Why Cases 160-181 MUST BE ACCEPTED

Given the risk that some of the Cases 160-181 might be appealed to their final possible round of appeal on the General Court on Gnosis, I found it necessary as one of the creators of the registry to summarize and clarify why these Cases **must be won by the submitter**.

1. **"Meant to be used from" argument:**
   a. Web3 is a space where all contracts are public and interactable from any frontend and client. The people who 'intend' for a contract to be used from a domain are the ones who created the frontend, not the one who created the contract. If contract creators want to control which frontends can interact with their contract, they shouldn't be deploying contracts on (public) blockchains in the first place.
   b. Alternative front ends have always been embraced by the Web3 community, as shown by this tweet by [Vitalik about this alternative Uniswap frontend by Kleros](#) (which has been proudly advertised by the Kleros community and Cooperative since then).
   c. This registry has always accepted contracts used from multiple domains. In fact this is the PRIMARY USE CASE that distinguishes it from the Address Tags registry (i.e. providing a *many-to-many* mapping of domains to contracts, instead of a *one-to*-one mapping of contract to project URL and contract label). Examples that are not token contracts are plentiful and diverse in their nature, ranging from gateway and router contracts to Opensea's seaport contract (see [this list](#) for examples with entry counts >2). If entries with token contracts on domains unknown to the token creators can't be accepted, then all these other entries must be rejected as well (and they haven't).
2. **"Redundant/Useless data" argument**: I will refute this argument on two fronts:
   a. Firstly, it is INCORRECT to say that it is redundant to allow ERC20 contracts into the registry as **every** ERC20 token is tradeable on every DEX. It is common knowledge that DEXes only list or verify a subset of trustworthy tokens on the market (hence the need for verified token lists). While there are [tens (if not hundreds) of thousands](#) of ERC20 contracts on Ethereum alone, most DEXes only whitelist a few dozen (and maximally a few thousand for the biggest ones) tokens on their frontends.
   b. Secondly, data that is not or minimally useful **is not prohibited** from the registry, as long as it is correct. For example, Ledger's official [Github repo](#) (which this registry feeds into) has been collecting data that can arguably be derived from simpler and more efficient ways (e.g. a subgraph or via querying the factory contract), such as this [long list of Balancer (LP) contracts](#), but it is nonetheless correct and in line with both the policy and the 'spirit of the registry'.
   c. If there truly is an issue with accepting these *less-than-useful* token contracts, it should be more about the terms of the [incentive program put out by the Kleros Coop](#) till end of November 2023 than the registry itself (and not an issue with the registry's policy). Dummy front ends and contracts have always

been free for anyone to create, and anyone can use them and submit them to this registry as long as it doesn't violate the terms of the registry.

3. **"Spirit of the registry" argument**: The registry was initially set up with Ledger to whitelist the range of addresses that can be interacted with and from a specific (sub)domain. Wallets from Metamask to Ledger Connect read and display the domain you are on when asking you to sign the transaction, and the intent of the registry is to make this relationship clear. This helps prevent users from accidentally signing transactions triggered by malicious iframes, popups or injections. Whitelisting token contracts for usage on DEX and DeFi frontends is a clear and intended use case of the registry.

May these arguments help all jurors new and old to uphold the policy of this registry and ensure that the cases resolve in the right way.