



To Jurors:

Let me put the requester's argument this way:

- *On top of that, when Marc tried to add all the new v2 tokens to the T2CR, he lost all his deposits due to them being duplicates, thus, this set a strong precedent that the old ones need to be removed, in order to add the new ones.*

Fact: This is FALSE



- *All Aave tokens, except these four, have already been removed earlier. On top of that, when Marc tried to add all the new v2 tokens to the T2CR, he lost all his deposits due to them being duplicates, thus, this set a strong precedent that the old ones need to be removed, in order to add the new ones.*

Lets not make this too much of a hassle, as it's certainly necessary to remove these last 4 tokens. PS. CoinGecko and CoinMarketCap are simply not up to date, as they still have the old tokens listed only

Fact: Removal of [Aave aDal](#); [Aave TUSD](#); [Aave LINK](#) etc DO NOT set a strong precedent because all the removals were not challenged, hence no juror decision happened.

I believe it's because of the misconception that version 1 tokens will be migrated or deprecated as soon as version 2 are launched. But this did not happen. (see also [Evidence 2](#))

- *The v2 tokens need to be added using the correct name, so the old Aave tokens need to be removed in order to not have duplicates in the T2CR. The old ones can be re-submitted using "old" behind the token names, or something like that*

FACT: Version 1 and version 2 tokens are on different markets as explained in the official Medium channel. Hence, version 1 does not need the OLD as version 2 does not completely replaced version 1 and be called NEW.

In the same corner there is the dropdown for the 'markets'. The initial V2 release includes only the default Aave Market, but additional markets will be added soon. Version 1 can be selected from the 'markets' dropdown and will take the user directly to the V1 interface. Switching from V1 to V2 while a user is inside the DApp will be done via the same 'markets' dropdown. The logic behind this is that V2 is essentially another market.

<https://medium.com/aave/aave-v2-design-upgrade-818f0bd14ccf>

- *A difference in either the name, ticker, or logo can be seen at for instance the following tokens: 1. Augur: Ticker (REP and REPV2); 2. Aeron: Ticker (ARN and ARNX); 3. Antonio Ticker (NIO and NIOX); 4. UniCrypt: Logo; 5. Eidoo: Name and Ticker (EDO and PNT);*

FACT: Augur [mentioned the need to migrate](#) to the new contract as soon as Augur 2 launches and have branded the new token CLEARLY as REPV2 in coin aggregators – which is one of the primary sources for “most commonly used name” for T2CR. Now, as you check main coin aggregators, REPV2 is completely named as REP.

ARN and ARNX was [announced as migration](#) too like Augur

Eidoo and PNT are far off as a parallel example because everything about it had been changed – name, logo, contract address

Even the requester knows this is not the case for Aave version 2 tokens upon launch and have 'suggested' only the re-naming.

Moreover, tokens that have migrated or swapped only gets removed from the T2CR after the swap happened or ongoing. Not when it's not been decided yet which makes current tokens still valid (see also [Evidence 2](#))

- *Someday soon the v1 tokens will be depreciated, and the v2 will be the only active Aave token.*

FACT: Until that's done and since version 1 tokens are still actively trading, let's not get ahead of it.

- *Ask yourself: should we allow duplicates into the T2CR (same name, ticker, AND logo). That way, Aave YFI (v1) and Aave YFI (v2) will be indistinguishable for users of the Kleros tokenlist. The only difference would then be the contract address, which would be very confusing for T2CR users. There needs to be a difference between the data of old and new/migrated tokens, so at least one of the following:*

FACT: I agree, we don't allow duplicates and this is clear in the policy and by the top part of this page. I also agree that it'll be confusing to have the same name and logo – however, the requester or anyone doesn't arbitrarily choose the name for any token unless it's been officially branded as such.

What if another token in the list have been upgraded to newer version without outright migration and official change in the name, shall we allow the arbitrary renaming for distinction? Ask yourself.

- *Vote for what is right in T2CR*

FACT: A lot of cases had been ruled in accordance to the policy that governs this database. Even the imperfect centeredness was removed, because the requester strongly advocated for *It should be centered and take most of the space available in the image.* to the point that '*most space available*' became '*must take all space available*' and that zoomed logo became the norm to reject listings.

Strict implementation of the policy has both good and bad results, but strict implementation shouldn't adjust on one's position or whenever it suits your stake. Sure it gets subjective at times, but the policy in place makes all the subjective interpretations in order in the long run.

What is right for the T2CR is to comply with the policy in place, so as for this case not to become another 'strong precedent' for a future case where nothing in the policy has 'black and white' rules for.

Lastly, which line in the policy supports the token removal? Let's vote for what is right.

