From Tragedy to Triumph : Reimagining Money to Preserve the Planet

J Pretorius, B Janse van Vuuren

www.thecarbonreserve.org

Abstract. The global economy has entered a new operating environment. For most of modern history, economic growth took place within a world of ecological abundance. Natural resources were treated as infinite, and environmental degradation was treated as an externality—something to manage, but not something that shaped the rules of the economic system.

That assumption no longer holds. Climate change, biodiversity loss, land degradation, and ocean collapse now impose real constraints on global output, long term economic stability, and future prosperity. These are not fringe concerns—they are systemic variables.

Yet the design of our monetary and financial institutions has not adapted. Central banks continue to manage money supply based on inflation, employment, and liquidity conditions, with little consideration for ecological thresholds. Financial markets continue to optimize for short-term economic returns, even when those returns depend on the preservation of long-term natural capital.

Efforts to correct these imbalances—through carbon pricing schemes, pigouvan taxes, disclosure mandates or green investment incentives—have had little to no success. The core architecture of our economic system and the money that fuels it remains disconnected from the real-world systems it ultimately depends on.

This paper introduces a new monetary concept: Mitigation-Backed Currencies (MBCs). These are currencies whose supply dynamics are influenced—directly or indirectly—by the achievement of measurable, verifiable environmental mitigation. They represent a new class of monetary instruments that integrate sustainability investments not as a goal, but as a condition of monetary issuance.

The purpose of this paper is twofold: to explain the logic behind this paradigm, and to demonstrate its feasibility through a working prototype—the Carbon Reserve Currency System (CRCS) and its monetary unit, the TOCO. This system links currency issuance to verified carbon storage, creating a monetary foundation that is directly anchored in achieving climate mitigation outcomes.

1 The Case for Monetary Reform[1]

1.1 The Market Failure

Modern economic growth has produced immense material progress—but at the cost of ecological degradation [1]. We are now deep into ecological overshoot, consuming resources faster than the planet can regenerate them, and destabilizing the Earth's climate and ecosystems in the process [2,3]. This is not a fringe issue—it is a foundational design flaw in how economic value is created and measured. The problem stems from a classical market failure: environmental degradation is treated as an externality [4]. The atmosphere, biosphere, and oceans form a global commons, but their depletion imposes no direct cost on the economic actors who cause it [5]. As long as capital can earn a return without accounting for planetary stability, investment will continue to flow toward extraction and pollution over preservation and regeneration [6].

1.2 Traditional Tools Have Failed

Efforts to internalize environmental harm—carbon taxes, cap-and-trade systems, subsidies, ESG disclosures—have been useful but insufficient [4,8]. Their impact is limited for three core reasons:

Instrumental Limitations: Market-based tools operate at the margin, nudging behavior within a system that still privileges short-term returns over long-term ecological value [9]. Voluntary carbon markets have struggled with credibility. Carbon prices remain too low [10]. Reporting rules lack enforcement teeth.

Institutional Constraints: Climate change is a global commons problem, but governance remains local. There is no sovereign authority over the atmosphere. This leads to fragmentation and free-riding [11,12]. National actors are reluctant to impose real costs unless others do the same.

Political Asymmetry: The global distribution of climate risk and responsibility is unequal. High-emitting countries face the most difficult transitions but often bear the least immediate consequences. Meanwhile, poorer and more vulnerable nations lack the capacity to respond [13,14]. These asymmetries fracture cooperation and stall global action.

Most importantly, these interventions operate outside the monetary system. They treat sustainability as a correction to market failures—not as a prerequisite for economic legitimacy. None of them touch the foundational mechanisms by which capital is created, allocated, or valued.

1.3 The Structural Flaw: Money Decoupled from Natural Capital

The root issue lies in how money is created. In modern economies, new money enters circulation primarily through two channels:

Private credit: Commercial banks issue loans based on profit expectations and collateral, with no reference to environmental sustainability [15].

Central banks: Inject liquidity through asset purchases or monetary policy, guided by inflation and employment—not by ecological performance [16].

Neither mechanism accounts for the condition of the biosphere. Nature is absent from credit models, central bank mandates, and macroeconomic signals. Money is created to support economic growth, even if that growth undermines the systems upon which it depends [1].

This design flaw—money supply untethered from ecological limits—creates a form of hidden leverage. We finance present-day economic activity by drawing down irreplaceable natural capital, without recognizing the long-term liabilities. We are subsidizing environmental degradation by underpricing it in the most fundamental unit of the economy: money itself [17].

1.4 Redefining Value: From Externalities to Foundations

To correct this, we must stop treating the environment as an external stock and recognize it as a foundational layer of economic value [18]. Planetary boundaries—like climate stability—define the ceiling of what can be safely produced. Social foundations—like education, health, and equity—define what must be secured for economic systems to be just and durable [19].

Together, these boundaries form the sustainable commons: the real space in which economic activity can safely and ethically expand [12]. If money is a claim on future value, then monetary expansion should depend on preserving and expanding this commons.

In this framework, verified climate mitigation becomes not just an environmental good, but a

[1] More detail outlined in the *Conceptual Framework*, Section 1.

monetary justification. Just as inflation and employment guide central bank decisions, ecological indicators—such as carbon removals—can be used as a legitimate basis for issuing new money [17]. Capital becomes aligned with planetary preservation [1].

1.5 Commonomics: A New Logic of Currency

This is the logic behind Mitigation-Backed Currencies (MBCs). By tying the issuance of money to verified mitigation outcomes, MBCs embed sustainability into the monetary base itself [1,17].

Each unit of currency represents a measurable environmental benefit. If ecosystems improve, the monetary base expands. If environmental performance declines, issuance slows or halts. This introduces ecological scarcity into capital formation without the need for taxes or quotas [18].

Unlike fiat systems, which reward extraction by default, an MBC system rewards ecological contribution. Mitigation becomes not just morally right, but financially rational. The system internalizes climate integrity as a precondition for growth [20].

1.6 Pathways for Implementation

MBCs can be introduced along a spectrum of ambition, from reforming central bank policy to launching parallel monetary systems [21]:

Monetary integration: Central banks incorporate environmental performance into asset eligibility, reserve requirements, or inflation targeting.

Mitigation reserves: Countries or institutions establish climate-backed reserves as a new form of monetary ballast or international reserve system [23].

Independent MBCs: Protocol-based systems issue currencies directly in exchange for verified carbon removals or ecosystem preservation.

This white paper focuses on the third path: designing and deploying a non-sovereign, mitigation-backed currency—issued only against independently verified Proof of Carbon Storage (PoCS). It represents a structural realignment of money, value, and planetary health.

2 Mitigation-Backed Currencies – A Framework

2.1 Definition and Rationale

A Mitigation-Backed Currency (MBC) is a digital monetary unit issued directly in exchange for verified environmental mitigation outcomes—such as long-term carbon storage, ecosystem restoration, or biodiversity preservation [22]. Unlike fiat currencies, which derive legitimacy from sovereign authority, or commodity monies, which are backed by extractable resources like gold, MBCs are grounded in the preservation and regeneration of planetary systems. Their value is anchored in biophysical assets and performance rather than political decree or synthetic scarcity [1].

MBCs are designed not to replace sovereign currencies, but to complement them by providing an ecologically aligned settlement layer and asset class. As ecological degradation accelerates and markets for mitigation remain fragmented and undercapitalized, MBCs offer a structurally novel approach to aligning monetary expansion with planetary health [17].

2.2 Mitigation as a Basis for Issuance

Mitigation possesses several characteristics that make it suitable as a monetary foundation. Like gold or Bitcoin, it is costly to produce, naturally scarce, and exhibits low correlation with traditional economic cycles [24,25].

Verified mitigation outcomes require significant upfront investment, long time horizons, and real-world infrastructure, creating a form of "hard" money with intrinsic value grounded in preservation effort and environmental permanence [22].

These outcomes cannot be fabricated or manufactured at will. They reflect constrained ecological capacity and require land, labor, capital, and institutional credibility to bring about. In this sense, mitigation introduces an inelastic, anchored, and socially meaningful constraint on the monetary base—serving as both a floor for value and a throttle on issuance.

2.3 Foundational Principles

1. For an MBC to function as a legitimate and credible monetary system, several core principles must be embedded into its design:

2. **Real-World Anchoring**: Currency issuance must be conditioned exclusively on measurable,

verifiable mitigation outcomes—not on speculative projections or offsetting claims [22].

3. **Integrity Over Volume**: Supply expansion must prioritize the durability and credibility of mitigation rather than rapid monetary growth [18].
4. **Programmable Scarcity**: Issuance constraints should be governed by transparent, protocol-defined rules that enforce ecological limits and prevent inflationary drift [17].
5. **Stake-Aligned Incentives**: All economic actors—issuers, holders, verifiers—must be incentivized to enhance system trust, ecological integrity, and long-term participation [12].
6. **Transparency and Auditability**: All issuance events, reserves, and transactions should be publicly verifiable, ideally secured by on-chain or tamper-proof registries [26].
7. **Interoperability**: MBCs must be compatible with legal, regulatory, and institutional frameworks, enabling real-world utility and mainstream integration [21].

2.4 Proof of Mitigation (PoM)

At the center of the MBC framework is Proof of Mitigation (PoM)—a verified record of ecological performance that qualifies for monetary issuance. Analogous to the gold reserves that once underpinned sovereign currencies, PoM forms the reserve base of an MBC system. If no mitigation is verified, no new currency is created. In this model, ecological effort becomes the gating factor for economic expansion [1,22].

The cost, effort, and duration associated with achieving PoM create natural issuance friction. Mitigation becomes not only a public good but also a source of economic legitimacy—it's the verification standard defining the "hardness" of the money it underwrites [18].

2.5 Supply Rule Design

MBCs must govern issuance through programmable supply rules that respond to real-world ecological and economic dynamics (Schoenmaker and Schramade, 2019). The goal is not merely to replicate fiat monetary policy with an environmental flavor, but to embed sustainability into the structural logic of issuance itself [18].

2.5.1 Ecological Caps and Adaptive Scarcity

The Earth's capacity to support mitigation is finite. Whether through land availability, ocean absorption limits, or sociopolitical constraints, ecological mitigation has upper bounds [27]. MBC protocols must therefore encode hard issuance caps, saturation-adjusted supply throttles, or halving schedules that anticipate and respond to diminishing marginal returns.

Such mechanisms ensure monetary expansion does not exceed the system's ecological foundation. They create forward visibility for participants while reinforcing the link between ecological boundaries and capital formation [29].

2.5.2 Time-Based Vesting

Environmental outcomes unfold over time. Forests sequester carbon over decades; even engineered removals require monitoring to ensure permanence [30,31]. Accordingly, MBCs should apply vesting schedules that release currency gradually as mitigation performance accrues.

For example, a nature-based mitigation asset may vest over 20–30 years, while engineered storage may vest over 1–3 years. This mechanism aligns economic recognition with ecological delivery and avoids premature monetization of incomplete or uncertain benefits [32].

2.5.3 Risk Adjustments and Insurance

Not all mitigation is equally durable. Assets subject to fire, political instability, or measurement error carry reversal risk [33,34]. MBC issuance should therefore apply risk discounts or slower vesting to such assets. These risk-adjusted issuance rules function analogously to credit ratings—modulating monetary value according to credibility, permanence and risk [35].

Discounted issuance value can be routed into insurance pools that compensate for reversals or systemic failures, to strengthen market confidence and protect the mitigation value of the currency [36].

2.5.4 Design Objectives

The overarching aim of these rules is to ensure that MBC issuance:

- Ensure monetary expansion reflects ecological and economic conditions [32].

- Create predictable incentives for long-term participation [12].
- Be transparent, auditable, and resilient to manipulation [26].
- Avoid over-incentivizing extraction or premature monetization of natural systems [30].

MBCs must not aim to reward the most mitigation—they must reward the right amount, under the right conditions, with the right safeguards. The result is a system that is scarce by nature, disciplined by design, and responsive to both planetary boundaries and human ambition [27].

2.6 Incentives and System Design

A functioning MBC system must do more than issue currency. It must support a market ecosystem in which all actors—mitigation producers, users, investors, auditors—are incentivized to maintain system health, scale mitigation, and transact confidently [37].

2.6.1 Stake-Based Issuance

PoM producers must stake a portion of MBC to access issuance rights, akin to minimum reserve requirements. Misconduct—e.g., reversal, fraud, or failure—can result in slashing of this stake. In parallel, users of MBCs may delegate their MBC to trusted producers in return for yield. This structure embeds fiscal accountability, trust-based capital allocation, and passive participation into the core monetary loop [26,38].

2.6.2 Mitigation Yield Notes

Because MBC issuance vests over time, producers face liquidity constraints. To address this, they may monetize future flows through Mitigation Yield Notes—tradable financial instruments that represent time-discounted claims on future currency. These can be structured as:

- Zero-coupon notes (one-time maturity).
- Coupon-bearing notes (periodic payouts).

Such instruments mirror fixed-income products in traditional finance and allow the market to price mitigation-linked yield curves directly while offering producers a means of financing expansion [32,39].

2.6.3 Seigniorage and Public Infrastructure

A protocol-defined share of all issuance—seigniorage—is directed to fund system operations. These revenues support:

- Protocol development and governance.
- Auditing and verification.
- Insurance reserves.
- Rewards for early stakeholders.

In this model, the monetary base itself funds the infrastructure required for its legitimacy [26,40].

2.7 Coordination, Governance, and Reserve Mandate

A functioning Mitigation-Backed Currency (MBC) ecosystem requires two distinct, complementary forms of governance: protocol governance and reserve governance. Each plays a critical role in maintaining credibility, resilience, and integrity—but they operate on different layers of discretion, authority, and purpose [21,41].

2.7.1 Protocol Governance: Rules that Define the System

The core monetary logic of MBCs—issuance thresholds, supply throttles, vesting curves, risk adjustments, staking mechanics, and seigniorage distribution—is governed by a transparent, auditable protocol layer. This protocol constitutes the immutable foundation of the system, akin to a monetary constitution. It defines:

- What constitutes valid Proof of Mitigation (PoM)?
- How and when currency may be issued?
- How vesting and slashing mechanisms function?
- Stake-weighted governance or delegated voting mechanisms.
- Protocol upgrade processes and quorum requirements.

This governance is decentralized, code-driven, and designed for resistance to capture. It cannot be bypassed, suspended, or overridden by market actors or reserve stewards. Its role is to encode ecological and economic logic into monetary issuance—ensuring predictability, fairness, and fidelity to planetary constraints [26,38].

2.7.2 The Reserve: Discretionary Stewardship within Hard Limits

In contrast, the Reserve functions as a non-issuing monetary authority: a market participant tasked with ensuring liquidity, supporting prices, underwriting insurance pools, and supporting confidence during volatility. It does not create currency, modify supply rules, or exert control over issuance logic.

Its discretionary actions include:

- Buybacks and price floors during speculative downturns.
- Liquidity provision for Mitigation Yield Notes and secondary markets.
- Deployment of insurance capital to cover verified reversals or losses.
- Adjustment of incentive curves within predefined bounds.

The Reserve operates under rule-constrained discretion—clear quantitative limits on the scale, frequency, and purpose of interventions. All actions must be publicly logged and justified within the scope of its mandate [21,42].

2.8 Multiple MBCs and Interoperability

Mitigation is heterogeneous. It spans carbon removal, biodiversity, soil health, ocean resilience, and beyond. It is likely that multiple domain-specific MBCs may develop, defined by unique verification standards [43,44].

To coordinate these, an index or meta-currency—MBC_x—can emerge, anchored in a weighted basket of constituent MBCs. Much like Special Drawing Rights (SDRs), this unit would enable cross-MBC pricing, collateralization, and market integration, while maintaining the biophysical specificity of its components [45].

Over time, market exchange rates between MBCs will reflect comparative scarcity, credibility, and ecological significance, enabling ecosystem-aware capital flows.

2.9 Regulatory Integration

MBCs are not designed to escape oversight. On the contrary, their long-term legitimacy depends on transparent, compliant integration with public institutions. Designed correctly, MBCs offer:

- Full KYC/AML compliance.
- Transparent audit trails.
- Regulator-readable smart contracts.
- Consumer protections for retail users.

The objective is to create a monetary system that aligns private markets with public goods—earning trust by design, not defying it [5,46].

2.10 Designing for Demand: Currency as Collective Infrastructure

Mitigation-Backed Currencies are not just new forms of money. They are a new logic for monetary legitimacy—one that redefines the basis of value around planetary preservation rather than extractive productivity [1,13].

In early stages, demand for MBCs is likely to be driven by speculation—rational bets on scarce supply and exponential adoption. But speculation is not mere noise; it is the first signal of latent value. When embedded in a transparent system with structural credibility, early capital can accelerate the development of infrastructure and trust [47].

Beyond speculation, MBCs offer a compelling value proposition:

- Zero-fee, low-friction payments—rivaling or surpassing legacy networks.
- Green asset class—native yield through ecological participation, where investors become beneficiaries of the system they help grow [39].
- Status and rewards linked to ecological impact—creating new forms of reputational capital in digital economies [48].
- A unit of account for climate-adjusted finance—enabling products, taxes, and reporting to embed mitigation value.
- Passive delegation mechanisms—allowing non-technical users to earn yield by allocating their currency to trusted actors.

As more users participate, MBCs become not just an economic tool, but a shared infrastructure for planetary coordination. They enable ordinary people to support restoration simply by holding or transacting in money. They convert ambient planetary risk into a priced, actionable financial layer.

In this way, MBCs do not just price the commons—they allow individuals and institutions to own a stake in its protection.

Ultimately, demand emerges not from utopian ideals but from aligned incentives. And as trust, liquidity, and utility converge, MBCs can evolve from speculative instruments into the monetary substrate of an ecologically sustainable civilization.

3 Creating a Carbon-Backed Currency (CBC)[2]

The Carbon-Backed Currency (CBC) is the first live deployment of the Mitigation-Backed Currency (MBC) framework. It applies the principles of real-world anchoring, scarcity through effort, and programmable issuance to a domain that is both measurable and urgent: carbon removal and storage [31, 49].

This is not a carbon credit system. It is a monetary architecture—backed not by fiat decree or speculative pledges, but by verified climate action. It offers a transparent, rules-based mechanism for issuing new money only when atmospheric carbon is removed and stored in ways that are credible, durable, and independently attested [16,50].

3.1 Why Carbon First?

Carbon is not just one environmental domain among many. It is the archetype of ecological market failure—global in scale, invisible in action, and deeply mispriced [4,51]. CBC confronts this failure directly by transforming carbon removal into monetary collateral.

Carbon was selected as the foundation for the first MBC for four core reasons:

Measurability: Carbon has decades of standardized quantification protocols, from life-cycle accounting to IPCC-aligned MRV systems. It is the most precisely measured ecological externality in history [52].

Maturity: The infrastructure surrounding carbon removal is already in place—from DAC (direct air capture) technologies to afforestation projects, from third-party verifiers to data platforms—enabling real-world integration from day one [31].

Urgency: Reaching net zero requires billions of tonnes of carbon removal this century. Yet traditional mechanisms—taxes, credits, treaties—have underdelivered. CBC introduces a structural monetary incentive for permanent removals [49].

Symbolic Necessity: Carbon is the clearest case of a commons problem with no natural price signal. Turning carbon storage into money itself offers a new feedback loop—where coordinated climate action is rewarded with new liquidity [27].

3.2 CBC ≠ Carbon Credits

CBC does not issue tradable claims against emissions. It does not offset liabilities or sell permission to pollute. Instead, it issues currency against one outcome only: verified, locked-away carbon.

Unlike carbon credits:

- CBC is a monetary asset, not an accounting certificate.
- It is redeemable and transferable as currency, not tied to any specific buyer's footprint.
- It requires no counterfactuals or speculative baselines—only physical, measurable storage.

This eliminates the ambiguity of "additionality," which dominates voluntary carbon markets. CBC does not ask, "Would this have happened without funding?" It asks only: "Is this storage real, durable, and verified?" [16,50].

3.3 Rejecting the Additionality Doctrine

Traditional offsetting relies on proving that an action is "additional"—i.e., it wouldn't have occurred in a business-as-usual scenario. This logic has led to perverse incentives: inflated baselines, delayed action, and the penalization of long-term stewards [50,53].

CBC rejects this model. It does not view carbon storage as a speculative delta. It treats it as collateral. Once verified and permanently removed, carbon becomes part of the monetary base—no different from gold bars under the old standard.
This unlocks a powerful shift:

- Long-standing forest preservation gains value, not just new plantations.
- Durable, measurable carbon assets can support issuance regardless of narrative.
- Climate performance becomes a monetary anchor—not an offset to failure elsewhere [16].

[2] More detail outlined in the *Conceptual Framework*, Section 3.

3.4 What Qualifies as PoCS?

Only high-integrity carbon removal and storage qualifies for CBC issuance. The protocol supports a dual-track PoCS system:

- **Industrial-based removals** (e.g., DAC + geological storage): high capital cost, high permanence, and strong MRV fidelity [31].
- **Nature-based removals** (e.g., reforestation, afforestation, and verified forest preservation): culturally resonant, scalable, but subject to higher risk discounts and longer vesting timelines [30,32].

Both tracks are required. Technological storage offers durability and auditability. Nature-based assets offer scale, relevance, and ecological co-benefits. But all must meet minimum standards for measurability, verifiability, and durability.

Assets like soil carbon, blue carbon, or biochar may qualify in future iterations—but only when their risk, MRV, and permanence mature to financial-grade standards.

To ensure integrity, CBC enforces single-use rules: carbon designated for PoCS cannot also be sold as a credit. This prevents double-counting and forces a clear choice between financial and compliance monetization [50].

3.4 A Currency, Not Compliance

CBC does not aim to replace carbon markets. It renders them unnecessary. By linking money creation directly to physical carbon storage, it creates:

- A new asset class for climate-aligned investors.
- A liquidity layer for project developers without credit sales.
- An actual economic use case – as a means of exchange, a store of value, and a unit of account.

This is not a tool for neutrality. It is a transparent, programmable foundation for structural net zero—where money itself expands in lockstep with the preservation of the planet [36,50].

4 Carbon Backed Currency Monetary System Architecture[3]

4.1 Introduction

The Carbon Reserve Currency System (CRCS) introduces a new approach to issuing currency—one backed directly by the long-term storage of carbon. The system issues a digital unit of account, a carbon-backed currency (CBC), which is tied to verifiable, locked-away carbon held in both natural ecosystems and engineered solutions.

CBC is not issued arbitrarily. It's minted in response to Proof of Carbon Storage (PoCS), meaning the carbon must be removed from the atmosphere and stored with confidence in its durability. As noted previously, this ensures that financial expansion is directly linked to climate preservation [16,31].

By integrating nature-based and engineered carbon storage through a unified, risk-based framework, CRCS aims to connect economic value with planetary integrity—allowing both ecosystems and investors to benefit [36].

4.2 TOCO: The monetary unit

The digital token in this system that carries this unit of account is called **TOCO**, short for "tonne of CO_2" — stylized as "Tonne of OCO" to reflect its programmable, digital-native character. While the "CBC" reflects the economic function of the unit, i.e. a Carbon-Backed Currency, "TOCO" reflects its unit of measure—a digital bearer token tied to one tonne of carbon storage, mirroring historical precedent such as the British pound sterling, which began as a unit of silver weight ("a pound of sterling silver") [38,49].

4.3 Unified PoCS (Proof of Carbon Storage) Mechanism

Any verified tonne of carbon stored—whether through DAC)or natural sinks like forests—is eligible to generate TOCO through a programmable vesting schedule. This schedule varies by type:

- **DAC PoCS**: TOCO vests after [1] year.
- **Nature-based PoCS**: TOCO vests over [30] years.

Instead of using separate asset classes or instruments, differences in reliability are handled through a simple,

[3] More detail outlined in the *Conceptual Framework*, Section 4.

consistent mechanism: risk-based adjustments to how much TOCO is ultimately issued [31].

4.4 Variable Risk Discount (d_r) applied to fund Insurance Pool to defend against Reversal

To account for the risk that stored carbon could be reversed (e.g. released through wildfire or decay), the protocol applies a risk discount to each PoCS submission.

- That discounted portion of value goes to a dedicated insurance pool, which exists to cover carbon losses.
- **DAC projects** typically receive little or no discount. **Nature-based storage** receives a higher discount, calibrated to its risk profile [33,36].
- Risk Discount (dr): DAC [·]; Nature Tier 1 [·]; Nature Tier 2 [·].

4.5 Fixed Seigniorage Fee (d_s) funds Reserve Treasury Operations and Rewards Investors

A fixed seigniorage fee (ds) is taken from each TOCO issuance event, independent of the storage risk [26,40]:

- A portion [·]% of this fee funds the Carbon Reserve operations—a treasury that stabilizes markets, rewards governance participants, supports liquidity, and rewards shareholders.
- The remainder funds the "Investor Pool"—rewards that return TOCO to investors who funded the creation of the system through capital or sweat [26,40].

4.6 Quantitative Burn (B) & Annual Issuance Cap (C)

To keep issuance in balance with demand and storage capacities, CRCS uses a quantitative burn mechanism calculated with a sigmoidal curve.

Quantitative Burn is CRCS's protocol-native monetary stabilizer. Similar to how central banks use quantitative tightening to withdraw liquidity from overheated markets, Quantitative Burn dynamically reduces the net issuance of TOCO as the system approaches its ecological or market saturation threshold. This ensures scarcity, price stability, and alignment with real-world mitigation capacity [41].

As saturation grows, a larger share of potential TOCO is burned (never released), slowing effective monetary expansion. This mechanism helps maintain the value of TOCO and matches economic growth to planetary constraints [18].

The key inputs to the sigmoidal burn curve calculation include the overall issuance cap (in TOCO) and the target price per TOCO where the discount factor is calculated as:

$$B(A,p) = \sigma\left(k\cdot\left[\frac{A\cdot p}{C\cdot p_{target}} - \beta\right]\right)$$

Where:

A = *cumulative verified carbon storage (tCO_2e)*

p = *current market price of TOCO in USD*

C = *issuance cap in tonnes*

p_{are} = *policy-targeted TOCO price in USD*

σ = *logistic sigmoid function*

B = *burn discount factor*

k, β = *slope and inflection parameters*

4.7 Vesting Schedule (f(t)) determines Drip Rate (T_{dr})

TOCO is not issued all at once. Instead, it's released over time according to the source:

- **DAC**: Fast access to TOCO, reflecting recent, permanent and verifiable storage.
- **Nature:** Slow access over decades, reflecting longer-term, historic and more variable permanence.

Drip Rate (T_{dr}): The time-based rate, f(t) at which TOCO is released from a validated Proof of Carbon Storage (PoCS) or:

$$T_{dr} = T\cdot D\cdot(1 - d_r - d_s)\cdot f(t)$$

Where:

T = total tonnes verified

D = vesting duration factor

dr = risk discount

ds = seigniorage fee

f(t) = time-dependent release function

This structure ensures issuance reflects both ecological timeframes and financial accountability [31, Aglietta and Espagne, 2016).

4.8 Producers Sell Carbon Yield Notes (CYNs) to Investors for Yield

For PoCS producers who want liquidity earlier, the system allows the minting of **Carbon Yield Notes (CYNs)**:

- CYNs represent a right to receive TOCO over time, based on the Drip Rate.
- They can be traded or held, just like a bond or savings note.
- The Carbon Reserve acts as a buyer or seller of last resort, supporting open market activity [5,39].

PoCS Source	CYN Style	Payout Profile, f(t)
DAC	T-bill (CYN-D)	One-time maturity at 1 year
Nature	Bond (CYN-N)	Regular TOCO coupons over 5, 10 & 30 years

This allows climate-backed yield to become accessible to investors, institutions, and the broader market [36].

4.9 TOCO Staking & Delegation

To activate PoCS providers must stake TOCO or attract it through delegation. This creates a two-sided incentive:

- Producers compete to attract TOCO from users.
- TOCO holders earn a portion of the producer's Drip Rate in return ([38].

4.10 System Dynamics Summary

System participants are incentivised:

Role	Incentive
PoCS Provider	Earns TOCO over time; unlocks liquidity via CYNs
TOCO Holder	Delegates TOCO to earn passive yield from PoCS activity
Carbon Reserve	Collects fees; stabilizes CYN and TOCO markets
Market Mechanism	Burn curve manages supply; risk discounts fund insurance
Environment	Carbon is stored long-term, insured, and directly valued

5 PoCS Trust Framework[4]

The Proof-of-Carbon Storage (PoCS) framework defines the integrity mechanism that underpins all monetary issuance in the Carbon Reserve Currency System (CRCS). It provides the structure through which verifiable carbon storage—whether from engineered systems or nature-based solutions—is validated, attested, and transformed into TOCO units, the asset backing Carbon-Backed Currency. As such, PoCS forms the core trust architecture of the CBC system [53].

5.1 PoCS Eligibility and Validation Standards

All PoCS submissions must meet a uniform set of requirements to be eligible for TOCO issuance:

Requirement	Description
Quantification	Scientifically validated, tamper-resistant measurement of tCO_2e stored
Verification	Third-party attestation from qualified legal and scientific validators
Permanence	Mechanisms to guarantee storage for the declared term

[4] More detail outlined in the *Conceptual Framework*, Section 5.

Requirement	Description
Legal Custody	Clear documentation of land rights or facility ownership
Monitoring & Audit	Continuous remote surveillance + periodic ground checks
Reversal Response	Triggered slashing, insurance drawdown, or TOCO burns upon verified loss
Registration	On-chain registry with metadata, audit trails, and traceability

These criteria ensure that PoCS assets can be treated as monetary-grade collateral: verifiable, durable, and free from double claims or data ambiguity [16,26,52].

5.2 Submission Pipeline

The submission process follows a multi-stage pathway:

1. **Wallet Creation & KYC**: The PoCS producer is onboarded via a registered wallet after identity and eligibility checks.
2. **Submission**: Project coordinates, legal claims, and data are submitted via a standardized interface.
3. **Automated Pre-Screening**: Checks for land-use history, conflicts, and known risks
4. **Attestor Assignment**: One legal and one scientific attestor are assigned, drawn from pre-approved pools.
5. **Attestation & Consensus**: The system finalizes the PoCS only once quorum is reached.
6. **Issuance**: TOCO units are issued over time (Drip Rate) based on validated tCO_2e and applicable risk discounts.

5.3 Attestation and pBFT-Style Consensus

The protocol uses a delegated validation model, inspired by Practical Byzantine Fault Tolerance (pBFT), to safeguard against fraud and collusion while enabling decentralized and efficient trust formation [54].

5.3.1 Attestor Roles

- **Legal Attestors** validate ownership, preservation instruments, and exclusion from credit markets.
- **Scientific Attestors** assess carbon quantification, durability, and storage methodology.

Attestors must meet professional criteria, stake TOCO as bond, and risk slashing for misconduct [26,38].

5.3.2 Consensus Mechanics

- A rotating quorum of attestors is algorithmically selected per submission.
- For scientific data, submitted values must fall within a defined deviation range (e.g. ±5%).
- If agreement is reached, the PoCS enters a 7-day challenge window.
- Disputes are resolved by the Proof Council DAO, a separate governance layer overseeing attestor conduct and protocol evolution [26,43].

5.4 Attestor Incentives, Risk, and Enforcement

To ensure alignment and accountability:

- Minimum TOCO Stake is required to be eligible for work.
- Slashing applies to validators submitting false data, acting maliciously, or showing repeated variance from consensus.
- Blacklisting is triggered after multiple infractions.
- Rewards are paid in TOCO, funded from protocol seigniorage.
- Challenge rights are available to all attestors to contest a finalized PoCS during its grace period.

This mechanism transforms attestors from one-time auditors into economically accountable stewards of integrity [26,38].

5.4.1 Asset Classes: DAC and Nature-Based PoCS

This dual-class system reflects the tradeoffs between high-integrity engineered removals and land-based preservation, while maintaining a common standard of auditable issuance [31].

Feature	DAC-Based PoCS	Nature-Based PoCS
Measurement	Flow meters + ISO standards	Remote sensing + Tier 2 biomass models
Storage	Geological or mineralbased	Legally protected forests (easements, SPVs, or reserves)
Custody	Facility title or operating rights	Legal deed or conservation agreement
Monitoring	Continuous sensors + oracle logs	Satellite continuity + AI-driven land-use tracking
Vesting	1 year	30 years (with ongoing monitoring and gradual issuance)
Risk Discount	Lower (engineered, auditable, capital-intensive)	Higher (subject to ecological volatility and governance risk)
Convertibility	Recent DAC credits may convert (once)	Nature-based credits are not convertible

5.4.2 Monitoring, Revalidation, and Reversal Enforcement

CBC maintains a live audit layer throughout the life of the PoCS:

- **Annual revalidation** via satellite (nature-based) or operational log checks (DAC).
- **Trigger-based reviews** if >10% decline in carbon storage is detected.
- **Legal re-attestation** ensures preservation mechanisms remain enforceable.
- **Automated TOCO burns** from the insurance pool or stake-slashing mechanisms are triggered when violations or reversals occur.

The goal is to make ecological failure financially reflexive, preserving the monetary base against degradation [26,33].

5.4.3 Insurance Mechanism and Risk Sharing

The Insurance Pool backs the system against unintentional loss:

- Funded by a [·]% risk discount from all PoCS issuance.
- Automatically burns TOCO in response to:
  - Verified storage reversals
  - Legal breakdown of preservation covenants
  - Proven fraud or material misrepresentation
- May be supplemented by forfeited stake from attestors or producers after arbitration.

By insuring against loss while incentivizing prevention, the system enforces monetary discipline without deterring valid participation [33,50].

6 Governance, Risk, and Monetary Integrity[5]

The Carbon-Backed Currency system is governed by a tiered framework that balances automation, expert oversight, and decentralized participation. Its aim is to ensure ecological integrity, monetary discipline, and institutional flexibility without concentrating power in any single entity.

Governance unfolds across three coordinated layers:

1. **Protocol Layer** — Enforces immutable rules (minting, vesting, burn curve, staking) via smart contracts.
2. **Institutional Layer** — Includes the Commons Council, Proof Council, and Monetary Policy Committee (MPC), responsible for oversight, ratification, and parameter updates.
3. **Operational Layer** — Executed by the Carbon Reserve, which implements policy mandates, conducts open market actions, and manages risk infrastructure.

[5] More detail outlined in the *Conceptual Framework*, Section 6.

This structure allows for adaptive monetary governance while ensuring ecological credibility and economic resilience [43,54].

6.1 Commons Council

The Commons Council is the system-wide DAO composed of all holders or stakers of TOCO or Carbon Yield Notes (CYNs). As the strategic ratifier of system evolution, it confirms appointments, approves protocol changes, and safeguards legitimacy. Representation is based on stake-weighted delegation but balanced—delegates are drawn from all system sectors (PoCS producers, attestors, users) with guaranteed minimum seats to prevent capture.

- **Ordinary proposals** (e.g. tooling updates) require a simple majority.
- **Constitutional changes** (e.g. mandate shifts) require a supermajority (e.g. 66%).

Delegation decays unless reaffirmed, encouraging active civic participation [41, 43].

6.2 Proof Council

The Proof Council oversees the PoCS system: attestation standards, validator onboarding, MRV methodologies, and dispute resolution. It is a SubDAO composed of rotating members from pre-approved pools of scientists, legal custodians, and PoCS producers.

Its purpose is not to represent stakeholders, but to safeguard technical credibility. Working Groups propose changes; the Council approves them based on defined thresholds and quality criteria. It arbitrates contested attestations and enforces slashing rules to maintain attestor discipline [26].

6.3 Monetary Policy Committee (MPC)

The MPC governs the monetary logic of the CBC system. Appointed by the Commons Council but operating independently, the MPC adjusts:

- Quantitative burn curve parameters.
- Staking thresholds for PoCS producers.
- TOCO issuance pacing.

Members are selected for their expertise in macroeconomics, market dynamics, or risk modeling, and serve staggered terms to prevent capture. The MPC publishes quarterly guidance and acts directly through protocol contracts. It does not influence attestation, governance appointments, or market operations [43,54].

6.4 The Carbon Reserve

The Carbon Reserve executes policy, and does not set it. It serves as the system's operational core, managing:

- CYN open market operations.
- Insurance pool deployment.
- Treasury and liquidity tools.
- Technical infrastructure and compliance.

Its actions are bound by hard-coded constraints and DAO-approved mandates. The Reserve is required to publish quarterly reports, maintain auditable logs, and operate within reversible intervention limits [40; 26].

6.5 AI-Augmented Governance (Future Layer)

AI agents will eventually support the system through bounded, transparent interventions. Potential use cases include:

- Auto-adjustment of burn curve in response to market stress.
- Adaptive seigniorage logic based on staking behavior.
- Real-time anomaly detection in PoCS submissions.
- Programmatic market-making for thin CYN liquidity.

All agents operate within pre-approved limits set by the MPC or relevant SubDAO. Overrides and kill-switches remain in the hands of human governance [55,56].

6.6 Safeguards and Transparency

To maintain trust and robustness:

- All votes, challenges, and protocol changes are published on-chain.
- Slashing applies to attestors, producers, and SubDAOs for misconduct.
- A system-wide emergency pause requires unanimous Commons Council vote.
- Dispute panels address edge cases where rules are contested.
- The system defaults to safe operational modes in the event of DAO failure.

This architecture ensures the CBC remains adaptive, accountable, and mission-aligned—even under stress [57,58].

7 Open Market Functionality and Investor Design[6]

7.1 TOCO Market Dynamics

A Carbon Based Currency is the core monetary unit of the CRCS ecosystem. Each unit represents one Ton of O=C=O (TOCO)—a digitally registered, verified, and durably stored ton of carbon dioxide.

Every TOCO in existence corresponds directly to a real-world mitigation claim that has passed through the PoCS Trust Framework. TOCO therefore is a non-pegged, asset-backed currency—backed not by fiat reserves or institutional credibility, but by provable, irreversible positive climate action [59,60].

TOCO is not a speculative token or synthetic stablecoin—it is a carbon-standard currency, whose intrinsic value derives from the positive climate work required to mint it. Every unit of TOCO reflects a verifiable act of carbon removal or preservation, backed by durable storage and legal assurance. But more than this, TOCO represents an investment in the very foundations of a stable and livable economy: the planetary systems that enable a flourishing civilisation [18].

This gives TOCO a set of properties rarely found in monetary assets:

- **Intrinsic value**, because it encodes irreversible contributions to climate stability (Reinsberg, 2021).
- **Natural scarcity**, because it can only be issued when real carbon is stored and verified [31].
- **Inelastic supply**, because issuance is biologically and industrially constrained—not subject to arbitrary expansion.
- **Durability**, because its underlying assets are preserved, insured and audited over long timeframes.
- **Credibility**, because its validation is decentralized, transparent, and governed by independent protocols.
- **Work-backed**, because each unit requires real investment, effort, and attestation to create [40].

Together, these qualities position TOCO not only as a climate-aligned store of value, but as a viable monetary base for regenerative finance—a currency whose backing is not abstract political will, but measurable ecological integrity.

Holders of TOCO can use the currency in a variety of ways:

- **Peer-to-peer payments** within the TOCO ecosystem or in aligned networks.
- **Staking for returns** to support validator operations or governance participation.
- **Investing in Carbon Yield Notes (CYNs)** as long-term carbon-yield investments.

As the system evolves, TOCOs may also serve as a unit of account and medium of exchange across climate-aligned financial applications — from insurance collateral to green lending protocols.

Unlike purely speculative crypto tokens or algorithmic stablecoins, TOCO is designed as a climate-aligned store of value. Its primary appeal is to actors seeking to preserve and grow wealth in a format that reflects ecological responsibility and economic realism. It offers a new class of sustainable capital — one that encodes not just scarcity and programmability, but a real, measurable contribution to planetary stability.

While each TOCO is issued against a fixed quantity of carbon removed (1 TOCO = 1 ton), its market price in external currencies (USD, BTC, etc.) is not fixed. Instead, the value of TOCO is determined by market demand for carbon-backed assets relative to the constrained issuance permitted by the protocol [61]. Because supply is governed by physical throughput—what the biosphere or engineered systems can durably remove—new issuance cannot be increased in response to price speculation or monetary demand.. This creates a structurally inelastic supply curve, much like Bitcoin's Proof-of-Work issuance, where energy expenditure limits new supply. In TOCOs case, it is ecological contribution—via PoCS—that governs creation. On the demand side, as more actors seek to hold, stake, or settle in TOCOs—whether for its climate credentials, yield access, or role in regenerative finance—the price adjusts upward. Over time, TOCO's price thus becomes a signal of both ecological value and financial confidence: a real-time reflection of how markets price planetary repair.

[6] More detail outlined in the *Conceptual Framework*, Section 7.

In the early phase of system growth, volatility is both expected and functional. As early adopters enter the system, prices may fluctuate—reflecting shifts in investor appetite, external market conditions, and the evolving credibility of TOCO as a financial and ecological asset. Over time, as issuance scales and carbon-backed monetary mass increases, market depth and monetary maturity should drive increasing stability, with TOCOs price converging toward a long-term equilibrium shaped by the cost and scarcity of real-world carbon mitigation.

This dynamic positions TOCO as a hybrid asset: volatile and opportunity-rich during early adoption, but credibly scarce and anchored to planetary value in the long term. It offers speculators an asymmetric entry point, and long-term holders a store of value rooted in the most urgent investment our world requires.

7.2 CYN as tradable yield instruments

Carbon Yield Notes (CYNs) are the primary mechanism through which investors access the economic yield of verified carbon removal. Each CYN represents a claim on future TOCO issuance derived from a specific PoCS submission. Each CYN corresponds to a specific PoCS contract, and carries:

- A **quantity of TOCOs** backing it.
- A **vesting term** (e.g., 1 year for DAC, 30 years for forests).
- A **discounted purchase price** (reflecting risk, permanence, and opportunity cost).
- A **maturity schedule**, after which it may be redeemed (in whole or incrementally) for TOCO.

Once purchased, a CYN unlocks TOCO over time, according to a predefined vesting schedule that reflects the risk profile and maturity term of the underlying carbon asset.

In financial terms, CYNs are analogous to sovereign debt instruments: they are zero-coupon, carbon-backed notes, issued at a discount to their redemption value. Their yield arises not from interest payments, but from the time value gap between purchase price and final redemption in TOCO [39]. This enables producers to monetize the future carbon value of their projects upfront—allowing them to reinvest capital, scale operations, or finance additional mitigation activity.

CYNs are issued in two primary formats:

- **CYN-D** *(DAC)* — These are short-dated notes backed by DAC or low-risk PoCS, with a fixed redemption date but no interim payouts. Functionally similar to treasury bills, they are sold at a discount and redeemed at full CBC value upon maturity.
  Example: Buy 95 TOCO worth of CYN-D → Redeem 100 TOCO in 12 months.
- **CYN-N** *(Nature)* — These are long-dated notes, typically backed by nature-based or higher-duration PoCS, with regular TOCO coupon payouts over time. Analogous to traditional bonds, they offer recurring income.
  Example: Buy CYN-N with 30-year vesting → Receive 1 CBC per year, for 30 years.

Both formats offer investors flexibility:

- **CYN-D** appeals to those seeking **short-term exposure** to TOCO appreciation or quick liquidity cycling.
- **CYN-N** suits investors targeting **steady income streams** or long-term alignment with ecological infrastructure growth and TOCO appreciation.

By design, all CYNs are non-transferable off-protocol and can only be redeemed for TOCO through the system. This ensures full traceability and prevents fragmentation of carbon-backed value outside the protocol's accountability layer [61].

Importantly, CYNs serve not only as investor instruments but also as a decentralized financing for PoCS producers. By selling future TOCO today, producers gain working capital without needing loans, collateral, or intermediaries—unlocking a new form of regenerative financing where carbon removal funds its own expansion.

7.3 Carbon Reserve as buyer/seller of last resort

The Carbon Reserve plays a role in safeguarding the credibility and continuity of the TOCO ecosystem. While it does not set prices, direct monetary policy, or interfere with attestation logic, it acts as a buyer and seller of last resort under specific, rule-bound conditions to maintain orderly market function and system integrity.

However, unlike central banks or algorithmic stabilizers, the Reserve cannot mint TOCO to

intervene. All interventions must be made from its TOCO-denominated stabilization treasury—a finite pool of TOCO accumulated through seigniorage revenue, slashed stakes, redemption spreads, and other system surpluses. This ensures that the Reserve's operations are constrained, transparent, and non-inflationary [40].

When markets enter periods of extreme imbalance—such as cascading CYN sell-offs or dramatic shifts in TOCO demand—the Reserve may conduct open market operations:

- **Buy discounted CYNs** from sellers when market appetite disappears, providing a floor of liquidity.
- **Sell TOCO** from its treasury into protocol-aligned liquidity pools to relieve excessive volatility or spread risk.
- **Conduct protocol-approved auctions** to reallocate surplus TOCO to long-term holders or system participants under stress.

These mechanisms do not fix the price of TOCO or guarantee redemption value for CYNs. Instead, they support price discovery and protect functional liquidity—especially in moments of uncertainty or fragmentation [62]. The Reserve's role is to anchor trust in system operations, not to enforce outcomes.

Its behavior is strictly governed by policies approved by the Commons Council and Monetary Policy Committee. Thresholds for intervention, maximum release volumes, and post-intervention recovery protocols are all on-chain and auditable. Over time, the Reserve's treasury will expand or contract based on system performance, providing a dynamic buffer that absorbs shocks without compromising monetary discipline.

This constraint-based model reflects the system's core philosophy: market exposure must remain real, and ecological integrity must never be compromised for liquidity convenience. Even in crisis, the Reserve stabilizes without distortion—backed by carbon, not illusion.

7.4 [Secondary markets, pricing mechanics, and liquidity design (WIP)

While CYNs remain protocol-bound instruments TOCO is fully tradable on open markets, enabling integration with the broader crypto and financial ecosystem.

The system is designed to support a range of market structures:

- Decentralized exchange (DEX) listings for TOCO on popular AMM platforms (e.g., Curve, Uniswap)
- Liquidity pools seeded with TOCO and major stablecoins or ETH/BTC to facilitate two-way exchange
- Bonding curve instruments for initial distribution or market making
- Oracles to track TOCO price and discount dynamics for external platforms

These market structures ensure that TOCO becomes both a liquid unit of account for ecological investment and a speculative asset for investors seeking exposure to a new class of carbon-backed money.

CBC's liquidity design emphasizes:

- Programmable scarcity via Drip Rate and MPC-managed issuance
- Single exit channel via TOCO (not PoCS or CYNs)
- Incentive-aligned participants whose capital reinforces carbon integrity

Future design layers may include TOCO-denominated green bonds, collateralization on lending platforms, or integration with regenerative finance protocols. All such extensions will be governed through the system's DAO architecture and subject to reserve integrity rules.

7.5 Investor Profile: Planetary Capitalists (WIP)

TOCO and CYNs are built for a new generation of investors: **planetary capitalists** who believe that markets must price ecological truth. These are individuals and institutions who:

- Recognize that climate risk is systemic financial risk
- Seek to align their portfolio with regenerative outcomes
- Want exposure to carbon as an asset class, but demand accountability
- See opportunity in financial systems that correct ecological mispricing

By providing a trustable, yield-bearing, and scalable instrument tied to real climate impact, the CBC ecosystem invites speculative ambition that serves planetary stability. Whether retail, DeFi-native, or institutional, these investors drive liquidity toward carbon-positive outcomes.]

8 Adoption Strategy and Roadmap (TBC)[7]

9 Scaling Beyond Carbon: The MBC Frontier[8]

The Carbon Backed Currency (CBC) represents the first implementation of a deeper design principle: that financial value can be directly tied to ecological integrity. But carbon is only the beginning. The same architecture that powers CBC—built on Proof-of-Contribution Stake (PoCS), risk-adjusted issuance, and protocol-based governance—can be extended to other domains of planetary health.

9.1 From Carbon to Comprehensive Mitigation

The Mitigation-Backed Currency (MBC) framework generalizes the logic of PoCS beyond carbon. Biodiversity preservation, ocean regeneration, soil restoration, and aquifer protection are all measurable forms of mitigation. Each of these domains can be brought into a unified issuance logic—so long as contributions can be quantified, verified, and enforced over time. What matters is not the domain, but the defensibility of the claim.

9.2 A Modular Protocol for Mitigation Tokenization

CBC's protocol is modular by design. As new forms of mitigation are onboarded, the same infrastructure—attestation, yield issuance, vesting, insurance—can be adapted. A PoMS (Proof of Marine Stewardship) for coral protection, or PoBS (Proof of Biodiversity Stewardship) for habitat corridors, can be validated through analogous flows. The core remains: contribution over time, verified under risk, yielding a measurable economic unit.

9.3 Toward a Planetary Index or Basket Reserve

As these domains mature, CBC could become one component in a broader basket of planetary-backed reserves—a kind of Mitigation SDR. This basket could include weights for soil stability, reef cover, biomass density, or groundwater preservation, priced by long-term value to global civilization. Such a unit could become the ecological counterpart to fiat monetary standards: a planetary baseline of trust.

9.4 Equity Across Regions

One of the most powerful implications of MBCs is their redistributive potential. Many of the world's richest ecosystems lie in historically marginalized regions. By monetizing protection—not just exploitation—the CBC model gives nations, communities, and Indigenous stewards a way to participate directly in the financial value of global stability. Ecological capital can become fiscal capital.

9.5 Financial Backbone for the Planet

CBC is not a side project to carbon markets—it is the beginning of a new monetary layer. A system where currencies are no longer backed by promises of productivity, but by proofs of protection. Where economic growth is measured not just in GDP, but in gigatonnes reversed, hectares restored, and watersheds healed. TOCO is the now—MBC is the future.

10 Conclusion: Towards a New Monetary Order (TBC)

A Carbon Backed Currency marks the beginning of a quiet revolution in how we understand and design money.

For too long, finance and environmental integrity have been treated as opposing forces — one driving growth, the other demanding restraint. TOCO offers a new path: a system where value creation and ecological preservation are not at odds, but fundamentally aligned.

This is not about ideology or disruption for its own sake. It is about evolving the core tools of economic coordination to meet the realities of the 21st century. Money is technology — and like all technologies, it must adapt. In a world facing planetary limits, the

[7] More detail outlined in the *Conceptual Framework*, Section 8.
[8] More detail outlined in the *Conceptual Framework*, Section 9.

ability to encode stewardship into the very fabric of economic value is no longer optional. It is essential.

By tying monetary expansion to verified climate action, TOCO becomes more than a currency. It becomes a foundation for a new era of prosperity — one where investment, innovation, and ecological security reinforce one another.

This is not the end state. It is the beginning of a broader architecture — a mitigation-based financial system where other domains like soil, water, biodiversity, and air can be anchored into value. Where preservation is not subsidized, but self-sustaining. Where every region can participate by protecting what it already holds.

We invite developers, producers, investors, and institutions to help build this future — not out of urgency, but out of opportunity. Because with the right monetary infrastructure, we can shape a world that is both livable and prosperous. One where economic progress and planetary resilience grow together.

Better Money for a Better World.

List of abbreviations

Abbreviation	Full Term
AI	Artificial intelligence
BTC	Bitcoin
CBC	Carbon-Backed Currency
CRCS	Carbon Reserve Currency System
CYN	Carbon Yield Notes
CYN-D	Carbon Yield Notes - DAC
CYN-N	Carbon Yield Notes - Nature
DAC	Direct Air Capture
DAO	Decentralized Autonomous Organization
DEX	Decentralized Exchange
ESG	Environmental, Social, and Governance
KYC/AML	Know Your Customer / Anti-Money Laundering
ISO	International Organization for Standardization
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
MBC	Mitigation-Backed Currency
MPC	Monetary Policy Committee
MRV	Monitoring, Reporting, and Verification
PoCS	Proof of Carbon Storage
PoM	Proof of Mitigation
PoMS	Proof of Marine Stewardship
PoBS	Proof of Biodiversity Stewardship
pBFT	Practical Byzantine Fault Tolerance
SPV	Special Purpose Vehicle
tCO_2e	Tonne of Carbon Dioxide Equivalent
USD	United States Dollar

List of citations

[1] H. E. Daly, *Beyond Growth: The Economics of Sustainable Development*, Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1996.

[2] W. Rees, "The Human Ecology of Overshoot: Why a Major 'Population Correction' is Inevitable," *Journal of Population and Sustainability*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 15–30, 2023.

[3] Global Footprint Network, "Ecological footprint data and insights," 2024. [Online]. Available: https://www.footprintnetwork.org/. [Accessed: May 2024].

[4] N. Stern, *The Economics of Climate Change: The Stern Review*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

[5] H. Allen, V. Yadav, and D. A. Zetzsche, "Central bank digital currencies: Financial stability and infrastructure design," *Journal of Financial Regulation*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 35–60, 2022.

[6] P. Kumar and S. Managi, "Compensation for Environmental Services and Intergovernmental Fiscal Transfers: The Case of India," *Ecological Economics*, vol. 68, no. 12, pp. 3052–3059, 2009.

[7] W. D. Nordhaus, *Managing the Global Commons: The Economics of Climate Change*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1994.

[8] J. E. Stiglitz and N. Stern, *Report of the High-Level Commission on Carbon Prices*, Washington, DC: World Bank, 2017.

[9] K. Arrow *et al.*, "Climate change policy for the 21st century: Goals and instruments," *Science*, vol. 272, no. 5265, pp. 221–224, 1996.

[10] J. Aldy and R. Stavins, "The promise and problems of pricing carbon: Theory and experience," *Journal of Environment and Development*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 152–180, 2012.

[11] S. Barrett, *Environment and Statecraft: The Strategy of Environmental Treaty-Making*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

[12] E. Ostrom, *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

[13] K. Raworth, *Doughnut Economics: Seven Ways to Think Like a 21st-Century Economist*, London: Random House Business, 2017.

[14] G. P. Peters and E. G. Hertwich, "CO_2 Embodied in International Trade with Implications for Global Climate Policy," *Environmental Science & Technology*, vol. 42, no. 5, pp. 1401–1407, 2008.

[15] A. Jackson and B. Dyson, *Modernising Money: Why Our Monetary System is Broken and How It Can Be Fixed*, London: Positive Money, 2012.

[16] H. Benveniste *et al.*, "Credibility of carbon removal and storage mechanisms," *Nature Climate Change*, vol. 9, no. 5, pp. 360–367, 2019.

[17] D. Schoenmaker and W. Schramade, *Principles of Sustainable Finance*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.

[18] J. Rockström *et al.*, "A safe operating space for humanity," *Nature*, vol. 461, no. 7263, pp. 472–475, 2009.

[19] M. Aglietta and E. Espagne, "Climate and finance systemic risks: more than an analogy? The climate fragility hypothesis," *CEPII Working Paper*, no. 2016-10, 2016.

[20] T. Jackson and P. A. Victor, "Does slow growth lead to rising inequality? Some theoretical reflections and numerical simulations," *Ecological Economics*, vol. 121, pp. 206–219, 2015.

[21] E. Campiglio *et al.*, "Climate change challenges for central banks and financial regulators," *Nature Climate Change*, vol. 8, no. 6, pp. 462–468, 2018.

[22] H. Chenet, J. Ryan-Collins, and F. van Lerven, "Finance, climate-change and radical uncertainty: Towards a precautionary approach," *Ecological Economics*, vol. 183, p. 106957, 2021.

[23] U. Volz, "On the Role of Central Banks in Enhancing Green Finance," *UN Environment Inquiry Working Paper*, 2017.

[24] S. Ghosh and V. N. Murthy, "Does Bitcoin hedge inflation and uncertainty? An Indian perspective," *Financial Innovation*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 1–27, 2021.

[25] V. Buterin, "DAOs, DACs, DAs and More: An Incomplete Terminology Guide," *Ethereum Blog*, 2014.

[26] P. De Filippi and A. Wright, *Blockchain and the Law: The Rule of Code*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2018.

[27] W. Steffen *et al.*, "Planetary boundaries: Guiding human development on a changing planet," *Science*, vol. 347, no. 6223, 1259855, 2015.

[28] F. Biermann and R. Kim, "The Politics of Planetary Boundaries: The State of the Debate," *Global Environmental Politics*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 41–60, 2020.

[29] K. Klitgaard and L. Krall, "Ecological economics, degrowth, and institutional change," *Ecological Economics*, vol. 84, pp. 247–253, 2012.

[30] B. W. Griscom *et al.*, "Natural climate solutions," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 114, no. 44, pp. 11645–11650, 2017.

[31] S. Fuss *et al.*, "Negative emissions—Part 2: Costs, potentials and side effects," *Environmental Research Letters*, vol. 13, no. 6, 063002, 2018.

[32] S. Roe *et al.*, "Land-based measures to mitigate climate change: Potential and feasibility by country," *Nature Climate Change*, vol. 11, pp. 269–276, 2021.

[33] G. Badgley *et al.*, "Systematic over-crediting in California's forest carbon offsets program," *Frontiers in Forests and Global Change*, vol. 5, 849448, 2022.

[34] T. A. West *et al.*, "Overstated carbon emission reductions from voluntary REDD+ projects in the Brazilian Amazon," *Science*, vol. 377, no. 6611, pp. 1095–1100, 2020.

[35] H. Benveniste *et al.*, "Credibility of carbon removal and storage mechanisms," *Nature Climate Change*, vol. 9, no. 5, pp. 360–367, 2019.

[36] B. Caldecott, E. Harnett, A. Cojoianu, I. Kok, and R. Pfeiffer, "Tackling tipping points: Climate-related financial policy for systemic resilience," *University of Oxford, Sustainable Finance Programme*, 2020.

[37] C. Hepburn, N. Stern, J. Stiglitz, G. Zenghelis, and D. W. Robins, "Better recovery, better world: Resetting climate policy after COVID-19," *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, vol. 36, no. S1, pp. S205–S221, 2020.

[38] V. Buterin, "DAOs, DACs, DAs and More: An Incomplete Terminology Guide," *Ethereum Blog*, 2014.

[39] OECD, *Green Bonds: Mobilising the Debt Capital Markets for a Low-Carbon Transition*, Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2017.

[40] J. Benes and M. Kumhof, "The Chicago Plan Revisited," *IMF Working Paper* No. 12/202, 2012.

[41] M. Aglietta and E. Espagne, "Climate and finance systemic risks: more than an analogy? The climate fragility hypothesis," *CEPII Working Paper*, no. 2016-10, 2016.

[42] I. Schnabel, "From moral suasion to monetary policy: Climate change and the ECB's role," *Speech at the European Sustainable Finance Summit*, Frankfurt: European Central Bank, 2021.

[43] J. Ghosh and S. Scott, "Green finance and sustainable development: Emerging trends and policy implications," *Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 123–138, 2021.

[44] C. Parker, M. Cranford, N. Oakes, and M. Leggett, *The Little Biodiversity Finance Book*, Oxford: Global Canopy Programme, 2020.

[45] International Monetary Fund (IMF), *Review of the Method of Valuation of the SDR—Quinquennial Review*, IMF Policy Paper No. 18/11, 2018.

[46] D. A. Zetzsche, R. P. Buckley, D. W. Arner, and J. N. Barberis, "Decentralized finance," *Journal of Financial Regulation*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 172–203, 2020.

[47] Y. Liu and A. Tsyvinski, "Risks and Returns of Cryptocurrency," *Review of Financial Studies*, vol. 34, no. 6, pp. 2689–2727, 2021.

[48] Y. Zhou, Z. Kong, Y. Yuan, and F. Wang, "Reputation-based Incentive Mechanism for Blockchain-based Carbon Trading Platforms," *IEEE Access*, vol. 9, pp. 130078–130090, 2021.

[49] C. Hepburn, E. Adlen, J. Beddington, E. Carter, S. Fuss, N. Mac Dowell, J. Minx, P. Smith, and C. Williams, "The technological and economic prospects for CO_2 utilization and removal," *Nature*, vol. 575, pp. 87–97, 2019.

[50] L. Schneider and A. Kollmuss, "Perverse incentives under the CDM: An evaluation of HFC-23 destruction projects," *Climate Policy*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 447–465, 2015.

[51] J. E. Stiglitz and N. Stern, *Report of the High-Level Commission on Carbon Prices*, Washington, DC: World Bank, 2017.

[52] Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), *Climate Change 2022: Mitigation of Climate Change*, Cambridge University Press, 2022.

[53] P. De Filippi and A. Wright, *Blockchain and the Law: The Rule of Code*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2018.

[54] J. Borrero and F. Batubara, "Adaptive monetary governance for sustainable development," *Sustainable Finance Journal*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 45–60, 2022.

[55] B. Burgess, J. Griffin, and T. Wood, "The role of AI in decentralized governance: Opportunities and challenges," *Journal of Blockchain Research*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 12–27, 2021.

[56] L. Araujo and P. Martins, "Adaptive AI for financial market interventions: A governance perspective," *International Journal of Financial Innovation*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 88–103, 2022.

[57] W. Reijers, F. O'Brolcháin, and P. Haynes, "Governance in blockchain technologies & social contract theories," *Ledger*, vol. 1, pp. 1–23, 2016.

[58] L. Gudgeon, G. Moreno-Sanchez, A. Roos, P. McCorry, and S. Meiklejohn, "The decentralized financial crisis: Attacking DeFi," in *Proceedings of the 2020 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pp. 1–18, 2020.

[59] World Bank, *State and Trends of Carbon Pricing 2023*, Washington, DC: World Bank, 2023.

[60] F. Cevallos, J. Ochoa, and M. Ortega, "Asset-backed cryptocurrencies for climate finance: Frameworks and applications," *Journal of Environmental Finance*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 45–62, 2022.

[61] Task Force on Scaling Voluntary Carbon Markets, *Final Report*, Institute of International Finance, Washington, DC, 2021.

[62] Bank for International Settlements (BIS), *The Role of Central Banks in Climate Change*, BIS Papers No 115, 2021.