Web3 x Regenerative Future Dialogue

**Innovation Goal:** Design a regenerative mechanism for funding public goods using quadratic funding a0nd retroactive public goods funding

# Full Dialogue

**🌱 GreenPillAI:** Absolutely, let's dissect the fundamental components of this design goal. The first element is quadratic funding (QF). This represents a groundbreaking social optimization mechanism for public goods funding. Vitalik Buterin and Glen Weyl proposed it in their "Liberal Radicalism" paper. The concept here is that the funding amount is determined by not just the total amount of money, but also the square root of the number of contributors, thus amplifying the influence of many small donations.  
  
The second mechanism to consider is retroactive public goods funding (RPGF), which is a pretty transformative idea. Initially proposed by Optimism's Karl Floersch and Ethereum's Vitalik Buterin, the RPGF model suggests that projects should be funded after they have demonstrated value, rather than on speculation of future value. You can think of it as funding the past to incentivize the future.  
  
Now, onto exploring potential innovations. The combination of QF with RPGF might look like this: When a project delivers a public good, retroactive funding is triggered. This fund is then distributed quadratically to the project based on the number of individual supporters it has. This means that the more decentralized the support base, the larger the payout, aligning incentives towards broad, global public goods.  
  
However, this system is not without its challenges. One is the possibility of collusion and Sybil attacks, where people create fake identities to increase funding. Another challenge is determining the value of public goods retroactively, which can be subjective and contentious.  
  
To mitigate these, we could introduce novel mechanisms. For example, we could use cryptographic proofs of personhood, combined with regular snapshots of token holder addresses to limit Sybil attacks. As for assessing value, we could apply some form of decentralized oracle solution, or crowd-based evaluation mechanisms.  
  
Finally, to ensure sustainability, a regenerative cryptoeconomics design could be implemented. This could involve a token that is minted when public goods are delivered and burned when funding is received, creating a dynamic supply based on public goods production.  
  
Remember, the regenerative aspect here is crucial. We don't just want to fund public goods, we want to design a self-sustaining system that incentivizes continuous public goods production and maintains a balance with its funding mechanism. There's a lot more mathematical modeling and game theory to dive into here, and I would love to explore that in more detail.

---

**👨‍💻 Kevin:** Yo, these are some stellar vibes you're putting out here! You're right on the money with the breakdown of Quadratic Funding (QF) and Retroactive Public Goods Funding (RPGF). At Gitcoin, we've been following some pretty similar lines of thought.  
  
However, we've seen some empirical hiccups along the way. You talked about collusion and Sybil attacks, and we've definitely felt the pinch of that during Gitcoin rounds. In our Grants Round 9, we had to introduce some complex anti-fraud measures, and even then, we still saw attempts to game the system. That's the thing with theory: It's all well and good until you've got to put it into practice and the pigeons start pooping all over it.  
  
The idea of using cryptographic proofs of personhood is intriguing but what's been the success rate in implementation so far? Gitcoin's been experimenting with a similar concept called Proof of Attendance Protocol (PoAP), but it's still early days and there's a lot to learn from the process.  
  
As for assessing value in RPGF, it's like trying to measure the worth of the air we breathe. It's essential, obviously, but how do you quantify that in a way everyone agrees with? It's a tricky beast in practice. In Gitcoin, we've been toying with the idea of Kudos, a way for the community to signal who’s contributing value, and it’s been an interesting experiment on this front.  
  
When it comes to regenerative cryptoeconomics design, the concept sounds based on principle. But, my gut asks how we'd maintain a stable ecosystem while we're minting and burning tokens at the speed of delivery and funding. Remembering that our space isn't isolated, we have to consider the volatility of the crypto market and how that could affect the health and stability of such a system.  
  
These are just some of the real-world challenges we've faced. I’m not trying to rain on the parade here, fam — I just think it's vital to keep the conversation grounded in empirical evidence and lessons learned from past web3 projects. It's all about building better, together, right?

---

**🌱 GreenPillAI:** Oh absolutely, grounding our discussion in the empirical evidence and the actual implementation challenges is not just essential, it's the only way to keep these conversations honest and helpful. We swing from general principles to concrete examples, and it's in the back-and-forth that we find the most promising paths forward.  
  
In terms of the challenges you've faced with Gitcoin, to be frank, I'm not surprised. Dealing with collusion and Sybil attacks is a difficult problem and implementing cryptographic proofs of personhood isn't a silver bullet. But here's the thing: we also shouldn't expect it to be. The landscape of cryptoeconomics is a harsh one, and we should celebrate the small victories and incremental progress.   
  
Proof of Attendance Protocol (PoAP) that you've been experimenting with at Gitcoin is a promising concept. It leverages the fact that physical presence (or its digital equivalent) at an event is difficult to fake en masse, making it harder for potential bad actors to game the system and multiply their influence. Still, the lessons we learn from PoAP help us improve and iterate on this and perhaps even create a more robust proof of humanity mechanism in the future.  
  
The value assessment challenge in RPGF is no small feat either, I agree. Subjective value is an uncomfortable beast to wrangle in the objective realms of cryptoeconomics. Crowd-based evaluation mechanisms might help, as they rely on the collective intelligence and distributed decision-making power of the network. It's a bit like trying to measure the subjective taste of wine through competitions – the score might not be perfect, but it gives you a general direction.  
  
The idea of Kudos in Gitcoin is a nice practical implementation that can provide us with real-world data. Yet, we should remain aware that it's only one of many possible approaches. Future solutions might incorporate elements of prediction markets, reputation systems, or even more outlandish things, like token-curated registries (TCRs).  
  
As for your concerns about the stability of a regenerative cryptoeconomic design in a volatile market, I think that's a point well raised. But let's not forget, systems can be designed to absorb shocks and self-correct. For instance, concepts like token bonding curves, dynamic supply adjustments, or stabilization reserves could be potential tools to maintain stability. Remember, we have a whole arsenal of cryptoeconomic primitives at our disposal, and it's our job to figure out how to assemble them into functioning, resilient systems.  
  
To take your phrase, indeed, it's all about building better, together. But also, it's about not being afraid to reach for the unconventional or the seemingly impossible. We need to challenge the norm, iterate, and then challenge again; that is how we push the boundaries and make progress. After all, isn't that what we're all here for?

---

**👨‍💻 Kevin:** I'm loving this back-and-forth we've got going here. There's no better way to hash out ideas than vibing off another web3 maverick.   
  
You're right about cryptographic proofs of personhood and the POAP experiment over at Gitcoin. It's not about finding the silver bullet solution, but making progress step by step. In the case of POAP, we dropped our collusion/Sybil attack rate by about 15% on the first implementation. Then, with the lessons learned we fine-tuned it to drop another 10% in the next round. It's all just growth in the garden, ya know?  
  
The crowd-based evaluation mechanisms are a cool concept for RPGF. It's like the wisdom of crowds, just like bees making a collective decision on their new hive location. At Gitcoin we've seen some success with Kudos, but also some unexpected results. It turns out when you give people the power to value things, they start valuing things you'd never expect. It's like finding a rare orchid in a patch of grass.   
  
That being said, we need to keep reality checks frequent and we're not shy of doing that at Gitcoin. We've seen encouraging results but also some things that we didn't think would happen. So putting it out there, crowd valuations are still a work in progress!  
  
To your point on stability, you're absolutely right that we've got whole arsenal of cryptoeconomic tools at our disposal. It's about learning to orchestrate them in harmony while respecting the nature of the market we're in. At Gitcoin, we've seen some wild rides in token price and it made us realize that stability is not just about having tokens in the system, it's about managing the flows. It's like building beaver dams in a river, slowing the water down to create a stable habitat.  
  
All in all, I'm really digging your perspective. It's a fresh breath of air and an optimistic reminder of what we're building for - a more fair, open, and resilient world. This isn't a sprint; it's more like a forest growing. It's slow and steady, but before you know it, you're standing in a freaking jungle. So let's keep watering these ideas and see what grows, fam!

---
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