

Hello, I was recently directed to the following page [Notion – The all-in-one workspace for your notes, tasks, wikis, and databases.](#) with a list of EIP4844 contributors which presumably will get a reward in OP for their work on EIP4844.

I am very pleased that successful projects like Optimism are funding public goods and in particular core development. Not only with monetary funding but also with their own time and man-hours in research and implementation. I am also glad to be personally considered for this funding even if my participation in EIP4844 has been infinitesimal at most. I wish other projects, in particular those with their own tokens, do allocate a percentage of their token to fund core development and public goods in general.

However, I believe that in this particular instance the approach taken by Optimism is not right for several reasons. Most, if not all of the people in that list, are core developers that already belong to a collective that is self curated and that distributes funding towards them, this is the [Protocol Guild](#). I believe this is the right place to allocate funding for core development.

Although it is understandable that Optimism may want to have a finer decision on how their funds are allocated among members, in this particular instance of a feature that has not even been shipped to Ethereum mainnet and whose date hasn't even been set on public testnets, I believe that this hurts Ethereum governance credibility of neutrality.

It also may have impact among core dev teams themselves: should I be careful in the future deciding in which subprojects do I work within Prysm to expect a higher payout if I work on projects that are of interest to Optimism? (noting that this project in particular is of high interest to Prysm's mother company). Should I neglect forkchoice and allocate more of my time to EIP4844?

On the other side of the same coin, the list itself fails to recognize participation of many people that do contribute under the hood. How about the devops on each team that helped setup and run special CI flows for the respective EIP4844 branches? How about project managers that are involved in facilitating some of these coredevs to take time from other resources to work on EIP4844? I don't want to claim that I have any right to decide how Optimism allocates their funds, just noticing that the protocol guild has already gone through these questions in detail, in an ample forum of coredevs and has instructed guides on who and how much should be distributed from the funds it obtains, and often times, in order to see a feature live on mainnet, there are many more working directly and indirectly (even facilitating those that work directly) than those that receive credit for it. I also don't want to take credit off the people in that list: I have personally seen the work and the countless hours that some of my colleagues are putting into this, they are true champions.

Having said so, and again repeating that I am very glad and honoured to be considered and quite happy to see such an influential project donating funds towards core development, I kindly request my name to be taken off that list.