

Aark

GFX Feedback)

This grant plan was especially strong in identifying target users that off Arbitrum, estimating a user acquisition cost via this plan, including retention in the plan, and generally having clear deliverables promised. The only weakness was the very large request size, but that was overcome in other areas of the scoring rubric. We recommend this grant me approved.

Wintermute Feedback)

Aark's application was very strong and scored well across most criteria. They provided a thorough understanding of their customer acquisition and object of grant use as indicated by their execution strategy. Their milestones, KPIs, and goals, were clear and concise with thorough justifications.

Their request grant size was sufficiently justified and in line with the protocol's usage. The product itself introduces some innovation to the perp DEX sector while capturing the LRT audience.

We will be supporting this application.

Karel Feedback)

Vote FOR Aark's proposal!

Strong proposal and highlighted a clear plan to draw users/liquidity to Arbitrum from outside ecosystems. Has shown strong traction to-date and hope to see this pass through the DAO to execute against plan and hit the target milestones/KPIs. Grant size is on the larger end but believe worthwhile use of DAO capital.

Aave

GMX Feedback)

The well-balanced approach in their grant application suggests they are aware of their marketshare in the money market space, and have structured their grant proposal accounting for the fact that while they are beyond their primary growth phase, that they still have exciting developments to bring to the ecosystem. The proposal aims to kickstart the adoption of GHO as a native stablecoin asset on Arbitrum while also focusing on growing and retaining users on the Aave V3 Arbitrum deployment

404 DAO Feedback)

Overall, Aave presented a strong proposal that was thoroughly written. They provided extensive data on their relevant usage metrics along with a very detailed execution plan the incentives which we believe fully justifies the size of this grant. Enabling the growth of native Arbitrum GHO will help strengthen Arbitrum's competitive position.

Providing more trackable success metrics within their milestones as well as sybil defense mechanisms were areas we felt the application could be improved. And while co-contribution of incentives was mentioned, since a commitment is reliant on an Aave DAO vote we did not award a bonus point.

Karel Feedback)

Vote FOR Aave's proposal.

Strong proposal; lots of data, detailed execution plan, thoughtful KPIs, and reasonable grant size given their traction and activity. Launch of the Native Arbitrum GHO feeds into ecosystem benefits from this grant, though some elements are dependent on passing through Aave DAO governance. Would have liked to see a more considerate effort towards driving volumes from Ethereum Mainnet to Arbitrum.

Across

GFX Feedback)

We greatly appreciated how this took data from a previous success story and sought to replicate it! That's what allows for large grants requests. The main weakness of this grant plan was a lack of deliverables promised that can help hold the grantee accountable - there are not explicit targets to hit in terms of traffic or other metrics. All other areas were strong, however. We recommend this grant be approved.

404 DAO Feedback)

Across has seen impressive usage since its launch and we are excited to bring an incentive program that was successful to Arbitrum. Execution strategy was clearly presented and there was extensive data to backup their plan. As GFX mentioned too, the only weakness in their application was the absence of trackable milestones that targeted hitting their presented KPIs.

GMX Feedback)

The team background is solid, with a history of successfully building projects and a deep understanding of incentive mechanisms. They have demonstrated the ability to attract organic traffic and retain users even after the conclusion of incentive programs, indicating a strong grasp of sustainable growth strategies. Their well-thought-out plan for utilizing incentives further strengthens our confidence in their proposal. Additionally, in line with successful grants related to bridging, Across protocol aims to incentivize users to bridge to Arbitrum by covering 95% of the fees associated with the bridging process. This approach recognizes the importance of bridge partners as the entry point for users into the Arbitrum ecosystem. The proposed allocation of 1 million ARB aligns with past bridge incentives and is expected to significantly reduce friction for users, thereby facilitating broader adoption. Overall, considering the team's expertise and the strategic importance of incentivizing bridge usage, we are inclined to support this proposal.

AcryproS

GMX Feedback)

Upon reviewing the project, it's evident that despite being live on Arbitrum for a significant period, there hasn't been substantial traction. The majority of Total Value Locked (TVL) comes from Binance, raising concerns about organic growth. While the team has a strong background, the project's focus solely on Uniswap V3 vaults limits its appeal, especially considering the lack of sticky liquidity post-incentives. Consequently, we don't foresee significant traction even with funding. The grant proposal aims to incentivize users to deposit into ALCM concentrated liquidity, but it fails to offer innovative features that would ensure the longevity of these incentives. Additionally, the project has struggled to attract significant TVL across multiple chains. While the grant size request appears reasonable, we doubt its ability to attract new users to the ecosystem, potentially leading to mercenary farming behavior. Therefore, we regret to inform you that we cannot support this proposal based on the observed protocol usage and projected outcomes.

Wintermute Feedback)

This application was solid and scored well across various criteria. They provided a clear and concise execution plan, milestones, KPIs, and goals.

Their requested grant size is sufficiently justified, however, their current protocol metrics on Arbitrum is underwhelming given the age of the protocol clearing indicating a lack of demand for their product. We would've like to have seen more of a focus on encouraging stickiness and migrating their BSC users.

Unfortunately, we will not be supporting this application.

GFX Feedback)

We generally liked this grant – it was sized appropriately and had a simple, easily monitored plan of execution. Where this grant plan would have really stood out is if there was a concerted effort to market these incentives to AcryptoS' existing user base on BSC.

AirPuff

404 DAO Feedback)

While AirPuff presents an interesting product looking to capitalize on the evolving LRT narrative, there are many concerns regarding their application. Mainly the lack of detail in justifying why their grant ask and grant allocation will lead to the projected KPIs given the current products usage. As they begin to have gain usage, we encourage AirPuff to apply to future incentives. Unfortunately, we are unable to support this grant ask.

GMX Feedback)

While the team has outlined milestones and KPIs, there could be more specific metrics related to user engagement, such as average user deposits or frequency of transactions, to provide a more nuanced understanding of user behavior and retention efforts. Overall, while the proposal shows promise, further clarity and detail in these areas could enhance its strength. Unfortunately we won't be supporting the proposal.

Karel Feedback)

Vote AGAINST AirPuff's proposal.

Fine proposal but believe lacking and unable to endorse for the following reasons: second audit readiness + target KPIs are based on market comparables vs. informed by any existing product usage and traction. It's not a large grant but protocol needs to start with its "training wheels" first and prove initial demand in the market prior to tapping into capital from the DAO to supercharge it.

Alchemix

404 DAO Feedback)

Alchemix presented a strong application scored well due to their prior history on Ethereum mainnet and thorough application. Their incentive design causes some concern due to how they plan to melt the ARB as repayment for the end-users loan. While we are normally against directly selling the ARB incentives as part of LTIPP, we believe in this case it is justified with how their users interact with their product. Overall, Alchemix justified their grant ask and provided a thorough execution strategy and fair success metrics. We will be supporting this application.

GMX Feedback)

The project has been in the space for a long time and has seen significant growth. However, there is a lack of details on how the project has performed on Arbitrum. The numbers mentioned regarding the size of the grant are conservative, and we doubt whether the protocol would be able to maintain liquidity post-incentives. The purpose of this grant is to bootstrap the AL (alchemist) ecosystem. While the overall grant is not large, which is a positive, I am unsure about the lasting impact of temporary boosts to the AL (assets). The protocol has been live on multiple chains, creating a significant impact in the DeFi ecosystem. The KPIs and milestones also seem quite low. For example, Milestone 3 aims for 50 addresses with open positions two-thirds of the way into grant distribution, and Milestone 4 targets 100 addresses with open positions at completion of grant distribution. This doesn't demonstrate a wide enough impact to enhance the ecosystem. Unfortunately we won't be supporting the proposal.

GFX Feedback)

This was a reasonably sized grant request for a protocol established on Ethereum and newly launching on Arbitrum. The grant plan was straightforward in goals and execution plan. Only

major improvement we would have suggested would be a marketing element to Alchemix's established Ethereum user base to come try the product on Arbitrum as well. We recommend this grant be approved.

Karel Feedback)

Vote AGAINST Alchemix's proposal.

Good proposal that scored well across the rubric criteria that has been able to show resilience on ETH L1 throughout the bear keeping in mind exploits and other events that affected the protocol. The requested grant size is not crazy with sufficient justification and matching, however unable to endorse for the following reasons: (i) inconsistencies in target TVL (5M vs. 20M; presumably from the reduction in grant size); (ii) more detail behind stickiness and the migration strategy to drive L1 TVL into Arbitrum (difficult to form a reference and see if milestones are obtainable); (iii) would like to see greater adoption on Arbitrum first to showcase initial Arbitrum market demand; (iv) would have liked to see all milestones mapped against the KPIs with more robustness (against TVL and users).

Wintermute Feedback)

Alchemix's application was very solid with thorough justifications of their requested grant size, KPIs, milestones, and goals. The product itself is unique infrastructure that Arbitrum can benefit from and has proven demand. Furthermore, the team has shown their ability to work with previous incentive programs, manage their own incentives, and focus on building out protocol relationships.

We will be supporting this application.

ALLO

404 DAO Feedback)

No security audits and missing sections - ex. grant execution strategy. Also unclear what this project actually is - an L1 or something on Arbitrum?

GMX Feedback)

The proposal for the Allo protocol lacks substantial evidence to support its claim of bringing \$2 billion in assets to Arbitrum, with no clear data on how this would be achieved or if the assets even exist. Moreover, there is a strong absence of a breakdown of milestones detailing how the tokenization of \$2 billion in assets on Arbitrum would be accomplished. Despite requesting \$110,000 in ARB tokens for increasing social media followers, there is little indication of how this would translate to increased on-chain activity on Arbitrum. Furthermore, the proposal neglects to allocate funds for audits, raising concerns about the security of the protocol, especially given the lack of audits conducted by the proposer. Overall, the proposal falls short in providing comprehensive details on how the funds will be

utilized, leading to the decision not to support it. The application is further weakened by confusion regarding whether Allo is a Layer-1 blockchain or native to Arbitrum, and the grants application section lacks crucial details, with most statements being vague.

Karel Feedback)

Vote AGAINST ALLO's proposal.

Unclear if it's a Layer 1 / how it's going to deploy on Arbitrum. Incomplete proposal across a number of dimensions. Grant milestones structured based on product/social deliverables vs. being distributing to users

ApeBond

GFX Feedback)

This grant request is larger than the Arbitrum TVL. Couple with milestones that do not sufficiently hold the applicant accountable for progress and the lack of traction on Arbitrum or any other deployment recently, it is difficult to approve this request. Recommend the applicant focus on what went well in the past and tailor a grant to replicate or scale any initial successes.

404 DAO Feedback)

While we appreciate ApeBond's objectives in trying to create more healthy liquidity for the Arbitrum token, we are unable to support this grant due to the focus of the incentives being more a proposed POL program for the DAO. We encourage the ApeBond to take this proposal directly to the DAO or through another program centered around enhancing the liquidity of ARB. Their application could've also been improved by linking more relevant data to back up their usage.

GMX Feedback)

We do not approve the application for ApeBond. Their KPI goals are unclear (initially, they mention wanting to decrease \$ARB liquidity debt by 5% and then state they are aiming for a debt reduction of 10% or more). Furthermore, \$ARB is a billion+ valuation, I'm not so sure as to the relevance of this experimental run for Arbitrum ecosystem, and it seems more to serve ApeBond's ends, which isn't a bad thing, but I'm not sure would be the most prudent spend of grant funds. Additionally, while the proposal emphasizes the use of the ERC-5725 token standard and the potential benefits of the bonding program, it lacks detailed analysis or evidence supporting the projected outcomes and impact on the ARB token liquidity.

APX Finance

GFX Feedback)

We found it interesting that the applicant plans to combine the liquidity from BSC and Arbitrum (to Arbitrum's benefit as the smaller market). The grant plan generally scored well all around. We recommend this grant be approved.

Karel Feedback)

Vote FOR APX Finance's proposal.

Strong proposal that scored well on rubric. Protocol has great traction on BSC and as evidenced in their various dashboards, and is an opportunity to draw a net new market to Arbitrum. Would have liked to see the following: (i) more granularity in milestones to highlight other key KPIs applied weekly/biweekly instead of monthly; and (ii) more detail behind stickiness strategies as they lightly touched on (centered around community and product delight) with a focus on rewarding ARB holders vs. driving stickiness of users/usage/liquidity + touching on strategy after incentives end

404 DAO Feedback)

APX scored well across a variety of categories and presented a thorough application. Links for team members would have been appreciated to verify the content they have presented. We felt their trading competition left a lot of details out relating to sybil attacks & wash trading. We appreciate the attempt to make the trading competition social in creating teams, but focusing around a volume based challenge rewards larger users to come together to maximize their allocation. Unfortunately we will not be supporting this proposal

GMX Feedback)

The proposal outlines a detailed plan for increasing TVL and trading volume on Arbitrum, accompanied by clear objectives and execution strategies. However, the milestones set are too low. Currently, the proposal suggests spending on incentives to create a \$5 million pool on Arbitrum, but most trading is expected to occur on BSC rather than Arbitrum. While the team trading contest is a novel and promising idea, unfortunately, we cannot support the proposal.

Wintermute Feedback)

APX Finance's application was thorough in their justification and details. They have proven their ability to natively run their own incentive programs which has worked out well. The unification of cross-chain liquidity will be a win for Arbitrum and their execution strategy seems sufficient. Their product has seen great traction outside of Arbitrum and we are hoping that this grant will be able to migrate existing users.

We would've liked to have seen a PnL Trading tournament alongside their trading volume tournament to encourage more organic trading activity. We also don't really see the need for the ARB holder incentives, but it will be interesting data nonetheless.

Overall, we believe this application is solid enough to present it to the DAO.

Artichoke

Karel Feedback)

Vote FOR Artichoke's proposal.

Decent proposal but lacking in details on execution strategy (more granularity) and strategies to drive stickiness following the incentives period. Relatively low adoption in contrast to life of project. Grant amount is reasonable however and hope to see further product and traction growth. Over to the DAO.

GMX Feedback)

Generally supportive of approving Artichoke's grant application. While sing-side LPing is not particularly new, it is generally attractive for users. The clear vision and small grant size tells me Artichoke would be positioned to fully utilize their grant should it be approved. The grant is modest and aimed to bring attention to their platform by boosting incentives for new and current users. I think for the small grant request the benefits outweigh the cost. The KPI and milestones seem reasonable.

404 DAO Feedback)

While the grant ask requested from Artichoke was reasonable, we are concerned about the project's traction as it has flattened over the last 6 months. Additionally, the use of incentives for the the project's native token is not something we generally support. While we understand that increasing CHOKE/tCHOKE TVL is important, we encourage Artichoke to reapply to future programs with revised strategy.

Wintermute Feedback)

Artichoke's application was solid with a decent execution strategy, and clear objectives and milestone. We appreciate their focus on stickiness and user retention as well as their justification for grant size. Their grant size is reasonable, however, given a considerable amount of ARB rewards are dedicated to incentivizing their native token we will not be supporting this application. Furthermore, given the age of the project and lack of protocol usage and adoption, we don't think it's the best use of DAO funds.

GFX Feedback)

This is a smaller project but the requested grants size is safely on the upper end of what we consider appropriate for experiments. Unfortunately, this grant plan suffered from the emphasis on the CHOKE/tCHOKE token pair. While we understand that tCHOKE is important in how the applicant's project functions, we don't generally support governance funds being used to

bootstrap liquidity or demand for an applicant's own token. Recommend the applicant submit some other mechanism to support growth in future grants cycles.

Autolayer

GFX Feedback)

This is a large request for a protocol that just deployed and is unaudited. The distribution formula is not well explained, making it hard to determine if the ARB would be farmable by sybils or small groups. We suspect the applicant was under a tight deadline to produce this grant plan given their recent launch and recommend they reapply in future grants cycles when more details and some initial success can be shown.

Wintermute Feedback)

AutoLayer's product is relatively novel in the LRT landscape but the concept is pretty common across DeFi. Their V2 product seems a lot more interesting however, has not been released. We found their application to lack any form of calculation and justification of their grant size and their execution plan was weak. Their V1 product has yet to be audited. Unfortunately, we will not be supporting their application.

GMX Feedback)

AutoLayer's presence in the Liquidity Restaking Token (LRT) space on Arbitrum is notable, especially considering the high demand in this sector and the limited number of players. Their points model and incentive distribution strategy, which involves matching the grant with their own native tokens, effectively doubles the incentives for users. The grant request is moderate, and given the scarcity of LRT projects on Arbitrum, securing funding could prove highly beneficial. AutoLayer aims to simplify Liquidity Restaking Models, making it easier for new Arbitrum users to adjust and modify positions in LSTs, which were previously more complex. Their modest grant request of 100k ARB, coupled with offering quadruple the amount of their own incentives to match, demonstrates a commitment to the project's success. Additionally, measures to cap the amount of ARB received could help prevent sybil attacks. The KPIs and milestones outlined in the proposal appear reasonable and achievable. Overall, there are no objections to supporting this proposal, as it addresses a growing demand in the Arbitrum ecosystem and presents a promising solution to simplify liquidity restaking for users.

404 DAO Feedback)

While Autolayer presents an interesting product looking to capitalize on the evolving LRT narrative, we are unable to support this application due to incomplete audits on the necessary contracts that involve the incentives. Additional details on how they would be allocating the incentive funds would've also been helpful in understanding the execution strategy. With points being based on transaction volume, we fear that this would've been likely abused. We encourage Autolayer to finish their audits and reapply to future programs.

Axelar Network

Wintermute Feedback)

Axelar's application scored well across a lot of criteria. This is due to their excellent reputation, age, infrastructure, and security. They also provided very clear KPIs, milestones, and goals. In contrast, their requested grant size is very large and should be considered heavily. We are not sure that the DAO should be spending 1.5M ARB on rebating ~\$2 in gas costs for 100k users and incentivizing liquidity for 2 assets. Their incentive mechanism is quite poor and doesn't necessarily attract users to the Arbitrum chain. There is also very little interesting data that can be gained from such a reward mechanism.

Unfortunately, due to the points mentioned above, we cannot justify this spend on behalf of the DAO. We will not be supporting this application.

404 DAO Feedback)

Axelar scored highly on this rubric due to their team's background, length since deployment on Arbitrum, multiple audits + bug bounty program (We think this application in particular highlights some of the bias the rubric has towards larger/established projects). Our main concerns arise with the extremely high grant ask for this proposal when compared to the Arbitrum volume and transactions of other bridges that have applied to LTIPP. Axelar has brought forth the largest ask with a execution strategy that doesn't focus around retaining users and expected cost per transaction of \$2 that was higher than many other bridges. We encourage Axelar to reapply to future programs with a lower grant ask and rethought execution strategy. We will not be supporting this application.

Karel Feedback)

Vote AGAINST Axelar's proposal.

While well scored on the rubric, the requested grant size is too high to justify against the benefits we may see from this. There are numerous interoperability solutions out there and do not believe this spend will drive high quality users and lead to retention to Arbitrum.

Incentivization mechanism and grant size should be revisited in a future proposal

Azuro

Wintermute Feedback)

Azuro's application was solid and scored well in areas like novelty, product, reach, and usage. Their product is a very unique piece of infrastructure that could be quite beneficial for Arbitrum as it covers the gambling sector. Furthermore, they have seen a good amount of usage on Polygon thus far, however, we are unsure of how organic this is due to their points program and upcoming token launch.

Their requested grant size is very large and while their calculations seem reasonable they have no history of activity on Arbitrum. Their target volume seems achievable, however, this is due to the high edge/spread they charge users.

Their execution mechanism is also not very innovative and doesn't provide much data for the DAO. Furthermore, I'm not sure if spending 1M ARB on rebating a 6% edge/spread is a great use of funds. We felt like they could've also spent more time designing a better rebate system that targets the onboarding of users and incentivises stickiness through unlocking ARB rewards based on wager amounts.

Unfortunately, we cannot justify the grant size based on the points mentioned above. This is a project we would've like to support had they been more realistic with their grant size and fleshed out a better execution strategy.

GMX Review)

Positive on the idea of supporting the Azuro project. Bookmaking is a ludicrous business model with intuitive PMF for decentralization via smart contracts. A viable betting platform for sports that is on-chain and decentralized has huge catalytic potential for growing Arbitrum's user base. The timeline and ask make sense if their reported estimates are to be trusted. Azuro seems to have a robust product offering, with a decentralized codebase and program kit, as well as a decentralized source of liquidity and decentralized tokenomics which include fee share of real yield. Feel grant size is too large but we are intrigued by the potential of Deep-On-Chain sports bettings and how it may drive volume to the Arbitrum Network

Karel Review)

Vote AGAINST Azuro's proposal in its current form.

Not yet deployed and live on Arbitrum but requesting a large grant size which I do not believe is warranted. Don't believe we should incentivize projects in order to launch here. Activity/traction is impressive on Polygon but there is some proving to be done first on Arbitrum before a grant of this size should be considered.

GFX Feedback)

While interesting, this grant plan suffered from being an enormous request for a protocol that is only beginning to launch on Arbitrum. The grant plan would have been more compelling if it had been tailored to migrate the applicant's existing user base on Polygon.

404 DAO Feedback)

Azuro presented a well-rounded application featuring their extensive data that highlighted their strong success on other chains. Some components within the application lacked granular details, specifically the execution strategy and milestones section. We are not completely sold on rebating the spread for their incentive design (some questing components to engage Arbitrum native users and explore the variety of applications built on top of Azuro would have been appreciated). However, given the potential for expanding a more niche sector in the

Arbitrum ecosystem, Azuro's proven success, and their distribution pipeline of applications we will be supporting this proposal.

Battlefly

Wintermute Feedback)

BattleFly DAO's application lacked in justifying their requested grant size. While they have shown their ability to attract users for previous games, this is not sufficient enough to justify their grant request for a new game in beta.

Their execution strategy lacked details and was unclear on how many users/winners it would effectively reach. With the information provided, the distribution method did not seem very inclusive and focused on rewarding the top 1 and 2 players quite heavily each week.

Lastly, we found their milestone section to be rather weak as it lacked details and timelines. Unfortunately, we will not be supporting this grant.

GFX Feedback)

Given the past success of this team and project, recommend identifying periods of sustained growth or increasing intensity of interaction from users and tailoring a grant request to replicating or scaling that previous success. While not opposed to funding a new module on an existing game, the general nature of the KPIs and milestones, coupled with the possibility of incentives concentrating in the hands of a few power users kept this grant plan from getting a high score. Recommend the applicant revise and resubmit in subsequent grants cycles.

404 DAO)

Battlefly presented a solid application overall and they were one of the first gaming projects to help onboard users to Arbitrum. As mentioned by other council members, distribution is a bit of concern since the same players could keep winning every week and only the top 2 are rewarded. 100K ARB is a bit of a high ask, but we are deciding to support Battlefly given their team's history of executing well and our stance that gaming should be supported on Arbitrum. Overall, we feel like this request was properly justified and should be presented to the DAO to decide if its worth funding.

GMX Feedback)

Based on the provided information, while the proposal demonstrates a clear understanding of the Arbitrum ecosystem and presents a detailed plan for incentivizing player participation in BattleFly Colosseum, there are concerns regarding the scalability and sustainability of the proposed approach. The reliance on weekly incentives and influencer-hosted Game Nights may not effectively address the cold-start problem faced by the Competitive Colosseum mode. Additionally, the projected revenue model based on player engagement may be overly optimistic, especially considering the uncertainties surrounding user adoption and market dynamics. Without a more comprehensive strategy to address long-term user retention and scalability challenges, it is uncertain whether the proposed grant would significantly contribute

for achieving a sustainable growth within the Arbitrum ecosystem. Therefore, we would recommend rejecting the proposal in its current form.

Bebop

GFX Feedback)

We thought this was a very interesting grant. It offers a fun incentive mechanism with the prize box. Unfortunately, in a (correct) attempt to mitigate sybil farming of that prize box, it would be restricted to existing accounts. That dramatically narrows the focus of the grant, since it's no longer able to use its most interesting mechanism to acquire new users for Arbitrum, and instead must make it up with increasing the amount of activity of existing users. In the end, the score was not high enough to recommend approval, but we strongly encourage the applicant to reapply to future grants cycles, particularly if they can find a way to retain sybil resilience and also target new users.

404 DAO Feedback)

Bebop presented a very thorough well written application. They scored well across most of the rubric; however, their milestone section could've been improved greatly to include trackability and focus on increasing activity. Due to the nature of the execution strategy, pairing usage incentives with increased solvers for best execution, as well as their strong justification, fair grant ask, and current traction we will be supporting application.

GMX Feedback)

Bebop, a DEX aggregator, has a considerable user base on various Layer 2 solutions, positioning them well to attract users from other L2 platforms to Arbitrum with the proposed incentives. Their unique incentive mechanisms, including gasless transactions and mystery box campaigns, add an unique aspect to their proposal. Moreover, BeBop offers easy integration for other projects through their APIs, enhancing composability within the ecosystem. The introduction of their aggregation system, JAM, aims to optimize trades for users, further contributing to their appeal. While the grant size is deemed somewhat high, there's confidence in BeBop's ability to deepen their presence within the Arbitrum ecosystem using the 400k incentives. Although it would have been preferable for them to demonstrate success on Arbitrum with a smaller grant initially, the overall consensus is to approve the proposal, acknowledging its potential to drive volume and engagement within the ecosystem.

Karel Feedback)

Vote FOR BeBop's proposal.

Strong proposal that scored well across the rubric. Has demonstrated meaningful adoption across L2s with traction on Arbitrum ready to be scaled. Highly composable with other Arbitrum DeFi protocols. Meaningful target milestones/KPIs to grow volume and that are well justified relative to recent traction on Arbitrum without incentives to highlight ability to scale up from here. While not disqualifying aspects, would have liked to see the following adjusted: (i) slight reduction in grant size (300k); (ii) more detail around the Mystery Box mechanic on proposed

allocation of the ARB and mechanics; and (iii) a rebalancing from the ARB Mystery Box allocation to another incentivization mechanic that can encourage new user growth (given the 1-month requirement for account age discourages new users from being able to access 70% of the incentives).

Bedrock

GFX Feedback)

We think this grant plan is conceptually in going in the correct direction, but is requesting a large amount and some portions of the distribution plan may leave the grant open to abuse by sybils. More details on how and when the ARB is actually distributed to various users would probably satisfy this. Strongly recommend this applicant reapply in subsequent grants cycles.

GMX Feedback)

Unfortunately we won't be supportive of the approval of Bedrock's application. LST/RST sector is heavily saturated and it is not clear from their proposal how exactly they plan to standout. However, their TVL figures (\$140mn in restaked ETH) suggests there is demand for their product offering, We just think their ask is too much. If Bedrock lowered their ask, we would be more receptive. Feel their grant request size is too large and a smaller amount could achieve a similar result. We also question how much stickiness the platform will have once EigenLayer no longer distributes their points. We saw no firm plan how they would keep users using their token after points+EigenPoints+Arb Incentives end. We are rejecting the application mostly on the basis of size of grant request.

404 DAO Feedback)

Bedrock presented a thorough and complete application that fully justified their large request. Their execution strategy covered all points across the rubric and was impressed with their recent uptick in usage. We felt the grant ask was fairly justified and Bedrock leaning into strong partner protocols will lead to nice second order effects for the ecosystem. We will be supporting this proposal.

Wintermute Feedback)

Bedrock had a really strong application with clear and concise KPI, goals, and milestones. Their execution strategy is clear and has a very large focus on working with Arbitrum protocols to bootstrap liquidity for uniETH. Their protocol has seen great growth since launch and will provide valuable infrastructure to Arbitrum. Lastly, their requested grant size is sufficiently justified through reasonable calculations. We will be supporting this application.

Karel Feedback)

Vote AGAINST Bedrock's proposal.

Well-written proposal and LST/RST are a promising space as a whole but unable to endorse this proposal for the following reasons: (i) while they've demonstrated great traction on L1, given the relatively sizeable requested grant size, it warrants further justification around the amount; (ii) related to (i), need to see the waters "tested" first on Arbitrum to understand if there is sufficient market demand that can be scaled with incentives; and (iii) would like to see more rationale around stickiness after incentives end for ARB via LTIPP, EigenLayer Points, and Bedrock Diamonds.

Beefy

404 DAO Feedback)

Beefy presented a clear execution strategy to help use incentives to bootstrap its new ALM products. The rest of their application was also very thorough in regards to milestones, KPIs, and available data. Their team has proven its ability to execute and they have gained significant traction on Arbitrum since STIP. Overall, we believe they have properly justified the grant request and we'll be supporting this application.

GFX Feedback)

Beefy offers a strong track record, a long history with Arbitrum, scored highly in security, and presents a straightforward plan of execution. We recommend this grant be approved.

GMX Feedback)

Yes, we will be supporting the proposal. Beefy has a solid reputation and a proven track record of building successful protocols not only on Arbitrum but also across other EVM ecosystems. The team's experience is commendable, instilling confidence in their ability to deliver on their proposed milestones. However, there is a concern regarding the timeline for disbursing the incentives, as the proposed timeframe seems to exceed the duration of the program. This discrepancy should be addressed to ensure proper fund allocation and utilization. The Beefy ALM product is innovative, leveraging concentrated liquidity from various DEXes on the Arbitrum ecosystem to incentivize users, which is a unique approach to distributing incentives. Nevertheless, there are some weaknesses to consider, such as the potential lack of stickiness of liquidity gained via LTIP Rewards and the competition in the concentrated liquidity space. Additionally, the selection criteria for incentivized pools and the sizable grant amount for an unproven product raise some concerns. While the project shows promise, it may face challenges in attracting significant TVL without sufficient incentives. Overall, while the proposal has strengths, it also presents valid concerns that warrant careful consideration before allocating funds.

BiDefi

Wintermute Feedback)

BiDefi's application was very weak and honestly missed the objective of the Arbitrum LTIPP. Their grant size was extremely large given the protocol's activity, they had no descriptive KPIs or milestones with concrete numbers, they have no audits, and their whole plan is to auction off the ARB they received so that they could generate a lot of revenue for their protocol. This violates the rules of the program.
We will not be supporting this application.

GFX Feedback)

The concept of multi-chain auctions is interesting. This grant plan is simply to auction off the ARB grant, which we can't support.

Karel Feedback)

Vote AGAINST BiDefi's proposal.

Poor proposal across many dimensions (activity, audit, etc.). Main disqualifying factor is use of grant to auction off for revenue purposes

Bond Protocol

404 DAO Feedback)

Bond Protocol presented a strong application that detailed the novelty of their product and execution plan in a clear & concise manner. They're a team that has built on Arbitrum for over a year now and have properly justified the grant ask despite moderate (though improving) usage. A more complete milestone section along with detailed KPIs that were more justified would've strengthened the application. But overall this is a project and application that we support.

Wintermute Feedback)

Bond Protocol's application scored well across a lot of criteria. They have a great track record, a good Arbitrum relationship, and bring innovative infrastructure. Their application was well-written and clear in their goals, KPIs, and milestones.

They have a solid reward distribution mechanism and really like the focus on working with protocols for their treasury management needs as this is rather sticky; we hope that the asset acquisitions are directly supporting LP efforts. However, we would've liked to see more justification behind the calculation of the grant size.

The grant size is rather large given the total activity of Bond on Arbitrum, but given the usage of incentives, we think it's okay.

We will be supporting this application.

Karel Feedback)

Vote FOR Bond Proposal's proposal.

Strong proposal with an innovative solution tackling bonds and treasury management needs for teams. Bonds are a strong reward and incentive mechanism is a sticky solution for projects (as evidenced through Olympus Pro adoption). Still nascent on Arbitrum but meaningful growth has been observed. Would have liked to see more detail around selection of the six bond issuers (criteria) as well as the timeline and milestones (eg. when this will turn on and how they will go through pipeline to execute against incentives). Over to the DAO!

Brahma

Wintermute Feedback)

Brahma's application was very strong and scored well across a lot of criteria. They provided very thorough justifications and explanations of their goals, KPIs, milestones, and how they will benefit the Arbitrum ecosystem.

Their product adds increased utility and features to Safe, making access to DeFi a lot easier for sticker users like DAOs and multisigs.

They provided a great execution strategy that incentivises usage of other Arbitrum DeFi protocols, encourages stickiness, and aims to migrate users to Arbitrum.

Their requested grant size was sufficiently justified. While the project doesn't have a crazy amount of adoption, these are the types of infrastructure projects the DAO should be supporting.

GFX Feedback)

The applicant's project is showing signs of traction, and the request amount was justified with target APY, which was helpful, but the target seemed somewhat arbitrary. The request is large relative to the protocol size, however. The applicant is advised to revise and resubmit in later grants cycles with a plan that identifies drivers of current growth and specifically replicates or scales that growth.

Karel Feedback)

Vote FOR Brahma's proposal.

Innovative project and well-written proposal across the rubric. Liked the allocation factors and believe there's sufficient diversity to ensure grant goes to the right users within the project. Would like to see further detail on composability and partnerships with other Arbitrum protocols (re: automation/batched routines) and justification behind the grant size and the execution plan to 5x Arbitrum TVL by end of LTIPP but given current organic traction in past few months and exposure Brahma has with other ecos (Blast), believe this is achievable.

GMX Feedback)

We would approve this proposal because it presents a comprehensive plan to drive growth and innovation within the Arbitrum ecosystem through the Brahma Console platform. The team's extensive experience and track record, coupled with their clear roadmap and well-defined objectives, inspire confidence in their ability to execute effectively. Their approach to incentivizing user engagement, increasing TVL, and achieving composability aligns well with the goals of the grant program. Additionally, the proposed milestones are ambitious yet feasible, supported by the team's past achievements and the organic growth of their platform on Arbitrum thus far. Overall, this proposal demonstrates a strong potential to contribute significantly to the development and expansion of the Arbitrum ecosystem.

Buffer

Wintermute Feedback)

Buffer's application scored well across a range of criteria. The protocol has a long history on Arbitrum, multiple security audits, and good data availability. They also provided a thorough execution strategy with clear goals, KPIs, and milestones, of which some were sufficiently justified. We appreciate their emphasis on sticky liquidity and various methods to incentivise user behaviour. However, we do think rebating protocol fees that are 7.5% of a user's position is not the most ideal DAO expenditure.

Our main concern with Buffer is the notable lack of adoption and demand for the product considering their age. Looking at their stats dashboard, daily volume ranges on avg. between \$50-\$60. Their TVL also sits at ~\$125k. So while they provided great calculations in an attempt to justify their grant size, it is rather ambitious and unrealistic. We can't justify their requested grant size.

GFX Feedback)

The project is interesting, but has shown a marked lack of adoption despite its age. The biggest weakness in this grant is that nearly half the request is to rebate users for fees paid to the applicant. The applicant states, "We believe that if we refund half of our fee's we will be able to triple our volume for the 90 days that we run the program". This suggests the applicant has a pricing problem and should lower their fees at their own expense and not that of Arbitrum governance. We recommend revising with a grant plan that does not allow the applicant to profit (user pays applicant, applicant paid by Arbitrum governance grant, effectively is just Arbitrum governance paying the applicant).

Karel Feedback)

Vote AGAINST Buffer's proposal (Updated on April 5th after assessing the final proposal that was anomalously posted as a new comment versus revising the original post like other proposal (due to limitation of the governance forum and not a fault of their own) - apologies!).

The final proposal which, re-ranked, scored moderately well across the rubric. Detailed justification behind the requested grant size across its 4 buckets of proposed incentive mechanisms, and good degree of detail applying this across its set milestones. The protocol's TVL relative to its long age/tenure on Arbitrum has not seen sustained growing adoption, however shows clear alignment with the ecosystem as a native Arbitrum protocol.

However, unable to endorse to the DAO for the following reasons: (i) while Buffer has used the trading competition incentive strategy in the past (and seen moderate success), the protocol's trading fees and rebate incentivization should be revisited and tested first outside of LTIPP prior to tapping into the DAO to subsidize this. This raises two issues of the grant going to the applicant instead of the end user and a concern of stickiness after the LTIPP incentive period ends; (ii) with 31% allocated to the trading competition, would have liked to see more detail about the planned upcoming social features and how they might reduce grant distribution falling into the hands of the few + drive user growth

Suggest the applicant consider resubmitting proposal at a future grants cycle address comments above + having tested the waters with the reduced trading fee and/or a smaller grant request applied towards the other incentivization buckets.

Bunni

404 DAO Feedback)

Bunni's current metrics are a little low, but explanations were provided along with details of why they expect retention to be better. The grant ask is minimal and properly justified. Matching of bribes is a nice component and overall team has a proven track record.

GMX Feedback)

The proposal from Bunni demonstrates a well-planned strategy, evidenced by their successful past incentive campaigns and ability to consistently achieve their targets. Their collaborative efforts, such as the partnership with Connex to improve bridge UX transaction time, reflect a commitment to product enhancement. Despite the small grant size, they intend to allocate a portion of the incentives to partner protocols, showcasing a collaborative approach to ecosystem growth. Bunni's protocol, which builds on UNI V3 to offer innovative tokenomics, has shown modest adoption on other chains. With Uni V4 on the horizon, having a protocol experienced in building on V3 and contributing liquidity to the ecosystem is valuable. The proposed KPIs and milestones are reasonable, further supporting the case for funding this proposal. Overall, the combination of strategic planning, collaborative ethos, and experience building on UNI V3 makes this proposal worthy of support.

Karel Feedback)

Vote FOR Bunni's proposal.

Decent proposal. Low metrics on Arbitrum but grant ask is minimal and a worthwhile experiment to test the waters. Bribe matching strategy and co-alignment with protocols to support cost/commitment is a fine strategy.

Charm Finance

404 DAO Feedback)

Charm Finance presented a solid application that scored well across alignment, security and general merits as their strategy targets growing the WBTC/WETH pie on Arbitrum. This application benefitted from being very straightforward in their plan and purpose. While we felt their milestone orientation were weak and grant ask was relatively high to their TVL, we are supportive of this endeavor to drive this liquidity/capital to Arbitrum. The grant ask is pretty small and feel the risk is worth pushing this to the DAO.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote AGAINST Charm Finance's proposal.

Well-written proposal but the justification for grant size focused on a single vault that exceeds total amount of TVL on Arbitrum is insufficient. There's indeed a large market to be tapped into but it seems unrealistic that this will be possible for the duration of the grant."

GMX Feedback)

The Charm Finance proposal aims to bring some of the 600 million in Mainnet Liquidity they have for their WETH/WBTC vault over to arbitrum using 55k of ARB. Given the relatively small ask of the grant and the need for more wBTC liquidity on Arbitrum I would be in support of this proposal. This incentive program's KPIs will depend on how much they can attract new users to the lower cost L2 environment.

For a fairly small grant this has the potential to deepen wBTC liquidity on Arbitrum and make it so users no longer need to leave the ecosystem to swap larger amounts.

GFX Feedback)

The request is small, the execution plan simple. This is at the upper bounds of what we consider appropriate for more experimental and speculative grants. We recommend approving this grant, as it scored well overall.

Chateau Capital

GFX Feedback)

We are supporters of bringing more RWAs onchain, particularly in forms that are minimally permissioned. The timing of this application is unfortunate for Chateau, because there is no past data to view, no early successes to build upon, the execution strategy seems to lack detail, and no specific milestones were offered to hold the grantee accountable (e.g. “establish X TVL” or “onboard Y users”). We recommend Chateau get its launch completed and come back in subsequent grants cycles when it can address this feedback with proof of initial market appetite and data on what may have worked prior to governance subsidies being given.

GMX Feedback)

We are positive of supporting Chateau Capital’s grant application. RWAs are still a growth sector for DeFi. Developing this sector on Arbitrum to mature RWA development will help situate Arbitrum into further relevancy and maintain leadership as the go to DeFi space. The proposed KPIs are well-defined and measurable, ensuring accountability and transparency. Overall, this proposal aligns with the goals of expanding RWA options on Arbitrum and leveraging the benefits of decentralized finance for investors.

404 DAO Feedback)

While Chateau Capital presents an intriguing use case for Arbitrum embracing RWAs, there are too many unknowns to responsibly allocate ARB to this initiative. The incentives could constitute an endorsement for users to allocate capital to this financial product, which needs much more due diligence before making a final decision. Additionally, with limited information to verify much of the information presented, we feel it is best to allow Chateau to grow organically rather than allocating to their grant. Furthermore, issues around grant distribution are heavily present as they state, they already have precommits from outside investors. By subsidizing the 15% APR with ARB, they can assure outside investors they will meet their 15% benchmark via staking rather than delivering on the private offering.

Wintermute Feedback)

Chateau’s application lacked sufficient details and data to support their grant request. They featured 0 tangible and progressive milestone goals, and their execution strategy lacked which pools they planned on incentivizing. Furthermore, when looking at their product page there is very little data available and 0 NAV for any of their products on Arbitrum. We cannot justify their requested grant size.

Chromatic

404 DAO Feedback)

Chromatic presented a proposal that covered all the components of the rubric and specifically provided a well-thought out execution strategy for targeting growth and adoption with their

rewards programs. While the usage metrics are a little low, we believe the grant will provide an opportunity to effectively reach new and existing users while testing multiple retention strategies. We will be supporting Chromatic's proposal.

Wintermute Feedback)

Chromatic provided a thorough application that did well at targeting all criteria. They did a good job at conveying the protocol's idea and highlighting the differences they bring vs competitors. We really liked their different approach to incentivizing new users through quests with additional requirements.

Their grant size is on the larger side given their age and current protocol usage. Furthermore, we would've liked to see a bit more detail in the milestone and KPI section for incentivizing traders and liquidity providers.

Overall, we will be supporting Chromatic as there is potential to gain data on new DEX incentivization mechanisms as well as understanding if permissionless perp listings could be a potentially in-demand sector on Arbitrum.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote AGAINST Chromatic's proposal.

Good, very detailed proposal that scored moderately well on the rubric. Like the quest/points system that is described. Impressive testnet metrics but current mainnet metrics leave something to be desired. With the requested grant amount and current metrics, there needs to be further justification to dramatically grow their TVL, volume, users, etc. to the target numbers. The grant execution and milestones are qualitatively described but would like to see more granular details on projected KPIs/targets over course of LTIPP (week-by-week) to draw a better picture."

GFX Feedback)

This grant plan suffered from several weaknesses around sizing and distribution. The size, while small enough to what we consider appropriate for experiments without much track record or data support, is still as large as the protocol's TVL. More importantly, a portion of the grant request is to refund users for fees paid to the platform (and not even covering gas). This is not different from Arbitrum governance making a direct payment to the project, and is beyond the scope of this grants program. We recommend the applicant revise and resubmit in a future grants cycle without this element.

GMX Feedback)

Overall, the proposal presents a comprehensive plan for the development and growth of Chromatic Protocol in the Arbitrum ecosystem. The objectives are well-defined, and the execution strategy is detailed, outlining specific actions for user acquisition, liquidity provider incentives, and trader retention. The proposed KPIs are logical and relevant for measuring

the success of the grant objectives. Additionally, the proposal outlines a detailed roadmap, including milestones and timelines for various initiatives such as audits, protocol launches, and incentive programs. The project's ask is reasonable, and if successful with this small request, they can eventually scale. This clear plan for the project's development adds credibility to the proposal's feasibility and the team's commitment to achieving its objectives. Overall, based on the technical readiness of the project, the detailed execution plan, and the clear roadmap provided in the proposal, accepting it would likely contribute to the growth and success of Chromatic Protocol within the Arbitrum ecosystem.

Chronicle Labs

Wintermute Feedback)

Chronicle Labs is an exceptional team with a proven track record and execution ability which are the main areas they scored highly in. They expressed basic but clear milestones and goals. However, we would've liked to have seen a more descriptive execution strategy regarding the protocols they will be working with the data feeds they plan to create on Arbitrum.

Other than increasing Oracle diversity & reduced gas costs, they failed to convey the differentiation and value that they will bring to Arbitrum in comparison to other Oracle protocols. There is also no direct mechanism to reach Arbitrum users with these incentives but this is simply a product of their protocol. Lastly, given the available Oracle alternatives on Arbitrum we don't see the justification in grant size and opportunity to position Arbitrum in front of other L1/L2s.

Unfortunately, we will not be supporting this application.

GFX Feedback)

Improving oracle diversity on a chain increases the resilience of the ecosystem, not only because protocols have more choices of oracle provider, but also because protocols can use combinations of oracle providers for different risk profiles, asset types, and as failsafes in the event of a primary oracle failure.

While we would have preferred to see Chronicle present on Arbitrum prior to this grant (the first oracles appear to have been deployed at the very end of February), the request is – for at least 15 new oracles – not large compared to other oracle provider applications.

Karel Feedback)

Vote AGAINST Chronicle Labs' proposal.

Good proposal that captured the main details (existing track record, metrics, strategy, etc.) but don't believe there was enough differentiation in their Oracle offering in contrast to other existing Oracles on Arbitrum that would lead to meaningful competitive positioning

GMX Feedback)

While the proposal seems well thought out and addresses the need for high-quality decentralized Oracle infrastructure within the Arbitrum ecosystem. Having said that it's unclear if there are identified users on the chain who will pay for this service on an ongoing basis or if they will continue to support these oracles after the subsidy ends (this campaign is only for 12 weeks). Also, subsidy for oracles is largely ending with oracles like pyth, redstone, and chainlink datastreams going to a pull-based user-paid model. Additionally a future proposal could better cover multiple specific KPIs related to the performance and reliability of the Chronicle Oracles on Arbitrum.

Cian

GFX Feedback)

This grant plan is straightforward in execution, deliverables, and justification. It helps that Cian also has a history of growth. We recommend approving this grant.

Wintermute Feedback)

Cian's application was very strong and scored well across multiple areas. They provided clear milestones, KPIs, and goals. Furthermore, they provided sufficient calculations and justifications for their grant size and milestones given the level of activity of the protocol.

The protocol has demonstrated clear demand from users with very strong TVL and userbase across multiple networks. The execution strategy is simple and will have second-order effects due to its composability, however, we would've liked to see some more innovation on encouraging users to migrate to Arbitrum.

We will be supporting this application.

Karel Feedback)

Vote FOR Cian's proposal.

Good proposal and decent growth since launching. Driving further LST adoption on Arbitrum is necessary and will help solidify Arbitrum's competitive position in the market. Straightforward request and good grant size to support well-justified KPI/metric targets. Cian's Grand Adventure initiative is novel and supports longer-term stickiness that may potentially outlive LTIPP. Only part I don't necessarily like is this: "part of the incentives may be allocated to new strategies built on Arbitrum; TBD." as it is an unknown and unclear.

Clipper

Wintermute)

Clipper's application was good and scored well in various criteria. They provided clear and concise explanations across their application - KPIs, milestones, and objectives.

Their grant size was sufficiently justified with calculations and their projections seem somewhat reasonable. We really liked how they calculated target TVL based on the most common execution size, this was great.

Extra points for incentivizing their existing users to LP on Arbitrum and their stickiness mechanics.

The only concern we have is the lack of protocol adoption given their age and whether or not Arbitrum needs another LM program.

Nonetheless, we will be supporting this application.

GFX Feedback)

This application would have been strengthened by focusing on the migration of existing user base to consolidate on Arbitrum. The liquidity mining portion is difficult to support at the requested grant size given Clipper's modest size. Some of the data also seems hard to believe (in both linked Dune queries and statements in the application text), and think the applicant conflates an address with being a unique users. Milestones should also focus on verifiable, specific metrics-based targets to avoid grantees having to argue their milestones were met in order to unlock full funding.

GMX Feedback)

While the proposal outlines clear objectives and strategies for incentivizing liquidity and user migration, we have concerns regarding the size of the grant requested in relation to the projected outcomes. The justification provided for the grant size seems inflated and lacks concrete evidence to support the proposed numbers. Additionally, while the objectives are outlined clearly, the execution strategy appears somewhat speculative. Without stronger evidence and a more conservative approach to estimating outcomes, We find it difficult to support this grant application.

Karel Feedback)

Vote AGAINST Clipper's proposal.

Well-written proposal but unable to endorse for the following reasons: (i) grant milestones and execution plan is sparse and needs to be built out further in order to justify the spend by the DAO (should see specifics across a series of milestones on target conversion, user figures, TVL, etc.); (ii) the requested grant size is near half of the Arbitrum TVL at time of review which makes it difficult to justify the grants breakdown and its usage to incentivize liquidity and migration of users.

404 DAO Feedback)

Clipper presented a strong application and they have seen solid traction on mainnet in addition to some other chains. We felt their ask was fair and justified, despite the traction on Arbitrum a bit lacking. The liquidity migration is a little costly with additional concern on how loyal the capital base and/or protocol will be in the long term. We also would have liked to see stronger

orientation of milestones with measurable success checkpoints. Overall though, this was a well rounded grant proposal with sufficient justification and we will be supporting application.

Collab.Land/Telefrens

GFX Feedback)

Unfortunately, the initial grant from the Arbitrum Foundation implies a cost of almost 35 ARB to generate a single trade. It's difficult to follow up with a fresh grant request of 50,000 ARB to subsidize Telefrens when the previous grant does not appear to have generated meaningful activity. If adoption picks up significantly or other progress towards viability can be demonstrated, then we would recommend the applicant resubmit at a future date.

404 DAO Feedback)

Collab.Land has been a great tool for the Arbitrum community, but we have decided not to approve this grant due to the lack of a security audit and non-apparent sybil resistant measures to prevent individuals from signing up with multiple telegram accounts to earn rewards. While it was indicated that a product pivot is underway we also found it concerning that usage and DAU dropped off significantly in early-February. Even if marketing efforts stopped, with over 3000 cumulative users we'd expect to see more consistent Telefrens transactions. Due to these factors, we would've liked to see more justification for the grant size.

GMX Feedback)

The applicant has previously received a grant, but the outcomes have been rather disappointing. With only 43,364 ARB generating a mere \$75,000 in trading volume and 1239 new trades, the results fall short of expectations. The team appears unproven, lacking a solid track record in acquiring new users and customers. Their execution lacks innovation, and it's doubtful that they can attract new users through incentive trading. Regrettably, we cannot support this application.

Compound

404 DAO Feedback)

Despite a larger ask, we are supporting this application as Compound presented a very clear execution plan along with proper milestones and KPIs. As one of the oldest DeFi projects there is extensive data on protocol usage and their previous incentivization programs have proved to be successful. Overall, we are confident that this is a good use of LTIPP funds and will likely drive additional large users and TVL to Arbitrum.

Wintermute Feedback)

Compound's application was strong across most criteria. They presented a strong understanding of their overall vision, goals, and benefits that this will bring to Arbitrum. While we

would've liked to see more assets listed before incentives start, there is already a solid amount of demand for the protocol on Arbitrum. We think Compound's integration with CEX's, existing Whale userbase on Mainnet, and overall TVL is an important value proposition for the Arbitrum community.

They provided sufficient justification for their request grant size (although on the larger end) and their incentive design targeted more valuable and longer-lasting users.

We will be supporting this application.

Karel Feedback)

Vote FOR Compound's proposal.

Strong proposal across different parameters with a slightly high but fair final ARB ask. Good traction on Arbitrum to-date and believe the appropriate mechanisms are in-place to attract liquidity and drive users from Ethereum L1 to Arbitrum One

Connex

GFX Feedback)

This is a large request, and as a result receives close scrutiny when scoring. We support the portion of this grant that rebates costs to users bridging into Arbitrum. We are less enthusiastic about the majority of grants funds accruing to LPs. More traffic should drive fees for LPs and attract more capital. In the end, it is the end users, not the LPs who are important, and we recommend the applicant revise and resubmit in future grants cycles with the overwhelming majority of rewards finding their way to end users.

404 DAO Feedback)

Connex presented a solid grant proposal. Their unique angle targeting LST/LRTs was appreciated and is a strong value add for Arbitrum's attractiveness. Additional details on exactly the routers (LP) will be incentivization would've been helpful as it currently reads like only a users will receive majority of the incentives. There were additional components within the execution strategy that made the grant difficult to follow, but overall we believe the benefits of supporting LST/LRTs on Arbitrum is worth cost and will be supporting this application.

GMX Feedback)

The proposal looks promising, backed by a strong team with a solid background. Connex has demonstrated significant organic growth recently and has established valuable partnerships with projects on Arbitrum. The milestones outlined in the proposal appear to be accurate, although there are some questions regarding the breakdown of grants that need clarification. Connex's cross-chain platform offers a solution for cheap and fast token transfers across multiple blockchain platforms. Their request for a grant to bootstrap Arbitrum LRT liquidity addresses a

crucial need in the Arbitrum ecosystem. By incentivizing liquidity provision, Connex aims to stimulate adoption and usage of LRT on Arbitrum, which can benefit the ecosystem as a whole. The grant size is reasonable, and the proposed KPIs are acceptable. Therefore, we support the proposal.

Wintermute Feedback)

Connex's application had some interesting ideas and relevant questions. Their requested grant size was on the larger end and focused on rewarding LPs and private routers which would result in ARB not ending up in the hands of Arbitrum users. Furthermore, their justification of the requested grant size was lacking calculations and there was no benchmark to existing market yields or competitor yields. However, we did appreciate their capital lock of up Router liquidity for 6 months.

Ultimately, it's hard to justify this grant request given their execution strategy and requested grant size.

Karel Feedback)

Vote AGAINST Connex's proposal.

Well-written proposal from a reputable team and protocol supporting many DeFi protocols across the Ethereum landscape. However, was unable to endorse for the following reasons: (i) relatively large grant size with a major focus focusing on LPs and routers instead of incentivizing end-users (gas rebate) - this was a key element of LTIPP to be prioritized; (ii) the off-chain agreements with routers to lockup for 6 months is interesting re: stickiness for routers but unclear how this translates to user stickiness; and (iii) grant size needed further justification to highlight market/competitor comparables vs. direct conversations with LPs (as a primary recipient of the grant itself).

Encourage they resubmit at a later grants date addressing comments as well as a greater focus on end user incentives.

Contango

404 DAO Feedback)

Contango presented a robust application that features a novel product stack, strong usage metrics and continued alignment with Arbitrum. We also applaud their extensive data provided and thorough execution strategy that was clear and trackable. Current traction looks to be picking up heavily and their grant ask is reasonable. We will be supporting this application.

Wintermute Feedback)

Contango's application was clear and concise in describing its objectives, milestones, and KPIs; all of which were sufficiently justified through reasonable calculations. The protocol itself has seen strong growth since its launch and offers a unique product for the Arbitrum ecosystem.

Their incentive mechanism is okay but still gameable by someone remaining delta-neutral through a separate trading venue. We would've liked to have seen a better reward system that attempts to encourage activity instead of just holding an open position for a long period of time (e.g., PnL Trading competitions).

Lastly, given their protocol is built on top of other DeFi primitives there are strong second-order effects from activity on the protocol.

We will be supporting this application.

Karel Feedback)

Vote FOR Contango's proposal.

Good proposal that ranked well on rubric + protocol has seen meaningful growth on Arbitrum since launch. Would have liked to see more granularity applied to grant milestone and additional KPIs to be tracked to assess performance. Wintermute's suggestion re: running a PnL trading comp as an additional incentivization strategy is sound!

Contrax

404 DAO Feedback)

It was clear the Contrax spent a lot of time thinking about their application and execution strategy. We think their UI/UX focused product will bring in new users and like their incentive design that bases the ARB emissions on TVL growth. A small grant ask that we think is properly justified.

Wintermute Feedback)

Contrax's application was well written and provided a good amount of justification and calculation of their grant size and execution strategy. Their adoption thus far has been underwhelming, however, their product looks decent.

We like their intended execution strategy that focuses on adoption and retention. Ultimately, the incentives also carry a second-order effect by increasing TVL across other Arbitrum protocols.

While their grant size is greater than their current TVL, we believe that they have a good enough execution strategy and product that focuses on driving users to Arbitrum.

We support this application.

Karel Feedback)

Vote AGAINST Contrax's proposal.

Decent proposal that scored well on rubric. Like the cross-protocol partnerships they have in-place with other Arbitrum protocols. However, minimal product differentiation (beyond web3auth/social sign-on), has shown minimal adoption/demand for the product in contrast to peers, and requested grant size exceeds their TVL. Risk that incentives and APR boost will not lead to organic, long-term/rental usage. Believe they should prove out further traction first and resubmit proposal at a later grants window.

GMX Feedback)

The proposal from Contrax Finance demonstrates a detailed understanding of its target audience and the broader DeFi landscape on Arbitrum. Their strategy to increase TVL through competitive APRs, loyalty rewards, and gas coverage aligns well with achieving growth and innovation within the Arbitrum ecosystem. The milestone-based approach, coupled with strict clawback conditions, ensures accountability and transparency in achieving the stated objectives. Additionally, the commitment to integrating with existing DeFi projects on Arbitrum and the emphasis on user retention through DAO engagement highlight a forward-thinking approach to long-term ecosystem development. Overall, Contrax Finance's proposal presents a well-thought-out plan with clear execution strategies and measurable KPIs, making it worthy of approval.

Copin.io

GFX Feedback)

The overwhelming majority of this grant request is to rebate users for fees paid to the applicant. This is no different than directly paying the grant funds to the applicant. In general, this is not a good approach. If the applicant wishes to prove that rebates on fees paid to themselves (vs gas or to a third party) achieves the desired results, they should first demonstrate that by waiving fees for a period and then presenting the results.

Wintermute Feedback)

Copin's application had reasonable milestones, KPIs, and goals, given the protocol's activity. However, their justification of grant size was somewhat arbitrary and there were no real calculations or benchmarks used.

We would've liked to see more integrations with other Arbitrum protocols other than GMX. Furthermore, we are not sure that using 90% of their requested grant to rebate trading fees is the best use of DAO funds to actively promote user activity. Their competition program lacked details and calculations for determining the winner, providing no information about anti-sybil measures.

Unfortunately, we will not be supporting this application.

GMX Feedback)

Copin's introduction of Copy-Trading features offers a unique perspective to the market. Their impressive increase in trading volume since January 2024, even without incentives, indicates

strong organic growth and alignment with market demand, currently reaching \$2 million in daily volume. With incentives, they aim for a 150% growth to \$5 million in daily volume. The protocol roadmap and milestones are clearly defined, and the team's background instills confidence, having developed successful projects in the past. Considering the requested grant amount, the proposal presents excellent value for money. While Coppin's copy-trading feature is on GMX V1, which may be considered a slight drawback given the platform's transition to V2, the grant size is reasonable and the KPI structure appears satisfactory. The team's proven track record further ensures confidence in their ability to deliver. Overall, there are no objections to funding this proposal, as it promises to bring decentralized copy-trading and valuable analytics to the Arbitrum ecosystem. We will be supporting the proposal.

404 DAO Feedback)

While Copin presented an application with good milestones, KPIs, and execution strategy, we found it hard to justify their grant ask size. While the trading competitions were a small portion of the strategy, details like how winners will be chosen made it difficult to measure the sybil/wash trading risk. We recommend they reapply to future rounds with a revised ask.

Copra

404 DAO Feedback)

Copra's gated usage has made it difficult to judge the traction of their product and while we scored it average, their product is unique and the overall execution plan was properly detailed. Overall, we felt the grant ask was fair for a new primitive around leveraging corporate bond instruments on chain and due to its small amount we have decided to support it.

Karel Feedback)

Vote FOR Copra's proposal.

Good proposal (team, novel product, execution plan). Limited traction but interesting early signs however given the requested grant ask, it's a worthwhile experiment for the DAO to support and provide with the potential for them to achieve their target metrics. Look forward to seeing the V2 audit + bug bounty program in place.

We will be supporting this application.

GFX Feedback)

Copra offers a use case not readily available on other chains, and has requested a relatively small amount that is appropriate for new experiments and protocols. The initial launch appears to have gone well, and the goals and execution plan are clearly defined. We recommend approving this grant.

Coupon Finance

Karel Feedback)

Vote AGAINST Coupon Finance's proposal.

Unable to endorse as proposal lacks sufficient detail around the execution strategy to meet target milestones/KPIs (more granularity) and is unfinished re: funding/treasury/contract addresses

404 DAO Feedback)

This grant plans seems reasonable as an experiment, and the applicants do a good job presenting justification for the mechanism. The request size just isn't sized appropriately for an experiment (recommend about $\frac{1}{4}$ up to $\frac{1}{2}$ this request size). The grant funds would be greater than the entire TVL of the protocol at present.

GMX Feedback)

The issues we have with this grant are, it has been launched since November and the project is still not out of Alpha Phase, the grant size for an unproven model that has failed to pick up traction seems highly risky for a 100k Arb grant. We are rejecting the proposal because the objectives outlined lack clarity and specificity, making it difficult to assess the potential impact and success of the grant. While the concept of Yield Curve Control (YCC) activities is intriguing, the execution strategy provided is overly complex and may not effectively achieve the stated goal of incentivizing long-term deposits and disincentivizing short-selling of \$ARB tokens. Additionally, the proposed milestones seem ambitious given the alpha-launch stage of the protocol, and there is a lack of clear KPIs to measure success. Without a more concrete plan and clearer metrics for evaluation, it is challenging to justify allocating funds to this proposal.

Covenant Finance

Wintermute Feedback)

Covenant Finance's application was decent and they provided a clear vision of how they expect to benefit the Arbitrum ecosystem. Their product is unique and introduces a new primitive to DeFi.

Their grant request is not large and their justification is sound. However, we are concerned about their ability to execute given their age and lack of adoption due to Beta and Alpha stages. Their composability with Uniswap V3 is great and the ability for the protocol to work with long-tail and obscure assets is a great added benefit.

Given they are deployed on Optimism, we feel it should ultimately be up to the DAO to decide whether or not they want to take a risk in funding a potentially new DeFi primitive that improves Arbitrum's competitive advantage. We will be supporting this application.

GFX Feedback)

We found this to be an interesting project, and a grant plan that was simple and clear. Unfortunately, the applicant did not quite meet the cutoff where we recommend a grant be approved. Recommend the applicant resubmit in later grants cycles and focus on improving their score in the security and product usage areas. What would make this grant plan much stronger would be to go live, have some success, identify the levers that were pulled to make that happen, and then tailor a grant to scale or reproduce that initial success.

GMX Feedback)

Covenant Finance aims to bring new debt markets to the Arbitrum and Crypto Markets. The product is innovative as it allows for a perpetual debt which is not currently offered on Arbitrum. The project is able to integrate many of the native debt tokens in the ecosystem including Pendle-YT tokens. Although the project is in early stages I feel the level of innovation the project brings may be a net positive for the ecosystem, the grant size is modest and I think worth the risk for the DAO. The KPIs and milestones also seem reasonable and well thought out. We would be supporting the proposal.

404 DAO Feedback)

Covenant presents a novel DeFi primitive focusing on instantiating liquidity for perpetual debt markets. While they lack usage, we believe this is an interesting use-case for Arbitrum's DeFi ecosystem. They provided a strong execution plan and KPIs with relatively sound milestones. While this grant ask is a bit high given current usage, this is a project we think it is worth it for the DAO to take a risk on and will be supporting.

Crptex

GFX Feedback)

Unfortunately, this grant plan did not stand out with high scores in enough areas to meet the threshold for us to recommend.

404 DAO Feedback)

Cryptex presented a well written application that was clear and succinct. Our main issues reside in the execution strategy that lacked granular details around the incentive design driving long-term demand and sustainability. Additionally, we would have appreciated more details around the grant distribution as much of the FCFS rebates likely end in the hands of a few active traders. While the grant ask is relatively fair, we will not be supporting this proposal.

Karel Feedback)

Vote AGAINST Cryptex's proposal.

Proposal scored decently across rubric measures but there's insufficient justification for the grant beyond the provided TVL figure and the goal of growing TVL over the course of the LTIPP

and it is unclear how it is planned to hit TVL goals as indicated in the milestone based on their execution strategy. Stickiness to retaining TVL after the incentivization period was omitted and there was no particularly novel mechanism to distribute incentives to users.

CVI

Wintermute Feedback)

CVI presented a solid application that presented a clear execution plan alongside KPIs, goals, and milestones. Their product is unique, but likely only appeals to a small group of users as indicated by the number of current users and total volume.

While CVI presented a clear execution plan, their application had very little justification for their grant size and their outlined distributions seemed rather arbitrary in size. However, we do appreciate the actual distribution mechanism.

Unfortunately, we will not be supporting this application given the requested grant size and the points mentioned above.

GMX Feedback)

The application for a grant from CVI outlines a comprehensive plan to incentivize trading activity, enhance liquidity, and drive engagement within the Arbitrum ecosystem. However, certain aspects require further clarification. The justification for the grant size lacks transparency, as it doesn't clearly break down how the requested amount aligns with the proposed objectives. Additionally, a comprehensive risk assessment and mitigation strategy are missing, particularly concerning potential negative impacts on market stability or unintended consequences of incentivizing trading. While the project exhibits promise, refinement and clarification are necessary to justify the requested grant size and ensure responsible execution of the proposed initiatives. Additionally, the large grant size raises concerns, as it constitutes a significant portion of the current Total Value Locked (TVL). A smaller initial grant would have been preferable, allowing the DAO to assess the impact on CVI and potentially allocate a larger portion at a later date based on demonstrated results.

Karel Feedback)

Vote AGAINST CVI's proposal.

Good proposal that ranked well across rubric but unable to endorse for following reasons: (i) insufficient detail to justify the grant size and execution plan; (ii) need to see more adoption and user growth to show more market demand before turning on incentives to scale something that is proven to work.

D2 Finance

Wintermute Feedback)

D2 Finance presented a solid application that was well-written and clear in its KPIs, milestones, and goals. The product is highly composable with proven integrations and cross-protocol traction. Unfortunately, their justification for the requested grant size was rather ambitious and didn't take into account the expected native yield of their strategy vault which would offset the required amount of ARB to achieve a 30% yield.

Their requested grant size is also more than their current TVL and based on their metrics majority of their stats were achieved off one major spike towards the end of Feb.

We would've liked to see a better distribution mechanism than simply offering a yield on top of a yield and there is little effort to achieve stickiness. Given their level of TVL we are also concerned that a lot of the ARB will be rewarded to a handful of users.

There is also a lack of information regarding the actual strategy of the ARB++ vault. For example, they could target a delta-neutral ARB position and pay out yield purely with ARB incentives which is not great.

Unfortunately, we will not be supporting this application.

Karel Feedback)

Vote AGAINST d2 Finance's proposal.

Well written proposal and detailed across protocol details, partnerships, data availability, and execution. Highly composable with other Arbitrum protocols as evidenced through their integrations. Saw strong performance through the GMX STIP sub-grant but since tapered off dramatically. Unable to endorse for the following reasons: (i) grant size > current TVL; (ii) protocol life and activity relative to target KPIs seem unrealistic; (iii) insufficient detail on milestones with their noted KPIs included beyond trading volume (TVL and retention); and (iv) explanation on stickiness of users/liquidity after the incentivization period (ie. to alleviate against a similar post-GMX drop).

GFX Feedback)

The applicant presented a plan that was relatively straightforward. What would have made this plan stronger would have been identifying something successful in the past, present data on the cost effectiveness of it, and then utilizing grant funding to replicate or scale that previous opportunity. The size of this request is large for an experiment without much data – either of the grant's execution plan being used previously/elsewhere, or of the project's own extended track record – to go on.

404 DAO Feedback)

d2 Finance presented a strong application that featured a thorough execution strategy & their composability leads to second order effects throughout the Arbitrum ecosystem. They have good traction thus far and we felt like their milestones were achievable and incentive design was

well thought out. Their grant ask is on the higher side for their current usage, but we believe timing is on their side with the launch of LTIPP incentives and support the application.

GMX Feedback)

The proposal demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of the Arbitrum protocol requirements and a clear alignment with the technical specifications and commitments of the grant. The protocol is native to Arbitrum and deployed solely on its network, with a history of performance and achievements showcased through significant trading volume and TVL growth. The utilization of native tokens, such as \$D2 and xD2, adds value to the ecosystem and incentivizes user participation effectively. With a well-defined execution strategy, milestone-driven roadmap, and robust risk management measures, the proposal exhibits a strong potential to contribute to the growth and stability of the Arbitrum ecosystem. The objectives outlined for the grant, including incentivizing TVL growth, vault retention, and trading volume, are clearly defined and measurable. The proposed KPIs are appropriate indicators of success, and the mechanisms for incentivizing "stickiness" are well-considered. Overall, the proposal presents a compelling case for funding based on its technical soundness, clear objectives, and strategic approach to achieving key milestones within the Arbitrum ecosystem. Therefore, we would recommend accepting the proposal.

dappOS

404 DAO Feedback)

dappOS presented a concise application, but they scored decently across most sections in the rubric. Their product has also seen past success with incentives through GMX's grant program. While their milestone section and KPIs could've been more detailed, we feel that their distribution mechanism and the novelty of their product are strong enough reasons to support this application.

Wintermute Feedback)

dappOS's application was good and scored well across various criteria. They seem to have a pretty large user base (hard to verify such data) that is active across multiple chains and protocols, therefore, acting as a nice funnel to the Arbitrum ecosystem.

Their goals, KPIs, and milestones are all clear in their purpose and their justification of grant size is sufficient and reasonable given their goals and level of activity.

Our main concerns are that they are already receiving funding from STIP via GMX's grant program which could be seen as double dipping and it makes it hard to fully understand how organic the current metrics are.

Furthermore, their incentive mechanism does not provide any new data and mimics what has previously been done for GMX.

Overall, despite these concerns, their ability to generate strong activity seems sufficient enough to receive their requested grant size.

We will be supporting this application.

Karel Feedback)

Vote FOR dappOS' proposal.

Good proposal and scored moderately well on rubric. KPIs/milestones are realistic with existing figures and grant size is well justified. Lacking in data availability (or accessibility of it) across chains (would be good to have source of truth across all chains/protocols). Would have been good to have more information on "new campaigns on popular dApp partners" re: stickiness.

deBridge

GMX Feedback)

DeBridge has already demonstrated its value by processing over \$200 million in trading volume through Arbitrum, representing a substantial portion of the total volume without any incentives. With the introduction of incentives, these numbers are expected to grow even further. Additionally, a portion of their incentives will be allocated to partner incentives for their deBridge API integration, enhancing their composability with other ecosystem projects. The proposal outlines clear milestones, and if achieved, they have the potential to attract a significant number of users to Arbitrum. The proposal is well-written and deserving of support. DeBridge has experienced significant growth and is seeking \$1 million in incentives to reduce costs and friction for entry into the Arbitrum ecosystem. The proposed milestones aim for ambitious targets that, if met, could substantially improve the accessibility and ease-of-use of Arbitrum. This grant is expected to be a net benefit to the ecosystem, considering DeBridge's pre-incentive usage and the likelihood of retaining users post-incentives. Overall, the proposal is viewed positively, with confidence in DeBridge's ability to contribute positively to the ecosystem.

Karel Feedback)

Vote FOR deBridge's proposal.

Strong proposal that scored well across rubric. The grant request, while large, is well justified and structured across end users (makers, takers, and integration partners). Milestones/KPIs are well justified and realistic to be achieved with added incentives from the program. Would have loved more detail regarding Arbitrum integration partners and any plans to continue to grow this over time.

404 DAO Feedback)

DeBridge presented a strong application that scored well across most of the rubric. They provided strong justification for a rather large grant ask and presented a thorough execution strategy. One major issue with the proposal is around the subsidizing of outflows from Arbitrum.

While this action is subsidized at a fraction of inflows, this is not an action that we would like to see incentivized and led to a point deduction. Regardless, their recent growth along with their strong justification has led us to support this proposal.

Defined

Wintermute Feedback)

Defined's application is very clear and concise. Unfortunately, the scope of their product is extremely wide and lacks a core focus on Arbitrum. One upside to this is that this could help users from other chains reach Arbitrum, however, there is no clear strategy on how this would be achieved.

Furthermore, Defined lost a lot of marks in their incentive design, novelty, and product usage (which informed the expected benefit of the grant size). Given their age, they have failed to gain any notable amount of traction in both volume and users. Furthermore, their incentive design does not provide any unique insights and trading competitions that use PnL % can be easily gamed unless the trading competition is isolated to less-manipulable trading pools.

Lastly, we would've liked to see more Arbitrum-specific roadmap goals.

Unfortunately due to the points outlined above, we will not be supporting this application.

GFX Feedback)

The request is modest in size, the deliverables straightforward, and we generally support rebates on gas costs. We are not as keen on rebates for a protocol's own fees, however, because that is just Arbitrum governance paying the protocol in a roundabout way.

GMX Feedback)

Defined's application lacks a distinct focus on Arbitrum. While their product ambitiously aims to connect users from various chains to Arbitrum, the absence of a well-defined strategy for execution is concerning. Moreover, their incentive design, novelty, and product usage fall short, resulting in minimal traction and user engagement. The proposed trading competitions are vulnerable to manipulation which is commonly seen in the space. Additionally, a more Arbitrum-specific roadmap would have been preferable and we will not be supporting this application.

DeltaPrime

Wintermute Feedback)

DeltaPrime's application was strong and scored well across multiple criteria. They provided detailed explanations of their goals, KPIs, and milestones. Their requested grant size is rather large, however, given their ability to use previous grants effectively and increase TVL on Avalanche reduces some of the concerns. We also like how composable the project is which will lead to a direct boost in metrics for other protocols.

In contrast, we would've liked to have seen more data around protocol usage, user information, retention etc.

We will be supporting this application.

Karel Feedback)

Vote AGAINST DeltaPrime's proposal.

Well written proposal that scored well in the rubric (team, strategy, KPIs, milestones, composability) + painted a clear picture that they understand their users well and have a good amount of insight from prior incentive programs they've run (re: points system). The large requested grant size relative to their activity on Arbitrum, the set goals of ~6x-ing TVL within a quarter, and lack of clarity on retention (to support their claim of TVL not flowing out of Prime Accounts for instance re: stickiness) brings pause.

Suggest they resubmit in a future grants window with a lower amount (ie. 500k ARB / \$50M TVL) after showing more PMF within Arbitrum and integration of other protocols.

404 DAO Feedback)

Deltaprime presented a very thorough application. Their organic metrics were quite impressive and they had strong justifications behind their grant ask. We appreciate their ability to incorporate learnings from past incentives and implement desired changes into this program. Overall, we felt the application was heavily tailored to enabling growth on Arbitrum and we will be supporting this proposal.

GMX Feedback)

Based on the detailed information provided, the proposal outlines a comprehensive plan to leverage the DeltaPrime protocol to encourage growth within the Arbitrum ecosystem. The protocol has already demonstrated success on Avalanche and Arbitrum, with a track record of high TVL and user engagement. The proposed grant will further incentivize liquidity provision and borrowing activities, driving TVL growth and deepening liquidity across partner protocols. The use of milestones, speed bonuses, and retention incentives ensures user engagement and stickiness, while the multi-chain integration through the LiFi bridge enhances accessibility and attracts capital from other networks. With a robust security infrastructure, clear objectives, and well-defined KPIs, the proposal exhibits a strategic approach to achieving its goals and contributing significantly to the development of the Arbitrum ecosystem. We would approve this proposal.

Deri Protocol

GFX Feedback)

We are supportive for 30% of the grant spend proposed. The remaining 70%, however, is to rebate users fees paid to the applicant. This is hard to support for several reasons. Firstly, the applicant hasn't demonstrated that fee waivers worked to increase (and then retain) volume before asking for a large amount of funding. Secondly, rebating fees paid to the applicant, as opposed to gas or third party fees, is equivalent to governance directly giving the applicant funding. Thirdly, when fees are at or approach 100% and also are fees to the applicant, this creates a perverse incentive for the applicant to encourage wash trading, sybil farming, or steering the grant funds to rebate the highest margin trades. We recommend the applicant revise and resubmit in future grants cycles with either a different distribution mechanism or significant guard rails to address the concerns above.

Wintermute Feedback)

his application was decent and scored well across various criteria. Their execution strategy was clear however, it lacked any form of justification or calculations on how they intend to reach their milestones and KPIs. Incentives for LPs were not benchmarked against market rates and they just targeted arbitrary numbers for TVL and daily trading volume.

Their requested grant size is on the large end and is not sufficiently justified, this is further compounded by a lack of daily users.

Lastly, we are not sure if spending 70% of this grant on trading rebates are the best use of DAO funds.

We will not be supporting this application.

Karel Feedback)

Vote AGAINST Deri's proposal.

Decent proposal but unable to endorse for following reasons: (i) 70% of grant is set to go to the applicant as a fee rebate vs. end users is outside of LTIPP scope and may lead to misaligned incentives to encourage wash trading/sybil/et al.; and (ii) insufficient justification on how they will achieve target milestones/KPIs.

Consider resubmitting with just the 30% grant size focused on LP rewards and greater justification on the above.

Dodo

Wintermute Feedback)

Dodo provided a solid application and mainly scored well due to their reputation, ability to execute, age on Arbitrum, security, and data availability.

However, their application lacked clarity regarding how they plan to distribute incentives. There was no granular breakdown provided on how they plan to distribute rewards over the 12 weeks. Their calculation for their requested grant size also lacked details and justification i.e., the grant requested was calculated on their desired TVL and target APY for the protocol and not on individual pools.

Furthermore, we have concerns over the efficacy of the incentive program as they have struggled to grow their TVL despite incentivizing the protocol over the past 2 years.

Unfortunately, due to the unclear execution strategy, lack of justification of grant size, and underwhelming growth of the protocol we cannot justify the size of the grant request. We will not be supporting this application.

Karel Feedback)

Vote AGAINST DODO's proposal.

Strong, complete application with a long history on Arbitrum. However, do not support the requested grant size for the following reasons: specificity on the program milestones and how they plan to distribute incentives (much of it is highly dependent on real-time refinement informed by data and community feedback). Despite their long-standing on Arbitrum (2+ years), they have not seen significant growth and do not see incentives being put to good use here.

404 DAO Feedback)

Dodo scored well due to their Arbitrum alignment, extensive available data, and multiple audits + bug bounty program. However, we believe the current grant request is much too large given their historic product usage. We would of liked to see a lower ask paired with stronger justifications to feel comfortable with the grant ask. We unfortunately will not be supporting this application for LTIPP, but encourage them to reapply for future incentive programs with a revised application.

DoG Protocol

Wintermute Feedback)

DoG Protocol's application scored pretty well across most of the criteria. They're offering unique infrastructure that can be easily leveraged by other game developers on Arbitrum specifically targeted towards increasing game usage and user retention. Their product is highly composable and their distribution mechanism is simple and clear.

In contrast, the application lacked clear anti-sybil mechanisms or best practices for protocols looking to set up in-game quests. There is also very little data or available metrics for the protocol given its age on Arbitrum.

We will be supporting this application.

GFX Feedback)

This grant plan highlights existing traction for the project, how to scale that with the aid of a grant, and delivers a clear strategy to do so.

GMX Feedback)

DoG Protocol's application showcased a comprehensive approach, with their SDK compatible with major game engines, simplifying game development for developers. Their strategy involves collaboration with 21 games, aiming for synergy with prominent gaming protocols on Arbitrum, such as Treasure. The allocated funding is intended to bolster user acquisition, enhance game usage, and improve user retention. Their product exhibits high composability, and their execution plan is well-defined. However, there is a noted absence of anti-sybil mechanisms, and we encourage the inclusion of additional metrics for monitoring performance and Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). Despite these considerations, we extend our endorsement for DoG Protocol's application.

Equilibria

Wintermute Feedback)

Equiliria's application scored well across most criteria. Their application had a thorough execution plan with sufficient justification for milestones, goals, KPIs, and the calculation of their requested grant size.

Furthermore, their execution strategy should lead to a significant amount of stickiness and long-term benefits post-incentive period. The protocol's design will inherently make Arbitrum more competitive due to higher socialized yields. Lastly, there has been proven demand for the product and the grant will help scale it further.

We will be supporting this application.

404 DAO Feedback)

Equilibria presented a solid application with strong justification and a fair ask. Overall we are supportive of their execution plan and believe that optimizing yield opportunities for Pendle participants will bring additional TVL and activity to Arbitrum. We will be supporting this application.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote FOR Equilibria's proposal.

Well-written proposal that scored decently on rubric. Given traction of product, justification for grant size, and detailed execution plan and approach to driving stickiness post-LTIPP, believe good use of DAO capital to incentivize and scale up further."

Factor

404 DAO Feedback)

Factor scored well across a majority of the rubric. We appreciate the team's commitment to Arbitrum and their continued Arbitrum native roadmap. Additionally, the product has started to catch some traction with their recent incentives mechanism. While their grant ask is a little high for their current usage, we believe the incentives can compliment their recent traction and support further protocol growth benefits. However, their incentive design(bribe mechanism based on veFCTR) does lead to the potential of weak distribution, mainly whales and OGs receiving the majority of rewards. Overall, we feel the benefits outweigh the costs and we support this application.

GMX Feedback)

We are generally supportive of Factor's grant application. They have been present in the space for a while with a provable track record and the grant ask seems responsible, along with their proposed plan of action for the grants. Considering Factor is currently in the rollout stage of the product they have spent a long time building, I expect the grant to strengthen this process and be quite cost-effective and based on Factor's incentive strategy outlined in their proposal, We would be inclined to accept the proposal. The strategy demonstrates a clear understanding of how to incentivize user adoption and liquidity depth within the Factor ecosystem on Arbitrum. By leveraging dynamic reward allocation, targeted boost incentives, and enhanced rewards for veFCTR holders, Factor aims to create stickiness among users and ensure sustained engagement over time. The proposed KPIs are well-defined and directly align with the grant objectives, providing clear metrics for evaluating success. Additionally, the milestones set forth are ambitious yet realistic, with a clear roadmap for achieving them over the 12-week grant period. Overall, Factor's incentive strategy appears robust and well-thought-out, making it a compelling proposal for acceptance.

GFX Feedback)

Our main concern with this grant plan is requesting an amount that is nearly as much as the entire protocol's TVL. The applicant scored highly in other areas, like composability, and solidly in most areas, which managed to offset the penalty to their score from the grant size. We recommend this grant be approved.

Fiat 24

Karel Feedback)

"Vote AGAINST Fiat24's proposal.

Interesting and good proposal that scored well on the rubric. Coming from FinTech and the open banking world, it's an impressive feat with their accolades re: receiving a Swiss banking license and building this atop Arbitrum. On the grant size, it is large for what will generally support a relatively closed and less composable ecosystem and the structure of the grant is not optimal with a portion going towards affiliate partnerships. Recommend they resubmit in a later grants window with a lower amount and focus only on the referral campaigns."

404 DAO Feedback)

While Fiat24 presented a strong application we are concerned about the potential for a double dipping of grant funds due to the overlap in SafePal's proposal. Both proposals presented similar execution plans by rewarding users who sign up, complete KYC, and transact. Additionally, the affiliate partner program grants will likely be going to other LTIPP applicants who use of Fiat24. Fiat24 has run a previous referral program of 19k, but the requested 490k is a big step up. Given the large ask of Fiat24, we have decided to support SafePal and its smaller request to see how this type of referral & sign up program performs over the next 3 months. Regarding their application specifically, the milestone section was lacking and additional data on usage would've been helpful. We encourage Fiat24 to apply again for the LTIP.

GMX Feedback)

The proposal presents a comprehensive overview, showcasing strong collaborations with industry giants like Visa and Mastercard. From the perspective of Real World Assets (RWA), the protocol has demonstrated decent growth, and with the proposed incentives and milestones, we anticipate significant adoption within the RWA space. The protocol's roadmap is clearly defined, with plans to expand and transition into an orbit chain, aligning well with Arbitrum's protocol goals. With all users undergoing KYC procedures, the risk of sybil attacks is mitigated, as each individual possesses a unique identity. Additionally, Fiat24 has previously proven its ability to onboard users into the RWA arena through a grant from the Arbitrum foundation. This presents a unique opportunity to blend DeFi and RWAs using the Arbitrum Stack. While the overall grant size is substantial, it has the potential to catalyze a wave of RWA users, benefiting the ecosystem as a whole. The proposed KPIs and milestones appear reasonable, and the team exhibits a commendable level of experience. Considering these factors, there is strong support for this proposal.

GFX Feedback)

This grant plan, while expensive, explicitly targets onboarding new users to Arbitrum and with a product that provides real utility. We recommend approving this grant.

Wintermute Feedback)

Fiat24's application was very unique and awesome to see. They bring novel infrastructure to Arbitrum that will likely result in very sticky TVL and users. Their application was solid with decent justifications for milestones, KPIs, and goals. Their requested grant size is on the larger end however, it is in line with their onchain metrics. They provided sufficient justification and calculation of their requested grant size through the cost of customer acquisition and their execution strategy follows closely to previous incentive plans that have worked well for them.

We are typically hesitant to reward grants to projects with KYC barriers, however, in this case, if successful, we believe Fiat24 can significantly improve the competitive landscape of Arbitrum.

Florence Finance

Wintermute Feedback)

This application did well in providing clear milestones, objectives, and KPIs. However, there is little data to support that there is demand for the protocol as ~95% of TVL is supported by the founders. This data also struggles to support the validity and quality of the protocol's +10k depositors.

Furthermore, the proposed incentive mechanisms provide no new data to the Arbitrum ecosystem and fail at attempting to encourage stickiness.

Unfortunately, given the points above, we don't think the grant size is justified and do not support this application.

GMX Feedback)

Florence Finance has not yet attained product-market fit, as indicated by their low TVL of 4.5M, with the majority of liquidity originating from founders and original Liquidity Providers.

Consequently, only 0.3M of TVL stems from organic LPs. Considering the grant size of 166,153 ARB, which appears relatively substantial given the team's limited track record, approving this grant could pose a significant risk. Therefore, we are unable to support Florence's application.

GFX Feedback)

Given how long Florence has been operating, a more specific grant plan that identified a past success and then used the grant funds to scale or repeat that success is recommended. If the applicant reapplies in future grants cycles, we recommend focusing on what Florence has already done well, then doubling down on it and also explaining how Florence's success helps to increase the number of users or assets on Arbitrum.

Fluid

404 DAO Feedback)

Fluid presented a solid application with an ask that is a bit high. Their KPIs and milestone section could've been improved as well. But, they provided great data and have seen a pick up in activity over the last couple months with a grant from GMX. Given the state of the telegram bot industry and the opportunity it presents for Arbitrum, we will be supporting this application.

GMX Feedback)

I am generally supportive of approving Fluid's grant application. Like stablecoins, the Bot sector in DeFi is growing and even saturated. However, since they tend to translate into direct adoption, and the main usecase is abstracting-UI/UX and ease-of-use, Bots might be one of those sectors it makes sense to develop even as it becomes saturated. The more users with an

abstracted and easy-to-use way to access Arbitrum, the better. A few good telegram bots in Solana have proven to be super catalytic in powering retail onboarding. I believe Arbitrum can always benefit from a good telegram bot. Fluid has a good program to retain existing users and making sure that onboarding new users does not go into waste if these users do not continue using their services, which is very important to the ecosystem.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote AGAINST Fluid's proposal.

Good proposal across most criteria in the rubric and has seen meaningful traction since launching via the GMX grant, however the grant execution and distribution mechanism seems unfinished and for that reason, can't endorse this. It references 110k for the trading competition and 40k for the affiliate program (together, 50% of the total grant ask) but lacks detail on how these will be run. Would also like to see more detail on plan to integrate other protocols and form partnerships beyond GMX on Arbitrum. Suggest applicant resubmit with more detail at a later grants cycle with details on the above."

GFX Feedback)

The funds requested are significant in size, and the applicant already has a large grant from GMX that has not yet concluded. We would prefer to see the results of that grant (including the amount of volume that continues once it concludes) before making a grant this size to a new project. Additionally, we strongly recommend the applicant remove in future requests any rebates of their own fees. Allowing the applicant to directly profit from the grants funding is beyond the scope of this – and most – grants programs.

Wintermute Feedback)

Fluid's application was quite solid with detailed information across most areas. They provided clear milestones, goals, and KPIs. However, their application lacked the calculation and justification of their grant size. Their requested grant size is rather large and despite the team having prior experience with growth campaigns, when looking at protocol metrics (users & no. of trades) we felt the grant size is unjustified. Unfortunately, we will not be supporting this application.

Fluidity

GFX Feedback)

Perhaps we're misunderstanding it, but the protocol's core mechanism seems vulnerable to sybil farming via wash trading. Irregardless, the request is enormous compared to the current size of the protocol and the applicant is currently still administering a previous grant. We would want to see the previous grant conclude and data that support it was effective before providing another one that's a million dollars in size.

404 DAO Feedback)

Fluidity scored well across majority of the rubric, providing clear and effective KPIs, solid milestones and an appreciated amount of co-contribution. Unfortunately, the grant ask is very high relative to their current usage (4x TVL) and past incentive programs have not shown strong retention. We encourage to Fluidity to reapply to future programs with a revised ask that is more respective of their current metrics.

GMX Feedback)

I am generally positive to supporting Fluidity's grant application. Their protocol is multichain and well established, handling impressive monthly volumes (\$300mn+). Their security record is also impressive and they've made an explicit mention as to how they plan and intend to counter sybil related activity to ensure clean usage of the grant. The provision of rewards via airdrop while using the wrapped USDC is an interesting and innovative way, and can bring more users to arbitrum. The program for usage of the ARB grants, the targeting and anti-sybil measures etc are planned well in detail. It is very clear they spent much energy and time on planning out the grant usage and I believe the grant would be very efficiently spent by them.

Wintermute Feedback)

Fluidity's application was quite strong, providing thorough explanations of KPIs, goals, and milestones. Their product is very unique and could potentially find a better use case in non-stablecoin assets. However, we don't think the product is very valuable to Arbitrum in its current form. The DAO is effectively encouraging and subsidising network spam which brings very little value to the ecosystem and hurts user experience outside of the Fluidity ecosystem. This is clear in their Dune stats where their fUSDC TVL is extremely low but overall volume is very high.

We unfortunately cannot justify supporting this application due to the requested grant size and intended usecase of the protocol.

Fringe Finance

Wintermute Feedback)

The application was okay but missed on a lot of the criteria. There was little calculation and justification of the grant size other than targeting certain TVL levels, however, we'd like to have seen the calculations made against pools they have on the platform index it against the market. The protocol offers some slight innovations i.e., larger focus on longer tail markets however their core concepts are identical to most other large DeFi protocols. Lastly, there is very little adoption.

They had some nice ideas in which they plan to incentivize stickiness and induce milestone unlocks.

Unfortunately, we will not be supporting this application.

GFX Feedback)

The applicant's request is larger than the protocol's TVL according to DeFi Llama. The age of the protocol also makes it difficult to provide a grant that's not focused on a specific mechanic and sound reasoning. For a protocol this age, we would recommend going back and finding something that worked well already in the past, then tailoring a grant plan to replicating or scaling that past success.

GMX Feedback)

The application lacks specificity and clarity, particularly concerning the utilization of grant funds and the mechanisms for incentivizing long-term participation on the Arbitrum network. Despite outlining objectives and an execution strategy, the proposal fails to provide detailed plans, measurable KPIs, and clear milestones, making it challenging to assess the potential success and impact of the program. Additionally, while the proposed incentives may attract initial liquidity, there's a lack of assurance on how the protocol will retain TVL and get a sustained growth in the Arbitrum ecosystem. Overall, the application does not sufficiently demonstrate how funding it would provide a lasting benefit to the ecosystem. Therefore, rejecting the application is advisable at this stage.

GammaSwap

Wintermute Feedback)

GammaSwap's application was good and scored well across a range of criteria. They provide clear and concise explanations of their milestones, KPIs, and objectives.

Their product is innovative and unique and attempts to solve a major problem for one of the largest DeFi categories. We really like their esARB mechanism which should create a notable amount of supply side benefits post LTIPP. Their execution strategy is sound and their TVL estimations and calculations are sufficiently justified.

Unfortunately, they are a niche product that is complex and may not appeal to a lot of users which is indicated in their lack of adoption. Nonetheless, there still seems to be some baseline of activity.

Their requested grant size is on the larger end for their protocol usage, however, given the points above we think it's sufficiently justified.

We will be supporting this application.

GFX Feedback)

This application largely suffered from being a very large request relative to the TVL and age of the protocol. It would also have benefited from more details around under what conditions or guidelines the incentives would be deployed, as they currently appear to be very discretionary for the applicant. Recommend the applicant resubmit in future grants cycles once there is more history and an initial success to build upon using grant funding.

404 DAO Feedback)

GammaSwap presented a strong application, scoring well across most of the rubric. We did feel the grant ask was a little high relative to their TVL, but given the uniqueness to their product we can understand how the protocol may not attract your everyday user. Given the strength and justification of their execution strategy, KPIs, and milestones we are supportive of this proposal to move to a DAO vote.

Karel Feedback)

Vote FOR GammaSwap's proposal.

Good proposal that scored well across the rubric which sufficient justifications around the grant size, the approach to executing against the plan, and maintaining results after LTIPP. Novel and innovative protocol that provides some degree of differentiation in contrast to the market which supports some of the stickiness considerations. They've demonstrated modest traction and adoption on Arbitrum to "test the waters" without incentives, and while the grant size requested is on the higher end in contrast to their TVL (~1-2 thirds of it), believe this is a worthwhile investment from the DAO to scale up adoption based on initial results.

Garden Finance

Wintermute Feedback)

This application struggled across a range of criteria. We don't think the DAO would benefit from spending 334k ARB on simply rebating a single bridging asset (BTC) as it provides little value and insight into the Arbitrum ecosystem.

The fee rebate provides little insight into incentive designs and doesn't necessarily target increasing activity and usage on Arbitrum. They could've been more creative in their mechanism design to encourage users to actively trial the product and perform actions on Arbitrum.

Furthermore, when looking at the most recent data on their Dune dashboard. Activity has dropped off significantly after their farming seasons, indicating there is a clear lack of demand; So much so that there is little justification for their requested grant size.

Unfortunately, we will not be supporting this application.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote AGAINST Garden Finance's proposal.

Decent proposal and scored moderately on the rubric. Where it falls short is on incentivize design and how they ensure stickiness (a question they deleted from their response). Since the close of their farming season, the product usage as grinded to a halt and they could benefit from further composability and cross-partnerships with other Arbitrum DeFi protocol to maintain ongoing usage vs. activity being driven only through farming seasons. Feels like this grant would only serve purposes of propping up activity vs. driving organic usage and second/third-order benefits of users performing actions on Arbitrum."

GMX Feedback)

The application from Garden Finance falls short and fails to articulate clear benefits for the Arbitrum ecosystem. Crucial details regarding the execution plan are lacking, leaving room for uncertainty. Furthermore, existing bridging partners have already cultivated loyal user bases, prompting skepticism about the necessity of funding additional bridges. While Garden Finance aims to bridge resources from the Bitcoin ecosystem, allocating resources to funding additional bridges may not represent the most optimal use of the program's resources. Unfortunately we will not be supporting Garden Finance's application.

Gearbox

Wintermute Feedback)

This application was great and scored well across various criteria. Gearbox has a unique and novel product that complements DeFi well and is very composable. They have proven their ability to achieve PMF and work with incentives

They provided clear objectives, KPIs, and goals, and a sufficient justification for their requested grant size.

Their execution strategy has a nice focus on migrating their existing users to Arbitrum while focusing on hot sectors in DeFi. We would've liked have seen a bit more details in their execution strategy regarding rewarding trading volume and anti-sybil measures.

We will be supporting this application.

GFX Feedback)

We're hesitant at this level of grant funding, but the applicant has demonstrated exceptional adoption on mainnet in recent months. The strong performance and track record of the applicant generally overcomes the large size of the request to what is effectively to deploy to Arbitrum.

GMX Feedback)

Gearbox's proposal introduces a unique feature called Credit Accounts, an account abstraction primitive that has the potential to attract significant capital to Arbitrum. The objectives outlined in the proposal are clear, well-defined, and aligned with driving growth and innovation within the Arbitrum ecosystem. Their execution strategy, incorporating mechanisms such as farming and incentivizing margin trading, demonstrates a thoughtful approach to achieving the program's goals. The allocation of resources and incentives across different pools and strategies reflects a strategic focus on driving user engagement and liquidity provision.

The proposed timeline and milestones are realistic, offering a clear pathway for assessing progress throughout the grant period. Emphasizing target utilization ratios and total transaction volume underscores a commitment to driving user adoption and engagement, vital for the success of any protocol. Furthermore, their strategy to incentivize stickiness through continued integration with other protocols highlights a long-term commitment to enhancing composability

within the ecosystem, benefiting not only Gearbox but also other projects and the overall Arbitrum ecosystem.

Additionally, Gearbox has a proven track record of innovation, attracting users with both simplistic interfaces and high yields, such as their leveraged ETH EigenPoint system. The grant size appears modest considering the value Gearbox brings to the ecosystem, enabling users to explore new DeFi strategies with ease. With a history of successfully gathering TVL using their own incentives, coupled with the Arb Grant, Gearbox is expected to attract even more TVL. Overall, the proposal presents a well-thought-out plan with achievable objectives, clear KPIs, and a strategic approach to creating more growth and innovation within the Arbitrum ecosystem. Therefore, we fully support the proposal.

Giveth

GFX Feedback)

We think a presence on Arbitrum by Giveth would be a benefit to the ecosystem. This grant plan, however, suffers from vague milestones that the grantee is unlikely to meet to unlock full funding. We recommend specific metrics that are unambiguous and can be easily verified (e.g. number of donations, amount donated, new donors, projects meeting their fundraising goals, or whatever else the applicant deems a good goal). Also, we cannot support using the majority of the grant to LP the applicant's governance token. LPing is an offer for sale, so directly providing ARB to LP (vs incentivizing others to LP) seems a lot like giving the applicant the ARB to sell, and we cannot support it. Recommend revising for future grants cycles with incentives more clearly focused on Giveth's mission and core competencies than its tokenomics.

404 Feedback)

Giveth presented a well-rounded proposal, one that specifically targets an area within Arbitrum that could use some support(PGF). The distribution on incentives would bring new users and we support Giveth's expansion to Arbitrum. However, part of their incentive design involved using the grant to directly provide liquidity for their own token which is something in our opinion falls outside the scope of LTIPP. Unfortunately, due to this component we cannot support Giveth but recommend that they reapply to either LTIP with an adjusted incentive design or another Arbitrum grant program.

GMX Feedback)

I'm generally supportive of Giveth's grant application. Public goods/charity/philanthropy applications are a natural PMF for blockchain tech. They allow a whole new segment of users, who are typically offchain, to tap into crypto, and it does not require their explicit buy-in/education/on-boarding. While I don't expect Giveth to have a large impact, their ask is small and they seem clear-eyed in their approach, and should they be successful, I think it would benefit Arbitrum

Wintermute Feedback)

Giveth's application was unique and focuses on an underrepresented DeFi category. Unfortunately, their application does not really fit into the guidelines of the LTIPP as their distribution of rewards will likely end up in the hands of protocol developers and not necessarily users and using a part of ARB rewards to fund an LP pool is not allowed. For this reason, we will be voting against this application.

Goverland

404 DAO Feedback)

Goverland presents an idea for a very compelling product (something our team probably would use), but unfortunately the grant ask falls outside what we see as the scope of LTIPP and is why they have scored poorly on this rubric (they are being graded on things that they can't provide). We recommend they either apply to the grant program from the Foundation or another avenue through the DAO such as Questbook or PL.

GMX Feedback)

Mobile-app enabled governance is something to consider in terms of relevance and future impact, but it is not something readily adaptable to where crypto is now and there are better positioned players in the space (Tally)

Karel Feedback)

"Vote AGAINST Goverland's proposal.

Interesting proposal but believe it falls outside of the scope of the LTIPP (developer grant). As a tool and product, it is interesting and is a tool that should be developed and adopted for governance purposes."

Granary Finance

Wintermute Feedback)

Granary Finance's application was solid and scored well across various criteria. They have a long history with Arbitrum and their protocol has seen some decent activity, however, it is underwhelming given the age of the project.

While they offer some slight variations to Aave V2, their product is still very similar. Their Arbitrum deployment has failed to gain any meaningful traction. Their execution strategy is pretty standard and we like their additional gamification system.

Grant size is sufficiently justified with clear goals, milestones, and KPIs. However, we are not sure that it's in the DAOs best interest to spend money on basic LM efforts for a lending protocol that is a fork of Aave and has struggled to gain traction.

Unfortunately, we will not be supporting this application.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote AGAINST Granary's proposal.

Fine proposal and detailed grant execution plan, KPIs, milestones. In particular, liked the stickiness response with their points/quest system. Unable to endorse for the following reason: product differentiation in contrast to alternatives on Arbitrum is insufficient and this is proven by adoption/traction on Arbitrum which has dwindled since early 2023. If they included some detail on how they could attract liquidity from Optimism as an example as part of the incentivization strategy, that would be compelling to review."

404 DAO Feedback)

Granary presented a well-rounded proposal. We felt their grant ask was well justified and specifically appreciated their in-house quest system to engage and retain users. Their milestones were thorough and well-justified which attributed to a perfect score across the Accountability section. We did however feel the protocol lacks a main differentiator but felt the overall strength of their application along with a reasonable grant size request make it worthwhile for the DAO to support.

GFX Feedback)

This grant plan would be considerably strengthened by identifying a past success, the mechanism that drove that success, and tailoring a grant specifically to replicate or scale that past success. Alternatively, a grant plan that specifically targeted Granary's user base on other chains to migrate to Arbitrum would be compelling.

GMX Feedback)

We would approve this proposal because it demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of the Arbitrum ecosystem and outlines clear and achievable objectives, execution strategies, and milestones. The protocol's track record, coupled with its proposed initiatives, such as expanding liquidity provision, optimizing yield strategies, and encouraging lending and borrowing activities, align well with the goals of the grant program. Additionally, the specified KPIs are relevant and measurable, providing a robust framework for assessing the success of the grant. Overall, the proposal exhibits a thoughtful and strategic approach to driving growth and innovation within the Arbitrum ecosystem, making it a strong candidate for approval.

Gravita**GFX Feedback)**

This grant plan did well in several areas. While we appreciated they modeled their grant on previous grants, it would have been much more compelling to demonstrate that the prior

grant for Dolomite delivered results supporting the goals of this applicant. Nonetheless, the plan scored well enough overall that we recommend approval.

Wintermute Feedback)

Gravita's application was solid and scored well across most criteria. They provided clear KPIs, goals, and milestones, with thorough justification of their grant size. Typically, we are not a huge fan of pure LM programs, however, given the nature of the protocol, it makes sense in this situation. Furthermore, it will certainly help the adoption of LRT tokens on Arbitrum, unlocking greater capital efficiency.

The protocol has seen solid growth since its inception and the team has proven they are effective in managing incentive programs. Lastly, they provided sufficient justifications and calculations for their request grant size.

We believe that this grant request will be a net positive for Arbitrum.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote FOR Gravita's proposal.

Well-written proposal and scored well on rubric. Protocol has seen moderate traction on mainnet and Arbitrum but GRAI currently sees limited liquidity and demand/integration on Arbitrum. Would have liked to see more granular milestones and KPIs biweekly with target APR for each pair (and how this changes from weeks 1-6 -> 6-9 -> 9-12) but believe a worthwhile bet to make from the DAO."

Gyroscope

GFX Feedback)

We appreciated that the applicant cited a grant and its results on Optimism. The reward for the incentives was not compelling in that example, however. Also, funding support for as-yet-to-be-determined integration partners is hard to sign off on, since as reviewers, we need to know where the ARB funds will end up. Finally, Gyroscope has almost no presence on Arbitrum according to DeFi Llama, which makes a large grant request difficult to support.

404 DAO Feedback)

Gyroscope presented a very thorough application. One that scored very well across most of the rubric. Specifically, they excelled in justifying their KPIs and objectives as it relates to expanding their E-CLPs and expanding their stablecoin integrations. The main concerns were centered around where the majority of their usage has been (Polygon and Optimism) and some lack of clarity around their milestones. Overall, we will be supporting Gyroscope on the basis of expanding stablecoin innovation and adoption on Arbitrum for what we feel as a very reasonable grant ask.

GMX Feedback)

The protocol may not have high numbers on the Arbitrum network currently, but they have demonstrated decent traction on other Layer 2 solutions. GYD stablecoin stands out by implementing a basket of assets for backing, along with automated risk diversification rules. Integration with Frax and Balancer enhances its composability with other ecosystem projects. The proposed \$10 million TVL target appears reasonable given their grant ask. The team boasts a solid background, with one founder having published work on Google Scholar. Their effective use of incentives in the past, particularly with Optimism, bodes well for their ability to drive adoption. Leveraging their points system to attract more users seems like a sound strategy, although safeguards against Sybil attacks should be clarified. Overall, Gryoscope aims to introduce a decentralized stablecoin backed by various assets to the Arbitrum ecosystem. With clear KPIs and milestones, they aim to utilize the \$100k grant to incentivize and bootstrap their stablecoin for adoption. If they can achieve a \$10 million liquidity target, they believe they can kickstart adoption. While Arbitrum lacks decentralized stable value options, Gryoscope has the potential to fill that gap if they can gain traction. The proposal is well-written and outlines their objectives very well.

Wintermute Feedback)

Gryoscope's application was very good, they provided very thorough details and justifications of their KPIs, milestones, goals, and objectives. They provided a clear vision of how they impact the DeFi landscape and how they will benefit the Arbitrum ecosystem.

Their product is unique and they bring some interesting infrastructure to Arbitrum. Their demonstrated ability to successfully work with previous incentives is a plus. Their requested grant size is sufficiently justified and they have a solid execution strategy, however, we would've liked to have seen some more variety in the pool selection. Lastly, their project is highly composable and the product has demonstrated its ability to capture a significant amount of 1inch flow and transactions.

We will be supporting this application.

Handle Fi

GMX Feedback)

The project appears promising, but lacks sufficient detail on project numbers and real-time data tracking, relying on static website statistics. While the mentioned targets are conservative, the requested amount is comparatively high, especially when compared to similar applications like Rage Trade and LogX. Additionally, there's ambiguity regarding the source of users—whether they are unique or sybil—without clear differentiation. Consequently, we won't be supporting the proposal due to the disparity between the impact created and the higher ask. In the secondary review, concerns were raised about the substantial amount of ARB requested and the KPIs and milestones' potential to drive significant growth in the Arbitrum ecosystem. The lack of

traction without incentives raises questions about product-market fit. While acknowledging the team's track record as builders and the novelty of their product, reducing the requested ARB grant by 200k would make the proposal more appealing. However, given the existence of similar products with better traction, allocating over 800k ARB to this application might not be the most beneficial use of resources for the ecosystem. Unfortunately we won't be supporting the proposal.

404 DAO Feedback)

While HandleFi has some interesting differentiators when compared to other perp projects, the substantial ask compared to TVL and the lack of traction is preventing us from supporting this application. Their incentive designs is interesting, but we are also worried that users being reward exponentially for hitting the volume KPIs will just encourage wash trading. Combined with a weak milestone section (the same targets were just repeated 6 times) and it being difficult to verify the protocol's presented data, overall this application wasn't strong enough to justify 840k ARB. We encourage Handle Fi to revise its request and apply for a future incentive program.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote AGAINST Handle Fi's proposal.

Detailed proposal that scored fine across various dimensions. At the time of writing (March 29), TVL has dropped by over 50% from the day before and the grant size requested is ~3x and the grant milestones lack sophistication (fixed at \$350M volume and 100 DAU) + it's unclear if this will lead to organic, meaningful growth following the incentivization period."

Harvest Finance

Wintermute Feedback)

Harvest Finance presented a decent application that scored well in areas like composability, Arbitrum relationship, co-incentives, and track record.

Their requested grant size lacked calculations and justification. Their Arbitrum traction is lacking for their age, however, they have decent TVL across other chains.

Their application also mentioned that they would be using a portion of rewards to incentivize the yield of their native token without little justification. Their native token already benefits from protocol revenue that will be generated from other ARB rewards/activity on the platform. The iFARM vault at the time of marking has not been deployed on Arbitrum, however, the team has mentioned that they are in the process of deploying it.

We would've also liked to have seen more of an emphasis on incentivizing current users from other chains to Arbitrum.

Given the composability of the project and the fact that rewards will ultimately benefit other protocols, we will supporting this application so that the DAO can make the final decision.

404 DAO Feedback)

Harvest Finance presented a solid proposal overall and we appreciated their collaborations with multiple other protocols which could lead to the grant having strong secondary effects. Unfortunately, due to the lack of justification around their ask, milestones composition and current usage relative to the high grant ask, we are unable to support this proposal.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote FOR Harvest Finance's proposal.

Strong proposal that scored well across the rubric. Happy to move this to the DAO but would have liked to see: (i) More thorough justification and calculation for requested grant size; (ii) Greater emphasis on building traction in Arbitrum; and (iii) Clearer explanation for incentivizing yield of native token, especially considering existing protocol revenue."

GMX Feedback)

The proposal has comprehensive strategy outlined by Harvest Finance, their track record of successful deployments across multiple networks, and their collaborative efforts within the Arbitrum ecosystem, we recommend accepting their proposal. Harvest's commitment to diversifying strategies, incentivizing partner vaults, and driving user adoption aligns well with the goals of achieving growth in the Arbitrum ecosystem. Their proposed allocation of incentives, targeted towards high-value vaults and LP pools, demonstrates a strategic approach to maximize TVL and yield for users. Additionally, the provision for users to stake ARB tokens into Harvest vaults further promotes stickiness and long-term engagement within the ecosystem. Overall, Harvest's proposal presents a compelling case for supporting their initiatives on Arbitrum.

GFX Feedback)

This grant suffered in two main areas. The milestones do not suitably hold the grantee accountable for increasing users or assets on Arbitrum, instead focusing on distribution of the grant itself. Secondly, it's difficult to believe that Arbitrum governance funds need to subsidize vaults that are already yielding 30% or more. If that doesn't attract users, then it doesn't seem like a good use of governance resources.

Helix

Wintermute Feedback)

Helix's application was very well written, clear, and concise. They provided good milestones, KPIs, and goals, with a decent justification of their requested grant size.

However, we are not sure if this type of protocol is the best fit for Arbitrum to spend its funds on. Such a protocol locks up capital for a long time +12 months, disincentivizing activity on the chain. Furthermore, due to the KYC requirements, it's likely that most of the ARB funds will end

up in the hands of a few institutions and users. There is also very little data available for this project and given its age and adoption, it's hard to justify the requested grant size. This grant effectively subsidises institutional capital for taking on long-term maturity risk. Unfortunately, we will not be supporting this application.

404 DAO Feedback)

Helix presented a strong application with an interesting product. They scored well across most of the rubric and provided good justifications across the board. Our main problems lie in the subsidization of their product returns for their LP base. Given the nature of the incentives, they are providing risk free returns at the expense of the DAO and therefore unable to support this proposal.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote AGAINST Helix's proposal.

Well-written proposal and intriguing product but unable to endorse for the following reasons: (i) Grant size lacks sufficient justification given need to see more data relative to age; (ii) KYC requirements will limit distribution and likely concentrate grant. Would like to see traction on Arbitrum first before moving to incentives and suggest applicant resubmit at a later date."

HMX

404 DAO Feedback)

HMX scored well across the rubric but their overall grant ask is too large to justify for a protocol who fails to differentiate from other protocols in the Arbitrum ecosystem. We noticed some additions concerns regarding commitment to Arbitrum for these reasons we are not supporting this application.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote AGAINST HMX's proposal.

Despite ranking high in the rubric assessment, the recent numbers and metrics are impressive but HMX's protocol is not substantially different from other projects on Arbitrum. Seemingly focused on a Blast expansion as evidenced through their socials and possible risk of Arbitrum DAO being grant farmed through LTIPP. Minimal evidence of co-contribution of marketing or incentives with major Arbitrum protocols."

Wintermute Feedback)

HMX's application scored well across a range of criteria. They provided clear KPIs, milestones, goals, and calculations justifying their requested grant size. However, we found their execution strategy failed to actively promote trading activity and provide any new insights. We thought their user acquisition plan was a great idea and expected more rewards to be weighted to this, however, 96.9% of their requested grant size will be going towards trading & gas fee rebates which we don't think is the best use of DAO funds. We would've loved to have seen them focus on attempting to actively push traders to use the platform and retain them (e.g., Trading Leagues, rewards that vest with trading volume, etc.).

Unfortunately we cannot justify the requested grant size due to the usage of funds.

Hop

Wintermute Feedback)

Hop's application was great and scored well across a range of criteria. They have an excellent reputation and strong usage statistics.

They provided clear milestones, KPIs, and goals, and provided sufficient justification for their grant size.

Our main concern is with the overall distribution mechanism and cost to the DAO. We would've liked to see a justification of TVL target based on user cohort trade size which would inform how much TVL is required to reduce slippage and attract larger bridging volume. Or even begin bootstrapping in-demand assets to Arbitrum.

Furthermore, we don't think spending money on bridge rebates is the best use of DAO funds as it doesn't actively target increasing user base and activity but mostly reduces the burden for users who were already looking to bridge.

Unfortunately, due to the reasons above we will not be supporting this application.

GFX Feedback)

The primary weakness of this grant plan is the sheer size. Given clear execution plan, walking through how the applicant arrived at the requested amount, and milestones, the application overcomes the penalty for the large request. We recommend approving this grant.

GMX Feedback)

We are generally supportive of approving Hop's grant. Hop Protocol is a substantial player in the bridge sector and has huge potential to help Arbitrum grow generally. Bridges are also sites of high crosschain traffic, so this provides an opportunity to put Arbitrum in front of new users. The detailed breakdown of how the grant will be utilized, including specific percentages allocated to different aspects such as liquidity mining incentives, gas fee subsidies, and bond fee subsidies, demonstrates a clear understanding of the challenges and opportunities within the

Arbitrum ecosystem. The plan to incentivize user "stickiness" by subsidizing onboarding fees while ensuring a stake in the network through ARB token rebates is particularly innovative and likely to achieve long-term engagement. They, are also open to match the grants funds with the HOP protocol DAO treasury funds which is a good sign.

404 DAO Feedback)

Hop presented a strong application that scored well on most sections in this rubric. In addition to being a long time supporter of Arbitrum, they provided detailed justifications for their KPIs, milestones, and overall execution strategy. We appreciated the sub-focus on Arbitrum Nova within their execution strategy and believe Hop plays an important role in driving further adoption and discovery for this chain. Overall, due to the robust nature of Hop's application, their past success and impact to driving users to transact on Arbitrum native chains we will be supporting this grant proposal.

Hourglass

GFX Feedback)

Interesting protocol that serves a need (stable-stable bridging/swaps) and puts forth ambitious milestones. Stable-stable bridging, however is increasingly competitive, making it difficult to predict a winner. Hourglass is new, with little history of use on Arbitrum. Recommend that the applicant resubmit with more data that indicates user demand for their specific protocol. Milestones and distribution plan (e.g. gas rebate) are acceptable as is, but the total grant request is about half the lifetime volume on Arbitrum from Hourglass.

404 DAO Feedback)

Transparently, this is one that we are leaning Yes on and feel like it should at least be brought to the other members of the council to review. While the ask is pretty high given their current usage metrics on Arbitrum, there are other strong aspects of their application and the product is novel. While it has yet to be seen if there is true demand for something like this, it could potentially provide an avenue for new capital and assets to be bridged to Arbitrum.

GMX Feedback)

Navigating the stable-stable bridging landscape has become notably competitive, rendering it challenging to foresee a clear frontrunner. Hourglass emerges as a newcomer in this arena, lacking a substantial track record within the Arbitrum ecosystem. While Hourglass's protocol design, featuring on-chain order books, introduces innovation, it may not address a current deficiency within the Arbitrum ecosystem. The protocol's recent launch on Arbitrum in February highlights the need for a more robust strategy to attract users beyond relying solely on gas rebates. We will not be supporting this application.

Wintermute Feedback)

Hourglass' application was well written and solid overall. They provided sufficient insight into bridging costs for users and the protocol offers some of the lowest fees in the bridging

landscape. Our main concern with this application was justification of grant size which was derived from very optimistic figures. There was little market comparison done to benchmark their results and their KPIs/milestones were significantly higher than their current protocol activity. Furthermore, we would've liked to have seen some more innovation around their execution strategy instead of just simple rebates (e.g., funnelling users into Arb protocols after bridging, requiring them to hold min. value on chain, etc.) as this does not provide much insight to the DAO and does not actively encourage users to bridge. Lastly, their execution strategy was a bit weak as it lacked details into the assets they will be incentivizing. They should've been more specific with the RWA assets they will be supporting and when this will be available (their UI has limited assets atm).

Index Coop

Wintermute Feedback)

Index Coop's application was very strong and scored well across the majority of the criteria. They provided thorough explanations of their KPIs and goals and set out clear milestones. Their justification of grant size was sufficient and they had a well-thought-out execution strategy that clearly targets increased TVL activity and users on Arbitrum. Their product is highly composable and they have a large existing user base. Their emphasis on specifically rewarding existing ETH users to Arbitrum is a great idea. We support this application.

GFX Feedback)

This protocol identifies and tries to fill a specific need. The grant plan, however, could have been considerably stronger if it had 1) identified a past driver of growth, and 2) tailored the plan to replicate or extend that growth. In particular, rebates for fees deserve some data that shows it moves user activity. Recommend the applicant revise and resubmit in future grants cycles with this in mind,

GMX Feedback)

I am generally positive about supporting Index Coop's application. They have a novel product, which has an offchain reach demonstrated by their partnership with eToro, CoinDesk and 21.co. In anticipation of RobinHood integrating Arbitrum to their app product-offering, and in consideration of the immense reach of mobile apps, I think that should Index Coop be successful it would greatly benefit Arbitrum as an ecosystem as well. Given that they partnered with etoro in Oct23, they could be a good fit to marry onchain with tradfi. Bitcoin ETF has been established with ETH ETF next, and I believe Index Coop would be a good fit for arbitrium for tradfi integration.

Karel Feedback)

Vote FOR Index Coop's proposal.

Strong proposal that scored well across the rubric. Despite being newly deployed to Arbitrum, their proposal well captures their execution plan, target milestones/KPIs, how they plan to incentivize migration to Arbitrum from Ethereum, and provides strong justification behind their requested grant. Outside of this, their adoption/partnership with TradFi products like eToro is promising to potentially attract off-chain users (would like to understand if there's a strategy here). On stickiness post-LTIPP, there is some light description on this and proposal would benefit from further detail on their new mechanisms re: trading competition, cross-selling with other products (and if there are any Arbitrum partnerships in mind).

Integral Finance

GFX Feedback)

Generally, this grant suffered from being a very large request, having milestones that appear extremely easy to meet with the size of the request. We would have preferred to see the applicant highlight something that had already worked well in the past, identified the mechanism responsible, and tailored a grant request to scaling or replicating that past success. The requested amount is simply too much for experimentation unless the plan also includes very rigorous milestones to meet in order to unlock full funding.

GMX Feedback)

Integral's grant proposal outlines a comprehensive strategy to grow the liquidity on Arbitrum, focusing on enhancing the trading experience and growing platform adoption. The allocation of rewards for LPs and integration efforts with aggregators reflects a well-considered approach to incentivizing participation. The emphasis on sustainable growth, along with proactive engagement with token projects and aggregators, underscores a commitment to long-term ecosystem development. Transparent metrics tracking and milestone setting provide clarity and accountability. With Integral's track record of building highly capital-efficient products, particularly in offering the most efficient swaps, their plan to allocate funds evenly between liquidity incentives and integration support appears sound. The proposed KPIs and milestones align well with the goals of increasing liquidity and fostering ecosystem growth on Arbitrum. Integral's focus on enabling other protocols to integrate and build on top of their platform could contribute significantly to Arbitrum's growth by offering cheaper swaps, attracting more users, and reducing friction. Overall, supporting this proposal could prove to be a mutually beneficial decision for the DAO and the broader Arbitrum ecosystem.

404 Feedback)

Integral presented a strong application that highlighted their recent growth, strong execution strategy, and thorough KPIs. The milestones should have been much more robust and while the grant ask is relatively large we believe given the recent growth there is value in supporting this request so we support this application.

Karel Feedback)

Vote FOR Integral's proposal.

Good proposal with very detailed justification behind grant size, and execution plan. and milestones/KPIs by week (re: LP incentives). Grant size is on the larger end in contrast to performance on Arbitrum vs. Ethereum but well justified re: capital efficiency + increased Arbitrum adoption and all in all presents a worthwhile experiment for Arbitrum to invest in scaling out. Would have liked to see more detail behind the development incentives (representing ~44% of the grant) and detail on parameters to be used to inform the 2-30k ARB incentives.

IPOR

404 Feedback)

IPOR presented a well-rounded application featuring a clear execution strategy, reasonable ask and good milestones. While their recent usage has been in a downtrend for the last year, there are clear benefits for supporting this infrastructure within the Arbitrum ecosystem including further second order effects across the Defi heavy landscape. Due to the nature of their incentive design and robust application we will be supporting this proposal

GFX Feedback)

The applicant's protocol has seen declining usage throughout its deployment life and the grant plan requests funds to liquidity mine the applicant's own token. Perhaps that is necessary for how IPOR the protocol functions? But that is not made clear in the application. Regardless, the novelty of the protocol, its potential use cases, and the modest size of the grant request lead us to recommend this grant be approved.

GMX Feedback)

The IPOR Protocol introduces a pioneering solution to Arbitrum, offering interest rate swaps and expanding DeFi opportunities. With a demonstrated history of achieving milestones and a skilled team, the project is poised to improve liquidity, enhance market efficiency, and aiming for growth within the Arbitrum ecosystem. The grant application aligns with strategic goals by aiming to incentivize participation and bootstrap liquidity, ensuring competitiveness alongside other projects. Given the potential for new trading options and the team's track record, the proposed KPIs and milestones appear reasonable for the modest grant request. If successful, this initiative could attract and retain users in the Arbitrum ecosystem, contributing to its overall development and vitality. Therefore, we recommend accepting this application, as it offers tangible benefits for Arbitrum users and adds value to the network.

Ithaca

GMX Feedback)

We are strongly supportive of approving Ithaca Protocol's grant application. Arbitrum has become known as the number one DeFi space. Options are still a nascent sector within DeFi, therefore, it is pertinent Arbitrum assist any projects seeking to develop and popularize a model for onchain options offerings. The combination of volume incentives targeting specific products,

user acquisition incentives to drive real user engagement, and mechanisms to promote stickiness such as the points program and FundLock demonstrates a thoughtful approach toward achieving growth and liquidity. The clear KPIs and milestones provide a solid framework for assessing the effectiveness of the grant in achieving its objectives.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote AGAINST Ithaca's proposal.

Well written proposal but unable to endorse given lack of adoption of the product. Need to see some signal of traction and to ""battle test"" some of the mechanism prior to applying incentives against them. Consider resubmitting after launching in a future grants window."

404 Feedback)

Ithaca presented a solid application and looks to be an interesting protocol. Unfortunately we cannot support this large of a grant ask for a new protocol with minimal usage date. We encourage Ithaca to reapply to future programs as they mature.

GFX Feedback)

This is a very large request for a protocol that is less than a month old. It's just a very high bar to justify this kind of spend before seeing the protocol's initial adoption by users.

Kaiju Cards

Wintermute Feedback)

Kaiju Cards presented a decent application that did well in some areas but lacked in other areas. They outlined a clear strategy, goal, and execution path with their requested grant size. Their grant request is on the smaller side however, still considerable given the age of the protocol and its activity.

The protocol lacked data to make more informed decisions about the current user base. Furthermore, while we expect gaming to lead to longer retention than other protocols, we found their incentive mechanism to offer no novel insights to the gaming world. Simply offering rebates to mint and burn NFTs does not necessarily force or encourage any interesting behaviour. The burning mechanism is also open to exploitation as the 1.2 ARB (~\$2.5) reward per NFT burn is greater than the cost of \$0.50.

Unfortunately, we will not be supporting Kaiju Cards.

GFX Feedback)

This grant plan would be much stronger by removing or revising the NFT burn portion of the distribution plan. The request was small, and so would not in our opinion be difficult to approve if the NFT burn mechanism not appear to have significant potential for abuse because a user could profit from it even with the gating fee.

GMX Feedback)

Kaiju Cards's application lacks sufficient data to make informed decisions regarding its current user base. Kaiju Cards' incentive mechanism lacks innovation and is something commonly used in the space. Merely offering rebates for minting and burning NFTs fails to stimulate user activity and more gaming time on the protocol. Moreover, the burning mechanism could pose a security threat which was not addressed in the proposal. Though the requested grant size is small, we do not support this application.

KelpDAO

Wintermute Feedback)

KelpDAO's application was very strong and scored well in most criteria. KelpDAO has seen extremely impressive growth for its age and presents a strong opportunity for Arbitrum to bring native restaking infrastructure to the ecosystem. We believe this is extremely important opportunity for Arbitrum to capture a competitive advantage over other L2s.

Their KPIs, milestones, and goals are very clear and well justified. Their distribution mechanism is sound, however, will likely not provide any new data to the DAO. Lastly, their grant size is completely reasonable given the size of the protocol.

We will be supporting this application.

GFX Feedback)

The applicant lays out a simple, but complete, plan to attract and then retain LSTs on Arbitrum. Kelp's current success demonstrates an interest in the product, and that it meets a demand in the market. We recommend approving this grant to migrate some of that demand to Arbitrum.

GMX Feedback)

KelpDAO's application is comprehensive and has scored favorably in most aspects, with a reasonable grant size. It shows promising potential to enhance Arbitrum's native restaking infrastructure within the ecosystem. Considering prevailing market narratives, we believe that the application could be advantageous for Arbitrum if KelpDAO successfully achieves its milestones and KPIs. Their goals are clear, well-thought-out, and justified. KelpDAO has demonstrated product-market fit and addresses a significant demand in the current market landscape. We will be supporting this application.

Kinto

GFX Feedback)

This is a bundle of 11 individual grants. We recommend breaking each of these into separate grants, and resubmitting. Some may warrant higher or lower amounts than would be accepted as a bundle. Creating as subgrants program, even with pre-defined recipients, is outside the scope of LTIP.

Wintermute Feedback)

This was a very unique application that unfortunately did not tailor well to the outline of the LTIPP (somewhat of a fault in the LTIPP). The application was solid but unfortunately, there were a couple of key areas that we had concerns about. Having a KYC-required chain places a strict barrier on the types of users that will be eligible for rewards; there was little justification as to the requested grant size, this could've been easily benchmarked with the current activity of launch partners; KPI unlocks should've been more focused towards growth milestones instead of technical milestones; and lastly, there was little data presented to support any of their claims. Unfortunately, we will not be supporting this application.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote AGAINST Kinto's proposal.

This proposal is a unique submission across LTIPP for a number of reasons: L2 and bootstrapping of a chain within Arbitrum Orbit + allocation to be used as a grant to go to users of sub-grantees. On one hand, there is importance for Arbitrum to show support for the proliferation of adoption of Arbitrum Orbit technology through the launch of new L2s and L3 but, on the other hand, the flow through of a portion of sequencer fees is likely not going to lead to a return of capital for a long time and the grant size requested is significant. The mechanism of the grant distribution also puts the funding in the hands of Kinto and then re-distributed to subgrants which is a risk vector (vs. going to the subgrantees directly / its end-users). Co-incentives are not guaranteed and subject to a governance proposal to take place after mainnet. Would also like to have seen the Mainnet stood up to be able to see initial growth and adoption prior to providing funding to support it.

Support for L2s and others who adopt the Arbitrum technology should come but the LTIPP is not the best structure for it at this point in time. Suggest Kinto resubmit either with a smaller grant amount after going into mainnet and showing TVL and user growth."

Kleros

Wintermute Feedback)

This application provided a clear understanding of its goals, objectives, and KPIs, however, we are not sure it really fits into LTIPP. The protocol is very unique and has been around for a long time however, there hasn't been that much adoption. While we understand that incentivizing native token stakers helps with the economic security of the protocol, it doesn't really make it applicable to the goals of LTIPP. There are also no available audits and V2 is only slowly being rolled out during the LTIPP distribution window.

We will not be supporting this application.

404 Feedback)

Kleros presented a solid proposal overall. Unfortunately, due to the nature of their incentive design being used to encourage only native token stakers and the lack of an audit, we can't support this application. We applaud the Kleros team for their novel product and believe they can succeed on Arbitrum, but recommend to reapply under a different incentive design or to another grant program with the DAO or Foundation.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote AGAINST Kleros' proposal.

Well written proposal and scored okay on the rubric. Novel protocol with a long history on Ethereum (and Gnosis) but V2 not yet on Arbitrum. Like Proof of Humanity as added anti-sybil protection. No audit on v2 yet available and the simplistic grant distribution that does not feel applicable to goals of LTIPP. Suggest resubmitting proposal after launching V2 with audits and more adoption on Arbitrum."

Knights of the Ether

GFX Feedback)

We appreciate the well-considered reasoning for this grant plan. The main objection is the size – around half a million dollars in ARB. We would prefer to see data on cost of acquiring new users or past campaigns that significantly increased the interaction of existing users with the chain. We recommend this applicant revise and resubmit in a future grants cycle with a smaller request that can be comfortably allocated to more experimental grant plans.

GMX Feedback)

Onchain gaming has huge potential but has yet to find a field-validated PMF which demonstrates that blockchain can mesh neatly with the business cycle of the gaming industry. Perhaps I'm being too skeptical about the prospects of onchain gaming, but it would be to Arbitrum's benefit if they succeed. We would be supporting this proposal for several reasons. Firstly, the team behind Knights of the Ether has a strong track record of experience in game development, with notable achievements in both web2 and web3 gaming spaces. Their past

successes in engaging and retaining users demonstrate their capability to execute and deliver results.

Secondly, the proposed incentives program is well-structured and strategically designed to drive user acquisition, retention, and engagement within the Arbitrum ecosystem. By leveraging Battle Passes, Loot Boxes, Leaderboard Events, and targeted community onboarding, Knights of the Ether aims to attract a significant number of new users to Arbitrum while incentivizing existing users to stay engaged.

Furthermore, the clear roadmap and milestones outlined in the proposal provide a tangible framework for measuring the success of the grant. By focusing on key performance indicators such as MAU, WAU, DAU, marketplace volume, and on-chain transactions, the team aims to demonstrate tangible growth and impact on the Arbitrum ecosystem.

404 Feedback)

Knights of the Ether scored decent across the rubric. While their request is fairly large, we like the Battle Pass incentive design enabling both a free and paid component to hopefully increase retention. They have also shown an ability to bring in new users to the Arbitrum ecosystem. While we would've appreciated more specific details for how ARB would've been distributed through the Loot Boxes & Battle Pass, we will be supporting this grant due to the long-standing commitment to Arbitrum, strength in being an onboarding agent for Arbitrum gaming, and the second order effects that come from incentivizing their gameplay rollout.

Wintermute Feedback)

This application presented solid milestones, KPIs, goals, and a decent execution plan. However, we found the application missed the key calculations and justifications of their requested grant size. We would've liked to have seen customer acquisition calculations and a breakdown of why certain buckets were being allocated X amount of ARB and why. Furthermore, there was very little data provided, of which most was given in an excel sheet which was hard to verify onchain. Their adoption seems to be moderate given the age of the game, but using their MAGIC marketplace volume as a proxy of activity their requested grant size is ~2x larger. Unfortunately, we cannot justify the request grant size but would encourage them to resubmit under a smaller grant size.

Karel Feedback) - Conflict of interest

KTX Finance

GFX Feedback)

Around half of this grant request is for fee rebates paid to the applicant. That's similar to just giving the applicant the funding. If platform fee rebates are a mechanism the applicant wishes to retain in future grant requests, we strongly recommend waiving fees for a period to generate data to confirm that fee reductions do indeed generate the desired effects. But experimentation with fee reductions on the platform (vs gas or third parties) should be financed by the applicant and not governance.

Wintermute Feedback)

KTX's application provided thorough justifications of KPIs, milestones, and goals, although some of which were rather ambitious. Their KPIs did not really align with their execution strategy and we would've liked to have seen more of a focus on driving non-Arbitrum users to the platform. The product itself is very similar to the likes of MUX & GMX with very little variation. Their protocol metrics are decent but do not justify their requested grant size as currently daily users and TVL is quite low. Furthermore, we would've liked to have seen more of a focus on running trading competitions to actively push users towards trading instead of simply offering rebates. Their application also lacked any focus on encouraging stickiness. Unfortunately, we will not be supporting this application.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote AGAINST KTX Finance's proposal.

Well written proposal that scored well on rubric. Some novel elements of the product and incentive mechanisms but unable to endorse for the following reasons: (i) ~50% LTIPP grant is going to APX as offset for their fee reduction as an experiment during the period of the program vs. going to the end user; and (ii) on top of this a much smaller sleeve is allocated for BD purposes to go to builders which is outside of scope of LTIPP."

Kunji

Wintermute Feedback)

This application did a good job at answering all relevant questions. Their execution strategy was solid and targeted the right things, however, we needed to see further anti-sybil measures. I.e., users can create multiple vaults of opposite strategies to ensure they consistently finish in the top 50.

Their product does not offer much variation in comparison to other leading social copy trading protocols which have a lot more traction.

Based on their current usage statistics, their request grant size is significantly larger and can't really be justified. We would've liked to have seen them apply for a smaller grant size in order to kickstart a base line of activity and TVL.

Unfortunately, we cannot justify the grant request.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote AGAINST Kunji's proposal.

Fine proposal and scored average via rubric but unable to endorse for the following reasons: (i) grant request in contrast to other peers in LTIPP was larger / less justified; and (ii) need to see more signs of greater traction and product adoption to show market fit before tapping into

incentives. Suggest they resubmit in future grants window with a lower amount and/or after showing greater traction with other planned integrations live."

404 DAO Feedback)

Our main concern with Kunji's application is the lack of sybil-protection, while they cap rewards at \$3,000 per wallet we fear that it is too easy for traders to make multiple vaults. Additionally, while it appears they gained a spike in usage in December of 2023, the retention from that event was almost non-existent and current usage is near 0. Their multisig is also non-compliant with the LTIPP eligibility requirements. Overall their ask is too large given their current traction, and encourage them to reapply in future programs with something lower. A point for improvement in future applications would be justified KPIS and better success-oriented milestones.

Kuroro Beasts

Wintermute Feedback)

Kuroro Beasts presented a solid application. They scored well in reach, activity, age, composability, and novelty. In contrast, the application lacked specifics regarding how they plan to incentivizing users in game and why such mechanisms are relevant (execution strategy). They also lost some points due to allocating 50k ($\frac{1}{3}$ of their grant request) to marketing campaigns, which leads to the ARB not reaching the hands of users and lacks the ability for oversight. However, they have been very open in reporting data for their marketing initiatives. Overall, we plan to support this proposal and think it offers the DAO a good opportunity to learn from ARB being spent on marketing efforts. The team has clearly shown their ability to attract users, so we think it's worth it for the DAO to vote on whether or not they want to support this type of grant.

GFX Feedback)

The grant plan demonstrates existing and growing usage (as measured by DAUs). The plan is also tailored to build on existing growth by specifically targeting segments of gamer population on other chains and in the audience of web2 gamer influencers. The total amount requested seems appropriate for the ambitious milestones and the plan of attack laid out. We recommend this grant be approved.

GMX Feedback)

Kuroro shows promising potential, supported by a robust protocol performance since their game launch. The proposed funding aims to facilitate the integration of gamers from diverse ecosystems such as Immutable, Solana, and Ronin. Leveraging a strong user retention rate, attracting users through this funding could yield considerable value. Kuroro pledges to match incentives and utilize the funds to achieve their Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) However, a notable portion of the grant is allocated to marketing, which might not directly benefit the Arbitrum ecosystem. Nevertheless, the team has maintained transparency in reporting data concerning their marketing endeavors. We endorse Kuroro's application.

Layer3

404 DAO Feedback)

Layer3 presented an excellent application that was not only very thorough and supported by verifiable data, it was also concise in most areas and formatted in a way that made it easy to digest the information. The team has a strong track record and the product has great usage metrics. Quests are great way to drive retention and onboard new users. Their milestones are clear and specifically target increasing users & activity on Arbitrum. We have them a 1 for sybil resistance as the only prevention methods we saw were using the Farcaster social graph to determine genuine/active users - but this is a great idea and we are excited to see more use of the Farcaster graph within Arbitrum.

Wintermute Feedback)

Layer3's application was very strong. They presented thorough and clear KPIs, milestones, and objectives. Their value proposition to Arbitrum is clear with extensive historical data to support their requested grant size. We appreciate their efforts to target higher quality users and reduce Sybil activity.

The product is extremely composable and the application targets a wide variety of protocols on Arbitrum. Furthermore, it provides great value to projects looking to outsource user acquisition.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote FOR Layer3's proposal.

Strong proposal across all dimensions and showcased a solid plan to execute and distribute incentives. Product has shown solid PMF and adoption across projects and ecosystems. Good execution and milestone design, though believe main points off come from: further sybil/bot protection mechanisms and bringng more data on-chain. Would be interesting to see a path towards data attestation and verifiability as part of the product."

Lido

404 eedback)

Overall, Lido presented a really thorough and great proposal. They provided a very detailed execution plan, grant justification, quantifiable milestones that are easily trackable.

Co-contribution of incentives also helps ensure liquidity stickiness in addition to the further integrations of wstETH across Arbitrum's DeFi ecosystem. Creating deep LST liquidity will considerably strengthen Arbitrum's competitive position.

GMX Feedback)

The proposal from Lido DAO's Liquidity Observation Labs (LOL) demonstrates a clear and comprehensive strategy to drive the adoption and usage of wstETH on Arbitrum. Their past success in growing wstETH on other Layer-2 networks, combined with a detailed plan for

incentivization, integration, and measurement of success, instill confidence in their ability to achieve their objectives. The team's experience in managing previous grants and their focus on long-term sustainability and growth are evident. With a well-thought-out execution plan, including incentivizing liquidity pools, governance token pairs, and leveraged staking protocols, this proposal seems poised to significantly increase wstETH activity on Arbitrum, contributing to the broader expansion of the Arbitrum DeFi ecosystem. We really like their strategy of matching the grant incentives post the LTIPP grants are over to maintain the liquidity on the protocol. Additionally, Lido is one of the most influential applications in the DeFi ecosystem. Their Wrapped Staked ETH (wstETH) has received traction on the platform without incentives. wstETH with enough liquidity could be a foundational staked asset on the chain, the additional liquidity allowing more projects to integrate the token and give users less reason to return back to the mainnet for wstETH buying/bridging. The LOL is also willing to match the grant request, further making this a good return on investment for the DAO. The KPIs and Milestones look fine to me. Overall, this proposal shows promise and deserves support.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote FOR Lido's proposal.

Well thought out proposal and strongly ranked in the rubric. They've been a leader in the space and, with the success of folks like Blast and LRTs building on EigenLayer, it's in Arbitrum's best interests to maintain deep liquidity for LSTs. Lido has been well Arbitrum aligned, incentivizing liquidity here since its initial wstETH deployment. Also great to see co-contribution of incentives as well as partnerships with other DeFi protocols on Arbitrum will contribute towards stickier liquidity. There is the natural concern of overall market share (30%+) to weigh but feel it's a competitive proposal to let the DAO decide."

Limitless

Wintermute Feedback)

Limitless' application was decent and scored average across most criteria. The requested ARB grant is a little on the high side given the age and activity of the protocol, however, is justified well enough.

They have a nice distribution mechanism that targets LPs to stay for a longer period of time through an escrow mechanism which is great. Their protocol is also rather novel and introduces some interesting opportunities for traders on Arbitrum.

Some of their KPIs lacked a bit of justification and seemed rather arbitrary. We would've also liked to see additional reward mechanisms that target increasing users and trading volume on the platform.

Overall, given the grant request, novelty, and distribution mechanism, we support Limitless' application.

404 Feedback)

Limitless presented a decent application overall. While it was difficult to verify the data from the Limitless Beta program and their milestones were not trackable at all, their incentive design is very clearly thought out and specifically promotes retention and stickiness. Additionally, the protocol is pretty novel and is a nice addition to the Arbitrum ecosystem. Overall, we believe these factors justify their grant request so we will be supporting this application.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote FOR Limitless' proposal.

Good proposal that scored moderately well on rubric. Grant size justification and use of funds is sufficiently incentivized and escrowed approach to lock/vest maintains liquidity post-LTIPP. KPIs are lofty with their current activity numbers and would have liked to see more granular milestones/KPIs over span of the program against their KPIs (TVL, volume, fees) and new ones like # of users."

Liquity

Wintermute Feedback)

Liquity's application shines through its history and innovation. Unfortunately, it's hard to justify the DAO spending funds given the lack of adoption Liquity has experienced on Arbitrum despite being deployed in 2022. This is a clear indication of a lack of demand which is likely due to the high collateral ratio trove redemptions that have been occurring and other similar protocols offering native token incentives.

When looking at the distribution mechanism, it's a simple LM program that does not offer any new insights or variety in distribution. It would've been good to see incentivization around rebating trove fees with rewards based on trove age, sponsoring LUSD integrations amongst lending markets, etc.

Unfortunately, we will not be supporting this application.

GFX Feedback)

This grant plan is simple liquidity mining for a bridged asset. It's unclear how Arbitrum governance's subsidies for an imported stablecoin with a local market cap below \$1.5m can be justified. Liquity is a recognizable brand name, but this is a non-yield-bearing asset that has to be bridged in from mainnet and it's not obvious why supporting it would be beneficial to Arbitrum. Recommend the applicant come back with a much revised plan if they wish to resubmit at a future cycle, perhaps with generous co-incentives, evidence of organic use, or with a yield-bearing asset that creates a capital flow into Arbitrum.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote AGAINST Liquity's proposal.

Good proposal that covered the major criteria in the rubric. Liquity's a strong name in the market but has not seen meaningful adoption on Arbitrum. Proposal lacks detail on how they will drive stickiness post-incentivization period to retain TVLs and users, and don't believe the DAO should provide subsidies to bootstrap short-term incentives without a more fulsome plan or additional co-incentives. Suggest they resubmit at a later date."

LOGX

Wintermute Feedback)

LogX's application was solid and scored well across most criteria. They excelled in their grant, milestone, and KPI justifications, providing very clear objectives and calculations. Their grant size is on the larger size, but the team has demonstrated their ability to execute on effective incentive programs that they have been running for some time. We like their emphasis on targeting CEX users and how they intend to achieve this.

The main things lacking from this proposal was lack of data, novelty, and contribution to Arbitrum's competitive advantage. The latter stems from Arbitrum's abundance of Perp DEXs, but LogX provides some interesting product features.

We support this application.

GMX Feedback)

LogX's application presents a well-rounded proposal, with a grant size that is both justified and reasonable. The protocol's high composability enhances its ability to unlock new value propositions for other applications. The team boasts a solid track record in attracting and retaining both power users and casual traders, achieving an average daily volume of close to 60M. Remarkably, 75% of their volumes originate from Arbitrum, despite their deployment on other chains such as Optimism, Mantle, Linea, and Blast. Their execution plan is clear, and the grant is expected to facilitate Arbitrum in acquiring more Centralized Exchange (CEX) traders, potentially igniting a new growth cycle beyond referral and affiliate programs. We support this application.

GFX Feedback)

This grant plan scored well in most areas of the rubric. We recommend this grant be approved.

Lumin Finance

404 DAO Feedback)

A decent application that score below average due to its current usage metrics and deployment date on Arbitrum (We've noticed that the rubric does seem to bias a bit too heavy towards

established projects, and this is in our opinion an application that reflects a good idea that scored low). Given its a peer to peer lending protocol we thought their might be some sybil concerns where individuals could just net the ARB yield, but given the over-collateralization requirements feel that this is mitigated. Otherwise, we felt this was really well presented grant request and we really liked that they divided the ARB based on milestone metrics. We will be supporting this application as fixed rates and peer to peer lending is an area Arbitrum could compete better on.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote FOR Lumin Finance's proposal.

Decent proposal and novel implementation (loans as NFTs to individualize loans + tradeable on the marketplace). Good execution strategy. Little product usage given date of deployment but believe it's a low risk grant that is dependent on the achievement of goals. For moving to DAO to decide. "

Wintermute Feedback)

Lumin's application was solid despite the low overall score. They did well in calculating and justifying their grant request and provided clear objectives, KPIs, and milestones. We liked that they split their grant request into two stages, requiring their protocol to hit certain milestones before having their second tranche of ARB unlocked. Their protocol also offers some unique product offerings and is pretty composable.

However, they did score poorly due to their lack of product usage and age of deployment on Arbitrum. As a result, this pulled down the expected benefit from their requested grant size. We think this application is worthy of progressing to a DAO vote as they have a clear vision of intended grant use with key milestones and they will only receive the full funds of the grant if they are successful in reaching their KPIs.

Marginly

Wintermute Feedback)

This application was decent and scored well in some areas. However, we found the application to miss a lot of details and justifications in their execution strategy. They provided no details on which pools will be incentivized which would infer TVL and APR justifications.

Furthermore, their "Bootstrapping new use cases" is very loose and just provides possible areas in which they may incentivize new pools with no commitment or timeline.

Lastly, their partner integration is a cool idea but once again, there is little justification for the size of the grant request and how much each user will be earning.

Looking at their Dune dashboard, there is barely any activity with consecutive days of no trading volume.

Unfortunately, due to their being no milestone ARB reward unlocks to protect the DAO we cannot justify supporting this application.

GFX Feedback)

This grant plan has three parts – one for liquidity mining and two for integrations/business development. We would have approved the liquidity mining portion alone, which was well justified and modest in request. It's very difficult to sign off on 100k ARB for business development and integration activities, though, given Marginly's small size and it being opaque how the benefits of that portion of the grant would accrue. Recommend the applicant resubmit in future grants cycles without the 100k ARB portion of this plan.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote AGAINST Marginly's proposal.

Decent proposal but main hold up is use of the grant with 100k of it being allocated for BD and integration purposes that does not lead to incentives ending up in the hands on end users. Encourage they resubmit at a later grants window without these components and focus on the LP incentives portion of the grant."

Maya Protocol

Karel Feedback)

"Vote AGAINST Maya Protocol's proposal.

Good, detailed proposal and nice to see activity/adoption from other chains. However, fail to see how this will contribute meaningfully to Arbitrum's competitive positioning. Believe protocols should launch / plan to launch on Arbitrum independent of receiving any incentives. Execution strategy re: the ARB grant being sold to AETH and CACAO and being paid out as LP tokens is not optimal. No plans to compose with other protocols on Arbitrum."

404 DAO Feedback)

Maya Protocol scored well across the rubric and was one of the more unique bridge applications we reviewed. We appreciate the new capital avenues they provide access too and felt their justifications were strong. However, due to the nature of the incentive design requiring the direct selling of ARB tokens, we are unable to support this proposal. We encourage Maya to rethink their incentive design and reapply to future programs.

GMX Feedback)

I'm generally supportive of approving the grant application for Maya Protocol. Bridge relations are an important node in any network's social circle, and bridge programs tend to be free marketing. By incentivizing liquidity provision in the AETH-CACAO pool, Maya Protocol aims to deepen liquidity, enhance user experience, and facilitate seamless cross-chain swaps, particularly with native Bitcoin flows. The proposal outlines clear milestones, execution

strategies, and KPIs for measuring success, providing transparency and accountability. Moreover, the emphasis on stickiness through bonus rewards for long-term liquidity provision aligns well with encouraging sustained engagement within the ecosystem. Overall, this proposal demonstrates a thoughtful approach to driving growth and innovation within the Arbitrum ecosystem. We would support the proposal.

GFX Feedback)

This grant plan is absolutely not within the scope of this grants program. The applicant requests a large amount of funding while only just deploying days before. That's fine, but does bring closer scrutiny. The grant plan is entirely to LP the granted funds in a pool with the applicant's own token. Grants do not exist to purchase or provide liquidity for a project's own token. Furthermore, this grant simply gives Maya the grant to keep as protocol owned liquidity rather than distribute it directly to end users. This grant should never have cleared the intake filter or preliminary rounds. We recommend the applicant in the future avoid grants requests that are difficult to distinguish from an airdrop to the protocol.

MC^2

Wintermute Feedback)

MC2's had a clear vision of how their product could improve Arbitrum activity, however, their application lacked a lot of justification. There was no justification for grant size, allocation of gas rebates, and clear execution of grant disbursement.

There was very little historical data provided (or able to be found) to support any part of the grant request. This also made it hard to understand how realistic the milestones, KPIs, and goals were.

Unfortunately, we will not be supporting this application.

404 Feedback)

MC2's application needed much more reasoning to justify their grant ask. Minimal data around the current usage made it difficult to vet the prospects of the product. Their proposed co-contributions would not be able to be started until July with their MC2fi token is launched. Given the stage and maturity of the company, we believe MC2 should apply for a grant from the foundation and continue to build out their product and community before looking to growth incentives.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote AGAINST MC2's proposal.

Fine proposal and interesting concept but lacking in details re: distribution and justification for grant size. Audit needs to be conducted by reputable firm and not an individual user. Would like to see more data and early signs of traction/activity before beginning incentives."

Mercle

Wintermute Feedback)

Mercle's offers a decent product that specifically targets the onboarding of users to Arbitrum and on-chain activity. They have some good features that could be useful for protocols on Arbitrum, however, we found their application to fall short in a number of areas.

There was very little information around the execution of distributing ARB incentives, which protocols they are working with and which actions they intend to incentivize and why. There was also very little justification and calculation behind their grant request. Based on these points, it's very hard for the DAO to actually know what their spending their ARB on and what interactions they're paying for.

Unfortunately, we will not be supporting this application.

GFX Feedback)

This is a service with a well-defined value add and track record. We have a major hesitation over the distribution plan, though. The grantee would have discretion over the choice of 5 partner dapps. While we recognize why this discretion might be warranted, it doesn't remove the fact that Arbitrum governance would not know where the final ARB ends up and may allow Mercle to conduct business development activities financed by Arbitrum governance. The grant plan otherwise scores highly, so we recommend approval, especially given the moderate size of the request.

Karel Feedback)

Vote AGAINST Mercle's proposal.

Fine proposal but unable to endorse for following reasons: (i) insufficient justification on grant size (pretty large) and how they will achieve milestones/KPIs; (ii) distribution mechanism lacks detail on how they will incentivize users through partnered dApp integrations (including selection); and (iii) relatively crowded space with no meaningful traction on Arbitrum yet. Also no audit yet.

GMX Feedback)

Based on the provided information, the proposal lacks alignment with the technical specifications and commitments of the grant. While the applicant demonstrates past experience and success with incentivization programs on other networks, there is insufficient clarity on how the proposed activities specifically cater to the requirements of the Arbitrum ecosystem. The objectives and execution strategy do not sufficiently address the unique characteristics of Arbitrum, such as its architecture, user base, and network dynamics. Additionally, the proposed KPIs lack specificity and relevance to the goals of the grant, making it difficult to assess the impact on the Arbitrum ecosystem accurately. Therefore, we recommend rejecting the proposal until it provides a more detailed and tailored plan for growth and innovation within the Arbitrum ecosystem.

We would also like to mention that it's worth experimenting with creating engagement through the Mercle approach, including cross-platform usage. Perhaps consider funding using LTIPP bounties for a lesser amount?

Monkey Empire

GFX Feedback)

The applicant could significantly strengthen a revised grant plan by focusing on specific events or mechanisms that led to any initial traction and then directing grant funds to scaling or repeating that. Separately, the applicant should consider adding (or explaining why it's not necessary) sybil protections to prevent farming of the rewards by a small set of individuals. Recommend revising with this feedback in mind and resubmitting at a future grants cycle and with a smaller request.

GMX Feedback)

Monkey Empire's application is deficient and fails to provide adequate justification for the grant size. Moreover, the absence of preventive measures and sybil protections suggests that the team has not sufficiently considered the efficient utilization of the grant. Therefore, we cannot support this application.

404 Feedback)

While certain sections, like their KPI's were detailed and justified, much of this application was not thorough enough to justify their grant ask. For a game we had hoped they'd better utilize in-game quests or partnerships to distribute incentives rather than simply rewarding minting NFTs. Additionally, there were insufficient details on the exact game play and how NFTs were minted - what actions must be taken by a player to earn/mint an NFT, is there a cost, how easy it to earn NFTs? Without these details it was hard to determine if this system could be gamed and users could create multiple accounts to earn the incentives. Overall, with a more complete application this is a project we think can apply for a later incentive program.

Mountain Protocol

Wintermute Feedback)

Mountain Protocol's grant request was rather large given the adoption of USDM. While the protocol has strong TVL on Ethereum mainnet, there is very little traction on other chain deployments. This is further confirmed by daily transfers, daily volume, and total USDM holders. Thus, given the lack of holders on Ethereum and other chains, we also expect incentives to land in a concentrated number of wallets.

Goals, milestones, and KPIs were rather clear for the most part, however, there was little detail about the execution strategy and goals for 'DeFi Partner Integrations'. The large focus on pure

liquidity mining efforts without additional mechanisms does not provide a compelling case for such the size of the grant request.

Unfortunately, we will not be supporting this proposal.

404 Feedback)

While we gave this application an average score, we still support it on the basis that we believe incentivizing liquidity for a yield-bearing asset pair is important. Deep liquidity in yield-bearing stablecoin / LST pairs will be a strong competitive advantage for Arbitrum. However, this application was lacking in a few areas such as incentive distribution, as traditional liquidity incentives will likely result in incentives landing in the hands of whales, and the execution strategy regarding DeFi Partner Integrations lacked clear details. But overall, Mountain Protocol has a good team and decent traction on mainnet which make for nice additions to our main reasonings for support.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote AGAINST Mountain Protocol's proposal.

Well-written proposal that ranked decently on the rubric and impressive adoption to-date from a market share perspective re: yield-bearing stablecoin backed by T-bills. While Mountain has seen strong adoption on Ethereum Mainnet, this is very limited in other ecosystems including Arbitrum. The current traction and execution plan to bring TVL into the Arbitrum ecosystem is lacking and may lead to concentrated number of wallets. The execution strategy to build stickiness is limited and centered around institutional players. Need more information and perspective on composability / integration with other DeFi partners on Arbitrum to paint a better picture to pass this through to the DAO."

GFX Feedback)

We generally thought this grant plan was well constructed, but was expensive relative to the existing Arbitrum footprint of USDM. Other areas of the rubric were able to overcome this penalty in score, however. We recommend approving this grant.

GMX Feedback)

The proposal outlines a comprehensive strategy to introduce and bootstrap USDM, a leading yield-bearing stablecoin, into the Arbitrum ecosystem. By incentivizing liquidity provision and fostering partnerships with DeFi protocols, the initiative aims to drive significant TVL growth on Arbitrum, ultimately strengthening both USDM and Arbitrum within the DeFi landscape. The requested grant size is justified based on projected TVL acquisition costs, offering a cost-effective approach compared to previous rounds. The execution plan is well-defined, with clear objectives, milestones, and KPIs to track success. The inclusion of specific KPIs related to USDM TVL, usage in DeFi protocols, and volume transacted with USDM provides a robust framework for measuring the effectiveness of the grant. Additionally, the proposal demonstrates a commitment to sustainability, aiming to establish use cases that are self-sustaining once

bootstrapped. Overall, accepting this proposal would ramp-up the growth and innovation within the Arbitrum ecosystem, solidifying its position as a leader in DeFi.

Mozaic

Wintermute Feedback)

Mozaic's application was solid across a range of criteria. They offer a unique product that makes yield farmer's life easier onchain which likely leads to stickier users as strategies are automated. Their requested grant size is fair and justified and they have received decent traction since their launch. However, we are very concerned about their security practices and standards as highlighted by their recent exploit that resulted in a \$2M loss. This loss was achieved by a compromised private key which should have never been an attack vector.

There is yet to be any information released about their full security overhaul and how they intend to safeguard user assets going forward. Unfortunately, due to this, we do not feel comfortable incentivizing users to use the platform.

GFX Feedback)

This protocol was exploited on March 15. We will not support a grant at this time, given the exploit occurred so recently.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote AGAINST Mozaic's proposal.

Strong proposal however security practices and recent exploit is cause for concern. Need to see details and a post-mortem + hope we see a positive outcome in the end and the team's ability to right the ship. Look forward to a future proposal if/when the time arrives."

MYSO

404 Feedback)

Myso presents a novel product that presents new onchain lending opportunities for DAOs and potential beneficial second order ecosystem effects if their product sees strong adoption. While we do not love the execution strategy around subsidizing a 3rd party for enabling the product, we understand the purpose. The milestone orientation could have been stronger and the grant ask is a little high but overall we believe this is something worthwhile for the DAO to fund and will be supporting this grant application.

GMX Feedback)

We are generally supportive of Myso Finance's grant application. They have a proven track record of pre-existing integrations, and their requested grant size is reasonable with clear application towards specific ends. The clear allocation of rewards to borrowers, lenders, and arrangers, along with the focus on fostering long-term engagement and growth, demonstrates a

thoughtful approach towards achieving the grant objectives. By incentivizing various stakeholders and implementing mechanisms to encourage "stickiness" within the ecosystem, the proposal aims to create a self-sustaining environment conducive to innovation and expansion within the Arbitrum ecosystem.

GFX Feedback)

The applicant presents a clear plan, justification for the request size, and - while the grant is large compared to protocol size - demonstrates steady growth since Q4 of 2023 that can be increased with grant support. We recommend this grant be approved.

MYX

404 Feedback)

Without a more detailed execution plan, KPIs, and milestones we can not justify such a large grant request for a protocol that has only recently deployed on Arbitrum. Protocol usage data was not linked in the application and our team was only able to find this Dune dashboard, which shows that MYX currently has \$6.6m TVL and \$2.64B in volume. While this is impressive usage for only being live for 1 month, there are too many missing details in this application to approve it.

Wintermute Feedback)

The application was rather incomplete and inconsistent across sections (i.e., token usage). They provide no data on previous protocol usage, current user base, volume etc. Furthermore, incentives should reach the end user and not be used to seed an LP pool for a trading competition. Their KPIs also do not make sense, their targeted Avg. daily volume is significantly lower than the supposed data that is being shown on Dune and their website.

We will not be supporting this application.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote AGAINST MYX's proposal in its current form.

The application lacks sufficient details with the large amount of capital requested (largest in LTIPP). While the protocol shows promising usage in volume within its first month, key information regarding execution, KPIs, and milestones are missing on top of its early life atop the Arbitrum ecosystem."

Neutra

Wintermute Feedback)

Neutra Finance's application had a thorough amount of reasoning and justification for some of its KPIs, and milestones. However, we did have some concerns regarding their execution strategy and significant attrition in TVL.

Their execution strategy allocated a significant amount of ARB rewards to partnerships and marketing campaigns, however, there is very little detail about which protocols they will be collaborating with and what the funds will effectively be spent on.

There is also a clause that states if their nUSDC vault is not ready by the time rewards need to be distributed, then their native token stakers will receive these ARB rewards which is a bad use of funds. There is also no mention of an audit being done for their new nUSDC vault.

Unfortunately, due to the age of the project, their lack of adoption, and execution strategy we will not be supporting this application.

GMX Feedback)

Generally supportive of the approving Neutra Finance's grant application. Their grant size is small and they have a tight focus on where to stream incentives to achieve their desired ends. Neutra Finance demonstrates a clear understanding of the challenges and opportunities in DeFi, offering innovative solutions to address them. The project's focus on user engagement, strategic partnerships, and new vault strategies aligns well with the goals of the DAO, aiming to attract more users to Arbitrum and introduce new vaults. Additionally, the detailed execution plan and past successes provide confidence in the project's ability to effectively utilize the grant funds to achieve its objectives. Overall, Neutra Finance presents a promising opportunity to contribute positively to the growth and development of the Arbitrum ecosystem. We would be supporting the proposal.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote AGAINST Neutra's proposal.

Detailed proposal that shared significant detail re: protocol details, roadmap, etc. RE: grant size, ~40% is allocated to partnerships and UA with minimal detail on protocols to be partnered with as well as bonus airdrops with a vague points/tickets system that lacks information in contrast to other proposals who described these strategies at length. With nGLP TVL having dropped significantly and the transition process currently being underway, providing incentives while this is in flux does not seem like a good use of DAO capital at this point in time. Suggest they resubmit at a later grants window."

404 Feedback)

Neutra's application was thorough and well-written, but our main concern is in regards to the high grant request when compared to the current usage metrics. The incentives are to basically re-jumpstart the protocol. Additionally, there is some unclear information around the use of partnership funds and little information around mitigating sybil farming. Due to these concerns we will not be supporting this proposal.

Nevermind

Wintermute Feedback)

Nevermind's application struggled to score well across most criteria, this is due to the uniqueness of their product and distribution mechanism.

The application focuses heavily on rewarding developers of AI agents - onboarding, usage, etc. This likely results in the ARB incentives not really going to users of Arbitrum and therefore, landing in the hands of only a few individuals/developers. They present a unique product to Arbitrum but their value proposition is unclear which is evident in their milestones and KPIs. Lastly, there is very little available data to assess current activity. Unfortunately, we don't think this application is suitable for LTIPP.

GFX Feedback)

This is an exciting concept, but unfortunately the grant plan suffers from a lack of execution detail, and focuses on integrations/business development. That would be fine in the context of driving adoption and new users and activity, but the milestones proposed do not hold the grantee accountable for increasing the number of users and assets on Arbitrum (or increasing the frequency with which they interact with Arbitrum). Recommend the applicant revise and resubmit in future grants cycles with more focus on volume or verified user acquisition,

Karel Feedback)

"Vote AGAINST Nevermind's proposal.

Intriguing concept and do firmly believe AI x crypto is the next best thing but don't believe LTIPP or equivalent is the right program for this. Grant breakdown and usage does not fit with broader incentivization program followed by other applicants / work towards achieving the LTIPP's broader goals. "

NFTperp

Wintermute Feedback)

Nftperp's application scored well across several criteria. They are a unique protocol that has proven their ability to grow and attract users and volume (v1) and we expect this to continue for V2. Their strategy, milestones, and objectives are clear and well-justified.

We would've liked to have seen more information about their actual taker distribution mechanisms and their methods to prevent wash trading. Furthermore, we found their requested grant size to be far too large given their current DAU and their targeted DAU. As a result, we expect a large amount of rewards to end up in the hands of a few large users.

Unfortunately, we will not be supporting this application.

Note: their application still contains one line of wording about distributing incentives over 10 months which was originally picked up by an LTIPP advisor. This looks to be corrected in their milestone section.

GFX Feedback)

The applicant presents an interesting new protocol. Unfortunately, the scale of the request is quite large, with a cost of 750 ARB per active trader, even if KPIs are satisfied. We recommend the applicant revise with a smaller request, more cost-effective approach, or by identifying lower-cost ways they have already been able to achieve success on their own and can be scaled with the backing of a grant.

GMX Feedback)

NFTperp's application is quite well rounded but they cost of 750 ARB per user is extremely expensive even if the target is met. We will not be supporting this application.

Okto

404 Feedback)

Okto brings a mobile first trading experience that we think has the opportunity to onboard new users from a large growing market - India. That have clear execution plan with decently ambitious goals of 10x volume and 5x users & TVL. Their milestones and KPIs are clear and effective - overall a solid application that justified an appropriate ask of 50k ARB. While we feel like to large of a percentage is allocated to the ARB Leaderboard Competition and it was hard to verify some of their usage data, we will be supporting this application.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote FOR Okto's proposal.

Interesting proposal and mobile-first product focused on India, a prime crypto region of the world who is very mobile-friendly. As a multichain wallet, they have many chain partnerships ranging from 10 EVM chains (Polygon zkEVM), Aptos, and soon Solana and Cosmos. Initially, was a bit concerned but their Okto Futures product will be native to Arbitrum which has seen decent traction since launching. See an opportunity to drive users, volume, and TVL to Arbitrum through their product. Revised grant size is reasonable. "

GMX Feedback)

The app is currently in the beta phase but has already shown impressive numbers. Given the grant's size, it's a clear choice based on the demonstrated metrics, and their commitment to matching the grant with generated fees adds further incentive. Notably, there's currently a lack of mobile-native futures aggregators within the Arbitrum ecosystem or on any other blockchain, particularly those integrated directly with supported wallets as proposed. The benefits of funding this innovative product outweigh the grant's cost and will likely drive increased adoption of Arbitrum among mobile users. The KPIs and milestones align well with the request size, indicating a reasonable and achievable roadmap for the project. Overall, this proposal presents a compelling opportunity to support the development of a unique and much-needed tool in the ecosystem.

Olas

GMX Feedback)

There is a place for capitalizing on narrative and trending opportunities, and AI is one of them. However, because AI presents a novelty, there is a question of the size of the ask and if it is optimal to the newness of the sector that Olas aspires to operate within. We have concerns regarding the feasibility and alignment of the proposed grant with the goals of the Arbitrum ecosystem. While the proposal outlines ambitious objectives and KPIs, it lacks clarity on how the requested funds will be effectively utilized to achieve these goals within the specified timeline. Additionally, the allocation of funds between Valory and the Olas DAO raises questions about the equitable distribution of resources and the potential for conflicts of interest. Without a more detailed and transparent plan for execution, including concrete milestones and risk mitigation strategies, it is difficult to justify supporting this proposal. We would be voting no for the proposal.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote AGAINST Olas' proposal.

Very novel/innovation and a space I've been paying attention to. That said, while Olas' had a comprehensive proposal across their protocol, roadmap and justification for the grant, there are elements of the grant request that are out of scope in my mind with respect to LTIPP re: awareness campaign, development academy, hackathon, and the Olas Build Program to a degree (not entirely clear but donation to program and redistributed back to contributors of program services)."

404 Feedback)

While Olas presented a very complete application and is building novel products in a space that we think Arbitrum should be investing in, their development academy and hackathon (unclear if the 50K ARB is going entirely to prizes or also cover costs) do not fall within the scope of LTIPP in our opinion. Their application highlights the need for the DAO to create additional development focused programs and we highly encourage Olas to apply to either the Arbitrum Foundation grant programs or wait to reapply for a future DAO led program.

Orange Finance

Wintermute Feedback)

Orange Finance's application was thorough and provided solid justification for their grant size. Furthermore, they provided clear milestones, KPIs, and goals, with their milestones tied to ARB unlocks based on protocol activity.

Their protocol has seen decent adoption given their age, however, no clear signs of strong demand. Nonetheless, their product builds on top of existing DeFi protocols and provides passive yield strategies for users.

They have a good execution strategy and we like that it directly targets stickiness that will last longer than the incentive period.

We will be supporting this application.

404 Feedback)

Orange Finance scored well across the majority of the rubric specifically due to their novel product and alignment with Arbitrum. They present a unique product that builds atop several other protocols within the Arbitrum ecosystem and we believe their traction metrics suffers simply due to the complexity of their product. The ask is a little high for their current traction but we are encouraged by their retention strategy and believe incentives will lead to longterm synergies. Due to the strong execution strategy, composability and long-term retention presented we are supporting this application.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote FOR Orange Finance's proposal.

Detailed proposal and well justified grant request amount. Protocol has seen decent adoption which has since lowered since submission but incorporates an interesting points program mechanic and locking mechanism that aligns well with longer term stickiness and achievement towards milestone goals (\$1M -> \$2/\$4M TVL). Support this going to the DAO."

Orderly Network

Wintermute Feedback)

Orderly Network's application was pretty good. It was well-written and provided a good amount of information for all relevant sections. Their infrastructure and product are unique and promote network effects within the Perp DEX space.

The justification of the grant size is okay, but rather ambitious in their end goal.

The main concern with this application is that there are very few first-order or second-order effects that are captured by Arbitrum as all trading is done on their app-chain (which is built on the OP Stack).

So the main benefit for Arbitrum is that their users can deposit into a vault and earn yield.

Given these concerns, we don't think this initiative is worth funding and do not support this application.

GFX Feedback)

The applicant requests a moderate amount of funding, has a clear and easy-to-monitor execution plan and milestones, and appears to be modestly growing without the grant. We

believe the grant funds requested are appropriately sized to try to double down on recent growth. We recommend this grant be funded.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote AGAINST Orderly Network's proposal.

Comprehensive proposal that ranked well in the rubric (distribution, strategy, etc.). Grant size is sized well when taking into account the moderate traction they've seen to-date. Milestones/KPIs are lofty to ~4x+ TVL and 3.5x their DAU throughout span of the LTIPP. Agreed with Wintermute's comments on effects being driven to their app-chain which is built on OP Stack. Given this and their differentiation at the product and end user experience level vs. other perp DEXs on Arbitrum, don't think this meaningfully contributes to supporting Arbitrum's competitive position in the market."

GMX Feedback)

The proposal submitted by Orderly Network is comprehensive, revealing a well-thought-out strategy for achieving growth and innovation within the Arbitrum ecosystem. Their clear roadmap, detailed execution plan, and specific KPIs demonstrate a commitment to achieving tangible results. By offering competitive APRs and incentivizing user participation in various products such as Deposit Vaults, Quantum Pools, and Algo Trading Tools, Orderly aims to attract new users and increase TVL on Arbitrum significantly. The proposed grant will enable them to implement these initiatives effectively, ultimately driving adoption of Arbitrum among diverse user segments and enhancing the overall ecosystem's vitality. We would be supporting the proposal.

404 Feedback)

Orderly Network presented a very complete application and they have seen impressive growth over since launch. Overall, they had detailed milestones with trackable success metrics, detailed KPIs, and a clear execution strategy. We were concerned about the long term and 2nd order benefits Arbitrum would see from this grant since Orderly operates its own app chain. However, we believe they have sufficiently justified their grant request and will be supporting their application.

Origin Protocol

404 Feedback)

OETH has decent traction on mainnet and as mentioned in other applications, support applications that help further LST adoption and liquidity on Arbitrum. Origin Protocol provided a complete application that scored well on most metrics; one thing we would've liked to see was better incorporation of their presented KPIs in the milestones. Overall the grant size was properly justified and we support this application.

GMX Feedback)

The team has demonstrated a clear understanding of how to bootstrap liquidity and achieve growth within the Arbitrum ecosystem through targeted incentivization measures. By leveraging both ARB and their native token OGV, they aim to drive liquidity to their pools on Balancer and incentivize integrations with lending platforms like Silo, thereby facilitating the expansion of LST usage on Arbitrum. The proposed milestones are specific and achievable, with a clear timeline for execution over the 12-week grant period and We are generally supportive of Origin Protocol's grant application. They have a proven track record in the LST sector, and out of the many LST applicants, boast one of the higher TVLs for their staked ETH offering. Helping proven players in competitive spaces should generally benefit Arbitrum.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote FOR Origin Protocol's proposal.

Good proposal and impressive growth on mainnet. Driving further LST adoption on Arbitrum is necessary and will help solidify Arbitrum's competitive position in the market. Relatively simplistic grant use and would have liked to see the team address stickiness of liquidity post-LTIPP (question deleted from proposal)."

Overnight Finance

Karel Feedback)

"Vote AGAINST Overnight Finance's proposal.

Good proposal that scored relatively well on the rubric and product has seen good adoption on Base. Nothing too sophisticated or novel re: incentive mechanism but believe planned APR is high relative to market/other peers on the market which is likely for OF to achieve their milestone/KPIs. Possibility of overpaying for initial growth that may not be sticky following the incentivization period (insufficient data to illustrate this for USD+. Looking at their prior OP grant (400k OP tokens), would suggest a similar size as a starting point to give them the opportunity to showcase better PMF within the Arbitrum landscape prior to increasing the size.

Suggest the resubmit with a lower amount at a later grants window."

GMX Feedback)

Delta-neutral stablecoins are generally an innovative offering over most other stablecoin projects, and as previously mentioned, the stablecoin sector is one area you generally do want to encourage development and competition compared to others (such as LSTs/RSTs). Would prefer a lower amount, but incentivising stablecoin minting can be tricky. They currently have around 20 million in TVL and quite small liquidity pools, so usage of the stabletoken is low. The

new V2 version is innovative yet unproven where they will use a combination of Perps and Spot to peg the token and offer yields from the funding fees. The biggest hindrance to funding is the grant size, the grant ask is too large for a project that does not have significant track record and is moving to an untested model.

404 Feedback)

Overnight Finance has seen some impressive traction over the past couple months across competing chains and seen some previous success on Arbitrum. While we feel the incentive design is a little narrow in scope, we believe the reach of Overnight's cross-chain userbase adds a good bit of direction with Arbitrum incentives. Additionally, while the grant request is very high, the reach of new users and potential redirection to Arbitrum is worth the cost. Overall, we support this application.

Wintermute Feedback)

Overnight Finance's application was solid and they provided sufficient information throughout. Their product is highly composable and one of the few relatively successful protocols offering such a product. Our main concern is with their requested grant size and execution strategy. Their requested grant size is on the large end which is coupled with a classic LM program targeting very high APYs which is arguably not the best use of DAO funds. We would've liked to have seen more of a focus on rewarding stickiness or implementing more novel LM efforts to provide better data to the DAO.

Unfortunately, we will not be supporting this application but encourage the team to resubmit with a smaller grant request.

PancakeSwap

404 Feedback)

PancakeSwap presented a well rounded application as they boast a protocol that has been around for a while and features good usage metrics. We are supportive in their multi-faceted execution strategy and justified grant ask. We support this application.

Wintermute Feedback)

PancakeSwap's application was solid and scored well across a lot of criteria. They have a great reputation and a long history of development and growth. They bring some interesting and novel product offerings to Arbitrum under one UI making it easy for users to access, their upcoming integrations with Arbitrum-native applications are also a plus.

They have a strong user base with a lot of TVL across other chains which is valuable for Arbitrum. Their KPIs, milestones, and goals are clear and sufficiently justified.

While their growth has not been explosive, there has been a steady upward trend since their deployment on Arbitrum. We would've liked to see more effort towards retaining users and LPs after the incentives end + a bit more innovation than pure liquidity mining.

We will be supporting this application.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote FOR PancakeSwap's proposal.

Strong proposal and scored highly on rubric (execution strategy, metrics, etc.) + potential to drive adoption from other chains (where they have more a presence vs. Arbitrum). Milestones are clear and aligned with LTIPP goals to grow volume, usage, and TVL, and, if successful, will be a net positive for the Arbitrum ecosystem. On incentivizing stickiness after LTIPP, keen to observe how Prediction and Stryke contributes to achievement of of LTIPP goals thereafter."

ParaSwap

GFX Feedback)

This request size was reasonable and for a protocol that can lend diversity and competition to the DEX space on Arbitrum. Where this grant plan could be improved would be more detail in distribution and especially milestones. Milestones should focus on measurable, easily verifiable, and unambiguously beneficial metrics. We strongly recommend that this applicant resubmit with improved milestones and increased focus on migrating users from other chains to Arbitrum.

GMX Feedback)

Paraswap has successfully achieved product-market fit and maintains a commendable track record in executing product and strategy initiatives. The application is comprehensive and holds the potential to enrich the diversity of high-quality DEXes within the Arbitrum ecosystem, thereby providing participants with access to increased liquidity. The execution plan is transparent and entails trading and reward-seeking competitions to stimulate activity, a strategy that has historically proven effective for Paraswap and appears to pose relatively low risk. However, the outlined milestones lack specificity, and the application lacks clear benefits to the ecosystem. We advocate for the inclusion of more justifiable performance metrics before endorsing this application.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote AGAINST ParaSwap's proposal.

Strong proposal and they're a household name in the space across multiple chains/ecosystems. However believe the milestones lack detail and should be paired with key KPIs they are driving. With one of their objectives being bringing over existing ParaSwap users from other chains to Arbitrum, would like to see this further detailed in the overall execution strategy. Believe grant amount is fair but invite them to resubmit proposal at a later grants window with more detail to the above."

Peapods Finance

GMX Feedback)

I'm generally supportive of this grant from Peapods Finance. The tokenization and capitalization of volatility is a novel offering enabled by DeFi and smart contract capabilities.

However, I do wonder about the stickiness of the users they are able to attract. Much like other DeFi exotic assets and platforms (VOLT Finance for example), the depth of reach for exotic DeFi assets is still outside the realm of even mainstream onchain adoption. Some more background on the growth AND maturity of their current mainnet TVL has developed so the Peapods team could give more insight into potential future prospects would be helpful in their future grant endeavors

Karel feedback)

"Vote FOR Peapods Finance's proposal.

Strong proposal and innovative protocol. Highly composable and detailed execution plan and grant justification. Since launching, has seen decent adoption on Arbitrum and continued growth on L1. Only concern is regarding the voting mechanism re: the "Top 5 Voted Pods" initiative but given size, not enough to disqualify."

404 Feedback)

Peapods Finance is a unique protocol with some interesting mechanisms. Overall, they scored well across the rubric due to their detailed execution plan, but lost a few points for the size of their ask and weak milestones. While their non-Arbitrum TVL is a little low, given the novelty of the protocol we believe this a protocol that can benefit the wider ARB ecosystem and may uniquely benefit from incentives. We will be supporting this application.

Pear Protocol

404 Feedback)

Pear Protocol presents a product that is novel to Arbitrum and successfully leverages other protocols in the ecosystem. They have justified their grant request with a detailed execution strategy and solid KPIs. We felt like their application could have provided more detailed milestones and the distribution of the incentives is a concern as they will likely end up in the hands of a few users. However, this is a protocol with history of building on Arbitrum and we believe incentivizing its full public launch will improve Arbitrum's competitiveness.

Wintermute Feedback)

This application was good and scored decently across some criteria. Their product is unique and we like that it is built on top of existing protocols. They had some solid justification and

calculation of KPIs, milestones, and goals, however, their estimations don't really justify their grant size given the protocol's current usage.

They could've also improved on their incentive design allocating some rewards to running trading competitions (which actively drive user engagement).

While we are aware the protocol is in a private beta, looking at their Dune dashboard there is 1 active daily users indicating very low signs of adoption. We would typically be against supporting an application of this size and grant request, however, their milestone ARB unlocks provide sufficient protection for the DAO.

We will be supporting this application.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote FOR Pear Protocol's proposal.

Well-written proposal that scored moderately well on the rubric. Innovative product that is composable with other Arbitrum protocols (liquidity agnostic). Despite being in closed beta, they have seen decent usage. Protocol was supposed to launch into full public launch on March 29 but have not seen any updated information on progress here. Proposal could have benefited from better distribution mechanisms (ie. capped per user) and more detailed milestones to also drive user metrics on top of TVL. For this proposal going to the DAO."

Perpie

Wintermute Feedback)

Perpie's application is pretty solid and ticks off a lot of criteria. The main areas they lost points in are the grant request size in conjunction with the product's usage and age.

Their distribution strategy seems fine although there may be potential for users to abuse self-referral rebates. Nonetheless, the distribution strategy is heavily focused on the end user and promoting trading activity on Arbitrum which is great.

While we don't think the grant size is justified, we plan to support Perpie as the Telegram bot industry has seen high demand. Thus, we think it's reasonable for delegates to decide the outcome.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote FOR Perpie's proposal.

Good proposal that scored well across rubric. Supportive as given nature of the product (Telegram bot), composability, and usage in line with GMX STIP campaign. Keen to see other aspects of roadmap implemented. Over to the DAO."

404 Feedback)

Overall, Perpie's application was decent and they addressed all the necessary components. They have had strong usage during other incentive programs, retention is a bit of a concern though. While the grant ask is a little high we support Perpie as demand for the TG bot industry is evident and is something Arbitrum DAO should support for LTIPP

Perpy

404 Feedback)

Overall, we felt this was a reasonable ask with a very detailed execution plan that incentivizes and attracts users in a couple different ways. While Perpy's product usage given its age is a concern, they have presented co-contributions and have given detailed KPI's and milestones that target attracting new users. Given their team history and commitment to Arbitrum, we have decided to support this application.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote FOR Perpy's proposal.

Detailed proposal and novel product/approach. Grant ask after lowering is well justified and aligned with their execution strategy to hit target milestones/KPIs. Furthermore, given composability of protocol + existing/future partnerships with Arbitrum protocols, can lead to furthering a flywheel on Arbitrum."

GMX Feedback)

Perpy's application presents a comprehensive overview, with a clear execution strategy outlined. Additionally, Perpy has proposed co-contributions, which are expected to aid in achieving the specified milestones and KPIs. The grant will be utilized to reward traders based on performance, introducing innovation to this segment of the market cycle. Despite the team's relatively short track record, they have demonstrated effective execution of strategies in the past. Therefore, we are in favor of supporting this application.

Pike

Wintermute Feedback)

Pike's application was very strong and they scored well in a range of criteria. Their application was very thorough in describing their execution strategy, goals, milestones, and KPIs. They had a good emphasis on attempting to attract new users and deposits to Arbitrum using their existing user base.

Their requested grant size is very large given their age and protocol usage. Typically we would be against such a request however, they have provided performance-based milestones to unlock further tranches of their grant.

The other concern is that they currently have no audit (one is being completed with ottersec). Ultimately, we think that Pike brings new and novel infrastructure to Arbitrum making it easier to connect with users across different chains. It will allow collateral to stay on Arbitrum while users explore other chains; and vice versa. Therefore, we feel like it's ultimately the DAO's decision as to whether or not they want to take a risk on the potential long-term benefits of Pike. We will support this application.

GFX Feedback)

This was a strong proposal in most areas other than request size and audits (which are still ongoing). Given the clear execution strategy, milestones, and metrics to proceed with the grant plan, Pike was able to overcome the softer scores in those areas of the rubric. We recommend approving this grant.

GMX Feedback)

While the product offering seems compelling, I question the size of the requested ARB and the ability for Pike to deliver on their aspirational goals relative to the size of the ask. If Pike were to lower their ask, I would be more receptive to their application. The Pike Protocol is aiming to bring cross-chain lending to the Arbitrum Ecosystem, they are in a capped launch at the moment, the product has yet to prove that it has significant demand for cross-chain lending/borrowing. They have stiff competition with native borrowing/lending platforms that are native to Arbitrum including Radiant. Their grant request has a wide range but overall I think it is too expensive and I fear when the incentives dry up so will the TVL gathered from the protocol. It would be better if they had a firm lower ask to test if their protocol gathered significant traction and then come back to the DAO for a large ask at a later time.

Karel Feedback)

Vote FOR Pike's proposal.

Comprehensive proposal that scored well across the rubric with a detailed execution plan, milestones, and with a lens to maintaining stickiness throughout LTIPP. While this is a very large (ranged) grant size request in contrast to their life, the protocol has seen strong adoption across TVL and users, and the grant unlocked will be conditional upon the achievement of milestones which reduces risk. Over to the DAO.

Playnance

404 Feedback)

Terrible application, ridiculous grant request, and insufficient application details. We will not be supporting this application.

GFX Feedback)

This project deployed March 1st and is requesting 3.6m ARB with an application that is not especially detailed. The request size alone makes it difficult to spend time to provide detailed feedback, since it's just so far away from what could reasonably be granted.

GMX Feedback)

They are requesting 3.6M ARB tokens which is outrageous. We will not support this application

Poolside

Wintermute Feedback)

Poolside provided a solid application that scored decently across most criteria. They have a clear vision of how their product intends to bring benefits to Arbitrum with straightforward KPIs and milestones. Their grant request is sufficiently justified and their project is quite composable. They didn't score well in protocol activity, age, and usage on Arbitrum and other chains, and lastly, there was not much innovation in the incentive mechanism.

Overall, it was a solid application with a reasonable grant request that attempts to solve an inherent DeFi problem. We will be supporting this application.

GFX Feedback)

This protocol aims to solve a pain point for rebasing tokens, though this is noticeably more of a pain point for issuers whose products suffer than it is for users who may simply opt into different tokens. The protocol is relatively young, with modest success in attracting users. This proposal would be considerably strengthened if the applicants identified clear mechanisms that have led to some initial success or momentum, and then craft the grant program around expanding or leveraging those mechanisms for sustained growth, rather than simply putting an APY target on LPing the major assets they already support without much differentiation.

GMX Feedback)

Poolside is a recently established protocol that has yet to gain significant traction. It aims to streamline the integration of yield-bearing assets within the Arbitrum DeFi ecosystem while safeguarding Liquidity Providers against foreseeable losses, addressing a prevalent concern in DeFi. We appreciate their strategy to incentivize participation in their pools, fostering increased TVL and potentially generating a favorable feedback loop to enhance pool efficiency. The rationale behind their grant request is sound, and we support this application.

Karel Feedback)

Vote FOR Poolside's proposal.

Well-written proposal that scored well across the rubric. While it's a young protocol, it has shown modest traction and the potential to grow/scale further with the right incentives in place (albeit Arbitrum adoption has been lacking). The proposal presents a relatively straightforward incentive structure but provides a detailed plan on how it hopes to achieve their goals. Would

have liked to see more detail behind stickiness post-program and greater detail on their Points system + how that could potentially feed into the proposal. Grant size could have been slightly reduced given current traction but a worthwhile experiment for the DAO.

Pre dy

404 Feedback)

This appears to be an incomplete application and does not fall within the guidelines of LTIPP as the grant would be used to initially create a lending pool. Even though an additional distribution strategy is mentioned, there is not sufficient details to properly evaluate this plan. The milestones & KPI sections are also incomplete or lack sufficient details. No official audit for V3-V5 is concerning and also contributed to our decision of not approving this grant request.

Wintermute Feedback)

Application is incomplete and extremely unclear on their goals, milestones, and KPIs. Their intended use of the grant is against the rules of LTIPP.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote AGAINST Pre dy's proposal.

Incomplete proposal and use of grant is inappropriate. Not enough specificity in the execution strategy and no detail re: stickiness to retain users/liquidity/etc. Given the size requested, more detail and a complete proposal is necessary."

Prime

Wintermute Feedback)

Prime's application was good and scored well across various criteria. Their product is relatively unique with a wide variety of assets, allowing Arbitrum to tap into their existing user base across multiple chains.

Their KPIs, goals, and milestones were clearly displayed with a good amount of justification.

They have a solid execution strategy with experience in distributing grants previously, although they could've been a bit more innovative in rewarding existing users to move capital or take out loans on Arbitrum.

Their requested grant size is well justified and inline with their current TVL. Our main concern is that there hasn't been a huge amount of growth or adoption of the protocol.

We will be supporting this application.

GFX Feedback)

Normally this request would be on the large side for the grant plan, but Prime's cross-chain deployments and stated intention to introduce users on other chains to Arbitrum allow it to score highly enough that we recommend this grant be approved.

GMX Feedback)

We would be supporting the proposal. The protocol demonstrates extensive experience in utilizing incentives, as evidenced by their successful implementation with Moonbeam. Their goal of achieving a TVL of \$10 million aligns well with their proposed grant amount and appears to be quite feasible. Of particular significance is their strategy to attract users from other ecosystems to Arbitrum, leveraging the same approach that proved effective with Moonbeam. Additionally, they plan to utilize the Prime Points community program to efficiently distribute incentives, further bolstering user adoption on Arbitrum.

The Prime Protocol introduces a compelling concept whereby users can borrow against their liquidity on any chain, facilitating cross-chain liquidity utilization. For instance, users could borrow against their BNB holdings on a different network and access USDC on Arbitrum. This design has the potential to broaden Arbitrum's liquidity base by tapping into external ecosystems while providing users with exposure to Arbitrum's low-cost environment. However, there is a need for more detailed information in the KPI and milestones section, particularly regarding the planned "ramping up" process, which requires clarification to ensure transparency and accountability in project execution.

Primex

Karel feedback)

"Vote FOR Primex's proposal.

Good proposal that scored decently on rubric. Interesting model allowing you to leverage + hedge LP through lending markets and like the achievement (points) system to gamify activity. Current levels of adoption is lacking. It's a somewhat large requested grant size which is at par to current TVL to-date on Arbitrum and relative to their activity. Objectives are lofty (boosting TVL to \$2.2M - ~24x what it is today on Arbitrum) but could be a worthwhile investment for the DAO to help bootstrap them the protocol. Will receive grant only if they achieve KPIs. For bringing this to the DAO."

404 Feedback)

Primex provided very little links for the council to verify the data presented, but after looking through their app, we see that've begun to get some traction on Arbitrum. The grant ask is a little high relative to their current usage and we would have appreciated more granular details around how they plan to raise their utilization across some of their targeted pools. Overall though we were pleased with their execution strategy and milestones and believe this should move to a DAO vote, given the relatively low ask and current traction starting to increase.

GFX Feedback)

The grant proposal could have been significantly strengthened by identifying a past success, presenting data on the cost effectiveness of that mechanism, and then utilizing the grant funds to scale or replicate that prior success.

GMX Feedback

Firstly, while the requested grant size seems justified based on the outlined incentive program, the objectives and execution strategy lack specificity and clarity. The proposal lacks detailed plans for achieving the stated goals, such as boosting liquidity and increasing trading volume, within the specified timeline. We are not generally supportive of Primex Finance's application. The DEX space is heavily saturated and it's not clear to me what exactly Primex brings that's new to the space.

Wintermute Feedback: Conflict of interest

Purity

GFX Feedback)

While the request is low, and should accordingly be allowed a riskier profile in considering a grant request, the project has not yet launched. Recommend the applicant resubmit once the product is live and has some evidence of user adoption that can be scaled with a grant.

GMX Feedback)

Purity has yet to be launched, it is advisable for the applicant to reapply once the product is operational and shows evidence of user adoption, thereby enabling scalability with the grant. While we acknowledge Purity's significant reduction in funding request and their interest in launching on Arbitrum, the absence of a completed security audit prevents approval of the grant request. Unfortunately we will not be supporting this application.

404 Feedback)

While we appreciate Purity lowering their ask by over 50% and are excited to see them consider Arbitrum for their launch, without a completed security audit we can not approve this grant request. Purity is better suited to apply for the LTIP program so that a security audit can be obtained and the mainnet launch of their trading products completed. For future applications, we recommend focusing on highlighting the key differences & improvements the Purity trading bot has over its competitors. Additionally, a more thorough explanation of the team's qualifications and the expected impact on the Arbitrum ecosystem will help strength the application.

Pyth

GFX Feedback)

Improving oracle diversity on a chain increases the resilience of the ecosystem, not only because protocols have more choices of oracle provider, but also because protocols can use combinations of oracle providers for different risk profiles, asset types, and as failsafes in the event of a primary oracle failure.

This grant plan's main weakness is the large spend. The cost per additional oracle is considerably higher than other oracle provider grant applications. Pyth, however, has a demonstrated ability to gain adoption on Arbitrum, and also provide more exotic or esoteric oracle feeds by virtue of the sheer number of feeds. On balance, the benefits of having a competitive oracle ecosystem on Arbitrum and Pyth's track record with working within the ecosystem outweighs the scoring penalties from the large size of the request.

GMX Feedback)

Pyth's application is undoubtedly beneficial for the ecosystem, although the grant size is considerable. While we support this application, we suggest exploring the possibility of reducing the requested amount. Having a diverse range of proven oracles within the Arbitrum ecosystem is immensely advantageous, particularly in light of numerous complaints about the high costs associated with other oracle services. Pyth boasts a proven track record and is poised to provide immediate benefits to the ecosystem upon integration. Despite the sizeable grant, the allocated ARB will be utilized for gas fee rebates, directly benefiting the ecosystem.

404 Feedback)

Very large grant size, but echo the sentiments of the other reviewers - Pyth has shown strong traction on Arbitrum and it is beneficial to have competing oracle

ecosystems.

Rage Trade

404 Feedback)

Given the lack of clear execution strategy and detail into how these trading competitions will be structured, we can not justify such a large ask. Additionally, there is not mentioned on how they will prevent or monitor wash trading; even though the prizes are based on ROI, we are not convinced this is sufficient. The applicant has strong alignment and history building on Arbitrum, but overall this application was lacking the justifications needed to approve this request.

Wintermute Feedback)

Rage Trade's application was decent and they scored well in areas like Arbitrum alignment, product usage, composability, and the potential for the grant to reach new users.

Their product provides an easy experience for users to trade on perps while abstracting a lot of the annoying blockchain aspects. They've also had a good amount of growth since the launch of their product.

In contrast, we found the execution strategy to be rather weak and not contain enough details specifically about how they will actually score users in their trading competition. They also didn't provide information on how they intend to combat gaming mechanics when rewarding users based on OI (i.e., imposing a min. Trade requirement).

They also lacked calculations and justifications for their requested grant size which was very large and while they have decent traction, their protocol activity does not justify the size of their

request. We would've also liked to have seen more protocols integrated before incentives started as allocating +1M ARB to a single protocol is not the best use of DAO funds. Unfortunately, we will not be supporting this application.

GFX Feedback)

The main weakness of this grant proposal was 1) an overly ambitious funds request, 2) lack of clarity around how grant funds would be distributed. We recommend this applicant revise and resubmit at future grants cycles with a considerably smaller request and with more details about how ARB would be distributed – preferably with as little discretion left to the grantee as possible by establishing rules and qualifications ahead of time.

Re.al

GFX Feedback)

This is an interesting use case for an Orbit chain and we recommend the applicant return in the next grants cycle. The grant plan is significant spend and on a chain that launched 3 days prior to our review, so the timing likely prevents this grant plan from being as strong as it could be with more preparation, data, and information about initial launch.

GMX Feedback)

Re.al introduces itself as the inaugural permissionless Layer 2 platform specifically designed for tokenized real-world assets (RWAs), leveraging Arbitrum Orbit. As the sole permissionless L2 platform dedicated to RWAs, and the exclusive chain-based ecosystem for RWA liquidity, re.al stands out in the market. While their product shows promise for achieving product-market fit under favorable circumstances, it's worth noting that they were deployed on Orbit only on March 17th. Monitoring their progress is essential, and we may encourage them to reapply for the next program. However, it's worth mentioning that their airdrop campaign to enhance liquidity is set to commence on March 21st, which could impact the review process. Unfortunately we will not be supporting Re.al's application at the moment.

404 Feedback)

Re.al's expansion to an Orbit L2 is exciting, especially given they are bringing a suite of products to the chain. Unfortunately, they are lacking the necessary audits which leaves a critical gap in their application. This paired with the fact they launched on March 17th makes the large grant ask difficult to justify with no current chain usage. We encourage Re.al to begin gaining initial traction and adoption on their Orbit chain and reapply to future incentive rounds.

Reboot

Wintermute Feedback)

Reboot's application was solid and scored well across some criteria. They provided clear goals, milestones, and KPIs, and a well-thought-out execution plan. In contrast, their requested grant size is rather large with little data available to cross-check the protocol's metrics with the

provided screenshots. Furthermore, we are not sure that distributing 450k ARB across one single game and one distribution mechanism is the best use of DAO funds. For example, we would've liked to have seen rebates to reduce the cost of entry to onboard more users, incentivization of other games, etc.

Unfortunately, we will not be supporting this application.

GMX Feedback)

The team recently launched the game a few months ago, and it has garnered a decent amount of traction with great retention and an average game time per player/user. Based on the provided application, it appears to be well-structured, with clear objectives, execution strategies, and outlined KPIs. However, there seems to be a significant emphasis on incentivizing user engagement through daily tournaments and ARB prizes, without substantial focus on broader ecosystem development or long-term sustainability beyond player acquisition. The proposed grant size and allocation also seem disproportionately large compared to the expected outcomes and impact on the ecosystem. Additionally, there's a lack of clarity on how the project intends to address potential scalability challenges or ensure equitable distribution of rewards. There may be concerns about users attempting to manipulate the tournaments by utilizing multiple entries, leading to a concentration of wins among a few participants. It is also unclear how the platform plans to retain its user base once the incentives end. While the project shows promise, a smaller grant might have been more appropriate, and the team may benefit from applying for the larger Arbitrum Gaming Fund to support their initiatives.

GFX Feedback)

If it was on the basis of past success, which also looked like it could be scaled with the assistance of a grant, and the straightforward incentives planned, we think this grant could be successful. Before committing such a large amount of funding, we would prefer to see a smaller request to make sure this approach works, though.

Reserve

Wintermute Feedback)

Extremely strong application that scores well across nearly all metrics. The grant size is well justified and very in line with Reserve's activity and user metrics. They described a very thorough and well-thought-out execution plan with clear justification for their milestones and KPIs.

Lastly, they've offered co-incentives, marketing, and voting power across other DeFi protocols to achieve their KPIs.

We will be supporting Reserve Protocol's application.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote FOR Reserve Protocol's proposal.

Strong, well detailed proposal that scored well on the rubric (great metrics and traction, detailed execution plan, etc). Large requested grant size but believe if they can execute and draw activity from current presence on Mainnet and Base then it will be a net positive to Arbitrum. Offered co-incentives and strong collaboration and ecosystem alignment with RTokens supporting other Arbitrum DeFi protocols."

GMX Feedback)

The requested grant amount aligns well with Reserve's established activity and user metrics, demonstrating a strong product-market fit. Their execution plan is detailed and meticulously crafted, with very clear milestones and roadmap. The protocol's compatibility with other protocols is emphasized, enabling RTokens to be backed by assets from various platforms, fostering a symbiotic relationship that boosts TVL alongside other Arbitrum protocols. There are also co-incentives, marketing strategies, and voting power collaborations with other DeFi protocols which will help them to meet their KPI targets. We would like to support Reserve's application.

Revest Labs

GFX Feedback)

This proposal is relatively straightforward, putting traditional incentives on a new module of an existing project. The risk-reward is favorable and worth giving a grant, and the goals are both easy to understand and easy to measure.

GMX Feedback)

Revest's application has the potential to offer utility to Real World Assets (RWAs) on Arbitrum, potentially acting as a catalyst for the ecosystem's growth. The budget and grant size demonstrate careful consideration and efficiency in capital allocation. Their execution strategy is transparent and aims to incentivize users to lock liquidity into Resonate RWA contracts. We endorse Revest's application.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote FOR Revest Lab's proposal.

Strong proposal with a detailed execution plan, proven team, and milestones / KPIs informed by prior activity. Grant size is more than reasonable and supports improved Arbitrum positioning re: RWAs on chain. Support!"

Reya Network

GFX Feedback)

The main weaknesses of this grant plan are 1) a very large request for 2) a protocol that is days old with no track record or data. Recommend the applicant revise and resubmit in future grants cycles with lower request and having identified a driver of initial success that can then be scaled up or repeated with the aid of grants funds.

GMX Feedback)

Reya's grant size request appears excessively large, particularly considering that the protocol is newly established with no track record. We view this grant as posing significant risk, with potentially limited rewards for the ecosystem even if milestones and KPIs are achieved. We suggest incorporating more user-centric KPIs, such as Daily Active Users (DAUs). Additionally, achieving 20k new users seems unlikely given the existing number of perpetual exchanges in the ecosystem, and the execution strategy lacks novelty. Regrettably, we cannot support this application.

404 DAO Feedback)

While Reya presents a very thorough application that uniquely leverages Orbit technology, the grant ask for a new chain with no prior traction makes it difficult to justify an ask of this amount. We encourage Reya to gain some initial data before reapplying to a future growth incentives program. Their application highlights the need for an Orbit specific grant program from the DAO. If this is launched we recommend Reya to apply there for additional funding or incentives.

Rolla

Wintermute Feedback)

Rolla's application was unique with a large focus on onboarding Web2 users with their underlying infrastructure. They had a solid amount of calculations for their requested grant size with a clear method of how they plan to use the ARB.

However, the protocol was significantly lacking any form of available data to reference previous activity so it was extremely difficult to judge the validity of their arguments. They also lacked some depth in their milestones.

Their distribution mechanism was okay, but it lacked the ability to provide new data to the Arbitrum ecosystem and had little focus on attempting to actively encourage any platform activity or induce stickiness.

Unfortunately, we will not be supporting this application.

GMX Feedback)

Rolla's application lacks clarity on how they intend to utilize the grant effectively and efficiently. Additionally, there is insufficient data available regarding protocol usage, resulting in low

trackability of their milestones. We perceive this grant as posing a significant risk with potentially limited rewards, even if KPIs and milestones are met. Despite the relatively modest grant size, the protocol lacks proof of concept and has a relatively short track record. Therefore, we are unable to support this grant.

GFX Feedback)

The applicant could present more clear execution plan and goals. In particular, grants that identify previous successes and wish to repeat or scale those successes are easy to approve. Unfortunately, there's just not much information like that to work with here to establish a track record or strategy.

Router Protocol

GFX Feedback)

Overall, this is the basis of a good grant plan. In order to make it even stronger, however, we would recommend focusing on Router's strengths (speed) in some way. The current grant plan does not target specific assets, origin chains, or identified groups of users who could be easily prompted to bridge assets to Arbitrum. A more focused approach will be easier to understand at the closeout of the grant whether it has been successful. Secondly, this feels like a defensive grant, as the incentive levels appear to be based off of a competitor's (Socket's) grant. This is a complex, and as yet, unresolved, issue with coordinating the grants program overall. At present, we do not support actively funding multiple sides in an arms race at the expense of Arbitrum governance. We recommend this applicant reapply with this feedback in mind, and hope to see them whenever the next grants cycle is.

GMX Feedback)

Router's application is deficient in crucial details regarding their target user demographics, and the execution plan lacks the clarity we desire. Additionally, we harbor some skepticism due to the abundance of existing bridging partners who have already established a loyal user base. Allocating resources to funding additional bridges may not be the most optimal use of the program's resources. Unfortunately we will not be supporting this application.

404 Feedback)

Our main concerns with this application is that there is a lack of historical data to judge whether the grant ask is warranted. While we understand that Router Protocol is relatively new, the volatility in data presented made it difficult to justify the grant ask along with the projections for their KPIs. With several other bridge applicants, we struggled to find key differentiators that would justify funding such a large request. We encourage Router Protocol to reapply for future incentive programs after once they gain more additional traction and adoption.

SafePal

GFX Feedback)

The project and grant plan offer a novel way to connect Arbitrum to real-world banking. It's unclear how many users will want to connect an Arbitrum address to banking services, but the structure of the connection (via NFT) and the nature of payment services suggest any users will be extremely sticky to Arbitrum as a chain.

GMX Feedback)

SafePal's grant proposal introduces an innovative strategy for linking Arbitrum with traditional banking services. While the potential demand for connecting an Arbitrum address to banking remains uncertain, this approach creatively enhances ecosystem engagement by leveraging payment rails and banking facilities. Although we have reservations about the \$20 CPA, this initiative presents an opportunity for experimentation to assess its viability on Arbitrum. If successful, it could serve as a model for collaboration with other wallet providers and payment rails in the future.

404 Feedback)

SafePal provided a thorough justification for the grant size along with clear milestones, KPIs, and a solid distribution strategy. We ranked them high on sybil resistance due to the requirement of a banking KYC. The SafePal banking gateway and Visa card product is novel and an exciting addition to the Arbitrum ecosystem that we believe will bring in new users.

Some additional points for improvement, there was a lot of duplicated content and several details could have been more concise. While the details and context were sometimes helpful, the length and redundancy of info made it sometimes difficult to grade the application. Additionally, SafePal provided a lot examples of previous incentive programs and product usage, but there was no way to verify most of this information.

Scattering

GMX Feedback)

The application for the Scattering protocol demonstrates a strong understanding of the NFT ecosystem on Arbitrum and introduces a novel idea of bringing liquidity to ERC 404 NFTs on a new marketplace. However, there are concerns regarding the lack of clarity in the budget breakdown and justification for the grant size. The calculations provided seem complex and speculative, lacking a clear rationale for the requested amount. Additionally, while the team demonstrates expertise in NFTs and development, The proposed KPIs seem adequate, but there's ambiguity regarding the data reporting strategy. Furthermore, the objectives and milestones are ambitious, but the timeline for achieving significant liquidity and trading volumes within 12 weeks may be overly optimistic, given the nascent nature of the ecosystem. The concept of utilizing a trading contest combined with CEX wallet campaigns to highlight the improved post-EIP-4844 trading environment is commendable. However, the grant size appears too large for the current development cycle of the project, especially considering the speculative nature of the ERC 404 narrative and the potential challenges in maintaining liquidity

post-incentives. Overall, while the project shows promise, the lack of clarity in budgeting and security measures means we wouldn't be supporting the proposal.

404 Feedback)

While Scattering presents an interesting product in a new asset class, we feel like this is highly experimental and the ask of 100k ARB is too large for such a nascent sector. In their application Scattering referenced Coin Gecko and the overall market cap of the 404 ERC Coins, which at the time was 234m. It is now 129m and is comprised mostly of a single asset, Pandora. We are not convinced by their growth targets which simply assumed a bull scenario where things double in a quarter. While possible in crypto, we don't have enough evidence to support allocating 100k ARB.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote AGAINST Scattering's proposal.

Have been keenly exploring ERC-404's but don't believe there is sufficient interest/traction here both on Arbitrum + Scattering to warrant the 100k grant size at this point in time. Believe more organic traction needs to be obtained first prior to adding incentives + a significant share of the entire ERC-404 market is behind a single project/asset (the OG creator). Suggest resubmitting in the next grant window and continue building in the meantime to explore ways to drive further 404 adoption as a whole."

Secured Finance

Wintermute Feedback)

Secured Finance's application was well-written, clear, and concise. They provided solid KPIs, milestones, and goals, however, some of which were ambitious given their level of protocol activity.

Their execution strategy was sound and they had a clear idea of how they plan to incentivize product growth.

However, their request grant size is unrealistically large given their TVL and user activity.

Growing their TVL from \$3k to \$4M is extremely difficult to justify and therefore we cannot support this application.

GFX Feedback)

This is just a very large request for a brand new protocol without any history. Recommend the applicant resubmit in future grants cycles when they can demonstrate some initial success to capitalize upon and scale.

GMX Feedback)

The protocol has demonstrated commendable growth through its previous Galaxie campaigns, and the team background inspires confidence in their ability to execute the proposed project.

The proposal itself is well-crafted, with clear milestones and appropriately targeted TVL goals.

Given these factors, we are inclined to support the proposal. Secured Finance's initiative to introduce a novel on-chain orderbook, aiming to provide a trade-fi-like experience and attract a new segment of traders to the Arbitrum ecosystem, is promising. While the overall grant size appears modest, the potential benefits of the incentives outweigh the costs in our assessment. However, there are concerns regarding whether the allocated funds for incentivization will be sufficient to attract genuine trade-fi users. Nonetheless, the outlined KPIs and milestones appear reasonable, providing a structured approach to project evaluation and progress tracking. Overall, while there are some reservations about fund allocation adequacy, the proposal presents a compelling opportunity for innovation and growth within the Arbitrum ecosystem. We would in favour of the proposal.

404 Feedback)

Secured Finance's presented a really strong application that was incredibly thorough with strong KPIs, execution strategy, and milestones. Additionally, their retention strategy was sound and we particularly appreciated the fractional vesting to encourage sustained engagement. However, due to their current TVL (Only \$3k on Arbitrum) and usage metrics, we believe the grant ask is too high to justify given. We highly encourage Secured Finance to reapply for future programs as they gain more traction on Arbitrum.

Smilee

GMX Feedback)

While acknowledging the uniqueness of Smile's product offering on Arbitrum and its initial traction, concerns persist regarding the clarity of key performance indicators (KPIs) and the lack of sufficient performance data. Additionally, the project's stage of development raises questions about its readiness for such a significant grant. The sizable grant request relative to the project's current total value locked (TVL), suggesting reservations about funding an unproven model with limited organic traction. Ultimately, we have concerns supporting the proposal, citing various concerns about the project's maturity, performance metrics, and grant size relative to its current status.

404 Feedback)

Smilee's application lacked in some important areas like available data on protocol usage, KPI justification, and milestone objectives. Additionally, the grant ask is quite high for a newly launched product. But given their unique product offering and their prior capital commitments, we believe Smilee offers an interesting opportunity to support a potentially new DeFi primitive in the Arbitrum ecosystem. We see this as a grant request that is worth it for the DAO to take a risk on.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote AGAINST Smilee's proposal.

Fine proposal and a novel DeFi solution in the Arbitrum ecosystem. Interesting early signs of interest (through their testnet trading competition) + TVL + partners but think the grant ask is too

high in contrast to their current life and traction on Arbitrum. Suggest they resubmit at a later grants window with a lower ask / after proving out greater traction."

GFX Feedback)

This grant plan is to reimburse users for trading fees paid to the applicant. We don't feel it's within the scope of this grants program to allow applicants to directly profit from the grant. If a platform's own fees are an impediment to growth, we recommend lowering fees and documenting the effect. Because grants funding is ultimately finite, it does not make sense for Arbitrum governance to finance fee subsidies to a grantee (vs gas or third party fees).

SNTL

GFX Feedback)

This protocol offers an interesting service, but has not demonstrated growth beyond a small niche. Also, offering 100% rebates (vs 80% or some lower number to make the user bear an absolute cost) leaves the distribution plan open to abuse. The size of the request was appropriately scaled, and so we suggest the applicant revise and resubmit in a later grants cycle with a different distribution plan, and a clear focus on how the distribution plan will capitalize on any successes it has already had.

GMX Feedback)

SNTL lacks a strong track record in executing high-performing strategies. Their proposal of offering 100% rebates raises concerns about potential abuse of the program, and we suggest reducing this percentage. Overall, there is a lack of demonstrated impact on the broader Arbitrum ecosystem, even if KPIs and milestones are met. Regrettably, we cannot support SNTL's application.

404 Feedback)

SNTL's overall ask was relatively fair with strong justification. Its product is pretty novel and provides additional competitive benefits to the GMX ecosystem. However, looking at SNTL's previous usage, it appears that most cumulative volume is driven by a few sales. A simple fee rebate for sellers will result in incentives likely ending up in the hands of a few large users. Overall, the lack of a broader impact on the Arbitrum ecosystem and likelihood of limited participants led us to vote against this request.

Solidly

Karel Feedback)

"Vote AGAINST Solidly's proposal.

Complete proposal and ranked well on rubric but grant size is too large to justify given amount of time they have been deployed on Arbitrum. Suggest resubmitting in a future grants window."

GFX Feedback)

The grant request is larger than the TVL of the protocol. Recommend the applicant revise and resubmit with a scaled down request to match the size of the protocol. More clarification on how the liquidity mining would be administered would also be helpful - is it targeting a specific yield on the LPing, a fixed amount of rewards per pool, or some other arrangement.

Wintermute Feedback)

Solidly's application described a clear execution strategy, milestones, and KPIs, but struggled on the justification side. The protocol brings some interesting innovations to Arbitrum, however, given their age and lack of growth/activity it's rather difficult to justify their grant request size. Unfortunately, we will not be supporting this application.

Sommelier Finance

Wintermute Feedback)

Sommelier Finance's application was very strong and they scored highly in most criteria. Their product brings new infrastructure to Arbitrum that benefits passive yield hunters, improves DEX liquidity, and improves money market yields. The product is highly composable, benefiting the rest of the Arbitrum ecosystem. Their goals, objectives, and KPIs are all very clear and well-justified. The product has seen really strong growth over its lifetime and will allow Arbitrum to easily tap into their Ethereum-based users, giving it a competitive advantage over other chains.

Lastly, we appreciate the added 'stickiness' mechanics to their distribution mechanism instead of just a plain LM program.

We support this application.

GFX Feedback)

Sommelier's pattern of sustained growth on Ethereum, combined with a detailed plan to execute makes this an easy grant to recommend be approved.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote FOR Sommelier Finance's proposal.

Strong proposal that scored well on the rubric. Thoughtful execution strategy, good traction despite its short life, and a deeply composable product that will compound benefits for the Arbitrum eco. If they are able to achieve their TVL targets (effectively 3x-ing by end of LTIPP), then should be a win for Arbitrum."

SpartaDex

Wintermute Feedback)

SpartaDex's application scored well across the majority of criteria. They present a novel gamified DEX with a strong Arbitrum history and moderate growth. We really like their incentive distribution design as it does a decent job at protecting against sybils while also being inclusive. They had clear and well-justified milestones, KPIs, and objectives which all related to increasing user activity and total value locked. Given their protocol activity and vision for the usage of the grant, we believe their grant request is justified.

We will be supporting this application.

GFX Feedback)

The concept of an ecosystem built around gamified DEXes is very novel and innovative. On the other hand, games and the serious business of conducting financial transactions seem pretty unrelated and gamification of financial services to a lesser degree (e.g. Robinhood) has presented a lot of regulatory and legal risk due to blurring the lines between gambling, finance, and gaming. Coupled with the lack of past success in generating traction, it's difficult to support this grant. If the applicant can show some previous action that led to sustained growth in some metric, and crafted a grant around extending that, then we would recommend resubmission at the next grants period.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote AGAINST SpartaDex's proposal.

Good proposal but unable to endorse for the following reasons: (i) Lack of past traction raises concerns about market demand and ability to meet target KPIs/milestones; and (ii) Need to see demonstrated growth first. Encourage applicant to resubmit later on."

GMX Feedback)

The proposal demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of the Arbitrum ecosystem and outlines clear objectives, execution strategies, and milestones to increase the growth and innovation within the ecosystem. The protocol's past performance metrics and roadmap illustrate a track record of success and a solid plan for future development. Additionally, the innovative approach to incentivizing user engagement through a gamified leaderboard aligns well with the goals of increasing DAU, volume, and TVL. The proposed KPIs provide measurable targets for success, and the allocation of funds to incentivize various activities within the Spartadex ecosystem ensures a focused and effective use of the grant. Therefore, we would recommend accepting the proposal as it has the potential to significantly contribute to the growth of Arbitrum ecosystem.

404 Feedback)

SpartaDEX presented a decent application that had strong milestones and was for the most part thorough. However, it was hard for us to justify such a large request without being able to verify the usage data (volume, DAU, and what their TVL actually consists of) presented in the application. Additionally, the exact distribution method was unclear as rewarded activities such as providing liquidity, volume, \$SPARTA token staking, and game progress did not have

indicated point values. While we understand this might be a complex process to design, for such a large ask it is details that we felt were necessary to feel comfortable supporting this application. Overall SpartaDex is an interesting product and we hope they remain committed to Arbitrum, we encourage them to reapply for future incentive programs with a revised request and additional details in their execution plan.

Sperax

Wintermute Feedback)

Sperax's application was solid and scored well in several areas. They have a long history of working on Arbitrum and their products are highly composable and provide value to other Arbitrum protocols.

Their goals, milestones, and KPIs are clear with sufficient justification of their grant size.

Our main concern is that there is a lack of protocol demand and there has not been sufficient growth despite SPA incentives.

We would've also liked to see some more innovation on the grant distribution side.

Nonetheless, given their current TVL and the fact that rewards will benefit other Arbitrum protocols, we will be supporting this application.

404 Feedback)

Sperax did a great job of aligning with the rubric by providing solid milestones, detailed KPIs & execution strategy, and adding a proportional amount of co-contribution. We would have appreciated more details on the grant justification but overall felt the grant ask is fair. We feel their product stack adds additional retention benefits and effectively enables USDs to grow outside the Demeter ecosystem. We will be supporting this proposal.

Karel feedback)

"Vote FOR Sperax's proposal.

Good proposal that scored well across the rubric. Long tenure and history on Arbitrum, grant size well justified, etc. Like many projects, TVL peaked in 2021/2022 and tapered into 2023, and has not seen much demand in recent times. However, believe second/third-order benefits driven by their composability and their grant execution plan to drive the noted KPIs (TVL and fee income) is sufficiently justified to pass this through to the DAO."

Stader Labs

GFX Feedback)

The Stader proposal to bring ETHx en masse to Arbitrum is straightforward, and supports the strategic objective of cementing Arbitrum's lead in LST share amongst L2s.

GMX Feedback)

Stader's protocol was recently deployed on Arbitrum in March, yet it has already attained product-market fit with 727M staked across all LSTs. Their application aims to diminish switching

costs and enhance Arbitrum while expanding DEX scalability and facilitating DeFi integrations across yield optimizers. The execution strategy is meticulously planned and transparent, with outlined strategies to augment the liquidity's stickiness. We support Stader's application.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote FOR Stader's proposal.

Strong proposal and very detailed execution plan to put the grant to good use across (i) bridging to reduce switching costs and drive activity from mainnet into Arbitrum; and (ii) incentives to scale partnerships with other Arbitrum protocols. Second-order benefits are strong given composability."

Stakewise

Wintermute Feedback)

Stakewise had a strong application based on its product, attractiveness, user base, ability to execute, and potential for long-lasting benefits.

We would've liked to have seen Stakewise actively try and expand to Arbitrum prior to the launch of LTIPP, however, given they have demonstrated a strong ability to grow TVL on Ethereum we think their grant size is justified (through their calculations as well).

We appreciate their commitment to match ARB rewards with their native token and ensure that these rewards are committed for 12 months.

Their execution strategy is simple and clear; we would've liked to have seen some more innovation than pure liquidity mining but their emphasis on rewarding migration is nice. Furthermore, we like that they will also be attempting to migrate their native governance token. We will be supporting this application.

GFX Feedback)

The applicant presents a plan that is both simple in execution and easy to monitor. Staked ETH also should be a priority for Arbitrum, as it is a quality, yield-bearing asset, thereby creating a capital flow from Ethereum to Arbitrum. Despite the high request size, we feel the potential gains for Arbitrum outweigh the price tag. We recommend this grant be approved.

GMX Feedback)

Unclear if they intend to support native minting as many other liquid derivatives have offered which greatly simplified the process of onboarding capital and continues to reinforce Arbitrum as a primary hub. The fact that the only reference was a small bridged amount of osETH (via presumably the canonical bridge) makes it seem unlikely; 40% of the incentives are going to incentivize their own native token (it is an 80:20 balancer token so that is potentially still contributing more so to osETH liquidity but again it seems a less productive use of the proceeds for building protocol usage and more towards their token. Would have been better to see these amounts go towards alternative uses.

The majority of the funds will be used to incentivize their own liquidity pool to deepen liquidity of the osETH/SWISSE market and try and bring osETH from mainnet to Arbitrum. The grant size is large and I struggle to see how deep liquidity they may build with osETH will continue once the incentives end. I fail to see how incentivizing their own token liquidity will have a long lasting impact on the DAO and be a good return on investment.

Karel Feedback)

Vote FOR Stakewise's proposal.

Detailed proposal that scored well in the rubric, namely re: stickiness to retain liquidity post-LTIPP and matching from Stakewise. Growing Arbitrum's share re: staked ETH is important and they've signalled a clear intention to align themselves with Arbitrum over the long term with the migration plans and incentives. The incentive mechanism is pretty straightforward re: liquidity mining. It's a large requested grant size relative to Arbitrum adoption/market demand and would have liked to see greater granularity + detail behind the milestones/timelines to match the stated KPIs, as well as the early start to a move into Arbitrum prior to LTIPP. Endorsing to the DAO despite this given importance of LSTs in the market.

Steadefi

Wintermute Feedback)

Steadefi's application provided clear calculations and justifications for their grant size, milestones, KPIs, and goals. Their project builds on top of GMX adding additional utility to the protocol.

Their requested grant size seems reasonable given the current TVL, however, some of their TVL goals are a bit ambitious. Their execution strategy is clear with a detailed list of vaults and pools they will be focusing on.

We would've liked to have seen some more innovation on the incentive side with a focus on stickiness. Nonetheless, we think the application is sufficient enough to progress to a DAO vote.

GFX Feedback)

The applicant has shown recent signs of growth, and we would like to support increasing that. To that end, it would have been helpful if the applicant identified specific mechanisms that they attribute current or past successes to, and then tailored their grant plan specifically to replicating or scaling that success. Given the size of the grant request, we prefer to see some data to validate a specific execution plan.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote AGAINST Steadefi's proposal.

Detailed proposal who has shown impressive growth since launching v2. Gitcoin Passport implementation is interest to protect against sybils. The grant size on its own is reasonable but do not feel it has been sufficiently justified to effectively 10x TVL by the end of the LTIPP (across both lending and strategy vaults). Much of the justification was drawn around the target and

associated assumptions to fill in the blanks to form a path to get there vs. drawing from data to execute against."

GMX Feedback)

The proposal from Steadefi outlines a comprehensive plan to attract and retain liquidity within the Arbitrum ecosystem through incentivizing users and providing innovative leverage yield strategies. Their detailed roadmap, including specific milestones and KPIs, demonstrates a clear path to achieving their objectives. Additionally, the team's past performance, security measures, and engagement with the community instill confidence in their ability to execute on their plans. The requested grant size and justification are reasonable given their projected impact on TVL and user growth. Overall, Steadefi's proposal aligns well with the objectives of achieving growth and making it a strong candidate for approval.

404 Feedback)

Steadefi presented a strong application that covered all components of the rubric. Their current usage is a little low for the grant ask and their execution strategy could have used more justification/reasoning behind how they have chosen their pools. However, their proactive approach to sybil attacks by using Gitcoin passport is a plus and we believe this likely leads to a lower grant claim than allocated. Their milestones are effectively designed to measure their success and we appreciate their feasibility component in justifying each KPI. We will be supporting this application.

Steer

GFX Feedback)

Steer is operating in a crowded field (liquidity management on DEXs) but in a niche with large TAM and growing adoption over the past few months. We would like to see dropped from this grant plan any subsidies for pools with competing chain tokens (e.g. WAVAX), and the size of the grant is large for a relatively commoditized space. Nevertheless, we recommend approving this grant based on the demonstrated early growth in user adoption and the widely shared need for liquidity management services, making competition important to maintain a good cost point for users long term.

GMX Feedback)

We recommend granting approval based on the evident early user adoption growth and the demand for liquidity management services, which underscores the significance of competition for maintaining favorable costs over the long haul. Steer Protocol pioneers a novel strategy by integrating Real World Assets into the DeFi ecosystem to boost liquidity providers' and protocols' yields. This innovative approach unlocks a fresh yield source derived from treasury-backed RWAs, offering an alternative to conventional liquidity mining incentives. With an average TVL gain per dollar of \$67.84, weighted by the total value staked, the current liquidity pools demonstrate a robust return on investment. Hence, we extend our support for Steer's application.

404 Feedback)

Steer presented a compelling application backed by previous examples of successful inventive programs. Their product usage is impressive and they appear to have a rapidly growing user base. They present some novel additions to the liquidity management space and we are supporting their application.

STFX

Wintermute Feedback)

SFTX's application was well-written, clear, and concise. They presented clear KPIs, milestones, and goals, and have a decent understanding of how their product benefits the Arbitrum ecosystem.

Their product has only recently begun to see substantial growth but is still slightly underwhelming given their age. Nonetheless, the protocol has a decent amount of activity and brings some novel infrastructure to the Arbitrum ecosystem.

Their justification of the grant size is okay but rather ambitious. Given the level of activity on their protocol, the allocated amount of weekly ARB seems high.

They've incorporated some nice requirements on both the user and manager side to ensure rewards are going to more genuine users. However, we would've liked to see some of their rewards allocated towards a PnL trading league for managers to actively push activity on the platform.

Given their alignment with Arbitrum, composability, recent growth, and novel product, we will be supporting this proposal.

404 Feedback)

STFX scored well across most of the rubric, mainly losing points for a large grant ask for their current usage which may lead to poor distribution. However, they have shown growth as the market has picked up and their execution strategy/milestone orientation is thorough and well-designed. We believe this market timing is opportune and this decision should be pushed to the DAO. We will be supporting this proposal.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote FOR STFX's proposal.

Strong proposal that scored well on rubric (protocol details, KPIs, milestones, etc). Despite launching in 2022, they have seen moderate growth with it beginning to balloon in recent times. While the grant size is high in contrast to usage and they have ambitious milestones/KPIs to hit, there are a number of product unlocks around the corner (Privy, PWA) that will help seed this on top of a potential LTIPP grant, believe it is a worthwhile use of capital from the DAO. Would have liked to see manager incentivization strategy as well on top of end users/investors and believe the assumed 50%/80% retention rate is too liberal and should be decreased. Over to the DAO."

Substance Exchange

GFX Feedback)

Overall this was a reasonable request size and execution plan. What would make this grant plans stronger, however, is more clear deliverables. Grantees set themselves up for success (and possibility of successive grants to expand upon initial ones) when they have clear, unambiguous, easy-to-measure milestones. Best practice is to offer a specific metric to meet (volume, TVL, number of users, etc) and a clear source of truth established upfront to measure whether that metric has been met. We strongly encourage this applicant to revise with this in mind and resubmit whenever the next grants submission period opens.

GMX Feedback)

The application presents a well-defined execution plan and a reasonable request size. Nonetheless, clearer and more specific milestones and KPIs would enhance the proposal, as the current ones are somewhat generic. The distribution method appears satisfactory and transparent, but we recommend that the applicant revise the milestones and KPIs before resubmitting the proposal. Unfortunately we do not support Substance's application.

Wintermute Feedback)

This application was solid across most criteria. They did a very good job at calculating and justifying their grant size, they also provided very thorough justifications for milestones and objectives. Their incentive distribution mechanism is great and very clear.

They lost some points around grant size given protocol usage and novelty as there are many perp dexes on Arbitrum.

Overall, this was a good application that was well thought out. We will be supporting this application.

404 Feedback)

While we appreciate Substance Exchange's detailed grant justification and comparison to other incentive programs from STIP, there were multiple concerns with their application. Substance Exchange failed to explain how they differ from other competitors in the Arbitrum ecosystem other than their rapid ability to list new coins. Additionally, their incentive model is heavily model after Gains Network's from STIP, which was found to have the 2nd highest sybil ratio. We are not convinced from this application that any measures have been put in place to reduce sybil or wash trading. Lastly, their milestone section did not provide any success metrics, but merely reexplained the grant distribution timelines. We are unable to support this application.

SushiSwap

Karel Feedback)

"Vote AGAINST Sushi's proposal in its current form. Suggest they resubmit in a future grants cycle with a smaller request.

Sushi's traction by volume on Arbitrum is meaningfully lower than other DEXs (some Arbitrum native) despite time in market. With 50% of incentives going towards a variety of blue chip and some existing token pairs (n = 9), it is not clear if this will drive meaningful and retentive improvement in metrics that grows the overall pie vs. just taking away from other Arbitrum DEXs (temporarily while incentives are running) . Would like to see more of the allocation go towards on onboarding new token pairs and to experiment with more novel incentive designs."

GMX Feedback)

Sushi has established itself as a leading DEX on Arbitrum, demonstrating significant impact in the DEX space. The application provides a clear description of fund utilization, notably highlighting plans to support other ecosystem projects on Arbitrum with the grant amount received. However, there is a concern regarding the allocation of 100K ARB towards incentives or ecosystem usage, particularly through Galaxy campaigns, which may attract sybils to the protocol rather than genuine users. While Sushi's proposal focuses on liquidity provision through various mining programs, it lacks a significant level of innovation. Nevertheless, the overarching goal to boost volumes for both Sushi and the ecosystem aligns with their objectives. The sub-grant program for building on top of Sushi's V3 holds promise if executed effectively. There are reservations regarding the Galaxy Campaign section due to potential sybil concerns, suggesting a reallocation of rewards to more impactful areas. Given past issues with achieving promised KPIs, close monitoring of Sushi's performance will be necessary. Despite these considerations, the proposal falls short of garnering support due to concerns over achieving promised KPIs, as Sushi has faced issues in meeting governance expectations previously. Thus, we are unable to lend our support to the proposal at this time.

404 DAO Feedback)

Sushi brought forth a strong and well-written application. They scored strongly across most of the rubric and presented a detailed execution plan along with justified KPIs. We would've appreciated more granular milestones to be able to measure their growth targets over time. While it is a significant amount of ARB being requested compared to their recent usage metrics, we believe the tactics deployed for enabling ARB liquidity + supporting native projects built on Arbitrum is worth the respective grant ask. We will be supporting Sushi's proposal and believe it is sufficient enough to at least be decided upon by the DAO.

GFX Feedback)

We dislike how much discretion the applicant would have in choosing which pools to incentivize, and also do not support what amounts to a subgrant via an ecosystem fund. Both open the door to the applicant being able to perform business development activities financed by Arbitrum governance. Because each ARB granted crowds out a future grant, this lowered the applicant's score. We did, however, like that part of the grant is meant to market to Sushi's user base on other chains. If reapplying in future grants cycles, we recommend such a large grant as this be broken into multiple smaller grants. We also recommend identifying drivers of earlier success,

then tailoring grants requests to replicate or expand on that success, in order to make large requests less experimental in nature.

Sweep

Wintermute Feedback)

Sweep's application targets a strong sector such as RWAs and their requested grant size is small but sufficiently justified. We found the application to not really provide a clear and concise description of the protocol, how it functions, and ultimately, how users can potentially earn ARB rewards. Furthermore, given the lack of protocol growth and lack of users of the SWEEP token, we expect the grant to end up in the hands of only a few individuals. We are also not sure that subsidising RWA yield in an environment where native on-chain rates are significantly higher is the best use of the DAO's funds.

In contrast, we appreciate the protocol's composability and efforts to innovate in the RWA sector.

Unfortunately, we will not be supporting this application.

GFX Feedback)

The protocol's concept is interesting, but has shown an inability to get TVL up either in absolute amounts or relative to its earlier metrics. The execution plan is not very detailed, and would benefit from more specifics on what, how, when, why, and by how much to provide incentives. It is also not clear who the targeted users are, or why they would either migrate to Arbitrum or increase their interactions with Arbitrum if they're already here. Also recommend improving the milestones to be more metrics based and easily verifiable. Much of the milestones appear oriented towards fleshing out details that are already expected to be present in the grant plan (e.g. identifying qualifying assets).

GMX Feedback)

Sweep does not have a good track record to execute their roadmap and strategy and performance metric is relatively weak. The execution plan is not clear and would like to see more details especially on target users. Given the lack of growth and users, we are not confident that Sweep will be able to execute this program effectively. Unfortunately we will not be supporting this application.

SX Bet

GFX Feedback)

We thought this was generally a well-crafted grant plan, with a clear product, actions to incentivize, data and past experience to justify the cost.

The structure of the incentives, however, seem more aimed at SX acquiring Arbitrum's users than in acquiring users for Arbitrum. This grant plan (smartly) identifies high friction to get a new user onto their own proprietary chain, and want to acquire users on Arbitrum where those users can interact with SX's markets that are active on both chains. The danger to Arbitrum, however,

is that this can act as a marketing funnel to find users on Arbitrum, give them a taste of SX's product at reduced cost, and then possibly migrate those users to SX's own dapp chain. The grantee does, in fact, attempt to address this with statements that they intend to migrate their own users to Arbitrum, though this is not a clear part of the grant plan. Because of that, we are able to score this grant plan highly. We recommend this grant plan be approved.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote FOR SX Bet's proposal.

Well detailed proposal that scored highly on the rubric. Initially was concerned that the proposal and incentives would serve as a way to draw users away from Arbitrum, knowing that Polygon Edge has been deprecated serves as an opportunity to see SX Bet migrate to Arbitrum. Would have liked to see more detailed reports and on-chain data to support some of their claims re: retention, volume, how they've used previous incentives to drive growth, etc. Recommend this go to the DAO for review."

Wintermute Feedback)

Symbiosis

Wintermute Feedback)

This application was clear and concise in describing their objectives, KPIs, and milestones. While the protocol does not necessarily bring anything new to Arbitrum, it is one of the more reasonable grant requests for bridging protocols. Furthermore, we appreciate the marketing efforts with Galxe to increase awareness and funnel users to Arbitrum.

Not sure if it was implied under cross-chain swaps, but it would've been good to see Symbiosis incentivize cross-chain swaps into DeFi protocols on Arbitrum.

We will be supporting this application.

GFX Feedback)

This grant plan focuses directly on lowering the cost to bridge onto Arbitrum One or Arbitrum Nova by subsidizing the gas costs to bridge in. While a 100% rebate may offer some niche griefing attack by someone seeking to drain the grant funds, they probably would not have a profit motive to do so. The request is reasonable in size, the plan easy to measure, and directly targets increasing the number of assets and users on Arbitrum. We recommend this grant be approved.

GMX Feedback)

I'm generally supportive of the Symbiosis application on the basis of the sector they're involved with. Bridge and crosschain development can only benefit a network. The grant was straightforward and it seems Symbiosis is cognizant of the space they're operating within and their place in it. The proposal from Symbiosis presents a comprehensive strategy to drive

liquidity and user engagement within the Arbitrum ecosystem. By offering gas fee refunds for cross-chain swaps, Symbiosis aims to incentivize users and attract significant trading volume to both Arbitrum One and Nova. The clear objectives, well-defined milestones, and commitment to transparent reporting demonstrate a thoughtful approach to achieving measurable outcomes. Furthermore, the integration of incentives with Galxe for wider outreach enhances the potential impact of the initiative. Overall, this proposal aligns with the goals of aiming growth and innovation within the Arbitrum ecosystem, making it a worthy candidate for support.

Syndr

GFX Feedback)

This applicant does not yet appear to be live on Arbitrum. The website has “coming soon” and “join the waitlist” and clicking around, various parts of it return 404 errors.

404 DAO Feedback)

Syndr presented a decent application in terms of milestones, KPIs, and execution strategy but it is not clear if their L3 is actually live. Their website returns multiple 404 errors when trying to get to the trading app and their first audit returned a high vulnerability. Without more information on the team, data of actual usage and adoption of its L3, or clear confirmation that the product is live we can not support this application. Their application does highlight the need for an Orbit focused grant program from the DAO, and we recommend that they reapply to either LTIP or this type of program once it is launched.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote AGAINST Syndr's proposal.

No website or real presence to point to to justify its grant size + timeline does not match up with LTIPP."

Synonym Finance

Wintermute Feedback)

Synonym Finance's application was good and scored well across a range of criteria. They provided thorough explanations regarding their KPIs, milestones, and goals, with supporting calculations. Considering their age, their protocol has been able to establish a solid uptick in activity and TVL, however, this has declined notably since their application.

Their target TVL is pretty ambitious and therefore, their requested grant size is on the large end. However, they provided a solid execution strategy. In their execution strategy, we appreciate that they are focusing on important markets relevant to Arbitrum and the DeFi ecosystem. Their locking mechanism and long-term emission schedule is a nice addition that should help incentivise stickiness.

We will be supporting this application.

GFX Feedback)

While the request is large and the project relatively new, the applicant did a good job utilizing data from recent grants for similar projects to justify both the sizing and execution strategy. We recommend this grant be approved.

GMX Feedback)

The protocol has experienced significant growth with its current incentives program and has garnered promising early traction. The proposal is well-defined, with clear milestones that outline the project's trajectory. Overall, it's a well-written proposal that provides comprehensive data on the protocol, and the incentive strategy appears sound. We are inclined to support this proposal. Synonym is a cross-chain lending platform, akin to Silo and Dolomite. While they have received funding from the foundation, it's not intended for use as incentives. This grant of 400k aims to stimulate borrowing and depositing on their platform. By funding this application, users will gain access to another lending/borrowing protocol with a proven track record, thereby enhancing the overall Arbitrum TVL and benefiting the ecosystem. Though the milestones may seem ambitious, they plan to use their token to incentivize users.

Synthetix

404 DAO Feedback)

Synthetix has a long history of success on mainnet and other L2s and we are confident that their expansion to Arbitrum would bring an increase in users, TVL, and activity. From the presented data on their previous incentive program on Optimism, it was clear that this program was successful and shows the experience the Synthetix team has with deploying incentives. We would've liked to see more details on the proposed trading competition and is a contributing reason to why we gave them a 1 for sybil resistance/wash trading. Overall, they have provided a clear execution strategy and we believe they have reasonably justified the grant size.

Wintermute Feedback)

Synthetix's application is well thought out, very clear, and does a good job of appealing to the majority of the criteria. There is little doubt that bringing Synthetix to Arbitrum should lead to a notable increase in TVL, users, sequencer fees, and trading volume. All of this is very apparent in the provided Dune dashboards and relevant DeFiLlama metrics.

They display a clear vision of how they intend to use their ARB grant, its associated KPIs and milestones, and the benefit this is expected to bring to Arbitrum. Furthermore, they have had extensive experience working with incentivizing activity on their protocol through OP grants and SNX incentives.

The main areas they were marked down on were the size of the grant, Arbitrum history, incentive design, and novelty. The request grant size is notably large and it's likely that Arbitrum only recoups the benefit from this over the long term.

We will be supporting this application as it's a strong candidate with a lot of potential value add to Arbitrum and think it's appropriate for delegates to decide if the upfront cost is worth it.

Karel Feedback)

Vote AGAINST the proposal in its current form with the 4.5M ARB ask (despite Synthetix's strong proposal, high rubric scores, and value that they could bring to Arbitrum). Suggest they resubmit in a future grants cycle with a smaller request.

As a new entrant to the Arbitrum ecosystem, they are a welcome addition if they can prove that they can drive users and capital from non-Arbitrum ecosystems and maintain them here. However, given their stated ambitions and plans as well as the dynamics of the perps space, it is unclear if this will be the case and this is a big bet to place to support an integration (https://mirror.xyz/kain.eth/kuLEnkUhJBpDJCs9gSIQ2_umGprJq3ZZCExmtc69zn8). With their own planned chain as part of the OP Superchain, there is a risk that this proposal funded by the DAO may, in the long term, draw users/liquidity/etc. outside of Arbitrum and be a detriment to the broader Arbitrum market. Given this, we should instead opt to test the waters to have them prove out the metrics we want to see with a lower amount first and see observe initial direct and second-order benefits to other Arbitrum protocols + alignment with the ecosystem versus provide to them one of the largest ARB amounts requested in LTIPP to do so.

It's abundantly clear that Synthetix has a proven team and protocol that has driven significant activity outside of Arbitrum (Ethereum Mainnet and Optimism), and there is clear value in them having a presence in the Arbitrum market. They've been marked highly in the rubric itself but believe the qualitative comments above are important to highlight. Would have liked to see more detail on the trading competition and "other growth experiments" (as well as the proposed candidates for collaboration partnerships with other Arbitrum proposals).

GMX Feedback)

The proposal lacks clarity in several key areas, particularly in justifying the requested grant size and outlining a comprehensive risk assessment and mitigation strategy. While the team outlines ambitious objectives and execution plans, the lack of detailed breakdowns and clear metrics for measuring success raises concerns about the feasibility and effectiveness of the proposed initiatives. Additionally, the proposal would benefit from more concrete evidence and data supporting the expected impact on trading activity, liquidity, and user adoption within the Arbitrum ecosystem. Without these essential elements, it's challenging to justify approving the grant at this stage and they have already announced move to an OP superchain for liquidity.

GFX Feedback)

This is by far the largest grant request we have reviewed this cycle, amounting to the equivalent of around \$9m. For comparison, the next largest grant request we've reviewed for LTIP was 1m ARB (~\$2m). Granting 4.5m ARB has the possibility to crowd out other grants to projects that are not as well resourced as Synthetix. Also, a large portion of the grant goes to fee rebates. While we support gas rebates, we do not support rebates on fees

to the platform, particularly one with as many existing resources as Synthetix. We recommend the applicant revise and resubmit in future grants cycles with at most 1m ARB request. To the extent platform fees remain in a grant proposal, we expect applicants to have strong data to support its effects – this means the applicant waive their own fees for a period to run a trial. While we think Synthetix is a protocol that Arbitrum will benefit from having on the chain, the size and composition of this request made it impossible to support while also holding this grant plan to the same standard as others we have reviewed.

The Beacon

404 Feedback)

Given the virality of Beacon's demo back in 2022, we are confident that incentivizing the launch of their "New Frontier Quest" launch will bring value to Arbitrum. There are multiple ways to incentive user activity - completing in-game quests, referrals, daily logins, etc - which we believe will likely bring in new users. While the overall execution strategy is lacking important details for an ask of this size, the other aspects of the application have led us to support this grant. Additionally, we're under the impression that Beacon does not need a security audit for their NFTs and have therefore not graded them on this aspect.

Wintermute Feedback)

The Beacon's application scored decently across a range of criteria. They have seen strong success during their demo phase which clearly shows their ability to attract users to Arbitrum and stimulate network activity. The product/industry is appealing to a wide variety of users inside and outside of Arbitrum and if successful creates a competitive advantage for Arbitrum.

The main concerns we had with this proposal were its lack of ARB distribution details and justification for grant size. They had a general idea of how they intend to distribute rewards but there was no granular breakdown on how much ARB will be allocated to each sub-sections. There is also very little discussion about sybil protections and the protocol has no audit history.

Overall, given the positive points mentioned above, we think the application should be progressed to a DAO vote, however, we urge the DAO to take into consideration the areas of concern highlighted.

GMX Feedback)

The Beacon's application demonstrates a well-rounded approach, showcasing success and achieving product-market fit in attracting users to Arbitrum. While we seek more details regarding ARB distribution and note the protocol's lack of completed security audits, we are confident in The Beacon's ability to execute effectively, given their strong track record. The protocol's compatibility with other games like Bridgeworld and Kuroro Beast is notable. Their strategy aims to elevate Arbitrum as a gaming chain, potentially leading to significant impact through a global launch. We endorse The Beacon's application.

TheStandard.io

GFX Feedback)

Overall, this grant plan would have benefited from more details, particularly around execution strategy, milestones, and targeting users that are either new to Arbitrum or increasing the how much existing users interact with Arbitrum.

GMX Feedback)

TheStandard.io proposes some novel approaches to the well accepted and devised CDP model popularized by the MakerDAO. However, I noticed they pretty low usages, with aspirations to grow from TSE (Total Stables Emitted) of ~€180K to some amount in the range of nearly 20x to about ~€2.8mn. I just question the ability for the team to stretch the grant money as far as they hope and think the application would go further with an adjustment to the final ask (100k-120k ARB). However, despite the detailed roadmap and strategic objectives outlined, the proposal lacks clarity and specificity in several key areas. Firstly, the execution strategy lacks concrete details on how the outlined objectives will be achieved, particularly regarding user growth, income balancing, and feedback integration. We won't be supporting the proposal.

404 Feedback)

Overall, TheStandard scored well across most of the rubric given their strong alignment to Arbitrum, grant co-contribution and thorough application. A point of improvement could've been its milestone section. While we appreciate the protocols novel twist on the stablecoin stack, we are struggling to find compelling reasons to allocate 125K ARB in an effort to solve the protocol's chicken and egg problem and feel the grant size is too large at the current protocol usage.

Threshold

404 Feedback)

Overall Threshold presented an extremely thorough application with a sound execution plan and strong KPIs. Their adoption showed a good track record and believe they are a great addition to the Arbitrum ecosystem. We acknowledge there is a component of the grant that falls outside the scope of the program (10% towards developing the tBTC direct minting dapp), however, we felt the grant application was strong enough to allow this to pass on to the DAO and have them vote to allow this exception.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote AGAINST Threshold's proposal.

Strong proposal that scored well across rubric (execution, KPIs, milestones, grant justification, etc.). Only hold up is 10% being allocated as a developer grant and while not significant, this has disqualified other applications (for me) and do not want to make an exception here despite all other criteria passing with flying colors."

GMX Feedback)

The proposal outlines a comprehensive strategy to aggressively grow the TVL of decentralized Bitcoin on Arbitrum, addressing liquidity provisioning, user stickiness, and direct minting functionalities. By incentivizing liquidity provision across key pools and implementing a tiered loyalty program, the protocol aims to attract and retain liquidity providers, thus deepening the liquidity pool on Arbitrum. Additionally, the integration of a direct minting DApp for Bitcoin on Arbitrum streamlines the process for BTC holders to access DeFi opportunities, fostering growth and innovation within the Arbitrum ecosystem. Overall, the proposal demonstrates a clear understanding of the ecosystem's needs and presents a well-thought-out plan to address them effectively, making it a strong candidate for acceptance.

Wintermute Feedback)

Threshold's application was very strong, they provided thorough details and justifications for their requested grant size, milestones, KPIs, and objectives. We really liked their execution strategy as it was well thought out and focused on incentivizing key areas such as liquidity, direct Arbitrum minting, and stickiness.

Their adoption on Arbitrum has been underwhelming, however, we believe it's important for the DAO to support such infrastructure that has already been successful on Mainnet and improve BTC alternatives.

Lastly, we appreciate their commitment to co-incentives during and 12 months after the LTIPP begins. We will be supporting this application.

Tigris Trade

Wintermute Feedback)

Tigris Trade's application did well across a variety of criteria. They provided clear goals, milestones, and KPIs; their requested grant size is fair for their protocol activity. However, we would've liked to see better justification and calculation of their grant size

Their distribution mechanism is okay but could've been improved by implementing better user retention mechanisms/gamification. They also lacked sufficient sybil/anti-washing trading mechanisms.

Given their history, age, protocol metrics, and requested grant size, we will be supporting this application.

GFX Feedback)

This would have been a more compelling grant plan if the applicant had demonstrated a past effort that bore fruit and the grant funds would allow to scale or repeat. Since the majority of the grant request would go to offset what the protocol charges users, it would be especially useful to see a period where protocol fees were waived or reduced and what effect that had on user activity. Recommend trying a few weeks' trial of that to show proof of principle and then resubmit at a later grants cycle.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote AGAINST Tigris Trade's proposal.

Fine proposal which has achieved promising adoption but unable to endorse as: (i) would like to see prior tests of metrics with reduce fees; (ii) more built out plan of stickiness post-LTIPP after incentives stop; and (iii) lower grant request. Recommend they resubmit at future grants window after proving out these experiments.

GMX Feedback)

Based on the proposal, while Tigris Trade demonstrates innovation with its unique features like the Distributed Signature-Based Oracle Network and Liquidity Tokens, we would reject the proposal because, while it outlines various incentives and plans to increase trading volume and liquidity, it lacks specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound objectives. The milestones provided lack clear metrics for success. We would have been willing to support with some tweaks (current 100% rebate on fees plus trading fees, more or less encourages just their existing small base of traders to get paid to trade). Lowering the rebate percentage might make this proposal supportable. Unfortunately, we won't be able to support the proposal.

Tradao

Wintermute Feedback)

Tradao's application had a great focus and vision on how they intend to drive user activity and growth on Arbitrum. They presented clear KPIs, goals, and solid milestones that were granular in unlocking more ARB as they reached key metrics. Their product is complementary to Arbitrum's largest DeFi sector which is a plus.

In contrast, we found their requested grant size to be on the large end given their protocol metrics (which are hard to verify). We also found their milestones and some of their incentive programs to lack any form of anti-sybil/wash trading measures.

Unfortunately due to the requested grant size, lack of verifiable data and anti-sybil measures, we will not be supporting this application.

GMX Feedback)

Tradao has yet to establish product-market fit, evidenced by their low daily transaction count of less than 78.6. Their application seeks to increase daily transactions by 75, with a grant totaling 190k ARB. This allocation appears excessively capital inefficient, with minimal ecosystem benefit even if Tradao achieves its milestones and KPIs. Moreover, the proposed grants for trading competitions and wallet generative incentives are unproven strategies in the current market conditions. Therefore, we cannot support Tradao's application.

GFX Feedback)

The request size was on the large side given current protocol metrics and history, which is also not especially easy to verify from other sources. The distribution plan and goals should probably also think carefully about how to safeguard against sybil farming. Recommend the applicant

revise and resubmit at a future grants cycle taking into account feedback from ourselves and other reviewers.

Umoja Protocol

GFX Feedback)

The protocol offers a novel and probably useful product. That being said, there's just no getting around the 150k ARB request for a protocol that is only a month old. It would be unfair to Arbitrum governance to subsidize the development costs of a protocol with unproven product-market fit. Recommend the applicant revise and resubmit next cycle when 1) the protocol has more usage data and has funded its own development, 2) the distribution plan can be more focused on user incentives, 3) the request is significantly smaller or the milestones significantly more ambitious.

Wintermute Feedback)

Umoja's application was solid and scored well in some criteria. They clearly outlined their goals, KPIs, and milestones, with a great understanding of how they intend to use the grant funds. Unfortunately, their requested grant size was too high given the level of activity on the protocol.

They also earmarked a substantial portion of their grant request towards efforts outside of the allowed LTIPP distribution window. It was also not clear if these earmarked ARB allocations were for expenses or incentives. Furthermore, there was a lack of grant size justification.

Unfortunately, we will not be supporting this application.

404 Feedback)

Umoja seems like a innovative protocol that would add to Arbitrum's mature DeFi ecosystem; however, their use of grants is not admissible for LTIPP and an application like this is better suited for a development program. It highlights the need for another DAO driven grants program. We recommend reformatting this application to be more incentive specific or waiting for a development focused program to be created.

Additionally, the actual distribution plan of incentives needs much more detail and a clearer execution plan. They presented justified KPIs and trackable milestones, but most are related to the development objectives. Lastly, there was little data presented on protocol usage, we could only find their points leaderboard.

Unidex

Wintermute Feedback)

Unidex's application was okay and scored well in some areas, notably their relationship with Arbitrum and data availability.

Their execution strategy lacked details and was not descriptive of the pools they plan to incentivise with relevant TVL and APR metrics. Their KPIs are extremely ambitious and not consistent with their justification of their grant size (attracting \$20M TVL with 32k of ARB will be very hard).

Their current protocol metrics are a bit underwhelming given their age showing a clear lack of demand from Arbitrum users. While their requested grant size is on the low end, unfortunately, their protocol metrics struggle to justify the request.

We do appreciate their trading rebate program which focuses on attracting users from other chains and referrals.

Unfortunately, we can't justify the grant request given the lack of protocol traction.

404 Feedback)

Unidex presented a decent application and has the potential to bring in new users from other ecosystems to Arbitrum, we especially liked that part of their execution strategy specifically targeted users who have traded on other chains ("10% if the wallet used has traded perps on another chain besides Arbitrum"). However, from their current usage metrics and past incentive programs on Arbitrum, there does not seem to be overwhelming demand for this product. Their volume is less than 1m since the beginning of the year on Arbitrum. Given how low this usage is we can not support this application.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote AGAINST Unidex's proposal.

Good proposal but could have used more details across grant execution and milestones, especially to justify how they plan to tangibly grow their metrics to the set targets (TVL: 33x, volume: 30x; DAU: 4x). Despite their history on Arbitrum, their metrics are subpar in contrast to alternatives in the market and while they're not asking for all that much, can't justify this given traction."

Uniswap

Wintermute Feedback)

Uniswap's application was solid but mostly scored well due to the history of the protocol, its usage, and the value it brings to the Arbitrum ecosystem. We are not typically supportive of pure LM efforts, however, Gauntlet and the Uniswap DAO have previously proven their ability to target pools correctly in order to achieve longer-lasting results. The application provided sufficient justifications of KPIs and objectives, however, we would've liked to have seen some more specifics around target pools, APRs, and milestones.

We will be supporting this application.

GMX Feedback)

I'm supportive of approving Uniswap's grant application. They are proven in the space and one of the leading innovators. Being a part of helping Uniswap grow their development can only be beneficial for Arbitrum. The proposed objectives, execution strategy, and KPIs are well-defined, indicating a thorough understanding of the project's goals and how to achieve them.

Furthermore, the proposal emphasizes the importance of fostering sustainable growth and innovation within the Arbitrum ecosystem, which aligns with the broader goals of promoting DeFi development and adoption. Overall, this proposal presents a compelling case for why the grant would enable significant positive impact on the Arbitrum network.

Just one feedback from our side would be to not use the incentives towards UADP holding 15K ARB as a delegate. It won't make a significant difference; it's better to use that 15K ARB towards incentives.

Karel Feedback)

"Vote FOR Uniswap's proposal.

Strong proposal and endorsing as believe this will lead to growth + sustained activity on Arbitrum. Would have liked to see more specificity around Gauntlet's strategy to select pools + other mechanisms."

Vaultka

GFX Feedback)

We worry that this grant would push rates needlessly high on the applicant's protocol based on what yields already appear to be. The demonstrated growth, composability, and relatively straightforward execution plan and milestones allow this application to overcome our hesitations, though. We recommend this grant be approved.

GMX Feedback)

Vaultka has a proven track record of delivering impactful grants, as demonstrated by their successful utilization of the GMX grant. The proposal stands out for its detailed timeline and milestone breakdown, which fosters accountability and facilitates progress monitoring throughout the program's implementation. Innovative incentive mechanisms, such as enhanced Vaultka NFT rewards, are introduced, showcasing Vaultka's commitment to fostering user engagement and retention. Moreover, the proposal's focus on creating a flywheel effect bodes well for both users and projects on Vaultka's platform, aligning with our sustainability goals. Additionally, Vaultka's early adoption of protocols and their significant TVL growth with various vaults highlight their pioneering role in the DeFi ecosystem. While the requested 1 million Arb Grant may seem substantial, supporting Arbitrum Native protocols like Vaultka, especially those introducing unique strategies, is crucial for the ecosystem's growth. The proposal's aim to attract significant TVL to their platform promises to benefit the broader ecosystem and attract new users. We would be inclined to support the proposal.

404 Feedback)

Overall, this was a great application that scored well in many sections. Vaultka presented a clear execution strategy to increase its lending capacity and TVL. They have also shown strong usage since going through GMX's grant program, with the TVL staying relatively sticky. We are supporting this application.

Verified USD

GMX Feedback)

Generally supportive of Verified USD's application. Stablecoins, while a competitive sector, are a primitive necessity for DeFi. It is one of the few sectors where you want a lot of competition because there are generally a lot of different approaches to a solution. Additionally, Verified USD wants to utilize the adoption of RWAs in their stablecoin model, which has some novelty. The team's proactive engagement with key partners such as Fiat24 and MugglePay, coupled with their track record of successful liquidity programs and ecosystem support, instills confidence in their ability to effectively utilize the grant funds to foster growth and innovation within the Arbitrum network. Additionally, their willingness to accept linear funding and the oversight of a multisig further ensures accountability and transparency throughout the grant execution process. Overall, this proposal aligns with the goals of promoting ecosystem development and advancing the utility of USDV within Arbitrum, making it a compelling candidate for approval.

Karel Feedback)

Vote FOR Verified USD's proposal.

Strong proposal that scored well across rubric (execution plan, grant justification, breakdown, milestones, etc.). Interesting opportunity to drive greater USDV adoption on Arbitrum from other ecosystems. Would have liked to see more justification re: why MugglePlay / Fiat24 as strategic partners for integration over others and also to fully confirm whether rebates to MugglePay/Fiat24 are to partners or directly to end-users. Regardless, support this moving to DAO.

404 Feedback)

VerifiedUSD presented a well-rounded proposal scoring well in most all categories. We support their integrations for enabling payments onchain and felt they provided solid justifications in their grant ask and planned strategy. We will be supporting this application.

XDEFI

GFX Feedback)

In general, we are supportive of gas rebate plans. This plan did not offer an obvious barrier to sybils or grieving the applicant, which in the end meant this grant did not meet the threshold for us to recommend approval.

Wintermute Feedback)

XDEFI's application lacked sufficient justifications and data to support its goals, KPIs, and milestones. The overall idea is simple and does reduce the barrier to entry for users, however, we don't like the idea that the ARB has to be sold for ETH to cover gas fees. They could've been more innovative in their execution strategy and gave users a purpose for bridging into Arbitrum. Furthermore, their application lacked clear milestones making it hard to assess the success of the grant during the distribution window.

Unfortunately, we will not be supporting this application.

GMX Feedback)

Xdefi's wallet application indicates it's widespread usage and a large user base, indicating its popularity and utility. The team behind Xdefi has a solid background, enhancing confidence in their ability to execute their proposed project. The grant amount requested is deemed very reasonable, and their unique incentive strategy, where incentives are returned to the chain in sequencer fees, adds an innovative twist to their proposal. The milestones and protocol roadmap are clearly defined, providing clarity and transparency in their objectives.

Xdefi's proposal offers a straightforward approach, promising to refund all gas fees for transfers through their wallet, thereby enabling users to explore the ecosystem at near-zero cost. With the implementation of new EIPs, the proposed grant is expected to have a significant impact on facilitating user exploration within the ecosystem. The proposed KPIs appear reasonable, and the team has a proven track record of delivering on their promises. As such, there are no objections to funding this proposal, as it aligns with the goal of promoting user engagement and accessibility within the ecosystem. We will be in favour of the proposal.

404 DAO Feedback)

XDefi scored well across the rubric. We appreciate XDefi's friction-reducing interface for users and shown commitment to Arbitrum. Our biggest issue with the proposal lies in selling the ARB for ETH to cover gas cost. While we support gas rebates we would prefer these be distributed as ARB to the end user rather than selling ARB directly. Additionally, both their milestone and KPIs sections were weak, as they were lacking any details on how the DAO could measure success. We encourage XDefi to rethink their incentive design and reapply for future programs.

Y2K**GFX Feedback)**

This is a large request, so should have some data to demonstrate that the plan is likely to work. Ideally for larger grants, the applicant has identified something that worked well in the past and is utilizing the grant funding to scale up or replicate that proven success. While straightforward liquidity mining is fine, there's also nothing specific to the application that targets either new users who aren't on Arbitrum or existing users bringing in more assets vs simply competing with any number of other governance-financed liquidity mining programs for the same assets. We recommend the applicant revise and resubmit with either a grant small enough to be

comfortable for experimental execution plans or with data on their own or very similar protocols that this plan would create (and retain) meaningful activity.

Wintermute Feedback)

Y2K's application was quite strong and scored well across most criteria. They provided thorough calculations to try justify their milestones, KPIs, and goals. Their product is quite unique and provides novel infrastructure for the Arbitrum ecosystem. They proven their ability to effectively use token grants while incentivizing stickiness through their lock up of LP tokens in exchange for rev share.

Their product usage is impressive, however, looking at more recent statistics there has been a long window of low protocol activity indicated by volume and users.

Their TVL is also less than their grant request however, this is due to the design of their product.

Their execution strategy was well thought out, but we would've liked to have seen a higher emphasis on TVL stickiness and reward continuous LP depositors over the incentive period.

Unfortunately, due to the lack of stickiness and size of the grant relevant to current protocol statistics, it's hard for us to justify this grant request. We would like to see the application resubmit this application with a lower ask.

Karel Feedback)

Vote AGAINST Y2K's proposal.

Well-written proposal that scored well on rubric however unable to endorse for the following reasons: (i) requested grant size for exceeds protocol TVL (4-6x); (ii) justification for the grant size needs to be built out more as it was based solely on the Emissions to Deposits Ratio but is insufficiently justified and unclear if strongly correlated enough to success that apply incentives will translate to hitting target milestones/KPIs; (iii) long-term stickiness needs further detail to highlight degree of treasury incentives to be offered; and (iv) audit for the V3 Tsunami product has not yet been completed with 33% of funds set to flow through it. Encourage applicant to resubmit at later grants cycle with: more signs of market demand + usage through V3, completed audit on V3, and with a smaller grant size to scale out usage.

Yearn

GFX Feedback)

This is a case where we were inclined to mark upwards some categories based on this being Yearn. However, we need to be consistent in our treatment of applicants, and had the name been removed from this application, we do not think we would support it. This is for two reasons. While Yearn has an excellent user base on several other chains, there is no user base to speak of at present on Arbitrum, according to DeFi Llama. This could have been a strength – had the grant plan been tailored to specifically marketing Yearn's Arbitrum products to its user base on other chains. Instead it was a relatively untargeted liquidity mining scheme that is just as likely to draw from existing Arbitrum projects as to bring in new capital from offchain. Secondly, the milestones, which are how progress is meant to be measured is just distributing the grant itself,

which doesn't seem like it holds the grantee accountable in any meaningful way. We recommend Yearn resubmit for future grants cycles after revising to address the feedback above.

GMX Feedback)

Yearn, a highly reputable protocol, has submitted an appropriate grant request. Their proposal demonstrates a good level of experience in utilizing incentives, particularly evident in their Op incentive campaign. Matching the grant funds received from the ARB Airdrop further adds to the positive outlook. With a proven track record in creating vault strategies that maintain sticky liquidity, Yearn's proposal is well-structured and comprehensive. The provided data related to the protocol, along with the milestone and incentive strategy, are commendable. Their modest grant request aims to bootstrap new vaults on Arbitrum, offering attractive interest rates to borrowers. With the goal of retaining 50% of the TVL through organic yield post-proposal, Yearn's accomplished team and reasonable grant size garner approval. Overall, this well-written proposal warrants support, as it promises to contribute positively to the ecosystem.

404 DAO Feedback)

Yearn scored well across most of their application, expect for their milestone section which failed to provide any performance metrics to hold Yearn accountable. While their incentive design was decent and straightforward, they did provide a clear execution strategy and KPIs. However, given Yearn's historic usage and team background, we think this proposal makes sense from a cost benefit standpoint as they have also pledged to use 75k ARB they received from the airdrop for incentives too. Overall, they justified the request of 300k ARB and we are supporting this application.

Wintermute Feedback)

Yearn has an amazing reputation with a strong ability to build and sustain TVL and users on its platform. Their application was pretty strong with clear evidence of being able to use incentives to bootstrap protocol TVL effectively. However, unfortunately, they provided no calculations and justifications for their requested grant size - we would've liked to have seen benchmarks to current market yields for their intended vaults to inform their target APR etc. They also lacked clear KPIs and milestones across the length of the program, and lastly, we are unsure if spending 300k ARB to incentivize USDT and USDC pools is ultimately the best use of DAO funds.

We felt like they could've included a wide scope of vaults that are more impactful to Arbitrum, focused on migrating users from other chains, and attempted to encourage stickiness. Unfortunately, we could not justify this grant request.

Karel Feedback)

Vote AGAINST Yearn's proposal.

A household name and strong proposal that ranked decently on the rubric, however unable to endorse for the following reasons: (i) greater detail behind their grant size, execution plan against the milestones (+ what KPIs are expected over the course of 12 weeks); (ii) despite

receiving the original \$ARB airdrop, would have liked to see a push into the Arbitrum prior to LTIPP and proof points to highlight demand within the Arbitrum market; (iii) needs more rationale behind driving stickiness (vs. "we're going to find out together what the real results are"), ideally pulling from experiences on Optimism; (iv) in order to achieve their 29M TVL target (316x current at time of review), a more comprehensive plan to do so + approach to migrate users from other chains. At present time, there's a risk that this doesn't grow the Arbitrum pie and instead cannabilizes upon other projects.

Suggest Yearn resubmits at a later date address comments above, ideally with milestone-based unlocks for incentives.

Yield Yak

Wintermute Feedback)

Yield Yak's application scored well across a lot of criteria. They had clear milestones, KPIs, goals, and objectives, and based their ARB distribution according to key milestones which is great. Their incentive mechanism is very basic and more could of been done there to incentivise stickiness. Their project is very composable and they have decent integrations thus far. They sufficiently justified their requested grant size, however, we would've like to see more thought behind trying to migrate their Avalanche users to Arbitrum by using ARB incentives. Lastly, we are slightly concerned about product demand on Arbitrum given their age. Nonetheless, this was a solid application and we will be supporting it.

GFX Feedback)

While we feel the request is relatively high vs the Arbitrum traction to date, the persistent presence on Avalanche does suggest the team can maintain much of the TVL and activity if they can get some momentum. We also appreciate that the request is scaled to a targeted, capped incentive and represents a maximum spend. We recommend this grant be approved.

Karel Feedback)

Vote FOR Yield Yak's proposal.

Strong, comprehensive proposal across major criteria (milestones, KPIs, etc.) with solid metrics driven largely by Avalanche (Arbitrum metrics are meh). Requested grant size is higher than ideal but sufficiently rationalized by the team in light of potential opportunity to migrate Avalanche users to Arbitrum and would have liked to see a more fulsome strategy drawn out to bring users over to Arbitrum as part of the incentivization strategy.