

I'm shocked – and really disappointed that this wasn't taken more into account for the Airdrop. This Airdrop was incredibly anti-climax, showing that we can have a distribution model that reward whales that took a much lower risk than the early adopters aka absolute first risk(s)takers.

First of all, I want to thank the team – and we all should be happy for what was handed out to us for free. I can't complain about that fact. But I can complain about something when it feels unfair, and wrong for the beginning of a project. It can't be more wrong having such few people, or one person to be exact to own that many tokens of the circulating supply. I would never allow it if this was my project.

To my case:

Let me give you some perspective here. Let's take a degenerate Uniswap play as an example, since everyone is familiar with that; You have person A

holding 10 Ethereum. He spots a ghost listed project that has massive potential and no-one has dared to invest yet because the liquidity is too low and it hasn't been locked yet. He invests 10 ETH because he believes in the project and is confident that the team knows what they are doing and that their code is SOLID.

The project then does 10x, and suddenly liquidity lock is confirmed and the liquidity has increased a lot. Now enters person B

, the person holding 200 Ethereum. He has been on the sideline all along, waiting for confirmation about whether or not the project is secure. Now he can finally enter with his 200 ETH. He does so, and the project does another 2x, for a total of 20x.

Person A that took the biggest risk and could potentially lose everything was rewarded with 20x, aka 200 Ethereum, while person B that waited until everything was secure and confirmed was rewarded with a 2x, that also equalled a 200 ETH return.

This is nothing but fair. The person who got in first was rewarded for his early and fearless participation, paving way for others to enter and creating trust, just how it was supposed to be. The first come first serve method has been a way of doing things for a reason. It is the most fair method, hands down – always will.

This was what I was trying to explain in my previous post. We are missing a point system that rewarded the people that were alone staking stETH in the beginning. These people were the person A

, that trusted these devs, and paved the way so the other people felt more secure doing it. It took forever for people to really get started with staking. But no, this Airdrop was rewarding later majority rather than early majority. Time didn't play much of a role here from what I can see. You have to take into account how early you staked. Were you staker number 10? 20? 100? 1000? I'm shocked that this wasn't one of the main KEY factors for this airdrop.

To the proposal:

My proposal is to reward people with a small portion of the Treasury (much less than what was Airdropped) some kind of function that calculates how much you staked, but also how early you staked in the line, and take a big difference between if you were staker number 10 or 1000. Bonus points should've been given out to people staking later to begin with.

Imagine going from 1 holder to 1000 holder. The 1000 holder are taking a much lower risk, and in this case the later holders just chipped in a bunch of ETH and was rewarded a lot more than the person who dared to stake first, a complete opposite mentality than what is fair. I can't emphasize this enough. But I have to admit, I don't have a clear distribution calculation, but I won't take this into account, and was hoping we could discuss on a model that would give some more tokens out fairly to the ones who really paved the way.

What do you guys think?