

# pobidoq: Accountability-RWA Platform

---

## Turning Public Documents Into A Living Map of Accountability

### Technical Whitepaper

Version 1.0 February 2026

*Built around accountability, evidence, and verifiable process.*

---

## Abstract

pobidoq is an Accountability Real-World Asset (Accountability-RWA) platform that structures large investigation files, enforcement records, and public inquiries into addressable accountability units. Through a Human AI Review (HAR) loop, the system surfaces contradictions, process failures, and unresolved questions, then records evolving accountability states on-chain as transparent indices. This whitepaper describes the technical architecture, data model, review workflows, and governance mechanisms that enable durable, institution-compatible accountability infrastructure.

---

## Table of Contents

1. [Introduction](#)
2. [System Architecture](#)
3. [Data Model](#)
4. [Security and Privacy](#)
5. [Use Cases](#)
6. [Roadmap](#)
7. [Economic Model](#)
8. [Competitive Landscape](#)
9. [Team and Governance](#)
10. [Risks and Mitigations](#)
11. [Conclusion](#)

# 1. Introduction

High-stakes investigations, regulatory actions, and public inquiries generate millions of pages of documentation. Yet only a fraction is ever deeply analyzed, every newsroom and NGO rebuilds timelines from scratch, and there is no shared, structured record of what has been questioned, clarified, or resolved. Public documentation exists, but accountability tracking does not.

pobidoq addresses this gap by treating accountability documentation as a structured, analyzable asset class. Where traditional Real-World Asset (RWA) platforms tokenize positive-yield assets bonds, real estate, invoices pobidoq tokenizes **documented accountability risk** and creates economic incentives to analyze, verify, and act on that risk.

## 1.1 Core Problem

The current state of public accountability documentation faces three critical failures:

- **Ephemerality:** Document dumps dominate headlines, then disappear into PDFs and archives with no long-term analysis infrastructure.
- **Fragmentation:** Each investigation or newsroom rebuilds timelines, entity networks, and contradiction maps from scratch, duplicating effort across organizations.
- **Opacity:** The public cannot easily see progress from "exposed" to "addressed," creating accountability theater rather than genuine resolution.

## 1.2 Our Approach

pobidoq provides:

1. **Structured Ingestion:** Convert PDFs, emails, scanned contracts, and unstructured data into queryable, addressable segments.
2. **Human AI Review (HAR):** AI surfaces anomalies and patterns; human experts confirm, refine, or dispute findings through a calibrated consensus mechanism.
3. **On-Chain Accountability Indices:** Finalized accountability scores are hashed and anchored on-chain for immutable, auditable historical record-keeping.
4. **Permissioned Privacy:** Sensitive data verification happens via Zero-Knowledge Proofs without exposing raw personally identifiable information (PII).

## 2. System Architecture

pobidoq operates through four interconnected layers that transform raw documentation into verifiable accountability signals.

### 2.1 Data Ingestion and Normalization Layer

The ingestion pipeline handles heterogeneous inputs:

- **Document Processing:** OCR for scanned images, PDF parsing, email extraction (MIME/PST formats), structured data imports (CSV, JSON, XML).
- **Segmentation:** Documents are split into addressable units (e.g., `doc_id:page:paragraph`) with stable hashes for version control.
- **Entity Extraction:** Named Entity Recognition (NER) identifies people, organizations, locations, dates, monetary amounts, and relationships.
- **Normalization:** Data is transformed into a queryable JSON format with metadata tagging for downstream analysis.

**Key Design Principle:** Every transformation (OCR, redaction, normalization) is logged to maintain chain of custody. Document hashes and segment IDs remain stable across versions.

### 2.2 Analysis and Scoring Layer

Large Language Models (LLMs) and specialized classifiers analyze the normalized corpus:

- **Contradiction Detection:** Cross-reference statements across documents to surface inconsistencies in testimony, timelines, or reported facts.
- **Process Failure Mapping:** Identify procedural violations, missing required documentation, or unexplained delays.
- **Network Exposure:** Map relationships between entities, flag undisclosed conflicts of interest, trace financial flows.
- **Timeline Reconstruction:** Build chronological sequences of events with uncertainty quantification for ambiguous ordering.

Each segment or cluster receives a **provisional accountability score** on a scale from "unassessed" to "resolved." These scores are suggestions, not verdicts they serve as input to the Human AI Review process.

## 2.3 Human AI Review (HAR) Loop

The HAR mechanism combines machine pattern recognition with structured human judgment:

1. **Candidate Insight Generation:** AI models surface potential issues (contradictions, anomalies, timeline gaps) with supporting evidence.
2. **Human Review and Enrichment:** Journalists, researchers, advocacy groups, and subject-matter experts examine candidate insights. They can:
  - o Confirm findings with additional context
  - o Refute with counter-evidence
  - o Refine with nuanced interpretation
  - o Flag for escalated review
3. **Community and Expert Evaluation:** Other participants vote on Review Artifacts through a calibrated reputation system. Role-based weights (verified experts, partner organizations) ensure quality signal.
4. **Consensus Threshold:** When an insight passes agreement thresholds (configurable by corpus governance), it triggers on-chain state updates and contributor rewards.

**Abuse Resistance:** Rate limits, staking requirements, and reputation decay prevent spam and Sybil attacks. Dispute resolution flows handle contested findings through escalation to trusted arbitrators.

## 2.4 On-Chain Accountability Layer

Smart contracts manage accountability state and economic incentives:

- **Accountability Tokens (\$ACCT):** ERC-20 tokens representing claims on baskets of Accountability Units. As accountability is credibly resolved, effective unresolved accountability per token decreases.
- **State Transitions:** Verified reviews trigger on-chain updates to accountability scores. All transitions are logged with provenance (who reviewed, what evidence, consensus level).
- **Merkle Proofs:** Document segment hashes are anchored in Merkle trees, allowing efficient verification of specific claims without exposing full corpus.
- **Reward Distribution:** Contributors receive on-chain rewards based on quality of review work, measured by peer validation and longitudinal accuracy.

**Design Philosophy:** Maximize transparency of rules while minimizing on-chain storage costs. Most data lives off-chain; blockchain serves as commitment device and audit log.

## 2.5 Governance and Interaction Layer

The platform provides interfaces for stakeholder participation:

- **Web Application:** Browser-based interface for document exploration, review submission, voting, and dashboard visualization.
  - **API Access:** REST and GraphQL endpoints for programmatic querying of accountability indices, entity networks, and raw corpus data (with permission controls).
  - **DAO Governance:** Token holders vote on protocol parameters:
    - Data schema evolution
    - Consensus thresholds for different issue types
    - Reward function parameters
    - Curator whitelist additions
  - **Integration Partnerships:** Newsrooms, research institutions, and advocacy organizations can white-label access, integrate accountability indices into their own tools, and contribute domain expertise.
- 

## 3. Data Model

The pobidoq data model defines four core abstractions:

### 3.1 Document Corpus

A versioned set of documents from a specific investigation, regulatory action, or public inquiry.

#### Attributes:

- `corpus_id` : Unique identifier (e.g., UUID)
- `name` : Human-readable label ("Mueller Report Files", "Panama Papers Subset")
- `version` : Semantic versioning (e.g., v1.2.3) for corpus updates
- `source` : Provenance (public FOIA release, partner submission, etc.)
- `ingest_timestamp` : When corpus was added
- `access_level` : Public, permissioned, or restricted

## 3.2 Accountability Unit

The smallest unit of on-chain accountability, referencing one or more document segments.

### Attributes:

- `unit_id` : Unique identifier
- `segment_refs` : Array of segment identifiers (e.g., `["doc123:p5:para2"]` )
- `issue_type` : Taxonomy category (contradiction, process-failure, conflict-of-interest, etc.)
- `accountability_score` : Current state on scale (0-100, or categorical: unassessed flagged verified resolved)
- `sensitivity_flags` : Victim protection, PII redaction, national security
- `review_history` : Linked list of Review Artifacts that modified this unit

## 3.3 Review Artifact

A structured submission by a human reviewer (optionally AI-assisted).

### Attributes:

- `artifact_id` : Unique identifier
- `reviewer_id` : Pseudonymous or verified identity
- `unit_refs` : Which Accountability Units this review addresses
- `claim_type` : Taxonomy (confirm, refute, refine, escalate)
- `evidence` : Supporting citations (segment refs, external sources, timestamps)
- `confidence` : Self-reported certainty (low/medium/high)
- `votes` : Community evaluation scores
- `status` : Pending, accepted, rejected, disputed

## 3.4 Accountability Token (\$ACCT)

ERC-20 token representing claim on a basket of Accountability Units.

### Mechanics:

- **Minting:** Tokens are minted when new corpora are ingested, proportional to estimated unresolved accountability (measured by document volume, flagged issues, complexity metrics).
- **Burning:** Tokens can be burned when accountability is conclusively resolved (e.g., legal settlement, policy change, public clarification accepted by consensus).
- **Valuation:** Market-driven; holders bet on eventual resolution creating value (investigative scoops, legal victories, regulatory enforcement).

## 4. Security and Privacy

### 4.1 Evidence Integrity

- **Immutable Hashes:** Every document and segment is hashed (SHA-256). Hashes are stored on-chain or in content-addressed storage (IPFS).
- **Chain of Custody:** All transformations (OCR errors, redactions, translations) are logged with provenance metadata.
- **Version Control:** Corpus updates create new versions; historical states remain queryable.

### 4.2 Victim and Sensitive Data Protection

- **Redaction Policies:** PII is automatically detected and redacted before public exposure. Original data available only to permissioned reviewers.
- **Zero-Knowledge Proofs:** Reviewers can prove statements about data (e.g., "Entity A appears in 15 documents with conflict-of-interest flags") without revealing raw content.
- **Focus on Systems:** Accountability framing targets institutional failures, not individual victims. Design prevents re-traumatization.

### 4.3 Abuse Resistance

- **Reputation Systems:** Reviewers earn reputation through accurate contributions; low-reputation users face rate limits.
- **Staking:** Submitting high-stakes reviews requires token stake; false or malicious reviews forfeit stake.
- **Dispute Resolution:** Multi-tiered escalation (peer review expert panel DAO governance vote) for contested findings.

### 4.4 Auditability

- **Open Logic:** Accountability scoring algorithms, consensus rules, and reward functions are public and inspectable.
- **Reproducible State:** Given corpus version + review history, any third party can reconstruct current accountability scores.
- **Long-Term Verifiability:** On-chain logs and off-chain archival ensure future observers can audit how conclusions evolved.

# 5. Use Cases

## 5.1 Investigative Journalism

**Scenario:** A newsroom receives a FOIA document dump (50,000 pages).

**pobidoq Workflow:**

1. Ingest corpus, run entity extraction and contradiction detection.
2. AI surfaces top 100 potential issues (timeline gaps, undisclosed meetings, conflicting testimony).
3. Journalists review suggestions, confirm key findings, add external sourcing.
4. Accountability indices alongside news story, showing which claims are verified vs. disputed.
5. Other newsrooms can build on this work, citing specific Accountability Units.

**Value:** Reduces redundant analysis, creates shared evidence base, increases story credibility

## 5.2 Advocacy and Legal Support

**Scenario:** An advocacy group tracks regulatory enforcement actions for ecological violations.

**pobidoq Workflow:**

1. Ingest enforcement records from EPA, state agencies, and court filings.
2. Map entity networks to identify repeat offenders and systemic patterns.
3. Community reviewers (lawyers, scientists, activists) validate findings.
4. Dashboard of companies with unresolved violations vs settled vs ongoing litigation.
5. Advocacy campaigns cite specific Accountability Units in public pressure campaigns.

**Value:** Long-term memory for accountability efforts, empirical basis for policy advocacy, transparency.

## 5.3 Institutional Due Diligence

**Scenario:** A foundation evaluating grantees wants to assess accountability track record.

**pobidoq Workflow:**

1. Query accountability indices for entities in grant application.
2. Review historical accountability scores, types of issues flagged, resolution status.
3. Assess risk level based on unresolved process failures or conflicts of interest.
4. Make informed grant decision with empirical accountability data.

**Value:** Risk mitigation, evidence-based decision-making, incentive for clean accountability records.

## 6. Roadmap

### Phase 1: Private Beta (Q1 Q2 2026)

- Launch with 2-3 pilot corpora (public investigation files).
- Onboard 50-100 reviewers (journalists, researchers, domain experts).
- Deploy MVP smart contracts on Ethereum testnet.
- Iterate on HAR workflows based on user feedback.

### Phase 2: Public Launch (Q3 2026)

- Expand to 10+ corpora across multiple domains (regulatory, investigative, legal).
- Deploy production smart contracts on Ethereum mainnet.
- Open API access for institutional partners.
- Launch \$ACCT token with initial liquidity.

### Phase 3: Ecosystem Growth (Q4 2026-2027)

- Integration partnerships with newsrooms, research institutions, advocacy organizations.
- White-label accountability dashboards for partner organizations.
- Advanced analytics (predictive accountability risk, comparative entity analysis).
- Cross-corpus queries and meta-analysis tools.

### Phase 4: Decentralization (2027+)

- Transition protocol governance to DAO.
- Community-driven corpus curation and taxonomy evolution.
- Open-source core infrastructure for self-hosted deployments.
- International expansion with localized review communities.

# 7. Economic Model

## 7.1 Value Creation

pobidoq creates value through:

- **Information Efficiency:** Reduces duplicated investigative effort, lowering cost of accountability research.
- **Market Signal:** Accountability indices provide risk signals for investors, grantmakers, journalists, and public.
- **Network Effects:** Each new corpus and reviewer increases utility for all participants.
- **Incentive Alignment:** Rewards high-quality review work, punishes low-quality or malicious contributions.

## 7.2 Revenue Streams

- **API Access:** Tiered pricing for institutional API usage (free for public corpora, paid for permissioned or high-volume access).
- **White-Label Deployments:** Licensing fees for organizations running private pobidoq instances.
- **Premium Analytics:** Advanced querying, custom reporting, predictive modeling for paying customers.
- **Transaction Fees:** Small fees on \$ACCT token trades and on-chain state updates.

## 7.3 Token Economics

**Utility:** \$ACCT tokens are required for:

- Staking to submit high-stakes reviews
- Voting on DAO governance proposals
- Accessing premium features and analytics

**Supply Dynamics:** Minted with new corpora, burned when accountability resolved, creating deflationary pressure as system matures.

**Distribution:**

- 40% - Contributor rewards (reviewers, curators, developers)
- 25% - Treasury (DAO-controlled for grants and partnerships)
- 20% - Early supporters and advisors (3-year vesting)
- 10% - Foundation (operations and ecosystem development)
- 5% - Liquidity provision

# 8. Competitive Landscape

## 8.1 Traditional Approaches

- **Document Management Systems (e.g., Alfresco, Documentum):** Focus on storage and retrieval, not accountability analysis.
- **Legal Tech Platforms (e.g., Relativity, Everlaw):** Optimized for litigation, not public accountability. Closed, proprietary, expensive.
- **Investigative Consortia (e.g., ICIJ, OCCRP):** Manual collaboration, project-specific, not systematic infrastructure.

## 8.2 pobidoq Advantages

- **Open Infrastructure:** Public accountability indices, transparent methodology, open APIs.
  - **Economic Incentives:** Token rewards align contributor interests with holistic accuracy.
  - **Composability:** Tools can build on our indices (news apps, research platforms, risk dashboards).
  - **Long-Term Memory:** Persistent accountability tracking across years and multiple investigations.
- 

# 9. Team and Governance

## 9.1 Founding Team

### **Pranshu Sharma**, Founder

Background in creative technology, storytelling, and blockchain applications. Previous entrepreneurial experience. Focus: Product vision, narrative positioning, stakeholder communication.

### **Technical Collaborator** (Recruiting)

Sought: Hands-on engineer with blockchain and AI experience to co-design smart contract architecture, data pipelines, and HAR workflows. Equity co-founder role.

## 9.2 Advisory Board (Forming)

Seeking advisors with expertise in:

- Investigative journalism and media ethics
- Public interest law and regulatory compliance
- Cryptography and security engineering
- Token economics and DAO governance

## 9.3 Governance Transition

**Year 1:** Centralized development under founding team, with community feedback loops.

**Year 2:** Hybrid governance core protocol decisions via DAO votes, operational decisions by foundation.

**Year 3+:** Full DAO governance with elected council for day-to-day coordination.

---

## 10. Risks and Mitigations

### 10.1 Technical Risks

- **AI Accuracy:** False positives in contradiction detection Mitigation: Human review loop, calibrated confidence thresholds.
- **Scalability:** Large corpora strain processing Mitigation: Incremental ingestion, distributed compute, caching layers.
- **Smart Contract Vulnerabilities:** Bugs in reward logic Mitigation: Formal verification, audits, bug bounties.

### 10.2 Operational Risks

- **Reviewer Quality:** Low-quality or malicious reviews Mitigation: Reputation systems, staking, dispute resolution.
- **Corpus Access:** Legal barriers to document release Mitigation: Partner with organizations that already have access, focus on public corpora.
- **Adoption:** Journalists and advocates don't use the platform Mitigation: User research, UX iteration, integration partnerships.

### 10.3 Legal and Ethical Risks

- **Defamation:** Accountability claims harm reputations Mitigation: Clear disclaimers (system surfaces questions, not verdicts), dispute resolution.
- **Privacy Violations:** Exposing sensitive data Mitigation: Redaction protocols, permissioned access, zero-knowledge proofs.
- **Regulatory Scrutiny:** Token classification as security Mitigation: Legal counsel, utility-first design, compliance with applicable jurisdictions.

# 11. Conclusion

pobidoq reimagines accountability documentation as a structured, analyzable, and economically valuable asset class. By combining AI-powered analysis, human expertise, and blockchain-based transparency, the platform creates durable infrastructure for tracking unresolved questions from public investigations, regulatory actions, and inquiries.

The system is designed to be:

- **Institution-compatible:** Professional framing, victim protection, evidence integrity.
- **Economically sustainable:** Token incentives align contributors with accuracy and completeness.
- **Technically robust:** Open protocols, auditable logic, abuse-resistant mechanisms.
- **Ethically grounded:** Focus on systems, not individuals; transparency, not spectacle.

The goal is not to replace investigative journalism, advocacy organizations, or legal institutions but to provide them with shared infrastructure that makes accountability work more efficient, more transparent, and more durable.

**Public documentation exists. Now it's time to build the accountability tracking layer on top of it.**

---

## Contact

**Pranshu Sharma**, Founder

[pranshoe@gmail.com](mailto:pranshoe@gmail.com)

<https://pobidoq.com>

**Last Updated:** February 8, 2026

**Version:** 1.0