This thread is to collect feedback on the RetroPGF 3 application process

Applications for Retroactive Public Goods Funding Round 3 are live! You can apply[here](here) and find guidelines on the application process here. Applications will close on Oct 23rd.

Iterating on Round 2 learnings

Based on the [learnings and reflections from RetroPGF 2](#), we identified the challenge of gathering more high-quality data on projects to evaluate impact & profit. Feedback from Round 2 highlighted the need for greater alignment between the application form and the voting assessment process.

See [RetroPGF 3: Round Design](#) for an overview of the iterations that have been made based on Round 2 learnings.

RetroPGF 3 Applications - gathering the correct data from Projects

The Optimism Collective is built on the axiom of impact=profit

— the principle that positive impact on the Collective should be rewarded with profit to the individual.

To achieve this vision, the RetroPGF process should measure the impact projects provided to the Collective and the profit projects already generated from their impact. RetroPGF rewards are meant to fill the gap between a projects impact to the Collective and the profit they already received for that impact.

The RetroPGF application form enables projects to self-report their impact & profit and provide references to relevant data sources. While the Collective has defined broad impact categories for RetroPGF, projects often have a more detailed understanding of how to measure the impact of their work, and it is important to empower them to surface their impact to badgeholders as they see fit.

Impact statement

The RetroPGF application features a section called "impact statement", in which projects can describe their contributions and the impact they provided to the Optimism Collective.

See screenshot of the impact statement

[

image

2000×3393 455 KB

](https://global.discourse-cdn.com/business7/uploads/bc41dd/original/2X/8/824763df3373793fd3eea334e3f75f6e37b7ce30.jpeg)

The impact statement includes the following fields:

- Describe your contribution(s) to Optimism: A free-form text field in which projects can describe their contributions

- Contribution links: Projects can highlight external resources relating to their contributions

- Impact category: Projects are asked to pick one or multiple of the Round 3 categories that best describe their impact

- Impact description: A free-form text field where projects can describe the impact their contributions provided to the Optimism Collective

- Impact metrics: Projects can highlight qualitative or quantitive metrics that highlight the impact of their contributions

Allowing projects to reference standardized external resources, such as Github Repos and onchain contracts, can power community-built data analytics tools to calculate projects' impact using a variety of different approaches and formulas.

Impact metrics try to support the evaluation process by giving badgeholders measurable insights into the impact of a project, instead of solely relying on qualitative descriptions.

Grants & Funding

The Grants and Funding section tries to collect information relevant to the profit side of the impact = profit equation. The main goal is to understand the funding projects have already received for their impact.

See screenshot of the Grants & funding section

[

image

2000×1039 127 KB

](https://global.discourse-cdn.com/business7/uploads/bc41dd/original/2X/b/bf7f02bb93b50406141896a075483674c8e8dc35.jpeg)

- Projects can add one or multiple grants and funding sources.

- For each grant/funding source, they can select from different categories (Governance fund, Partner fund, RetroPGF 2, RetroPGF 1, or "other") and provide an amount and a description of the grant/funding they received.

- While projects can volunteer information on investments they received, in this round the application form and guidelines do not require projects to report this information. The reasoning behind this is that venture investment is made in exchange for ownership in a project and, therefore, should not be considered as profit.

The application form does not collect information relevant to means testing (see Vitalik's Review of Optimism retro funding round 1). Means testing tries to understand the means a project has at their disposal and how reliant projects are on RetroPGF rewards to continue their work. By rewarding with the expectation of future work, means testing leans more towards proactive grant giving. As the main experiment here is to reward contributions retroactively

, RetroPGF 3 experiments with deprioritising collecting information relevant to means testing. If badgeholders finds this to be limiting in reviewing projects for RetroPGF 3, the Collective may iterate on this in future rounds.

Call for Feedback

- Does the application form provide a smooth experience for applicants? Are there possible hurdles or unnecessary friction?

- Is the application form aligned with the review process of applications?

- Does the information provided by projects help badgeholders review their impact & profit?