

The Sandbox Macro View:

When we think about creating the Sandbox there are certain core priorities that we want to emphasize: Long-term engagement with the Ecosystem, Real Value Created by Contributors, and a Culture of Collaboration and Engagement that will bring together the most proactive, exciting and engaged people within NEAR.

Values and Goals:

The crucial element that will very much influence whether the Sandbox is able to successfully embody the aforementioned values centers around the notion of rewards. On the one hand there are financial rewards that contributors will expect. But in line with the other values there are additional ‘rewards’ that surround the concept of *starting a network, meeting like minded people*, and being the first one involved in *new projects* that have further financial and tangible rewards. That is what I would propose how we shoot to reward members of the Sandbox:

- Financial Rewards
- Network and Opportunity Rewards
- Innovation and ‘First-One-Involved’ New Project Opportunities
- Learn !

While right now it may not seem to be super significant, we can imagine NEAR 5 years from now being a huge ecosystem of cutting-edge projects, and the Sandbox as being a massive digital city for new and old people alike to work within and among these projects.

Tasks:

This then leads to the second key question: What kinds of things are people going to be doing in the Sandbox? The answer, as has been outlined before by Eunice, is: Tasks that expand the Ecosystem with the different projects therein. These tasks may include:

- *Telegram/ Discord soft moderation*
- *Creative and design*
- *Social media*
- *Content writing and translation*
- *Videos*
- *Events*
- *Tech support and development*

There are two points to go along with these tasks:

First, that other projects / guilds in the Ecosystem should be able to leverage NEAR community funds to post tasks required by their projects that contributors can work to source either in NEAR or for some alternatively proposed reward. The idea here is that if a project joins the Sandbox they will be contributing to its growth by creating opportunities for contributors to add value to the Ecosystem. For contributors the opportunity-zone created expands significantly, because they now have the opportunity to work across protocols within NEAR (i.e. Paras, Mintbase, Flux, Zest, etc.). For NEAR and the overall growth of the Sandbox, more opportunities and more tasks, means more production inside the ecosystem and more macro growth overall. In essence, win-win-win.

Second, the specific lists of tasks can be broken down into more concrete items with included descriptions. Here is an example:

- **Content Writing and Translation:**

- **Writeup on Most Important Takeaways from NEAR Engineering Meetings:** Every week the NEAR Engineering Team posts a public meeting. Significant technical revelations on the development of NEAR can be discovered, especially when viewed over time. Provide a short weekly writeup and a longer monthly writeup on NEAR Engineering development. This should include main facts about what is happening. Each weekly writeup should be accompanied by relevant social media posting. Each monthly writeup should include outreach to one of the team members for request for comment on the development status.
- **NEAR Without the Noise Video Edits:** Use the NEAR Without the Noise Video Edits to explain a certain facet of Web3 that is developing within the NEAR Ecosystem. Outline in an article or your own video how these developments are important for a specific industry that is digitizing or on the brink of significant innovation. Outline other companies working in this space that may not be familiar with crypto, and also outline the facts and figures of the market at hand.

These examples should serve as both opportunities and examples for contributors to be creative with their own initiatives and to also work with other contributors / Guilds to create value in a collaborative manner. When the Sandbox launches there should be some very clearly defined opportunities outlined. But there should also be less clear references to similar opportunities that could take place (i.e. if Createbase has a weekly call consider doing the same for them).

When we get this infrastructure in place there will be no shortage of activities to engage within as these *foundational opportunities* will replicate and scale as the Ecosystem equally develops with more projects signing on board.

Foundational Opportunities → Vague Buffer for added Creativity → New and Original Opportunities

Final note from this part: New and original opportunities should be rewarded more highly if they are of quality.

Rewards:

Third part. This is the real meat of this writeup. Granted that we want to create a culture for the sandbox that embodies the aforementioned values, and granted that we want it to be home for contributors to engage in a multiplicity of activities, we need to come up with some way of rewarding these contributors financially.

I do not think the right approach is a ‘race to the bottom’ in measuring metrics and analytics. That is an ‘impersonal’ approach that allows people who are not invested in the protocol to ‘check the box’ without any genuine love or commitment for the project or ecosystem. Those are not the types of people we want in the Sandbox.

Instead I propose a method for rewarding Sandbox contributors that is characterized by two different logics: One in how rewards are measured, via *Series of Contributions, Acts, and Proposals*, and the other being in how *rewards are built over time*.

Series of Contributions, Acts, and Proposals:

When we normally look at rewards they are pretty often segmented into either grants or bounties. And frankly I don’t think either of them is sufficient for encompassing the paradigm of *Long Term Ecosystem Development*. Instead, I think that contributors are better off synchronizing to a logic that compiles rewards and opportunities over time based on commitment and engagement. After all, it is through being committed and engaged that people are able to demonstrate their passion and real feelings about an activity, as opposed through a one-time *check the box* event (That in my mind is key).

So how will the Sandbox compile rewards based on commitment and engagement?

I would recommend we break up all activities into individual events (*ACTS*) and the integration of multiple acts into larger events (*SERIES*). The financial incentive should come from completing *SERIES* of actions as opposed to individual actions. What does that mean?

Take any of the listed items above for different activities in the Sandbox: Say creating a video. It’s one thing to create a video, its another to add animations and subtitles in another language, and its another to ship it around social media. We want that final product, instead of just a video being completed. And we want the creator to

take ownership and pride in the fact that they not only created the video but also tweeted it out and added animations.

Imagine if the video was something about Business Development on NEAR that would be great for the Chinese Community to see. Well, the video creator works with a member of a Chinese Guild to translate and add subtitles, and then works with 4NTS to tweet about the video and showcase it. In this manner more connections are made within the Ecosystem and more value is added.

What is important to emphasize here is the role that persuasion and conversation plays. In order to be successful on a big level, you will have to work with other people in the Ecosystem (which is really what this is all about). You could get 20% of the reward for just making the video. But by talking to different people and adding value to it, you would complete the SERIES and earn 80% of the larger reward.

Side Note: When it comes to actually calculating the rewards my proposal would be to start small for the action in question (i.e. making a Video about NEAR -- 20 NEAR reward) and then multiple it by a factor of 4 - 6 if it is completed as a SERIES event. So the video ends up being now worth 80 NEAR with a small portion going to the translator and to the twitter team.

The drawbacks of this model is that it requires people in the Sandbox to be more outgoing, collaborative, and focused on value that is built up over time, as opposed to one-off actions. My approach to this is that it would be better to have 10 people who fit this mold really well, than 100 who just want bounties and will disappear.

The final element of this reward system is the proposal element. Once a contributor has been around long enough, the Sandbox should open up for them to be able to put forward proposals. This means that after X amount of time, they now have *levelled up* to the point where they are able to say *I want to do X series including A, B, and C, for Z amount of NEAR over T Period of Time*. This is an area that we lay the foundation for now, with the intention of actually rolling out and implementing in the next 6 - 9 months (from the best of the first batch of Contributors).

Time Bonuses:

One final point on the reward structure: Time bonuses should be built in to multiple rewards for *ANY ACTIVITY* based on the amount of time a contributor has been actively involved in the ecosystem. Actively involved means completing Y amount of acts and series on a monthly basis. Time bonuses make any posted activity + reward increased by whatever factor their time bonus allows for:

Time in Sandbox	Factor Reward Increase
6 months	10%

12 months	20%
18 months	40%
24 months	45%
30 months	Guild Status

This adds a further incentive to being a part of the Sandbox: The more series you engage in the more value you can make. In order to do a series you will most likely need to work with other people. As time goes on you are rewarded more for working with others.

Imagine a team of 10 people who get really good at working with each other. Well in 6 months they will have a pathway to earning good money and providing serious value with added value to their rewards simply because they have been around for 6 months.

Governance: Progressive Decentralization

At first this will require a hands on approach that will not be decentralized. It will be done by Sandbox founders / extremely trusted members. Governance in the early stages of the Sandbox should be about:

1. Explaining the culture and mindset of how it works.
2. Rewarding instantly and quickly for quality activities done.
3. Encouraging more people to engage and encouraging ecosystem participants to get involved.

Only once we have a robust network of contributors can we move to expand the governance council of the sandbox to make decisions more collectively and also reward larger sums for key proposals. However, as far as I understand, when setting up this kind of community there will be a certain amount of arbitration up front that should be consolidated in order to streamline efficiency and consistency in its early days.

Conclusion:

From what I have outlined above we want the Sandbox to be the Digital City of NEAR that makes activities within the Ecosystem collaborative and inclusive while also rewarding. By bringing in all Ecosystem participants and rewarding over time for SERIES of events instead of 1 off events, we have the opportunity to create a really involved community of proactive and seriously talented contributors.