ARBOREAL CAPITAL

Research Note 006
The Funding Problem

How the mechanism pays for itself—not through fees and treasuries, but through a design where monitoring is a byproduct of ownership, costs decrease as the network grows, and the fundamental value of the underlying asset is denominated in physics rather than token price.

Mitch Hart

March 2026

1. The Wrong Question

The first question every serious analyst asks about Arboreal Capital is: how do you pay for verification? Research Note 005 describes a three-layer architecture—satellite monitoring, ground truth networks, and statistical spot-checking—that must operate continuously across billions of trees for centuries. That costs money. Where does it come from?

The conventional answer is fees. Transaction fees on trades. Annual holder fees assessed as a percentage of token value. Registration fees on new trees. These revenue streams flow into a verification reserve—a smart-contract-controlled treasury—that disburses funds for monitoring operations. The math works: at a 0.25% annual holder fee and a total market capitalization above approximately $500 million, the mechanism generates enough revenue to fund its own verification indefinitely.

This answer is correct. It is also insufficient. A system that depends on fees and treasuries has the same fragility as any institution—it works until it doesn't. A prolonged bear market drains the reserve. A governance dispute freezes disbursements. A smart contract exploit empties the treasury. Fees and reserves are the plumbing. They are not the mechanism.

The right question is not "how do we fund monitoring?" The right question is: can we design the incentive structure so that monitoring is a byproduct of ownership itself—so that the act of holding and protecting a token position produces verification as an automatic consequence, the way a tree produces oxygen as a byproduct of photosynthesis?

> **Key Reframe:**
> *The funding problem is not a revenue problem. It is a mechanism design problem. The correct solution is not to fund monitoring but to make monitoring an inevitable consequence of self-interested behavior.*

2. Holders as Verification Infrastructure

Consider what a token holder actually does when protecting a large position. A holder with $50 million in tree tokens across multiple regions is not passively waiting for someone else to verify the trees. The holder is actively monitoring. Commissioning satellite tasking over high-value positions. Hiring local contacts to check on specific trees. Funding fire prevention and controlled burns in regions where fire risk threatens holdings. Lobbying local governments for protective land use policy. In short: performing exactly the work that the verification system needs done.

This is not altruism. The holder is protecting a financial position. But from the system's perspective, the holder's self-interested activity is indistinguishable from funded verification. The satellite imagery the holder commissions is ground truth data. The local contacts the holder pays are a ground truth network. The fire prevention the holder funds reduces system-wide mortality rates. Every dollar the holder spends protecting their position is a dollar the verification system did not need to spend.

At small scale, this effect is marginal. A few whales monitoring their holdings does not constitute a global verification network. But consider the system at scale.

At ten million holders, each carrying a GPS-enabled camera in their pocket at all times, the probability that any accessible tree has a holder within visiting distance approaches certainty. These holders do not need to be assigned verification duty. They visit forests for recreation, for tourism, for curiosity. When they are near one of their trees—or any registered tree—they can submit a ground truth observation as casually as posting a photograph to social media. The infrastructure cost is zero because the infrastructure is eight billion smartphones.

At one hundred million holders, the network effect becomes dominant. The system does not need to fund a verification workforce because the holders are the workforce. The system does not need to commission satellite imagery because holders with large positions are already commissioning it to protect their investments. The system does not need to organize ground truth expeditions because holders are already visiting their trees.

> **Key Insight:**
>
> *Verification cost per tree decreases as the number of holders increases. This is the inverse of typical scaling problems, where costs rise with growth. Here, growth is the solution to the cost problem, not the cause of it.*

3. The Biome Value Floor

Every financial asset has a fundamental value floor—the price below which the asset is objectively undervalued relative to what it produces. For a stock, this is the discounted cash flow of future earnings. For real estate, it is the rental yield. For a tree token, the fundamental value floor is not timber price. It is not carbon credit value. It is the economic value of the ecosystem services that the tree anchors.

Old-growth trees are not standalone organisms. They are keystone structures in biome architecture. A 500-year-old tree anchors a mycorrhizal network that extends across hectares, connecting hundreds of smaller trees and understory plants in a nutrient-sharing web. It provides canopy structure that regulates microclimate, retains moisture, and shelters biodiversity. It stabilizes soil, regulates watershed hydrology, and sequesters carbon not just in its trunk but in the entire soil ecosystem it supports. Remove the anchor tree and the cascade begins: canopy opens, microclimate shifts, moisture drops, understory dies, soil erodes, watershed degrades.

These services have economic value. Costanza et al. (2014) estimated global ecosystem services at $125 trillion per year—exceeding global GDP. The economic value of a single watershed's flood control and water filtration services can be quantified in the cost a downstream city would pay for engineered alternatives. New York City's Catskill watershed provides water filtration that would cost $6–8 billion to replace with a treatment plant. The old-growth forests in that watershed are not scenic amenities. They are infrastructure.

This matters for the funding problem because the biome value floor is denominated in physics, not in token price. Water filtration services do not decline during a crypto bear market. Flood control does not correlate with Bitcoin's price. Pollination services provided by biodiversity in old-growth forest do not respond to Federal Reserve interest rate decisions. The fundamental value of the underlying asset is uncorrelated to every market cycle that could threaten the token's trading price.

A holder who understands this does not sell in a bear market. The holder recognizes that the token's market price has temporarily diverged from the fundamental value of the biome services it represents—and that this divergence is a buying opportunity, not a reason to exit. The biome value floor provides holder retention during market downturns, which provides fee continuity during market downturns, which provides verification funding during market downturns. The floor holds the mechanism together precisely when it is most at risk.

Design Principle:

The token's fundamental value is denominated in ecosystem services—water filtration, flood control, soil stability, biodiversity, carbon sequestration—none of which correlate with financial market cycles. This is the only crypto asset class whose value floor is set by physics rather than by sentiment.

4. Bear Market Survival

The most dangerous scenario for any self-funded mechanism is a prolonged bear market. Token values collapse. Transaction volume evaporates. Fee revenue shrinks. The conventional response is a reserve buffer—accumulate surplus during good years, draw down during bad ones. This works for a while. It does not work for a decade.

Arboreal Capital survives a prolonged bear market through three mechanisms that operate independently of token price.

First, the holders-as-infrastructure effect persists regardless of price. A holder who paid $100 for a token now worth $20 does not stop caring about the tree. The holder's sunk cost creates psychological attachment. More importantly, the holder's rational calculation is forward-looking: if the biome value floor suggests the token is worth $100, a current price of $20 is a reason to protect the tree more aggressively, not less, because the upside from recovery exceeds the cost of maintenance. Holders in a bear market are the most motivated conservationists in the system because they have the most to gain from the tree's survival.

Second, verification costs scale down proportionally. The system does not require the same verification intensity at a $500 million market cap as at a $50 billion market cap. Spot-check frequency can be reduced from 2% annually to 0.5% without materially increasing fraud risk at lower valuations, because there is less incentive to commit fraud when tokens are worth less. Satellite monitoring costs are largely fixed but represent a small fraction of total verification expense. The system degrades gracefully: lower value means lower required spending, and the relationship is proportional, not catastrophic.

Third, the alive-until-proven-dead default (Research Note 005) means that reduced verification frequency does not trigger mass token freezes. Trees do not die because satellites stop watching them. A period of reduced monitoring increases detection lag for trees that actually die, but the vast majority of old-growth trees in any given year are alive. When the market recovers and funding returns, the system resumes full verification and catches any deaths that occurred during the lean period. The trees waited. The mechanism can wait too.

> **Key Insight:**
> *The mechanism does not fail in a bear market. It degrades proportionally. The trees do not care about the token price. The biome value floor provides holder retention. And the holders who remain are the most motivated to protect their trees because they have the most to gain from recovery.*

5. The Plumbing

The mechanism design described above—holders as verification infrastructure, the biome value floor, graceful degradation—is the architecture. It still requires plumbing. Revenue must flow. Costs must be covered. The following section describes the financial mechanics that support the architecture.

5.1 Transaction Fees

Every transfer of a tree token incurs a protocol fee enforced at the smart contract level, initially calibrated at 1–2% of transaction value. Transaction fee revenue is proportional to trading volume and therefore volatile. It provides upside funding during active markets and should be directed primarily toward the verification reserve as a buffer against lean periods.

5.2 Annual Holder Fees

Every token holder pays an annual fee assessed at 0.1–0.5% of market value. This is the baseline funding mechanism—proportional to the value at stake, independent of trading volume. As token values rise, funding rises. As they fall, funding falls—but so does the required verification intensity. The holder fee is self-calibrating.

If a holder does not pay—due to lost keys, abandoned positions, or deliberate forfeiture—the token enters a grace period followed by return to unclaimed status. Forfeited tokens can be re-claimed through the tagging process described in Research Note 003. This ensures every active token in the system has at least one holder who values it enough to pay for its maintenance, and it guarantees that the gold rush never truly ends—entropy continuously recycles tokens back into claimable supply.

5.3 Registration Fees

After the initial free registration period (Research Note 003), new tree registrations incur a fee that deters spam and funds the verification of the new tree. Registration fees are a one-time event per tree, directed to the verification reserve.

5.4 The Verification Reserve

Revenue from all three sources flows into a verification reserve: a smart-contract-controlled treasury that smooths revenue volatility and provides a buffer against unexpected costs. The reserve is governed by token holders (per Research Note 004), cannot be accessed by the founder or any single entity, and its balance is publicly auditable on-chain. Target reserve level: two years of operating costs.

5.5 The Arithmetic

At a total market capitalization of $500 million and a 0.25% annual holder fee, the system generates $1.25 million annually from holder fees alone. Satellite monitoring of one million trees costs approximately $50,000. A 2% spot-check rate at $25 per audit costs $500,000. Transaction fees on annual volume equal to 10% of market cap at 1.5% generate $750,000. Total revenue: $2 million. Total cost: approximately $600,000. The system is self-funding with a surplus that accumulates in the reserve.

Below $500 million, a higher holder fee at launch (0.5%) and reduced spot-check frequency close the gap. Above $500 million, the surplus grows and the reserve accumulates. At $50 billion—still a fraction of what global ecosystem services are worth—the reserve grows by hundreds of millions annually, and the holders-as-infrastructure effect has made most formal verification redundant.

6. The Emergent Dataset

The verification system does not merely confirm tree survival. It accumulates data. Every satellite pass produces multispectral imagery. Every ground truth submission produces a geotagged photograph with metadata. Every mortality event produces a timestamped record. Over years and decades, this accumulation produces something that does not exist anywhere else on earth: a continuously updated, financially incentivized, individual-tree-resolution longitudinal dataset of global old-growth forest.

The closest existing analogue is Landsat, which provides 30-meter resolution satellite imagery on a 16-day revisit cycle, funded by the U.S. government since 1972. Landsat is invaluable for macro-scale deforestation monitoring but cannot resolve individual trees and has no ground truth calibration layer. Global Forest Watch, operated by the World Resources Institute, processes Landsat and Sentinel data to detect tree cover loss, but relies on institutional grants and has no financial incentive structure ensuring data accuracy.

The Arboreal Capital dataset differs in three ways. First, it is individual-tree resolution—each record corresponds to a specific organism at specific coordinates, not a pixel in a raster image. Second, it is financially incentivized to be accurate, because holders lose money if their trees are misclassified as alive or dead. Third, it includes continuous ground truth from millions of distributed human observers, providing calibration data that no purely remote sensing system can match.

This dataset is valuable to entities that have no interest in tree tokens. Carbon credit certifiers need verified forest survival data to underwrite offset claims. Insurance companies pricing wildfire, flood, and drought risk need real-time ecosystem monitoring. Government agencies reporting against climate commitments need auditable forest data. Pharmaceutical companies surveying biodiversity need catalogued biome data. Academic researchers studying forest ecology need longitudinal observations at scale.

API access to this dataset is a revenue stream that grows more valuable over time. A one-year snapshot is interesting. A ten-year time series is valuable. A fifty-year continuous record of every old-growth tree on earth—verified, with satellite imagery, ground truth, and mortality data—is irreplaceable. No institution could produce it intentionally. It can only be produced as a byproduct of millions of people protecting their financial positions over decades.

Key Insight:

The verification system is not a cost center. It is building the most comprehensive ecological monitoring dataset in history as a byproduct of self-interested behavior. The dataset's value grows exponentially with time, creating a second revenue stream that becomes more significant than holder fees at long time horizons.

7. The Symbiosis

In a forest, a tree does not fund its own survival through a tax. It participates in a web of symbiotic relationships where its waste products are another organism's inputs. The tree produces oxygen as a byproduct of photosynthesis. Animals consume the oxygen and exhale carbon dioxide. The tree absorbs the carbon dioxide. No treasury manages the exchange. No governance vote authorizes the transfer. The system self-funds because each participant's self-interested metabolic activity produces what the other participants need.

The Arboreal Capital funding mechanism follows the same architecture. Token holders, acting in pure self-interest, produce two outputs: conservation pressure on specific trees, and verification data about those trees. External consumers—carbon markets, insurers, researchers, governments—consume the data and pay for access. That payment funds more verification, which produces more data, which attracts more consumers.

The token holders are the trees. The data consumers are the animals. The verification system is the atmosphere. Each participant breathes in what the other breathes out. No one needs to be altruistic. No one needs to coordinate. The system self-funds because the incentives are symbiotic by design, not by accident.

This is why the funding problem is not a revenue problem. Revenue—fees, reserves, API access—is the plumbing that supports the architecture. The architecture is a self-reinforcing loop where ownership produces monitoring, monitoring produces data, data produces revenue, revenue supports ownership, and the entire system becomes more robust with every cycle.

8. Conclusion

The conventional framing of the funding problem asks: can the mechanism generate enough revenue to pay for verification? The answer is yes—the arithmetic works above $500 million in market capitalization, and the plumbing of fees and reserves handles the mechanics. But this framing understates the design.

The mechanism does not merely fund verification. It makes verification a byproduct of ownership. The holders are the monitoring network. Their self-interested activity produces conservation and data as waste products. The data attracts external revenue that reinforces the system. The biome value floor prevents holder exodus during market downturns. And the whole structure scales inversely—more holders means lower verification cost per tree, not higher.

The result is not a mechanism that can afford to operate. It is a mechanism that becomes more efficient and more resilient the longer it runs and the larger it grows. The only question is whether the network reaches critical mass. Everything after that is biology.

Design Principle:

The mechanism funds itself or it does not exist. But 'funds itself' does not mean 'generates enough fee revenue.' It means: the act of holding tokens produces conservation as a metabolic byproduct, and the system converts that byproduct into everything it needs to persist. Self-funding is not an accounting exercise. It is an emergent property of correctly aligned incentives.

References

Costanza, R. et al. 2014. Changes in the global value of ecosystem services. *Global Environmental Change* 26, 152–158.

Crowther, T.W. et al. 2015. Mapping tree density at a global scale. *Nature* 525, 201–205.

National Research Council. 2000. Watershed Management for Potable Water Supply: Assessing the New York City Strategy. National Academies Press.

Planet Labs. 2024. Planet Monitoring: Pricing and Technical Specifications. Planet Labs PBC.

World Resources Institute. 2024. Global Forest Watch: Technical Documentation. World Resources Institute, Washington, DC.

Arboreal Capital. 2026. Research Note 002: The Death Profit Paradox.

Arboreal Capital. 2026. Research Note 003: The Gold Rush.

Arboreal Capital. 2026. Research Note 004: The Arbitration Problem.

Arboreal Capital. 2026. Research Note 005: The Verification Problem.

Arboreal Capital · arborealcapital.io · Research Note 006 · v1.0 · March 2026