

I have flipped my allegiance in this case and now support the Submitter.

There are two main points of contention around the image size and the image whitespace.

The first point is that the image has extra vertical whitespace and the policy states the image should take up "most of the space available". There is no policy on how images should be cropped. Square images are not forbidden by the policy, and in fact by looking at other logos in the list, they are the defacto standard for images submitted to the T2CR. If the dimensions of the logo were rotated the logo would not be able to take up any more space than it does now. Therefore this image uses *all* of the available space that it possibly can without distorting. Thus it satisfies the policy point stating that it must fill "most of the available space".

The second argument centers on the statement in the policy: "The token symbol should be a transparent PNG of at least 200x200 px.". This statement is being read by the challenger as two separate requirements: "The token symbol should be a transparent PNG. The token symbol should be at least 200x200px." However this is not how the policy statement is written. The use of "of" instead of "and" clearly indicates that that the 200x200px stipulation is referring to the PNG and not the token symbol.

The logo supplied by the submitter is a PNG of at least 200x200px. The logo also takes up as many possible pixels as it can without distorting. Therefore this image does not violate the policy and should be accepted.

Policies can always be deconstructed and leave some room for misinterpretation and ambiguity. In my opinion, the way it is written clearly favors the submitter. In addition the logo fits perfectly well into the T2CR and clearly is not in violation of the spirit of the DApp. We should not reject simply because the challenger has found possible ambiguity in the wording of the policy. This image can just as easily be argued to be in compliance of the policy as it can be argued not to be, and the wording of the policy more strongly supports it being compliant than not.