Hi [@Jonas](#), [@op_julian](#), [@system](#),

I'm reaching out regarding three declined RetroFunding Round 6 applications that represent essential impact from our development and events teams. These applications were perceived as duplicates by reviewers, despite their distinct contributions.

While our Optimism Fractal Respect Game Events [application](#) was approved, the current outcome means most of our contributors' significant impact over the past year would go unrecognized. This is particularly concerning because the approved application explicitly excludes these other contributions.

The approved application specifically states, "It does not include the development of tools used at the events or the Optimism Town Hall events which take place after Respect Game events, as there are separate applications for these projects." As a result, these vital contributions are now at risk of not being recognized at all.

Context

As leader of two teams focused on Optimism governance, I've coordinated both technical development and event facilitation over the past year. This represents substantial impact from:

- A technical team with one full-time and three part-time developers who have built governance infrastructure that is not currently being recognized

- An events team with two full-time and two part-time contributors who have hosted ~60 governance events that are not currently being recognized

- Multiple contributors who have worked almost exclusively on Optimism over the past year to create critical infrastructure and processes for the Collective

Our request is crucial not only for our teams - whose continued ability to support the Collective depends substantially on RetroFunding - but also for the Collective itself, as our tools and events provide essential infrastructure for improving governance processes. Our experience offers the Collective an opportunity to become more supportive of novel governance approaches while improving RetroFunding's inclusivity and effectiveness. This aligns directly with the Collective's core axiom of rewarding impact with profit and building more equitable systems.

Request

The [Application Review Process](#) states "The Foundation decides which applications are allowed to be edited." Through this provision, I respectfully request permission to:

1. Update our approved Optimism Fractal Respect Games Events application to include contributions from the declined applications

2. Rename it to "Optimism Fractal Respect Games + Optimystics Tools and Events"

This request is straightforward because:

- The Optimism Fractal Respect Games application was already approved with unanimous support

- Changes align with the Collective's mission to reward impact

- Badgeholders would gain a complete picture for evaluation

I've already begun drafting the combined application to ensure a smooth update if approved.

Understanding Our Appeal

While approving this request should be straightforward based on the reasons above, I've prepared detailed documentation that provides valuable context both for this specific appeal and for improving future RetroFunding rounds. The document, titled [Recognizing Impact in RetroFunding: Round 6 Appeal and Process Insights](#) examines:

1. Impact of Structural Changes:

How RetroFunding Round 6 design modifications affect evaluation of diverse, high-impact contributions

1. Supporting Teams and Contributors:

Overview of the technical and events teams driving governance innovation

1. Excluded Project Contributions:

Analysis of how the approved application explicitly excludes key technical and community contributions

1. Review Process Challenges:

Documentation of reviewers' misunderstanding the application review process rules/procedures, impact assessment, and technical issues

1. Critical Recognition of Community Contributions:

Why proper evaluation supports both team sustainability and Collective growth

1. Benefits for the Collective:

How this appeal advances both immediate fairness and long-term governance evolution

In addition, the documentation includes comprehensive links to each project's applications, impact pages, and prior appeals, clearly demonstrating significant verifiable impact through metrics and community feedback. Despite this demonstrated impact and thousands of hours of critical work specifically for Optimism Governance, all the members of our teams have collectively received only a modest 30,000 OP from Optimism in total (during RetroPGF Round 3).

This documentation provides both important context about our contributors' work and concrete insights for enhancing how the Collective recognizes and rewards impact. I encourage Foundation members and anyone interested in improving RetroFunding's impact evaluation processes to review these materials.

Timing and Next Steps

While voting has now begun, most reviewers have not yet cast their votes. Approving this update would enable proper evaluation of our contributors' complete impact during the remainder of the two-week voting period.

We would greatly appreciate if you could approve this request to ensure reviewers can fully understand and evaluate our work. If a complete update isn't possible, even removing the sentence that explicitly excludes other contributions would help prevent misunderstanding and enable more accurate evaluation.

I'm happy to provide any additional context needed or discuss alternative approaches to ensure fair consideration of this work. Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of this request.

Note:

This post has been updated to reflect current timing (now that voting has begun) and provide important clarifications about our contributors' work and impact. Over the past few days I've also significantly expanded the accompanying [Recognizing Impact in RetroFunding Round 6](#) documentation with enhanced analysis and process insights.

For an overview of recent updates, please see[here](#). Your consideration of this request is greatly appreciated.