

This thread is to collect feedback on the Retroactive Public Goods Funding (Retro Funding) round 4 voting experience

Please read [Retro Funding 4: Onchain Builders - round details](#) to gain relevant context on the mechanics of Retro Funding 4.

Iterating on Retro Round 3 learnings

A number of learnings from the voting process in Retro Funding 3 were identified in the [retrospective](#):

1. The broad scope of projects and lack of comparable metrics made data-informed voting decisions difficult. Despite the challenges, there was a movement towards more data-driven decisions in evaluating open source contributions and onchain deployments.
2. The quorum requirement had a negative effect on the applicant and badgeholder experience, transforming the process into what some perceived as a popularity contest.
3. The self-selection of applications to review by badgeholders does not ensure a fair review by a minimum number of badgeholders for each application.
4. While a vast improvement to RetroPGF 2, the implications of the voting algorithm were difficult to understand and leave room for further research and improvement

Retro Funding 4: Voting experience

Retro Funding 4 will be experimenting with a new approach to voting, in which badgeholders vote via weighting metrics rather than voting on individual projects. The thesis behind this experiment is that by leveraging quantitative metrics, citizens are able to more accurately express their preferences for the types of impact they want to reward, as well as make more accurate judgements of the impact delivered by individual projects.

This design aims to address feedback and incorporate learnings from retro round 3 by exploring data driven decision making and eliminating the quorum requirement and self-selection of applications by badgeholders.

Implementation

[

image

1920×1152 65.4 KB

](<https://global.discourse-cdn.com/business7/uploads/bc41dd/original/2X/a/a0c6d10f90c571ad6216241526390d0bd0de880f.jpeg>)

The implementation of this voting experience is a collaboration between a number of teams across the Collective.

- You can find product designs created by the Optimism Foundation design team [here](#). Thanks to Ed, [@joanbp](#) [@mitch](#) [@Michael](#) [@LauNaMu](#) [@Tamarandom](#) [@amer](#) and [@Griff](#) for participating in user interviews to improve the designs!
- The voting interface is being implemented by West, who were selected via a [Foundation Mission](#). You can find the relevant repo [here](#)
- Open Source Observer is creating the data infrastructure to power metric-based voting, you can find the relevant documentation [here](#).
- Agora is providing underlying voting infrastructure, you can find their API, which will power the voting interface, [here](#)

Impact Metrics

A key part of Retro Funding 4 is the creation and selection of impact metrics to measure the impact of Onchain Builders.

The following data sources will be available to power metrics:

1. Blockchain trace data from OP mainnet, Base, Metal, Zora, Mode, and Frax, powered by [GoldSky](#)
2. Web 3 social & reputation data from Farcaster, ENS, Gitcoin Passport, EigenTrust and Lens
3. Code contributions (e.g. Github) and data collected during the [Retro Funding application process](#)

To shape the creation and selection of impact metrics, badgeholders have been involved in an ongoing process involving surveys, polling and a comprehensive survey. This process is facilitated by [@simonapop](#)

. The findings and refined results of this engagement with badgeholders will be shared shortly as we continue to iterate these processes in a meaningful way.

The final list of metrics available in the voting interface will be curated by badgeholders around mid-July. In addition to contributing to the design of metrics, anyone can create & propose an impact metric via Open Source Observer. There's an ongoing data challenge by OS Observer with a total of 3k OP in rewards for proposing new metrics, more details [here](#).

Rewarding the use of Open Source licenses

One of areas of impact which Retro Funding aims to reward is the use of Open Source licenses. "Open Source / Open Access" is one of [Optimism's Collective values](#) and has been the most popular among governance participants during the creation of the Collective's values.

In the voting interface, badgeholders will have the option to assign a multiplier to Open Source projects, as well as exclude all non open source projects (see [WIP designs](#)).

- The licenses used by projects are identified by collecting the Github repo which holds the projects contract code during the [application process](#).
- To define Open Source licenses the definition of the [Open Source Initiative](#), a long standing non-profit dedicated to the definition of open source, will be used.
- If a project holds their contract code within multiple repos with different licenses, of which at least one is a closed source license, the project will be considered as closed source. This rule keeps the implementation practical, and avoids arbitration about which repo is how important to a project, or how to handle semi-open-source projects. We're open to proposed solutions to this edge case which are operationally and technically viable.

Voting algorithm

The Foundation will published a Mission Request to do research on different voting designs and their tradeoffs. This research will inform the selection of a voting algorithm which will be applied in Retro Funding 4, updates will follow.

Defining profit within in the impact = profit framework

The Collective is experimenting with using a deliberative process to come to consensus on a definition of profit, which will be universally applied to the Retro Funding 4. You can find more information on the deliberative process [here](#).