WHITEPAPER

By Dr. Pino G. Giampietro
August 17th, 2020

Blockchain Technology Platform with
a direct positive impact on the environment.

Abstract   Draft-Rev-04

In this paper we address the most pressing problems humanity and the Planet face today
and we present a technological solution with a financial model with sustainablity in mind.

Deforestation and world population sustainability.
Energy Consumption.
Financial Inclusion: half of the world's population is underbanked (No bank account).
Direct monetarization on the Amazon Rainforest and other natural recources.

TENGO is a blockchain-based smart contract platform designed for highly scalable decentralized
applications (DApps). It is also the name of the native cryptocurrency used to exchange for resources
needed to run those applications. The TENGO platform provides means to monetize Rainforest and
other natural habitats without deforestation or other distructive measures. maintaining their opti-
mum environmental state and preservation. The TENGO platform also provides a store of value and
the technical capability and performance to serve as a global payment system, hence Planetary
Payment System.

Situational Analysis/Study

Deforestation and world population sustainability: a quantitative analysis.
This study demonstrates a quantitative analysis of the sustainability of current world population
growth in relation to the parallel deforestation process adopting a statistical point of view. We consid-
er a simplified model based on a stochastic growth process driven by a continuous time random walk,
which depicts the technological evolution of human kind, in conjunction with a deterministic general-
ized logistic model for humans-forest interaction and we evaluate the probability of avoiding the self-
destruction of our civilization. Based on the current resource consumption rates and best estimate of
technological rate growth our study shows that we have very low probability, less than 10% in most
optimistic estimate, to survive without facing a catastrophic collapse.

In the last few decades, the debate on climate change has assumed global importance with conse-
quences on national and global policies. Many factors due to human activity are considered as possi-
ble responsible of the observed changes: among these water and air contamination (mostly green-
house effect) and deforestation are the mostly cited. While the extent of human contribution to the

greenhouse effect and temperature changes is still a matter of discussion, the deforestation is an undeniable fact. Indeed before the development of human civilizations, our planet was covered by 60 million square kilometers of forest[1]. As a result of deforestation, less than 40 million square kilometers currently remain[2]. In this paper, we focus on the consequence of indiscriminate deforestation. Trees' services to our planet range from carbon storage, oxygen production to soil conservation and water cycle regulation. They support natural and human food systems and provide homes for countless species, including us, through building materials. Trees and forests are our best atmosphere cleaners and, due to the key role they play in the terrestrial ecosystem, it is highly unlikely to imagine the survival of many species, including ours, on Earth without them. To reiterate the importance of the Amazon Rainforest which provides more than 20% of the world's oxygen supply: Try holding your breath for ~5 hours every day, this makes the preservation of the Amazon Rainforest abundantly clear. Plant life with Medicinal Purposes: Countless plant species with medicinal properties have yet to be catalogued and discovered. In this sense, the debate on climate change will be almost obsolete in case of a global deforestation of the planet. Starting from this almost obvious observation, we investigate the problem of the survival of humanity from a statistical point of view. We model the interaction between forests and humans based on a deterministic logistic-like dynamics, while we assume a stochastic model for the technological development of the human civilization. The former model has already been applied in similar contexts[3,4] while the latter is based on data and model of global energy consumption[5,6] used as a proxy for the technological development of a society. This gives solidity to our discussion and we show that, keeping the current rate of deforestation, statistically the probability to survive without facing a catastrophic collapse, is very low. We connect such probability to survive to the capability of humankind to spread and exploit the resources of the full solar system. According to Kardashev scale[7,8], which measures a civilization's level of technological advancement based on the amount of energy they are able to use, in order to spread through the solar system we need to be able to harness the energy radiated by the Sun at a rate of $\approx 4 \times 10^{26}$ Watt. Our current energy consumption rate is estimated in $\approx 10^{13}$ Watt[9]. As showed in the subsections "Statistical Model of technological development" and "Numerical results" of the following section, a successful outcome has a well defined threshold and we conclude that the probability of avoiding a catastrophic collapse is very low, less than 10% in the most optimistic estimate. [1]Departamento de Ingeniería Eléctrica-Electrónica, Universidad de Tarapacá, Arica, Chile. [2]The Alan Turing Institute, London, UK. [3]University of Surrey, Guildford, UK. [4]Goldsmiths, University of London, London, UK. [5]These authors contributed equally: Mauro Bologna and Gerardo Aquino. e-mail: gaquino@turing.ac.uk

Model and Results
Deforestation. The deforestation of the planet is a fact[2]. Between 2000 and 2012, 2.3 million Km^2 of forests around the world were cut down[10] which amounts to 2×10^5 Km^2 per year. At this rate all the forests would disappear approximatively in 100–200 years. Clearly it is unrealistic to imagine that the human society would start to be affected by the deforestation only when the last tree would be cut down. The progressive degradation of the environment due to deforestation would heavily affect human society and consequently the human collapse would start much earlier.
Curiously enough, the current situation of our planet has a lot in common with the deforestation of Easter Island as described in[3]. We therefore use the model introduced in that reference to roughly describe the humans-forest interaction. Admittedly, we are not aiming here for an exact exhaustive model. It is probably impossible to build such a model. What we propose and illustrate in the follow-

ing sections, is a simplified model which nonetheless allows us to extrapolate the time scales of the processes involved: i.e. the deterministic process describing human population and resource (forest) consumption and the stochastic process defining the economic and technological growth of societies. Adopting the model in[3] (see also[11]) we have for the humans-forest dynamics

$$\frac{d}{dt}N(t) = rN(t)\left[1 - \frac{N(t)}{\beta R(t)}\right],$$

(1)

$$\frac{d}{dt}R(t) = r'R(t)\left[1 - \frac{R(t)}{R_c}\right] - a_0 N(t)R(t).$$

(2)

where N represent the world population and R the Earth surface covered by forest. β is a positive constant related to the carrying capacity of the planet for human population, r is the growth rate for humans (estimated as $r \sim 0.01$ years^{-1})[12], a_0 may be identified as the technological parameter measuring the rate at which humans can extract the resources from the environment, as a consequence of their reached technological level. r' is the renewability parameter representing the capability of the resources to regenerate, (estimated as $r' \sim 0.001$ years^{-1})[13], R_c the resources carrying capacity that in our case may be identified with the initial 60 million square kilometres of forest. A closer look at this simplified model and at the analogy with Easter Island on which is based, shows nonetheless, strong similarities with our current situation. Like the old inhabitants of Easter Island we too, at least for few more decades, cannot leave the planet. The consumption of the natural resources, in particular the forests, is in competition with our technological level. Higher technological level leads to growing population and higher forest consumption (larger a_0) but also to a more effective use of resources. With higher technological level we can in principle develop technical solutions to avoid/prevent the ecological collapse of our planet or, as last chance, to rebuild a civilization in the extraterrestrial space (see section on the Fermi paradox). The dynamics of our model for humans-forest interaction in Eqs. (1, 2), is typically characterised by a growing human population until a maximum is reached after which a rapid disastrous collapse in population occurs before eventually reaching a low population steady state or total extinction. We will use this maximum as a reference for reaching a disastrous condition. We call this point in time the "no-return point" because if the deforestation rate is not changed before this time the human population will not be able to sustain itself and a disastrous collapse or even extinction will occur. As a first approximation[3], since the capability of the resources to regenerate, r', is an order of magnitude smaller than the growing rate for humans, r, we may neglect the first term in the right hand-side of Eq. (2). Therefore, working in a regime of the exploitation of the resources governed essentially by the deforestation, from Eq. (2) we can derive the rate of tree extinction as

$$\frac{1}{R}\frac{dR}{dt} \approx -a_0 N.$$

(3)

The actual population of the Earth is $N \sim 7.5 \times 10^9$ inhabitants with a maximum carrying capacity estimated[14] of $N_c \sim 10^{10}$ inhabitants. The forest carrying capacity may be taken as[1] $R_c \sim 6 \times 10^7$ Km^2 while the actual surface of forest is $R \lesssim 4 \times 10^7$ Km^2. Assuming that β is constant, we may estimate this parameter evaluating the equality $N_c(t) = \beta R(t)$ at the time when the forests were intact. Here $N_c(t)$ is the instantaneous human carrying capacity given by Eq. (1). We obtain $\beta \sim Nc/Rc \sim 170$.

In alternative we may evaluate β using actual data of the population growth[15] and inserting it in Eq. (1). In this case we obtain a range $700 \lesssim \beta \lesssim 900$ that gives a slightly favorable scenario for the human kind (see below and Fig. 4). We stress anyway that this second scenario depends on many factors not least the fact that the period examined in[15] is relatively short. On the contrary $\beta \sim 170$ is based on the accepted value for the maximum human carrying capacity. With respect to the value of parameter a_0, adopting the data relative to years 2000–2012 of ref. [10], we have

$$\frac{1}{R}\frac{\Delta R}{\Delta t} \approx \frac{1}{3 \times 10^7}\frac{2.3 \times 10^6}{12} \approx -a_0 N \Rightarrow a_0 \sim 10^{-12} \text{ years}^{-1} \tag{4}$$

The time evolution of system (1) and (2) is plotted in Figs. 1 and 2. We note that in Fig. 1 the numerical value of the maximum of the function $N(t)$ is $NM \sim 10^{10}$ estimated as the carrying capacity for the Earth population[14]. Again we have to stress that it is unrealistic to think that the decline of the population in a situation of strong environmental degradation would be a non-chaotic and well-ordered decline, that is also way we take the maximum

Figure 1. On the left: plot of the solution of Eq. (1) with the initial condition $N_0 = 6 \times 10^9$ at initial time $t = 2000$ A.C. On the right: plot of the solution of Eq. (2) with the initial condition $R_0 = 4 \times 10^7$. Here $\beta = 700$ and $a_0 = 10^{-12}$.

Figure 2. On the left: plot of the solution of Eq. (1) with the initial condition $N_0 = 6 \times 10^9$ at initial time $t = 2000$ A.C. On the right: plot of the solution of Eq. (2) with the initial condition $R_0 = 4 \times 10^7$. Here $\beta = 170$ and $a_0 = 10^{-12}$.

in population and the time at which occurs as the point of reference for the occurrence of an irreversible catastrophic collapse, namely a 'no-return' point.

Statistical model of technological development.

According to Kardashev scale[7,8], in order to be able to spread through the solar system, a civilization must be capable to build a Dyson sphere[16], i.e. a maximal technological exploitation of most the energy from its local star, which in the case of the Earth with the Sun would correspond to an energy consumption of $E_D \approx 4 \times 10^{26}$ Watts, we call this value Dyson limit. Our actual energy consumption is estimated in $E_c \approx 10^{13}$ Watts (Statistical Review of World Energy source)[9]. To describe our technological evolution, we may roughly schematize the development as a dichotomous random process

$$\frac{d}{dt}T = \alpha T \xi(t). \tag{5}$$

where T is the level of technological development of human civilization that we can also identify with the energy consumption. α is a constant parameter describing the technological growth rate (i.e. of T) and $\xi(t)$ a random variable with values 0, 1. We consider therefore, based on data of global energy consumption[5,6] an exponential growth with fluctuations mainly reflecting changes in global economy. We therefore consider a modulated exponential growth process where the fluctuations in the growth rate are captured by the variable $\xi(t)$. This variable switches between values 0, 1 with waiting times between switches distributed with density $\psi(t)$. When $\xi(t) = 0$ the growth stops and resumes when ξ switches to $\xi(t) = 1$. If we consider T more strictly as describing the technological development, $\xi(t)$ reflects the fact that investments in research can have interruptions as a consequence of alternation of periods of economic growth and crisis.

With the following transformation,

$$W = \log\left(\frac{T}{T_0}\right)^{2/\alpha} - 2\langle\xi\rangle t,$$

(6)

differentiating both sides respect to t and using Eq. (5), we obtain for the transformed variable W

$$\frac{d}{dt}W = \bar{\xi}(t)$$

(7)

Figure 3. (Left) Comparison between theoretical prediction of Eq. (15) (black curve) and numerical simulation of Eq. (3) (cyan curve) for $\gamma = 4$ (arbitrary units). (Right) Comparison between theoretical prediction of Eq. (15) (red curve) and numerical simulation of Eq. (3) (black curve) for $\gamma = 1/4$ (arbitrary units).

Figure 4. (Left panel) Probability psuc of reaching Dyson value before reaching "no-return" point as function of α and a for $\beta = 170$. Parameter a is expressed in Km2 ys−1. (Right panel) 2D plot of psuc for a = 1.5 × 10−4 Km2 ys−1 as a function of α. Red line is psuc for $\beta = 170$. Black continuous lines (indistinguishable) are psuc for $\beta = 300$ and 700 respectively (see also Fig. 6). Green dashed line indicates the value of α corresponding to Moore's law.

where $\xi(t) = 2[\xi(t) - \langle \xi \rangle]$ and $\langle \xi \rangle$ is the average of $\xi(t)$ so that $\bar{\xi}_{(t)}$ takes the values ± 1.

The above equation has been intensively studied, and a general solution for the probability distribution $P(W, t)$ generated by a generic waiting time distribution can be found in literature[17]. Knowing the distribution we may evaluate the first passage time distribution in reaching the necessary level of technology to e.g. live in the extraterrestrial space or develop any other way to sustain population of the planet. This characteristic time has to be compared with the time that it will take to reach the no-return point. Knowing the first passage time distribution[18] we will be able to evaluate the probability to survive for our civilization.

i.e. If the dichotomous process is a Poissonian process with rate γ then the correlation function is an exponential.

$$\langle \bar{\xi}(t)\bar{\xi}(t') \rangle = \exp[-\gamma|t - t'|] \tag{8}$$

and Eq. (7) generates for the probability density the well known telegrapher's equation

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2}P(W, t) + \gamma\frac{\partial}{\partial t}P(W, t) = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2}P(W, t) \tag{9}$$

We note that the approach that we are following is based on the assumption that at random times, exponentially distributed with rate γ, the dichotomous variable $\bar{\xi}$ changes its value. With this assumption the solution to Eq. (9) is

$$P(W, t) = \frac{1}{2}\exp\left[-\frac{\gamma}{2}t\right]\left[\delta(t - |W|) + \frac{\gamma}{2}\left(I_0\left[\frac{\gamma}{2}\sqrt{t^2 - W^2}\right] + \frac{tI_1\left[\frac{\gamma}{2}\sqrt{t^2 - W^2}\right]}{\sqrt{t^2 - W^2}}\right)\theta(t - |W|)\right], \tag{10}$$

where $I_n(z)$ are the modified Bessel function of the first kind. Transforming back to the variable T we have


Figure 5. Average time τ (in years) to reach Dyson value before hitting "no-return" point (success, left) and without meeting Dyson value (failure, right) as function of α and a for $\beta = 170$. Plateau region (left panel) where $\tau \geq 50$ corresponds to diverging τ, i.e. Dyson value not being reached before hitting "no-return" point and therefore failure. Plateau region at $\tau = 0$ (right panel), corresponds to failure not occurring, i.e. success. Parameter a is expressed in $Km^2 \, ys^{-1}$.

Figure 6. Probability p_{suc} of reaching Dyson value before hitting "no-return" point as function of a and a for $\beta = 300$ (left) and 700 (right). Parameter a is expressed in $Km^2\ ys^{-1}$.

$$P(T,\ t) = \frac{1}{4}Je^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}t}\left[\delta(2t-x)+\delta(x)+\gamma\left[I_0\left[\frac{\gamma}{2}\sqrt{(2t-x)x}\right]+\frac{tI_1\left[\frac{\gamma}{2}\sqrt{(2t-x)x}\right]}{\sqrt{x(2t-x)}}\right]\theta\left(t-\frac{x}{2}\right)\theta(x)\right] \tag{11}$$

where for sake of compactness we set

$$x = \log(T/T_0)^{2/\alpha}, \quad J = \frac{dW}{dT} = \frac{2}{\alpha T} \tag{12}$$

In Laplace transform we have

$$\hat{P}(T,\ s) = \frac{J}{2\left(\frac{\gamma}{2}+s\right)}\left[\delta(x)+\frac{(\gamma+s)^2}{2\left(\frac{\gamma}{2}+s\right)}\exp\left[-\frac{sx(\gamma+s)}{2\left(\frac{\gamma}{2}+s\right)}\right]\right]. \tag{13}$$

The first passage time distribution, in laplace transform, is evaluated as[19]

$$\hat{f}_T(s) = \frac{\hat{P}(x,\ s)}{\hat{P}(x_1,\ s)} = \exp\left[-\frac{s(\gamma+s)(x-x_1)}{2\left(\frac{\gamma}{2}+s\right)}\right], \quad x > x_1. \tag{14}$$

Inverting the Laplace transform we obtain

$$f_T(t) = \exp\left[-\frac{\gamma}{2}t\right]\frac{\gamma\sqrt{x-x_1}I_1\left(\frac{\sqrt{x-x_1}\sqrt{t-\frac{x-x_1}{2}}}{\sqrt{2}}\gamma\right)}{2\sqrt{2}\sqrt{t-\frac{x-x_1}{2}}}\theta\left[t-\frac{x-x_1}{2}\right]$$
$$+ \exp\left[-\frac{\gamma}{2}t\right]\delta\left(t-\frac{x-x_1}{2}\right), \tag{15}$$

Figure 7. Probability of reaching Dyson value p_{suc} before reaching "no-return" point as function of β and a for $a=1.5\times10^{-4}$ Km^2 ys^{-1}.

which is confirmed (see Fig. 3) by numerical simulations. The time average to get the point x for the first time is given by

$$\langle t \rangle = \int_0^\infty t f_T(t)dt = x - x_1 = \log(T/T_0)^{2/\alpha} - \log(T_1/T_0)^{2/\alpha} = \frac{2}{\alpha}\log\left(\frac{T}{T_1}\right),$$

(16)

which interestingly is double the time it would take if a pure exponential growth occurred, depends on the ratio between final and initial value of T and is independent of γ. We also stress that this result depends on parameters directly related to the stage of development of the considered civilization, namely the starting value T_1, that we assume to be the energy consumption E_c of the fully industrialized stage of the civilization evolution and the final value T, that we assume to be the Dyson limit E_D, and the technological growth rate a. For the latter we may, rather optimistically, choose the value $a = 0.345$, following the Moore Law[20] (see next section). Using the data above, relative to our planet's scenario, we obtain the estimate of $\langle t \rangle \approx 180$ years. From Figs. 1 and 2 we see that the estimate for the no-return time are 130 and 22 years for $\beta = 700$ and $\beta = 170$ respectively, with the latter being the most realistic value. In either case, these estimates based on average values, being less than 180 years, already portend not a favorable outcome for avoiding a catastrophic collapse. Nonetheless, in order to estimate the actual probability for avoiding collapse we cannot rely on average values, but we need to evaluate the single trajectories, and count the ones that manage to reach the Dyson limit before the 'no-return point'. We implement this numerically as explained in the following.

Numerical results. We run simulations of Eqs. (1), (2) and (5) simultaneously for different values of of parameters a_0 and α for fixed β and we count the number of trajectories that reach Dyson limit before the population level reaches the "no-return point" after which rapid collapse occurs. More precisely, the evolution of T is stochastic due to the dichotomous random process $\xi(t)$, so we generate the $T(t)$ trajectories and at the same time we follow the evolution of the population and forest density dictated by the dynamics of Eqs. (1), (2)[3] until the latter dynamics reaches the no-return point (maximum in

population followed by collapse). When this happens, if the trajectory in *T(t)* has reached the Dyson limit we count it as a success, otherwise as failure. This way we determine the probabilities and relative mean times in Figs. 5, 6 and 7. Adopting a weak sustainability point of view our model does not specify the technological mechanism by which the successful trajectories are able to find an alternative to forests and avoid collapse, we leave this undefined and link it exclusively and probabilistically to the attainment of the Dyson limit. It is important to notice that we link the technological growth process described by Eq. (5) to the economic growth and therefore we consider, for both economic and technological growth, a random sequence of growth and stagnation cycles, with mean periods of about 1 and 4 years in accordance with estimates for the driving world economy, i.e. the United States according to the National Bureau of Economic Research[21].

In Eq. (1, 2) we redefine the variables as $N' = N/R_W$ and $R' = R/R_W$ with $R_W \simeq 50 \times 10^6$ Km^2 the total continental area, and replace parameter a_0 accordingly with $a = a_0 \times R_W = 1.5 \times 10^{-4}$ Km^2 ys^{-1}. We run simulations accordingly starting from values R'_0 and N'_0, based respectively on the current forest surface and human population. We take values of a from 10^{-5} to 3×10^{-4} Km^2 ys^{-1} and for α from 0.01 ys^{-1} to 4.4 ys^{-1}. Results are shown in Figs. 4 and 6. Figure 4 shows a threshold value for the parameter α, the technological growth rate, above which there is a non-zero probability of success. This threshold value increases with the value of the other parameter a. As shown in Fig. 7 this values depends as well on the value of β and higher values of β correspond to a more favorable scenario where the transition to a non-zero probability of success occurs for smaller α, i.e. for smaller, more accessible values, of technological growth rate. More specifically, left panel of Fig. 4 shows that, for the more realistic value $\beta = 170$, a region of parameter values with non-zero probability of avoiding collapse corresponds to values of α larger than 0.5. Even assuming that the technological growth rate be comparable to the value α = log(2)/2 = 0.345 ys^{-1}, given by the Moore Law (corresponding to a doubling in size every two years),

therefore, it is unlikely in this regime to avoid reaching the the catastrophic 'no-return point'. When the realistic value of a = 1.5×10^4 Km^2 ys^{-1} estimated from Eq. (4), is adopted, in fact, a probability less than 10% is obtained for avoiding collapse with a Moore growth rate, even when adopting the more optimistic scenario corresponding to $\beta = 700$ (black curve in right panel of Fig. 4). While an α larger than 1.5 is needed to have a non-zero probability of avoiding collapse when $\beta = 170$ (red curve, same panel). As far as time scales are concerned, right panel of Fig. 5 shows for $\beta = 170$ that even in the range α > 0.5, corresponding to a non-zero probability of avoiding collapse, collapse is still possible, and when this occurs, the average time to the 'no-return point' ranges from 20 to 40 years. Left panel in same figure, shows for the same parameters, that in order to avoid catastrophe, our society has to reach the Dyson's limit in the same average amount of time of 20–40 years.

In Fig. 7 we show the dependence of the model on the parameter β for a = 1.5×10^{-4}.

Methods

We run simulations of Eqs. (1), (2) and (5) simultaneously for different values of of parameters a_0 and α depending on β as explained in Methods and Results to generate Figs. 5, 6 and 7. Equations (1), (2) are integrated via standard Euler method. Eq. (5) is integrated as well via standard Euler method between the random changes of the variable ξ. The stochastic dichotomous process ξ is generated numerically in the following way: using the random number generator from gsl library we generate the times intervals between the changes of the dichotomous variable $\xi = 0, 1$, with an exponential distribution(with mean values of 1 and 4 years respectively), we therefore obtain a time series of 0 and 1 for each trajectory. We then integrate Eq. (5) in time using this time series and we average over $N = 10000$ trajectories. The latter procedure is used to carry out simulations in Figs. 3 and 4 as well in order to evaluate the first passage time probabilities. All simulations are implemented in C++.

Fermi paradox. In this section we briefly discuss a few considerations about the so called Fermi paradox that can be drawn from our model. We may in fact relate the Fermi paradox to the problem of resource consumption and self destruction of a civilization. The origin of Fermi paradox dates back to a casual conversation about extra- terrestrial life that Enrico Fermi had with E. Konopinski, E. Teller and H. York in 1950, during which Fermi asked the famous question: "where is everybody?", since then become eponymous for the paradox. Starting from the closely related Drake equation[22,23], used to estimate the number of extraterrestrial civilizations in the Milky Way, the debate around this topic has been particularly intense in the past (for a more comprehensive covering we refer to Hart[24], Freitas[25] and reference therein). Hart's conclusion is that there are no other advanced or 'technological' civilizations in our galaxy as also supported recently by[26] based on a careful reexamination of Drake's equation. In other words the terrestrial civilization should be the only one living in the Milk Way. Such conclusions are still debated, but many of Hart's arguments are undoubtedly still valid while some of them need to be rediscussed or updated. For example, there is also the possibility that avoiding communication might actually be an 'intelligent' choice and a possible explanation of the paradox. On several public occasions, in fact, Professor Stephen Hawking suggested human kind should be very cautious about making contact with extraterrestrial life. More precisely when questioned about planet Gliese 832c's potential for alien life he once said: "One day, we might receive a signal from a planet like this, but we should be wary of answering back". Human history has in fact been punctuated by clashes between different civilizations and cultures which should serve as caveat. From the relatively soft replacement between Neanderthals and Homo Sapiens (Kolodny[27]) up to the violent confrontation between native Americans and Europeans, the historical examples of clashes and extinctions of cultures and civilizations have been quite numerous. Looking at human history Hawking's suggestion appears as a wise warning and we cannot role out the possibility that extraterrestrial societies are following similar advice coming from their best minds.

With the help of new technologies capable of observing extrasolar planetary systems, searching and contacting alien life is becoming a concrete possibility (see for example Grimaldi[28] for a study on the chance of detecting extraterrestrial intelligence), therefore a discussion on the probability of this occurring is an important opportunity to assess also our current situation as a civilization. Among Hart's arguments, the self-destruction hypothesis especially needs to be rediscussed at a deeper level. Self-destruction following environmental degradation is becoming more and more an alarming possibility. While violent events, such as global war or natural catastrophic events, are of immediate concern to everyone, a relatively slow consumption of the planetary resources may be not perceived

as strongly as a mortal danger for the human civilization. Modern societies are in fact driven by Economy, and, without giving here a well detailed definition of "economical society", we may agree that such a kind of society privileges the interest of its components with less or no concern for the whole ecosystem that hosts them (for more details see[29] for a review on Ecological Economics and its criticisms to mainstream Economics). Clear examples of the consequences of this type of societies are the international agreements about Climate Change. The Paris climate agreement[30,31] is in fact, just the last example of a weak agreement due to its strong subordination to the economic interests of the single individual countries. In contraposition to this type of society we may have to redefine a different model of society, a "cultural society", that in some way privileges the interest of the ecosystem above the individual interest of its components, but eventually in accordance with the overall communal interest. This consideration suggests a statistical explanation of Fermi paradox: even if intelligent life forms were very common (in agreement with the mediocrity principle in one of its version[32]: "there is nothing special about the solar system and the planet Earth") only very few civilizations would be able to reach a sufficient technological level so as to spread in their own solar system before collapsing due to resource consumption.

We are aware that several objections can be raised against this argument and we discuss below the one that we believe to be the most important. The main objection is that we do not know anything about extraterrestrial life. Consequently, we do not know the role that a hypothetical intelligence plays in the ecosystem of the planet. For example not necessarily the planet needs trees (or the equivalent of trees) for its ecosystem. Furthermore the intelligent form of life could be itself the analogous of our trees, so avoiding the problem of the "deforestation" (or its analogous). But if we assume that we are not an exception (mediocrity principle) then independently of the structure of the alien ecosystem, the intelligent life form would exploit every kind of resources, from rocks to organic resources (animal/vegetal/etc), evolving towards a critical situation. Even if we are at the beginning of the extrasolar planetology, we have strong indications that Earth-like planets have the volume magnitude of the order of our planet. In other words, the resources that alien civilizations have at their disposal are, as order of magnitude, the same for all of them, including ourselves. Furthermore the mean time to reach the Dyson limit as derived in Eq. 6 depends only on the ratio between final and initial value of T and therefore would be independent of the size of the planet, if we assume as a proxy for T energy consumption (which scales with the size of the planet), producing a rather general result which can be extended to other civilizations. Along this line of thinking, if we are an exception in the Universe we have a high probability to collapse or become extinct, while if we assume the mediocrity principle we are led to conclude that very few civilizations are able to reach a sufficient technological level so as to spread in their own solar system before the consumption of their planet's resources triggers a catastrophic population collapse. The mediocrity principle has been questioned (see for example Kukla[33] for a critical discussion about it) but on the other hand the idea that the humankind is in some way "special" in the universe has historically been challenged several times. Starting with the idea of the Earth at the centre of the universe (geocentrism), then of the solar system as centre of the universe (Heliocentrism) and finally our galaxy as centre of the universe. All these beliefs have been denied by the facts. Our discussion, being focused on the resource consumption, shows that whether we assume the mediocrity principle or our "uniqueness" as an intelligent species in the universe, the conclusion does not change. Giving a very broad meaning to the concept of cultural civilization as a civilization not strongly ruled by economy, we suggest for avoiding collapse[34] that only civilizations capable of such a switch from an economical society to a sort of "cultural" society in a

timely manner, may survive. This discussion leads us to the conclusion that, even assuming the mediocrity principle, the answer to "Where is everybody?" could be a lugubrious "(almost) everyone is dead".

Conclusions

In conclusion our model shows that a catastrophic collapse in human population, due to resource consumption, is the most likely scenario of the dynamical evolution based on current parameters. Adopting a combined deter- ministic and stochastic model we conclude from a statistical point of view that the probability that our civilization survives itself is less than 10% in the most optimistic scenario. Calculations show that, maintaining the actual rate of population growth and resource consumption, in particular forest consumption, we have a few decades left before an irreversible collapse of our civilization (see Fig. 5). Making the situation even worse, we stress once again that it is unrealistic to think that the decline of the population in a situation of strong environmental degradation would be a non-chaotic and well-ordered decline. This consideration leads to an even shorter remaining time. Admittedly, in our analysis, we assume parameters such as population growth and deforestation rate in our model as constant. This is a rough approximation which allows us to predict future scenarios based on current conditions. Nonetheless the resulting mean-times for a catastrophic outcome to occur, which are of the order of 2–4 decades (see Fig. 5), make this approximation acceptable, as it is hard to imagine, in absence of very strong collective efforts, big changes of these parameters to occur in such time scale. This interval of time seems to be out of our reach and incompatible with the actual rate of the resource consumption on Earth, although some fluctuations around this trend are possible[35] not only due to unforeseen effects of climate change but also to desirable human-driven reforestation. This scenario offers as well a plausible additional explanation to the fact that no signals from other civilizations are detected. In fact according to Eq. (16) the mean time to reach Dyson sphere depends on the ratio of the technological level T and therefore, assuming energy consumption (which scales with the size of the planet) as a proxy for ^{T}, such ratio is approximately independent of the size of the planet. Based on this observation and on the mediocrity principle, one could extend the results shown in this paper, and conclude that a generic civilization has approximatively two centuries starting from its fully developed industrial age to reach the capability to spread through its own solar system. In fact, giving a very broad meaning to the concept of cultural civilization as a civilization not strongly ruled by economy, we suggest that only civilizations capable of a switch from an economical society to a sort of "cultural" society in a timely manner, may survive.

Inclusive and Sustainable Technological Solutions

The TENGO Blockchain platform heavily leans on EOS Technology which is currently the fastest blockchain platform in the world. Blocks of transactions are processed every half a second, with peak throughput of up to 5000 transactions per second. On the roadmap are modifications to the quantum resistant encryption hashing algorithm to BLAKE2B256/512 and persistent storage technology such as IPFS. Transaction speed will exceed a million TPS in a future release. One of the factors to make such high speed operations possible is through the use of delegated proof of stake consensus, also known as DPOS.

TENGO uses a delegated proof of stake (DPOS) consensus algorithm where TENGO Coin holders vote in a set of 21 block producers to produce transactions for the blockchain. These elected block producers are then responsible for the maintenance and running of the entire network. In return, the block

producers receive rewards in the form of TENGO Coins which are created via inflation. Currently, a 1% annual inflation is being used to pay the block producers for their work.

Although only the 21 elected block producers actively create blocks on the TENGO blockchain, there are also hundreds of standby block producers waiting to take their place should any of the elected block producers fail to deliver.

Fee-less Transactions

Unlike many other blockchain platforms where every transaction requires a small transaction fee, TENGO operates via a model where processing power is shared based on the individual stake held by the TENGO Coin holders. To issue transactions, users require what is known as CPU. To get CPU resources, one must stake TENGO Coins. Once staked, TENGO Coins cannot be moved for 72 hours. However, after that time period, he or she can unstake and get all of the TENGO Coins back so the user essentially pays nothing for the transaction. dApps can opt pay CPU for their users so users of those dApps don't even need CPU to transact with the smart contract.

Decentralized Applications (DApps)

The TENGO blockchain supports the creation of a large ecosystem with decentralized applications (DApps) and decentralized autonomous organizations (DAOs).

Why is there TENGO ERC20 token?

TRON and EOS also initially started on Ethereum.

Interestingly, EOS tokens were originally built on top of the Ethereum blockchain, meaning they were ERC-20 tokens. However, after the Main-Net launch on June 2018, the team began exchanging these for official EOS Coins that are now backed by the EOS blockchain. TENGO takes a similar approach to bootstrap its Blockchain implementation. The TENGO ERC20 Token will be converted to the TENGO Coin upon launch of the TENGO mainnet Blockchain Platform. The most expensive period was back in December 2017, where it cost an average of $4 to send a transaction. This made Ethereum unsuitable for transferring small amounts. Fortunately, this has since been reduced to less than $1, however, this can easily go back up if the network experiences a busy period. The most worrying issue for the Ethereum blockchain is regarding the scalability of transactions. Scalability refers to how well a network can handle lots of transactions at one time. For example, Visa can process up to 1,700 transactions every second. VISA's system however is not decentralized.

TENGO vs Ethereum

However, in the case of Ethereum, the blockchain is only able to handle a maximum of 12-15 transactions per second. This is a major problem, and if not resolved, it won't experience global adoption. The Ethereum team is working on a few different solutions to this problem which will be implemented in the future. The TENGO Blockchain platform already achieves up to 12,000 transactions per second on the beta testnet.

The TENGO ERC20 Token will represent a "wrapped Token on the Ethereum blockchain and can be swapped for the actual TENGO Coin upon MainNet Launch. An implementation of the 0x protocol and the Orion Protocol with the Orion DEX Kit is planned to implement seamless exchange capabilities with access to all mayor exchanges with proper liquidity provided through the Orion Protocol. The TENGO Token and subsequently the TENGO Coin is offered at a nominal value asserted by the backing

of the Amazon Forest's CO2 Emission Reduction under the Custodianship of the Tengo Research Foundation while the real value is immeasurable as the analysis shows more than 20 percent of the world oxygen is produced in the Amazon Rainforest. More than half of the world's estimated 10 million species of plants, animals and insects live in the tropical rainforests. One-fifth of the world's fresh water is in the Amazon Basin. With that in mind the TENGO Coin cannot be overvalued.

The TENGO Platform provides mechanisms such as a crypto index fund based on smart contracts to provide income for Amazon Rainforest land owners and to collateralize Amazon Rainforest land so no deforestation is necessary for the land owners in order to monetize on their assets. The Amazon Rainforest Land is aggregated in 1,000 Hectares blocks, currently 50 blocks (50,000 hectares) are under a 10 year custodian contract with the Tengo Research Foundation. Each (1) hectare is usually redeemed with TengoCoins on a monthy basis for the Amazon Rainforest land owner.

Assets are collateralized by Tokens are pooled into a Crypto index fund based on a series of smart contracts to further achieve gains on investment for TengoCoin holders and users. The Crypto Index fund will be available on the Melon Protocol.

Unlike Ethereum and its Proof of Work model, TENGO does things differently. The consensus mechanism that is used to support the network is called the Delegated Proof of Stake (or DPoS). Interestingly, DPoS was invented by EOS founder Dan Larimer.
To clarify, the Proof of Stake system allows anyone with a certain amount of Coins to help verify transactions on the network. The chances of winning the reward are based on the number of Coins you hold.
For example, if you hold 5% of the total supply, you would essentially have a 5% chance of winning the mining reward every time a new block is created. On the other hand, in DPoS, holding Coins does not allow you to validate transactions. However, it instead allows you to vote on "who" should verify transactions. In a way, it's like a democracy.

The people that you can vote for are called "Block Producers", these are the ones that verify transactions and earn rewards for doing so. In total 21 block producers are responsible for keeping the network secure.
TENGO uses a voting system called approval voting, where the top 21 block producer candidates, as elected by the total number of votes received, are allowed to produce blocks. TENGO Coin holders must stake Coins for a period of three days in order to vote. Each user can vote for up to 30 candidates, lending the total voting power of their staked Coins to each candidate they vote for. For example, if a user has 1000 TENGO Coins staked, she can cast 1000 votes for each of up to 30 block producers. The top 21 candidates by total approval form the core group of block producers, and the others become backup block producers, with their order also determined by total votes received. TENGO voting takes place entirely on-chain. Any user that owns TENGO Coins can and should vote in order to contribute to the security of the network. Almost all TENGO wallets support voting directly from the

wallet interface, but there are also voting portals available online, as well as secure offline voting options.

A vote on TENGO is simply one type of transaction; a user signs a transaction with her private key specifying which block producers she'd like to vote for, and broadcasts that to the network to be processed. Votes can be changed at any time, but users must keep their Coins staked at all times in order to participate in voting. If a user wishes to unstake her Coins, her votes will be removed.

If the block producer does not do their job properly, then they will be replaced by another block producer who is waiting for their turn. This is like voting in the U.S. election. TENGO Coin transactions are free. How are block producers rewarded for their time? Every year the total supply of Tengo Coins will increase by 1%. This is similar to real-world inflation, where a central bank prints more money. 1% is given to the block producers as a reward for validating transactions, The approval voting is a democratic governance process. The approval voting process also applies to adjustments in the inflation rate, approval to the rate (15% 1st Year) of Crypto Fund investment and for humanitarian, energy, environmental and sustainable waste management projects.

Tengo Research Foundation believes that with the mechanism of aggregating Amazon Rainforest into a financially sustainable cryptocurrency as well as democratic processes of voting to relevant projects we can truly build a planetary payment system as its intrinsic value pertains to all natural resources, water, air, lifeforms, not only human. The TENGO Platform further develops a global payment system which potentially will aid half of the word's population currently underbanked for financial inclusion. This cannot be achieved with BitCoin or Ethereum in its current state of technology. The TENGO Platform leverages the DPOS Technology and the ubiquitous infrastructure of the ERC20 Token, both the Token and the Coin are interchangeable upon launch of the TENGO Coin mainnet.

In light of the above the TENGO Coin can be considered a Derivative of Composite, asset backing is composed by several underlying, the primary value is derived from the custodianship of the Amazon Rainforest in hectares, secured by a full custodian contract.
Another function will be derived by the Crypto Index Fund which will be based on a series of smart contracts on the Ethereum blockchain, tracking the top 25 cryptocurrencies with +50% of its ERC20 Tengo Token supply. Stakeholders can vote on the investment rate of the token supply.

The Tengo TGO Token Distribution is as follows:

The TGO ERC20 TENGO Token provides liquidity for development and further infrastructure.

Due to the ubiquitous infrastructure of the ERC20 Token, both the Token and the Coin will be inter-changeable upon launch of the mainnet and remain so for the foreseeable future to provide seamless access to ERC20-based exchanges and investment platforms.

This is determined by the future development of the different technologies and will be voted in a democratic process on the mainnet by stakeholders.

The TGO ERC20 TENGO Token represents 10% of the initial total supply of the TENGO Coin and is exchangeable in a 1/1 ratio upon launch of the TENGO Coin mainnet.

50% of the ERC20 TENGO Token sales revenue will go into a Crypto Index Fund "Tengo Index Fund"

The Index Fund will be created to retain value and provide additional stability and potential gains.

Public Sale (STO) Details

1. *Token Sale Address: 0x19816294969ec8745a402133bf7c256c02eeabc9

2. *Token Sale Start Date: Dec 17th, 2020

3. *Token Sale End Date: Mar 17th, 2021

4. *Token Price (in USD and/or ETH): $0.05

5. Public Sale Allocation: 3,100,000,000 TGO

6. Public Sale Vesting Period: 0 month

7. IEO Launchpad: TBD... (tentatively Binance Launchpad / Huobi Prime)

8. Country: Panama

9. Soft Cap / Hard Cap : €12,000,000.- / € 118,400,000 .-

10. Amount Raised: ~€150,000.-

11. Token Distribution Date: Mar 19th, 2021

Private Sale Details

1. Private Sale Token Price (in EUR): €0.01

2. Private Sale Allocation:€120,000.-

3. Private Sale Vesting Period: 9 month

4. Seed Sale Token Price (in USD and/or ETH): $0.01

5. Seed Sale Allocation: €80,000.-

6. Seed Sale Vesting Period: 12 month

References:

Scientific Reports | (2020) 10:7631 | https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-63657-6

1. Waring, R. H. & Running, S. W. Forest Ecosystems: Analysis at Multiple Scales (Academic Press, 2007).

2. The State of the World's Forests 2018. Forest Pathways to Sustainable Development, Food and Agriculture Organization of the
United Nations Rome (2018).

3. Bologna, M. & Flores, J. C. A simple mathematical model of society collapse applied to Easter Island. EPL 81, 48006 (2008).

4. Bologna, M., Chandia, K. J. & Flores, J. C. A non-linear mathematical model for a three species ecosystem: Hippos in Lake Edward.
Journal of Theoretical Biology 389, 83 (2016).

5. U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA), https://www.eia.gov/international/data/world.

6. Vaclav, S. Energy transitions: history, requirements, prospects (ABC-CLIO, 2010).

7. Kardashev, N. Transmission of Information by Extraterrestrial civilisations. Soviet Astronomy 8, 217 (1964).

8. Kardashev, N. On the Inevitability and the Possible Structures of Supercivilisations, The search for extraterrestrial life: Recent
developments; Proceedings of the Symposium p. 497–504 (1985).

9. Statistical Review of World Energy source (2018).

10. NASA source https://svs.gsfc.nasa.gov/11393.

11. Frank, A., Carroll-Nellenback, J., Alberti, M. & Kleidon, A. The Anthropocene Generalized: Evolution of Exo-Civilizations and
Their Planetary Feedback. Astrobiology 18, 503–517 (2018).

12. Fort, J. & Mendez, V. Time-Delayed Theory of the Neolithic Transition in Europe. Phys. Rev. Lett. 82, 867 (1999).

13. Molles, M. Ecology: Concepts and Applications (McGraw-Hill Higher Education, 1999).

14. Wilson, E. O. The Future of Life (Knopf, 2002).

15. Bongaarts, J. Human population growth and the demographic transition. Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B 364, 2985–2990 (2009).

16. Dyson, F. J. Search for Artificial Stellar Sources of Infra-Red Radiation. Science 131, 1667–1668 (1960).

17. Bologna, M., Ascolani, G. & Grigolini, P. Density approach to ballistic anomalous diffusion: An exact analytical treatment. J. Math.
Phys. 51, 043303 (2010).

18. Hanggi, P. & Talkner, P. First-passage time problems for non-Markovian processes. Phys. Rev. A 32, 1934 (1985).

19. Weiss G. H. Aspects and Applications of the Random Walk, (North Holland, 1994).

20. Moore, G. E. Cramming more components onto integrated circuits. Electronics 38, 114 (1965).

21. Business Cycle Expansion and Contractions, https://web.archive.org/web/20090310081706/; http://www.nber.org/cycles.

22. Drake, F. The radio search for intelligent extraterrestrial life. In Current Aspects of Exobiology 323–345 (Pergamon Press, New York,
1965).

23. Burchell, M. J. W(h)ither the Drake equation? Intern. J. Astrobiology 5, 243–250 (2006).

24. Hart, M. H. Explanation for the Absence of Extraterrestrials on Earth. Quarterly Journal of the Royal Astronomical Society 16,128–135 (1975).

25. Freitas, R. A. There is no Fermi Paradox. Icarus 62, 518–520 (1985).

26. Engler, J. O. & von Wehrden, H. Where is everybody?? An empirical appraisal of occurrence, prevalence and sustainability of
technological species in the Universe. International Journal of Astrobiology 18, 495–501 (2019).

27. Kolodny, O. & Feldman, M. W. A parsimonious neutral model suggests Neanderthal replacement was determined by migration and
random species drift. Nature Comm. 8, 1040 (2017).

28. Grimaldi, C. Signal coverage approach to the detection probability of hypothetical extraterrestrial emitters in the Milky Way. Sci.
Rep. 7, 46273 (2017).

29. Daly, H. E. & Farley, J. Ecological Economics, Second Edition: Principles and Applications)Island Press, 2011).

30. Paris Agreement, United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) https://unfccc.int/files/meetings/paris_
nov_2015/application/pdf/paris_agreement_english_.pdf.

31. Tol, R. S. J. The structure of the climate debate. Energy Policy 104, 431–438 (2017).

32. Rood, R. T. & Trefil, S. J. Are we alone? The possibility of extraterrestrial civilisations (Scribner, 1981).

33. Kukla, A. Extraterrestrials A Philosophical Perspective (Lexington Books, 2010).

34. Strunz, S., Marselle, M. & Schröter, M. Leaving the "sustainability or collapse" narrative behind. Sustainability Science 14, 1717–1728 (2019).

35. Song, X.-P. et al. Global land change from 1982 to 2016. Nature 560, 639–643 (2018).