Revenue and Delegate Contribution** gi0rgos brought up the importance of increasing DAO revenues and asked what specific contributions the DAO expects from its members to help achieve this. They noted that current discussions focus on spending money, and there is a lack of specific guidance for delegates on how their actions can positively impact revenue generation (00:39:38).
- **Security Council Elections Update and Future Events** Raam At Arbitrum announced that the period for the results from the security council elections to take effect has finished, meaning the September 2025 cohort is officially in play . Sinkas Oikonomopoulos and Tamara Benetti confirmed that the next big venue for the DAO will be ETH Denver, followed closely by ECC in Khan (00:42:47).

Suggested next steps

- [ ] Raam At Arbitrum will take the feedback regarding splitting the budgeting in ARB and USD and get internal feedback from the finance team.
- [ ] Raam At Arbitrum will double check with the legal team to confirm the compliance process for delegates in the new RAD program.

📖 Transcript

Nov 25, 2025

Meeting Nov 25, 2025 at 17:57 EET - Transcript

00:00:00

Sinkas Oikonomopoulos: Okay, we're recording. Yes, John, you made it.
John Kennedy: Hey. Yeah, I was on my phone. I'm not sure why it was in view mode. Um, but hi everyone. I'm here. Um, as a short statement, u you know, there's a lot of material we've already posted about what I've done on the council so far and uh you know, I I um am really happy to take questions about um you know, my vision uh for how I can help the council in the future. Um, yeah, but I'm here, you know, so that anyone who wants can ask me questions or even connect with me.
Sinkas Oikonomopoulos: Awesome.
John Kennedy: I even put up a calendar link in delegate chat in case anyone wants to uh set up a time to talk with me separately.
Sinkas Oikonomopoulos: Thanks, John. Any any questions, guys, for John while we have him? Come on. Don't be like that. Be friendly.
Dan Peng: There's a question that Kristoff loves to ask that I think is very relevant and it's what are the what are the uh goals and kind of vision for 2026 and what is your role going to be in that?

00:01:21

John Kennedy: Yeah. So my role focuses on go to market and on operations and strategy. Um you know I was head of product at AWS game tech um and talked to kind of most of the gaming companies in the world as a part of that role. Uh so that makes me particularly useful on the go to market side understanding how to connect into partners and gaming companies and evaluate uh companies who were you know intending to invest in uh from a gaming perspective. Um and uh you know I also dig in with operations. I run my own uh you know venturebacked startup here. Uh we got seed funding this year for 3.2 million and we're building a team. Uh so it looks like a lot of the companies that we're investing in. Um and so you know from an operational perspective

I can definitely help with portfolio companies and also the operations of uh of the the AGV itself. Uh you know I've built and run large organizations from a strategy perspective. Um, I think we have big opportunities in gaming.

00:02:21

John Kennedy: There's kind of been a dip in web 3 gaming that we can take advantage of right now. Um, and uh, and so we've got a big opportunity and I want to help us uh, take advantage of that and really ride the wave that's coming um, in gaming and certainly we've seen a swing back towards uh, desktop gaming and web gaming and that's a huge opportunity for Arbitum. Um I still believe as I did in the beginning that Arbram is the best ecosystem to take advantage of that wave of gaming and create a persistent um platform and community of people who are using arbitum in you know every games they're playing every day. Uh creating the steam of arbit of of web 3 gaming uh similar to kind of steam from you know that everyone knows to to it's the biggest ecosystem of games today. Um, and actually now we've just got Michael on the call. Thanks for joining, Michael. I wasn't sure you're gonna be able to make it. Um so yeah I've got um I think there's a lot I can bring from my background and advising uh VCs for the past odd decade and building startups myself and being in the gaming industry uh contributing to kind of operations that I've done for the past year helping in I helped you know during the process of hiring and uh and forming up strategy um and a lot that I want to see uh the council do uh

00:03:44

John Kennedy: and the and AGB do in the next uh two is
Sinkas Oikonomopoulos: Perfect. Thank you, John. Other questions? I see one in the chat from Cameron for Christopher. Since it came up yesterday in the candidate discussion, will you commit to AGV publishing financial statements, for example, balance sheet, etc. Getting an annual audit and providing a holding table with cost basis and how they're currently marked. Uh and he goes on to say that these are all typical things an LP would expect from a fund that is not uh that are now not currently provided by AGV.
John Kennedy: Yeah, I think Michael and Dan should comment on that first. I'm supportive of transparency. Um, there's specific processes we have within AGB and uh,

you know, I'm I've supported those processes in the past for transparency.
Michael Chang: As with everyone else, I'm supportive of transparency. I would simply make the comment that there is some information that is deemed confidential. It's always one of these uh questions that you have. I've had this before with LPs at the various firms I've worked at.

00:04:53

Michael Chang: Some LPS like state pension funds require this sort of information. It's also why a number of venture firms don't take money from those types of organizations. Um disseminating that information for private companies can sometimes be sensitive. you don't want that information going to uh competitors. So, we have to be mindful of the investments we make and and our responsibilities to our portfolio companies as well as to the DAO.
John Kennedy: It's very politic Michael. Um I think that's a good answer. Um but we do strive for transparency as much as possible and much more than uh you know other uh other VCs. Uh certainly um I think you know there's a lot uh that you can gather from the reports that are put out by AGV and certainly if there are specific questions people are worried about they should ask and we'll do what we can to to bring forth the information.
Dan Peng: Yeah, I'll jump in real quick too.
John Kennedy: We've been pretty responsive in the past. Yeah.
Dan Peng: Um Yeah.

00:05:55

Michael Chang: If I may too, and joining here just now four months, I will say that compared to many of the firms I worked at before, the level of oversight uh uh here is actually much more than say billion dollar funds I worked at before. So, commendability to the Dow here for providing that level of insight. Many firms actually don't even have this, right? What's up?
Dan Peng: And I I just wanted to jump in real quick too. So um something that's been a consistent discussion point is um how do we balance the asymmetric info that's required by like internal um teams within VCs and then what how do we uh represent information in a way that's digestible but also responsible to the DAO and then what is

being shared to the DAO's representatives which is um really the council right so that includes John Tim um the rest of the folks that are running for reelection and any future council members And then what is shared to the wider dow, right? Because you have to remember the reason there's a council is to serve as oversight and to almost serve as serve as like proxies for the quoteunquote LPS in the situation.

00:06:56

Dan Peng: And so we do have several meetings to design that better. Uh this year was focused on deploying the first capital and getting the organization stood up. Uh Michael joining has been immensely helpful for us to continue designing the organization and um you know I think I'm I'm looking forward to a healthy dialogue on this u because it is one of the first of its
Sinkas Oikonomopoulos: Any other questions for Yeah, Jojo?
Dan Peng: kind, right? I don't think there's any other Dows that have a VC program that's as sophisticated as ours. Um, so we're really establishing the bar here.
JoJo: Hey, now I have a more specific question. Uh, uh, John, what do you think that the council should do differently in the next term, if any? Because you might just tell me everything is fine.
John Kennedy: Yeah.
JoJo: We work on what we do.
John Kennedy: Thanks, Jojo. Uh, the thing I really want to do is dig in uh with port with with port co. So, you know, we're starting to gather uh many different port codes together.

00:07:54

John Kennedy: Um, and I think we can do more to form a community. I think we can do more to bring them together um and and help them uh and kind of double down on our investments with effort as well as money. So, you know, I think there's a lot of work to do there. That's something I'm really excited about. Um and certainly as we bring on u more portfolio companies and make more investments that will become more and more important. um you know my my VC that has invested in fact there are three VCs that invested in my company and they do a huge amount to help us in terms of go to market and operations and hiring people and you know connecting with partners and connecting with potential customers all these kinds of things. I want to see that level of uh help coming from us uh for for port codes and I know that Dan and Rick now Michael are doing a lot with port codes already but I also think the council can dive in there with our experience um and you know and with our network as well.

00:08:48

JoJo: Cool. Thank you for your perspective. I appreciate it.
John Kennedy: Thanks, Jojo.
Sinkas Oikonomopoulos: All right. If there are no other questions for John, we can move on to the next person in the AGV elections, which is team Chang. I'm not sure if team is in the call. Let me quickly scan. Absolutely.
Dan Peng: I'm at a conflict, but he may be able to join later. And if he can uh join, I'd love to pass the torch to him for a quick um discussion.
Sinkas Oikonomopoulos: Yeah. So, we can circle back uh to Tim then. Okay. Then we have uh I'll move on with the two notable proposal discussions in the forum. One is the temporary extension of the delegate incentive program. Um and the other is about rewarding acting delegates uh or RAD because we love our acronyms in this DAO uh program by Arbit Foundation. We'll start with the extension of the delegated program by Jojo. Jojo, do you want to get into it?
JoJo: Yep.

00:09:53

JoJo: So I made the think 30 minutes ago and answer into the rad proposal and why did I do that? So first uh sorry for putting up the question uh so late into the call but whatever the end didn't have the time during the weekend. Now why am I talking about the rap proposal? because effectively they are tied right my goal when I posted this was to say okay we don't have a deep we had two failed vote one from the foundation and one from a delegate about it uh there is a mixed type of feeling in which um Dow seems like he wants deep but he can't find the consensus right so the idea was after asking if there was anything that would go on a vote by December Right. Um, let's extend the previous one. Let's even extend it partially just to TRX. And TRX for people that are not familiar, it's a it's a mechanism that is relatively similar to to this, right? It's it's just literally based on voting. And so we have the time to figure out um what do we want for the next DEP?

00:11:04

JoJo: I know the foundation was surveying delegates. I was one of the delegate that was surveyed, right? And so as I posted in the ad, I do see the the path as following. So let's assume that there is a healthy discussion about the foundation proposal, right? And there are modifications or maybe not whatever and we go on a vote in a way that is compatible with the post that we have which means if I recall that the last legal date is the 11th of December if I recall. Um I don't think we need an extension at that point. So my plan was to have the have this extension posted discussed and eventually voted in two weeks from now. At this point what we want is to focus on the RAD proposal uh get feedback there vote there. If any the extension can be voted if there is a either a failed vote on the proposal from the foundation or you know we we we just agree to disagree collectively right and so it goes into January and February and then at that point I do see the extension going on vote because it's literally about buying time right uh for the DA and that's it I don't even have too much to add on Y

00:12:23

Raam At Arbitrum: Hey Jojo. Uh, so just to clarify, you're saying that you will only put up you only intend to put up this proposal to vote if the RAD proposal fails at the voting phase.
JoJo: I I effectively put it in a written form in the forum like 30 minutes ago. So totally fine if you if you don't know. If you just scroll in there and go to the last paragraph, I basically say, okay, at this point the extension goes to a vote if in the 4th of December we vote the RAD, it fails, right? So the 11th of December, we know it failed and the 11th of December is the last legal date for a vote and we put the extension on. It doesn't make sense at this point to put it up concurrently. The again, it's it's not about finding the best program. the the proposal I made is is literally just an extension, right? Uh but if we are in a situation that before the poll we don't have a consensus, so we have a fail boat, it it might just go on a vote, right?

00:13:27

JoJo: So what I hope here is that the uh how can I say it the not even the mission but the the overarching goal behind the the extension is clear is not to compete with the rad is not to have alternative is literally to to buy time and if we finalize the rad we likely don't need the the accent at least I won't put it up for robot then if other delegates will put it up for robots I can't do too much about that, but that's my personal feeling about that.
Sinkas Oikonomopoulos: Other questions for Jojo?
Raam At Arbitrum: Cool.
JoJo: No problem, man.
Sinkas Oikonomopoulos: Just me strong.
Ministro del dólar: Hey, uh it's not this is not a question. It's more an opinion uh a personal opinion. Um I agree that the extension should be like the last uh minute uh option like the nuclear op the nuclear option if we don't if we don't have anything uh approved by then it sounds it makes sense from my perspective but I I would like to encourage everyone to to to provide your feedback in the other discussion in the rat discussion Because uh from the programs manager perspective uh even if we only vote with the TRX extension uh this is a a program which has a few design flow flaws let's say uh I feel this is again a personal opinion I feel more comfortable uh working or dealing with uh

00:15:23

Ministro del dólar: with a rat as example because uh most of you uh can acknowledge the the situation where uh if you don't have uh an onchain boat in an specific month um this the current design the the the design that could be extended if we don't have the rad uh it enters in a in a wor situation where you need to allocate the points to the delegates if you want them to keep incentivized. But in the other program, it's tied to activity. It's tied to every to every single vote. Uh it's more flexible. So I I I can say that at least from my personal opinion, I would uh I would advocate for have the RAD before the the Christmas and the holidays. uh because I from my perspective is a better design than the current one.
JoJo: Yeah. O overall we all want a new proposal from the scratch because we we kind of all right as far as I uh see personal opinion SI did what it could toward the year to adapt to the new condition of the DAO and it's it's difficult right when you have a vote it's difficult to adapt something that was voted um and so we we need new mechanism we

also likely want top code to be involved because sync needs stuff to do.

00:16:58

JoJo: uh and um we we do want a program that it's effectively that effectively matches the the needs that we have right the biggest feedback was to separate contributor and body programmer and this was uh taken inbound uh already think this is a great thing okay because it's the two things are just too different right and um we will see how it goes I I posted a few question about projections and history And again, it's like 30 minutes ago, so I don't expect this to be live anytime soon in term of answer, but we we we all want a new program if possible. And if not, let's just buy us a couple more months to to reflect on the new one. And that's it.
Sinkas Oikonomopoulos: Perfect. Thank you, Jojo. Unless there are other questions, we can move on with the RAD program from Origin Foundation.
Raam At Arbitrum: Thanks, Jojo. Thanks, Incas. Um, since we have 35 minutes, do you mind if I share some slides for a couple of minutes, the ones that you've probably all seen by now, but thankfully they are shorter because the new program is much simpler.

00:18:06

Sinkas Oikonomopoulos: Yeah, sure.
Raam At Arbitrum: Um, so let me know if you can see my screen.
Sinkas Oikonomopoulos: Yep.
Raam At Arbitrum: Can you see it in uh the slideshow mode?
Sinkas Oikonomopoulos: Yes.
Raam At Arbitrum: No. Cool.
Sinkas Oikonomopoulos: Yes, sir.
Raam At Arbitrum: Okay. So, yeah, obviously you know that dip 2 failed uh but that's okay. We have gathered all the feedback from the governance calls from the comments um from uh also feedback that was sent directly to us and uh this is kind of the overall summary that we got from the the dip 2. So people weren't too comfortable with the program structure. Uh the fact that delegate and contributor rewards were part of the same program. Uh people had issues with the budget and compensation. Uh I think the fact that we highlighted illustrative figures was misleading and also the fact that um the budget was based in ARB instead of USD um made people a bit uncomfortable. Uh

there was also complaints around the fact that the peer assembly was quite complex uh that it made it quite hard for newcomers to join uh and of course gives creates overhead for the existing um assembly members.

00:19:29

Raam At Arbitrum: People weren't comfortable with the amount of subjective power that the PM and also the opco had especially regarding the contributor rewards. Uh and there was also some feedback around the lack of objectives and confusion around what was expected as well as the fact that this did didn't really address uh the more meta level delegation uh issue. So we believe that this new proposal the RAD uh introduces most of this at least. So yeah this program aims to reward delegates for providing ration and voting on proposals. uh builds upon feedback as I mentioned and this is just the first of a series of upcoming proposals in that will fall under the umbrella of a Dow incentive program. So um going back to the feedback point about how people wanted the contributor and delegate incentive programs to be completely separate. uh this is why we've worked on delegate incentives first and then in January uh we will we'll work on a uh contributor incentive program and we actually had some workshops on this in uh in Argentina.

00:20:37

Raam At Arbitrum: So the main changes between this proposal and the previous DIP 2 is that uh this new proposal excludes contributor rewards as well as the peer assembly. It is USD denominated and it is far more objective by design. um objectives. One is to increase active voting power over time. So to actually incentivize uh new delegates to join as a result of the fact that this is a much simpler program. Uh to reduce voter apathy. So to increase the participation rate in proposals and people voting. Uh to improve program cost effectiveness and also to ensure that there is sufficient publicly available information to provide insight on decisions made. uh driven by the fact that delegates should be providing ration on the forum as to whether they voted for or against a proposal. So in terms of the delegate rewards, a delegate is defined as a party with voting power with the capability to vote for proposals. Uh they are rewarded for the following two very simple things.

00:21:37

Raam At Arbitrum: Casting votes on a per proposal basis as well as publishing ration for each proposal. Uh the other requirements are that they need to declare interest uh on the forum pass compliance. There's a minimum voting power threshold which I'll get to. Uh also for because this is on a per proposal basis, the total votes cast on a respective proposal should reach quorum and also the proposal should follow the correct uh governance process as per the constitution. So coming to the budget um we've defined kind of five different types of proposals. So onchain constitutional onchain non-constitutional uh off-chain decision-m so this is when the offchain vote is binding uh offchain elections such as you know the AGV elections this week as well as off-chain temperature checks which would have like a uh sequential onchain proposal. So these are the budgets per proposal for each proposal type. So 15K for onchain constitutional proposals, 7K for the following three and 5K for off-chain temperature checks. Uh we've also listed payout cap.

00:22:47

Raam At Arbitrum: So this is the maximum that a delegate could be paid for voting and casting their rationale on a respective proposal. So $700 uh do not yeah 700 in uh for onchain constitutional 500 for the following three and 300 for off-chain temp checks. And we have added a minimum voting power of 200k ARB uh in order for delegates to be eligible uh for these rewards. So as similar to the previous program that failed um this budget needs to be set by the PM and approved by the OPCO ahead of each quarter uh per proposal type. And the PM can off also offer bespoke incentive grant budgets for specific proposals. For example, if there are multiple proposals that fall within a larger proposal like STIP where there was literally hundreds that fell within the STIP initiative. Uh and the PM can also choose to not offer any rewards to prevent potential abuse. So if a proposal doesn't follow the uh governance process, if people are spamming the system to try and farm more rewards or if a proposal is cancelled um uh during or before voting actually starts and yeah rewards are calculated relative to each delegate's share of voting power as well as the portion of the incentive budget remaining and the payment cap.

00:24:08

Raam At Arbitrum: So basically if more people cast their votes then each delegate will receive uh a smaller percentage of the overall budget. Uh but this is also why we we want this to be flexible and reviewed each quarter because a lot of things change in in the DAO as well as in the as well as macro factors. Um but yeah this should provide more stability and and certainty uh because of the fact that it's now USD denominated. uh similar to last time as well uh payouts will be issued in in ARB. So it's paid in ARB but denominated in USD at the end of each month and if uh delegate rewards will acrue however if a delegate doesn't earn at least $100 worth of rewards within 3 months then they forfeit the acred rewards. This is just to ensure that uh we we don't need to process dust transactions. governing rules. Delegates need to adhere to the T's and C's as linked in the proposal and AEES uh and the PM cannot receive rewards from the program.

00:25:10

Raam At Arbitrum: Uh yeah, this would be funded by the uh remaining delegate incentive 1.7 budget and um the budget would be used to allocate rewards but also for uh the program management fees if selected by the OPCO as well as any miscellaneous uh operational costs incurred by the opco which currently has been set to up to 50k. Uh in terms of the roles of the PM, this is to oversee day-to-day operations. They are responsible for managing budgets, tracking rewards and reporting including uh writing a bi-anual transparency report and uh they act under the direction of the opco and ultimately it is up to the opco to onboard a program manager. Uh however the opco also could play the role of the program manager if they uh think this is necessary and yeah the role of the opco is to provide oversight and ensure program integrity to approve key decisions and changes uh to hire supervise fire the PM uh to facil facilitate compliance and payouts and yeah ultimately they're the ones that are accountable to the DAO. So yeah that's the TLDDR.

00:26:18

Raam At Arbitrum: There is also a session I've put in the calendar for Friday. I believe at

2:00 p.m. UTC. Um, so we can spend more time there. Uh, diving into the details. Is there any feedback? I only have one screen today, so I didn't see um if there are any comments in the chat.
Sinkas Oikonomopoulos: No, there haven't been comments in the chat.
Raam At Arbitrum: Yeah, hopefully it wasn't too long. Chris, read your comment. Just eight
Sinkas Oikonomopoulos: All right, see two questions, Jojo and then Deox.
JoJo: U very quickly because I left a comment in the forum and again I don't I don't present anybody to read that in the last 30 minutes. Ram one suggestion maybe consider if it makes sense having a budgeting that is split in AR and USD and I don't want to be clear the pro to distribute USD but the accounting everything has been done in USD keeping ARB in the treasury it's it's always clunky when you do this program we have seen this with styles and other programs it might make sense to convert apart and then just just reby when it's time to distribute I know It's a bit complex from an operational standpoint but effectively first from an optic standpoint it negates the cell pressure if you just reby and second it was difficult in previous program but now the stuff is more

00:27:48

JoJo: centralized it it could be done it takes a little bit of effort of course but uh yeah I just wanted to have your general opinion on is
Raam At Arbitrum: So this is regarding whether we should convert some ARB into USDC uh for the near term in order to make payments directly in USDC instead of Uh
JoJo: no payments in ARB. Payments in ARB. But when it's time to pay, you just you literally take the USD that you have in the treasury and you buy back the ARB on the open market.
Raam At Arbitrum: okay I see. Uh well I can I can take this feedback and and uh get some internal feedback from the finance team etc. Obviously, I'm not part of the finance team, so I don't have expertise in terms of best practice re
JoJo: Of course and uh it's is it's not only for the deep or the radical whatever I I think in general the DAO should move toward
Raam At Arbitrum: recon conversions, but um thanks for your feedback and sorry I can't provide more of a thorough
JoJo: this type of approach in which if we need to distribute tokens outside we want to distribute ARB but in a very volatile market that uh literally with ARB one year ago at $1, right?

00:29:06

JoJo: It's 21 cents now to just ensure a smooth operation. It might just make sense to have some of the budget in stables that just reby from the open market and RAD just happens to be the the first in which we could do something like that for what?
Tamara Benetti: Um Jojo just chiming in here.
JoJo: Yep.
Tamara Benetti: Um something we have been discussing in um internally and also now in Buenosirus was to uh whether like because a year ago most of the treasury was in ARP. So obviously we we never touched revenues, we never touched ETH, we never touched uh any USDC. Uh but now given like with the AR price like the overall consolation is a little bit different and it might make sense to just stop selling ARB and use revenue for DAO programs. Um that's like it was just like some something that we're talking about but mostly just because yeah we don't want to sell at this price.
Sinkas Oikonomopoulos: All
Tamara Benetti: So there like there is there is a lot of awareness around it and yeah just FYI.
JoJo: Okay.

00:30:17

JoJo: Okay. Thank you. Thank you for this detail.
Sinkas Oikonomopoulos: right. Uh, that works.
Tekrox: Hey, hey, Ram. Uh, question. Why 200k minimum? Like what's the mindset behind this number? Why not 50k? Why not 500k?
Raam At Arbitrum: So this is to be I guess in proportion to the uh budget proposal. So if you look on the proposal we actually linked a simulation sorry yeah a link to a spreadsheet of like simulations uh for each of the the various threshold. And if you were to reduce the budget below 200K, um each delegate would be getting only a few dollars worth for voting on each proposal, which in our opinion didn't seem like we didn't think it would actually motivate a delegate to vote if they're only getting like a few bucks, like $10 to vote on a proposal. But if you don't agree then yeah please feel free to provide that feedback.
Sinkas Oikonomopoulos: and Alex.

AlexQ cp0x: Uh hi uh it was nice to see you in Ram. uh and uh I don't um notice uh other minimum requirements uh for the new delegates for voting within uh um 19 days as uh the previous program and uh do uh we need uh go through KYC procedure uh and if not uh how about C bills in this case because two thousands of ARP it's Not so big right now.

00:32:12

Raam At Arbitrum: Uh sorry what do you mean by 2,000 of which let me go back to the budget slide actually okay yeah um so your question was around compliance so yeah it depends on like there will be some because this
AlexQ cp0x: Uh 200,000s. Uh sorry.
Raam At Arbitrum: is a new program there will probably be something that um delegates would need to sign uh however the full compliance process might depend on how recently a delegate last went through the process. Um, but yeah, I'll have to double check this with the legal team. And what was your last question? knows about the minimum voting power being too small or could you repeat it
AlexQ cp0x: Yeah. Uh I just uh um if we do not have the KYC procedure, it what's uh maybe a lot of cibu who who can get this rewards.
Raam At Arbitrum: Yeah, but as mentioned because this is a DAO program um and people are receiving money from the Treasury, they would need to go through compliance.
AlexQ cp0x: Yeah. Yeah. Thanks.

00:33:21

AlexQ cp0x: Thanks.
Sinkas Oikonomopoulos: and Paula.
Paulo Fonseca: Well, I want to highlight the same thing that um CP0X is uh saying. If there's is a payout cap for each voter that is voting and people can distribute their ARB through multiple accounts, there are multiple different human beings and different delegates that vote with different reasons. This is a way of gaming the system, right? because you would be exploiting the fact that there's a payout cap per each delegate for each proposal. So let's as an hypothetical um and I'm sorry to call out uh specific examples but this is actually an example that's going on right now. So the delegate right

now that has more than 200,000 in uh arbitum is Zeptimus and Zeptimus has 200,000 ARB delegated to him and a big part of that ARB that is delegated to him comes from uh Griff green. So Griff is a delegate and you will be voting and Zetimus is also a delegate that will be voting with ARB from Griff right and they both can get rewarded and they both will get rewarded until the payout cap proportionally to their voting power so on and so forth.

00:34:39

Paulo Fonseca: I'm not saying that they're gaming the system, but under the current rules, um people with a lot of ARB could dist distribute it to several uh real delegates and um all of them would be getting the incentives, right? So, um there is an issue with having this uh payout cap like this um that I think should be looked into.
Raam At Arbitrum: Thanks for your comment. I don't see the example that you raised as civil activity. Uh ultimately any well it's up to each token holder to decide whether to delegate to themselves to someone else.
Paulo Fonseca: It is not. It is not. I'm not saying it is. That's But it is a way of gaming it, right?
Raam At Arbitrum: Uh, and also delegates do also receive delegate dele voting power delegated to them. So I guess in Griff's case, he's only been able to delegate his own voting power that he owns. Um, but yeah, going back to the compliance point, we also do monitor for civil activity. So um, yeah, I don't think it would be

00:35:44

Paulo Fonseca: Yeah. Yeah. I'm not I'm not saying that this is civil. This is not civil. But what I mean is that this is a way of uh getting more incentives for like there will be no need for people to have more than 200k if they want to gain the system. So they can split their voting power. um through several accounts that are, you know, several different human beings that would pass the compliance and get rewards either way, right? And uh yeah, that's that's that's an issue with this mechanics.
Raam At Arbitrum: Yeah, I mean fair enough. But I I still don't see uh the real issue there. But I suppose it is possible.
Paulo Fonseca: Yeah. Okay. Um the other thing that I wanted to comment about is the um uh the qualification criteria to be paid is to vote and to post the rationale, right? And

um um we we need to be clear about what kind of rationale would be rewarded because there uh uh the subjectivity of the program lies on this aspect right now basically and if this program would be u very subjective or not subjective at all is an important factor right in the design of the program and uh yeah I think it needs to be specified what we mean by posting a rationale where should that rationale be

00:37:10

Paulo Fonseca: posted and you know if there's going to be any subjectivity about what that rationale will be because uh if people will vote and they will vote with the answer uh with a rale just you know because you know uh because I felt so or because whatever even if it's a stupid rationale it probably should be valid and uh you know um eligible for rewards either way. So uh we either have some criteria of what that rationale should be or we don't and people can put whatever rationale will be there and that's also a driver to you know um cause a lot of s***** content in the form.
Raam At Arbitrum: That's a valid point. Um, and as the proposal says, the the rationale should explain the delegates reasoning uh behind why they voted one way. Uh I would imagine that if a delegate said I voted this way because I felt like it. Um I guess it would be up to the PM or the OPCO to evaluate whether that is justified. Um but yeah, it is ultimately up to the PM and OPCO to distribute rewards and maybe they can um provide more clarity on that down the line.

00:38:22

Paulo Fonseca: Yeah, but the that that's what I mean like the clarity should be provided now because this changes the mechanic of the proposal and the risks of the proposal, right? because uh you know what this would lead to is that uh everybody would just comment with a you know chat GPT reason that sounds okay uh just with a minimum effort to just you know comply with it and get the money. So
Sinkas Oikonomopoulos: I love how some discussions I'm trying to make people participate and in in this discussion and everyone is happy to participate and also the chat is is active happy to see that. Um, right. Are there any other questions or feedback for Ram and AF and the proposal? We still have 45 minutes. Dan, did you have any ch any luck with team? Okay, I'm talking in the air. Dan is not even here. So, I guess that means he didn't have any luck with Tim. So, all in all, that would be all for the different

proposals for today's call.

00:39:38

Sinkas Oikonomopoulos: Uh we still have 15 minutes to go. So if there is any questions in general or any topics that anyone wants to bring up uh we can do that. Otherwise we can all get back 15 minutes of our day and get on with our work or our personal lives or whatever it is that you do at 4:45 p.m. UTC. Yes, you're
gi0rgos: I don't like to keep you here guys but I just want to say a quick a quick question. H I've said in the past that we have to aim in increasing our revenues and that we are having a lot of discussion over the over proposals that are need money to be spent. So I don't have problem with the threshold be 200,000 or 500,000 or or whatever. But as a smaller delegate I have a a question that I think is a common question. What do we expect our members to do in a contribution aspect so as their actions will increase our revenues? we don't have specific uh needs uh or basically we even if we do have specific needs there are no specific orders to us we haven't done any conversations of what the DA expect from any one of us and that's something that I would like to know so as I personally could know how I can be helpful for the DAO and I think that I'm not the only one.

00:41:31

gi0rgos: So maybe we can focus on it and it will bring revenues to our team. That's it for me.
Sinkas Oikonomopoulos: Thank you. If anyone wants to respond, happy to let them. Otherwise, Ram and then coin flip.
Raam At Arbitrum: I'm not sure if coin flip's uh hand is regarding to Kyorgus's point. If so, I think you should go first.
Coin Flip: No, it's not.
Raam At Arbitrum: Okay. Uh well, I actually just wanted to go back to the RAD proposal and and mention something to Paulo's question about uh big delegates, I guess, distributing their voting power to other people because of the fact that the minimum you need to vote is 200. Uh Paulo, if you look at the in the proposal, there's a link we shared um called Yeah, if you it says uh an illustration of how the po the payouts may look um if all voting power was eligible. In that spreadsheet, you'll see that like delegates with

more voting power are the only ones which can actually meet the payout cap, but those with 200 i.e. the minimum amount of voting power required get a lot less.

00:42:47

Raam At Arbitrum: So, I guess that also would disincentivize people from distributing their voting power to quote unquote game the system because yeah, the way the rewards are distributed is also partly uh done proportional to one's voting Power. And I hope that gives more clarity.
Sinkas Oikonomopoulos: Okay. Um, is there anything else? Coin flip, you wanted to raise your hand earlier. Is it something that you want to still chime in?
Coin Flip: Well, actually I had two small things. One was actually the same point that Ron made, which is that I think that this only impacts big delegates. And I I'd be hardressed to imagine delegates with tens of millions of votes going in trying to act improperly with the nature of the ecosystem set up. Whereas I think smaller delegates would actually lose out by transferring those update. Uh at least for this part of the program. Uh actually the question I was ask was slightly more social which was is is ETH Denver the next big um venue where the DAOCO slash you know arbitum will have a presence or is there anything else prior to ETH Denver.

00:44:11

Sinkas Oikonomopoulos: I think it's if Denver.
Coin Flip: Okay.
Sinkas Oikonomopoulos: Yeah, it should be if Denver. I mean, I don't think I have anything on my mind for December and then it's like the D break and holds January. I don't think there are any big events. So, if is probably it.
Tamara Benetti: And then I think three weeks later there is uh ECC in Khan. So it's really close this year.
Coin Flip: Oh god.
Tamara Benetti: Yeah.
Sinkas Oikonomopoulos: It is gas.
Coin Flip: All right.
Sinkas Oikonomopoulos: Yeah. And that's a New York. All right. Uh I think that leads to it being all for today. Unless anyone has any final things they want to bring up. All right, I

guess not. Uh, so that probably brings us to the end of today's call. I will close on a happy note and I'll show you everyone the merch item that was being distributed at RBverse in case anyone has missed it which was this little handheld fan. But we turn it on magic. I don't know. It seemed cool. I thought everyone should know. I really like this little fella. So yeah, I'll see you all in the next open discussion of proposal calls um in two weeks from now and uh the second week of December. I remind everyone that we're going to have the GRC not the first week but the second. till then. Oh, Ram please.
Raam At Arbitrum: Yeah, sorry. One more thing to update on that I forgot to mention. Uh the uh the period for like results from the security council elections uh to become effectuated has finished. So yeah, the grace period is over. Um so basically the September 2025 cohort is officially um in play.
Sinkas Oikonomopoulos: That's great. All right, let's wrap it up. Thanks everyone and we'll see you guys around.
Tekrox: Bye everyone.
John Kennedy: Five.

Transcription ended after 01:00:30

This editable transcript was computer generated and might contain errors. People can also change the text after it was created.