Autopoiesis in Decentralized Autonomous Organizations as Complex Systems: A Comparative Analysis and Case Studies

Francesco Santoro
Department of Mathematics, Computer Science and Physics, University of Udine, Udine, Italy

Email: francescosantoro76@gmail.com
Manuscript received August 14, 2024; accepted September 7, 2024; published October 16, 2024
DOI: 10.18178/IJBTA.2024.2.2.90-99

Abstract: This article explores the concept of autopoiesis and its application to Decentralized Autonomous Organizations (DAOs). Autopoiesis describes the self-producing and self-maintaining characteristics of living systems, a concept that has been applied in various fields beyond biology. DAOs, operating on blockchain technology, exhibit a level of autonomy, transparency, and democratic governance. They are self-governing and self-sustaining systems that operate based on coded rules and protocols. The article suggests that DAOs align with the concept of autopoiesis, making them a specific type of complex system. Diverse case studies demonstrate the resilience and autopoietic features of these organizations. All things considered, the concept of autopoiesis could provide a valuable lens for understanding DAOs.

Keywords: autopoiesis, decentralized autonomous organizations, DAOs, blockchain technology, smart contracts, complex systems, autopoietic systems, resilience, adaptability

1. Introduction

The advent of blockchain technology has given rise to a new form of organization known as Decentralized Autonomous Organizations (DAOs). These organizations, defined by their autonomy, transparency, and democratic governance, operate based on coded rules and protocols, making them self-governing and self-sustaining systems. This article delves into the concept of autopoiesis, a term that describes the self-producing and self-maintaining characteristics of living systems, and its application to DAOs. The concept of autopoiesis, first introduced by Chilean biologists Humberto Maturana and Francisco Varela in the early 1970s, has been applied in various fields beyond biology, including sociology and systems theory. In the context of DAOs, autopoiesis provides a valuable lens for understanding these complex systems. This article presents a comparative analysis of autopoiesis and DAOs, exploring how DAOs align with the concept of autopoiesis, making them a specific type of complex system. Through key case studies of DAOs we demonstrate the resilience and autopoietic features of these organizations. The exploration of autopoiesis in DAOs provides significant implications for the study of complex systems, offering a theoretical framework for understanding how systems can maintain their identity and adapt to changes in their environment. This article aims to contribute to the ongoing discourse on DAOs, providing insights into their autopoietic nature and the potential implications for their long-term sustainability and evolution. The findings of this study are derived from a meticulous examination and analysis of the data alongside the behavioral patterns exhibited

by the Decentralized Autonomous Organizations with the highest Total Value Locked (TVL). Through a systematic observation of these entities, a comprehensive understanding of their operational dynamics was achieved, which, in turn, provides insightful contributions to the broader discourse surrounding blockchain-based organizational frameworks.

2. Understanding Autopoiesis

Autopoiesis, a term derived from the Greek words 'auto' for self and 'poiesis' for creation or production, is a concept that describes the self-producing, self-maintaining, and self-organizing characteristics of living systems [1]. The concept was first introduced by Chilean biologists Humberto Maturana and Francisco Varela in the early 1970s to define the nature of living systems [2]. Maturana and Varela proposed that autopoietic systems are characterized by their ability to continually regenerate and maintain their own structure, even while interacting with their environment. This is achieved through a network of processes where the function of each component is to participate in the production or transformation of other components in the system. In essence, an autopoietic system is a self-producing and self-maintaining unit, bounded by a selectively permeable boundary that allows for interactions with its environment while maintaining its organizational closure. The concept of autopoiesis has been applied in various fields beyond biology, including sociology and systems theory. In sociology, Luhmann [3] adapted the concept to describe social systems as self-referential systems, where communication creates and recreates the system. In systems theory, autopoiesis has been used to understand the self-organizing properties of complex systems, providing a framework for analyzing how systems maintain their structure and adapt to changes in their environment [4]. A complex system is a system composed of many components which may interact with each other. The key characteristics of a complex system are:

- Non-linearity: The behavior of complex systems is often non-linear, meaning that small changes in input can lead to disproportionate or unexpected changes in output.
- Emergence: In complex systems, higher-level properties and behaviors emerge from the interactions among lower-level entities. These emergent properties are often unpredictable based on knowledge of the system's components alone.
- Adaptability: Complex systems often have the ability to adapt or evolve over time in response to changing conditions or inputs.
- Self-Organization: Components within complex systems often self-organize into patterns or structures without central control or external guidance.
- Feedback Loops: Complex systems typically involve feedback loops, where outputs from one part of the system influence inputs to another part of the system.
- Interconnectedness: In complex systems, components are interconnected in a network structure, often with many connections between elements.
- Robustness and Fragility: Complex systems can be both robust and fragile, with the ability to withstand certain types of disturbances while being highly sensitive to others.
- History Dependence: The behavior and evolution of complex systems are often dependent on their historical conditions or initial states, a concept known as path dependence.
- Modularity: Complex systems often exhibit modularity, with distinct subsystems or modules that have specific functions and interact with one another in defined ways.

Examples of complex systems are biological organisms, ecosystems, the earth's climate, the economy, and human social and political systems. The connection between complex systems and autopoiesis is that both deal with systems that are self-organizing and adaptive, and where the behavior of the system as a whole emerges from the interactions of its components. Autopoiesis can be seen as a specific feature of complex

system, that allow the system to not just self-organizing, but self-producing and self-maintaining. Further, in the field of social and organizational studies, the concept of autopoiesis has been expanded beyond biology to consider the self-producing characteristics of social systems. This makes it a useful concept in understanding complex systems in a wide variety of contexts. Understanding autopoiesis has significant implications for the study of complex systems. It provides a theoretical framework for understanding how systems can maintain their identity and adapt to changes in their environment, while also highlighting the importance of the system's internal dynamics in shaping its behavior [5]. This perspective can help us understand the resilience and adaptability of complex systems, from biological organisms to social and ecological systems.

3. Decentralized Autonomous Organizations

Decentralized Autonomous Organizations are a novel form of organization that operates on blockchain technology, enabling a level of autonomy, transparency, and democratic governance not seen in traditional organizations. DAOs are essentially digital entities that exist online and operate according to pre-programmed rules. They are governed by smart contracts, which are self-executing contracts with the terms of the agreement directly written into code [6]. The structure of DAOs is characterized by a decentralized governance model, where decision-making power is distributed among token holders. These token holders can propose, debate, and vote on decisions concerning the organization, such as changes to the DAO's rules or allocation of resources. This democratic governance model is a stark contrast to traditional hierarchical organizational structures, where decision-making power is concentrated at the top [7]. The main features of DAOs include transparency, immutability, and autonomy. Transparency is ensured as all transactions and decisions are recorded on the blockchain, which is publicly accessible. Immutability refers to the fact that once a decision is made and recorded on the blockchain, it cannot be changed or deleted. Autonomy is achieved as DAOs operate according to pre-programmed rules, without the need for human intervention [8]. In today's digital world, DAOs have the potential to disrupt traditional organizational structures. They can operate without geographical boundaries, enabling global collaboration and participation. Furthermore, they can provide a solution to the trust issue in online transactions, as the transparency and immutability of the blockchain ensure that all parties can verify transactions and decisions [9]. However, it's important to note that while DAOs have significant potential, they are still in their early stages and many challenges remain. The challenges and limitations of DAOs include regulatory uncertainty, blockchain scalability issues, and the risk of smart contract bugs. Regulatory uncertainty arises as it is unclear how DAOs fit into existing legal frameworks, which can lead to potential legal risks for participants [10]. Scalability issues pertain to the existing limitations of blockchain technology, which may find it challenging to process a large volume of transactions. However, these issues do not correlate with the scalability of DAOs in itself, as they possess the potential for limitless membership expansion. Lastly, the risk of smart contract bugs is a significant concern, as demonstrated by the infamous The DAO hack in 2016, where a bug in the DAO's smart contract was exploited, resulting in the loss of around $60 million worth of Ether [11]. DAOs have manifold characteristics [12]:

- Autopoietic: the autopoietic characteristic signifies the ability of an organization to self-replicate and sustain itself without being dependent on a singular point of failure. The metaphor of the multi-headed hydra can be invoked to illustrate this phenomenon, whereby for each severed head, two new heads regenerate. The network architecture of decentralized autonomous organizations places significant emphasis on its network edges, ensuring that the loss of a central node does not pose a threat to the long-term viability of the organization.

- Alegal: the alegal attribute indicates that the organization does not transgress legality but develops a foundational framework over time. The concept of functional equivalence derived from ecological systems can be applied in this context. Alegality refers to activities or systems that exist outside traditional legal frameworks, without being illegal. In this context, Decentralized Autonomous Organizations:
  – are decentralized and autonomous, differing from legal entities with centralized control.
  – are global and borderless, challenging laws based on territorial jurisdiction.
  – use "smart contracts" where the code is law, which is outside the conventional legal system.
  – might have built-in dispute resolution mechanisms, which exist outside of traditional legal systems.
  – pose regulatory challenges due to their unique structure, which can place them in an alegal space.

While alegality can offer freedom and flexibility, it can also bring risks, such as a lack of consumer protections and difficulties in dispute resolution.

- Superscalable: the superscalable quality denotes the organization's capacity to accommodate a large number of members and, in contrast to modern firms, become more efficient and capable as it scales in size. A theory of the firm suggests that as organizations grow, they typically experience increasing inefficiency costs proportional to their membership size. This scalability concept of DAOs is different from the scalability of blockchain networks that instead could represent an issue. However, decentralized autonomous organizations utilize a toolset that enables fractal membership growth, whereby each new component within the organization enhances the overall synergy, facilitating large-scale coordination.
- Executable: the executable quality indicates that the organization can carry out its operations through minimal protocols, such as software applications. The introduction of one-click registration for corporations served as the initial step towards achieving this, followed by the ability to establish an autonomous company using command-line functions. Decentralized autonomous organizations envision software product suites that encompass the entirety of a firm's operations, readily accessible and functional. It is important to note that this quality does not necessarily depend on access to digital infrastructure but encompasses a set of robust design patterns that can be easily replicated throughout the organization.
- Permissionless: the permissionless quality suggests that any entity can join or leave the organization based on publicly defined criteria. The concept of exit, voice, and loyalty plays a significant role in discussions on agency. Decentralized autonomous organizations can extend this notion by incorporating the concept of entrance, allowing any entity to create, fork, or join the network.
- Aligned: the aligned quality indicates that the organization possesses incentives to overcome common coordination problems. The field of game theory provides models for analyzing interactions among rational decision-makers, highlighting dilemmas of cooperative, zero-sum, and symmetric games, as well as their inverse scenarios. As a counterforce, decentralized autonomous organizations widely employ mechanism design through economic incentives or social norms to achieve a rough consensus and facilitate their operations. Headless brands and cultural values are equally if not more, powerful tools for fostering affinity.
- Co-owned: the co-owned quality indicates that the organization incorporates proportional ownership among its members. The ownership economy represents a novel paradigm of participant-owned services, facilitated by peer-to-peer currency that enables the flow of both information and value within networks. Decentralized autonomous organizations, as programmable cooperatives, mandate that members equitably share in the financial, material, and social capital generated through their participation.

- Mnemonic: the mnemonic quality suggests that the organization inherently generates a public record through its operations. Historically, the task of preserving formal and tacit knowledge has been undertaken by stories and institutions such as archival libraries and monasteries. By partially automating the production of institutional memory, decentralized autonomous organizations can provide assurances of accountability and facilitate intergenerational knowledge transfer.
- Composable: at granular level, DAOs are built out of a series of smart contracts. Each of these contracts can have its own unique functionality—governing voting rights, token distributions, or the rules of the organization, for example. Composability allows these contracts to interact with each other and with other external contracts on the Ethereum network. This can enable complex interactions and dependencies that mirror those found in traditional organizations. For instance, a DAO that is designed for investment purposes could interact with other protocols for lending, borrowing, or trading tokens. A DAO for content creators could integrate with a decentralized marketplace for digital art. The possibilities are as diverse as the smart contracts available on the blockchain. In essence, composability in DAOs refers to the potential to create complex decentralized systems by combining and reusing existing parts in novel ways, thus accelerating innovation and enabling a wide range of applications and functionalities.
- Neutral: political neutrality in the context of DAOs would mean that the government doesn't interfere with the operations, decisions, or structure of the DAO. Considering its global and borderless nature, it is generally less influenced by political party or government agenda. This tendency to political neutrality can result in more neutral and reliable products in several ways:
  – Decentralized Decision Making: In a DAO, decisions are typically made by consensus among the members, rather than being dictated by a single authority or influenced by external political forces. This means that the organization can focus on creating products that best meet the needs of its members, rather than those of a specific political group or ideology.
  – Transparency: DAOs are built on blockchain technology, which provides a transparent record of all transactions and decisions. This makes it hard for any party, including the government, to exert undue influence or make changes without the knowledge and consent of the members.
  – Inclusivity: Because DAOs are decentralized and not controlled by a single authority, they can potentially be more inclusive, allowing a broader range of voices to be heard. This can result in products that are more representative of the needs and desires of a wider population, rather than being skewed towards a particular political viewpoint.
  – Reduced Corruption and Bias: The transparent and decentralized nature of DAOs can also help to reduce corruption and bias. There's less opportunity for a small group of people to manipulate the system for their own benefit, as can sometimes happen in traditional, centralized organizations.

4. Autopoiesis and DAOs. A Comparative Analysis

Complex systems are characterized by their non-linearity, adaptability, and emergent behavior, often composed of a multitude of interacting components [13]. DAOs, with their decentralized nature and reliance on collective decision-making, exhibit similar characteristics. The non-linearity is evident in the way decisions are made and implemented, with outcomes not always directly proportional to the inputs (i.e., votes or proposals). DAOs also demonstrate adaptability, as they can modify their rules and structures based on member consensus, and emergent behavior, as the collective actions of individual members often result in outcomes that are not predictable from the behavior of individual members alone. Autopoiesis is a concept that has also been extended to social systems. DAOs seem to fit this description as they are self-governing and self-sustaining social systems. They operate based on coded rules and protocols, and their continued

existence and evolution are determined by the collective actions of their members. This self-producing nature of DAOs might align to some extent with the concept of autopoiesis, making them a specific type of complex system. Similar to autopoietic systems, DAOs exhibit self-producing and self-maintaining characteristics. They are designed to operate autonomously, executing predefined tasks and decisions based on the consensus of their members. This autonomy is facilitated by smart contracts, which are self-executing contracts with the terms of the agreement directly written into code. The application of the concept of autopoiesis to DAOs provides a novel perspective for understanding these complex systems. Viewing DAOs as autopoietic systems highlights their self-organizing and self-sustaining nature, which is a fundamental aspect of their design and operation. This perspective can help in understanding the dynamics of DAOs, including their resilience, adaptability, and evolution over time. There are potential benefits and challenges associated with viewing DAOs as autopoietic systems. On the one hand, this perspective can enhance our understanding of the inherent resilience and adaptability of DAOs, which can be crucial for their long-term sustainability. On the other hand, it also raises questions about the stability and predictability of these systems, given their capacity for self-change and evolution. In particular, Decentralized Autonomous Organizations and complex systems share a host of features intertwined with autopoiesis due to their inherent design and operational modalities. Here's a comparative analysis:

a. Emergence:
- Complex Systems: Display emergence where the collective behavior leads to the manifestation of properties not inherent to individual components.
- DAOs: Exhibit emergence as the collective decision-making process can lead to unforeseen outcomes or decisions that would not arise from individual actors alone.

b. Self-organization:
- Complex Systems: Possess the ability to self-organize and adapt to changing conditions.
- DAOs: Are built on self-organization principles, where the collective interacts and makes decisions without a centralized authority.

c. Non-linearity:
- Complex Systems: Showcase non-linear dynamics where small changes can have significant impacts.
- DAOs: Might display non-linearity especially in decision-making processes where the input of individual members can have disproportionate effects.

d. Adaptability and Learning:
- Complex Systems: Adapt and learn from the environment to improve their structure and functionality over time.
- DAOs: Through collective decision-making, adapt to new information and learn from past decisions to evolve.

e. Interdependence:
- Complex Systems: Have interdependent components where the behavior of one affects others.
- DAOs: Members and the decisions are interdependent, reflecting a similar interconnectedness.

f. Interconnection:
- Complex Systems: Components are interconnected in a complex network.
- DAOs: Operate on interconnected networks (e.g., blockchain) and the decisions in one DAO can have repercussions on others.

g. Heterogeneity:
- Complex Systems: Comprise diverse components with different properties and behaviors.
- DAOs: Have heterogeneous membership with diverse skills, knowledge, and perspectives contributing to the collective decision-making.

h. History-dependent:
- Complex Systems: Are influenced by their past states.
  - DAOs: Decisions and actions are recorded on a blockchain, making the history immutable and influential in future interactions.

i. Fractal Properties:
- Complex Systems: Exhibit fractal properties with self-similarity across scales.
  - DAOs: Might not exhibit fractal properties as distinctly, though certain governance structures or decisions might reflect self-similarity.

j. Unpredictable Behavior:
- Complex Systems: Exhibit unpredictable behaviors due to non-linearity and interconnection.
  - DAOs: Can also showcase unpredictability especially in collective decision-making outcomes.

k. Positive and Negative Feedback:
- Complex Systems: Contain feedback loops that amplify or dampen effects.
  - DAOs: Decision-making processes can include feedback mechanisms, where previous decisions inform future ones, and member reputation systems can create feedback loops.

The comparative analysis elucidates how DAOs embody many characteristics of complex systems, underpinning their dynamic, adaptive, and non-linear nature. Through decentralized governance and blockchain technology, DAOs represent a real-world manifestation of complex system dynamics in the domain of organizational management and decision-making.

5. Key Cases

The DAO**:** several DAOs exhibit features that could be defined as autopoietic characteristics. For instance, The DAO, one of the most famous examples, was designed to be a fully autonomous organization with no central authority [14]. "The DAO" was a groundbreaking project launched in 2016 on the Ethereum blockchain. It aimed to create a decentralized investment fund that operated through smart contracts, allowing participants to make decisions collectively. The DAO raised a significant amount of funds, reaching over $150 million in Ether (the cryptocurrency of the Ethereum network) through a token sale. Participants who contributed to The DAO received DAO tokens in return, which represented their stake and voting power in the organization. The unique aspect of The DAO was its autonomous nature. It was designed to be self-executing and self-governing, with decisions made by token holders through a voting mechanism. The idea was to eliminate the need for traditional intermediaries and give control directly to the stakeholders. However, in June 2016, a critical vulnerability was discovered in The DAO's smart contract code, which allowed an attacker to drain funds from The DAO. This incident exposed a flaw in the system and raised questions about the security and robustness of smart contracts. The Ethereum community faced a dilemma on how to address the situation. Ultimately, a controversial decision was made to perform a hard fork of the Ethereum blockchain, effectively reverting the transactions and returning the funds to their original holders. This decision led to a split in the Ethereum community, resulting in two separate blockchains: Ethereum (ETH) and Ethereum Classic (ETC). Despite the security breach and subsequent contentious resolution, The DAO demonstrated the concept of autopoiesis in the realm of DAOs. Autopoiesis refers to a system's ability to self-create and self-maintain its structure and processes. The DAO, as an autonomous organization, was capable of making decisions, allocating resources, and executing actions without the need for external intervention. While The DAO's implementation had vulnerabilities, the idea of DAOs and their autopoietic potential has continued to evolve. DAOs today continue to be explored as a means of decentralized governance and decision-making, empowering communities to collaborate and manage resources in a more democratic and transparent manner. Despite its eventual downfall due to a security breach, The DAO

demonstrated the potential for a system to operate and evolve autonomously.

MakerDAO: it is another example, which has implemented a system of governance that allows it to adapt and evolve based on the decisions of its members [15]. MakerDAO's trajectory over time highlights its resilience and autopoietic features. Starting in 2015/16, the vision of MakerDAO was to create a permissionless, decentralized stablecoin on the Ethereum blockchain, a groundbreaking idea at the time. Its initial launch in 2018 brought about the creation of DAI a stablecoin that was intended to provide users of volatile assets a hedge against inflation. However, its main use turned out to be for large ETH holders to go long on ETH and use the DAI to buy more ETH, which caused the price of DAI to dip below the actual threshold. In response to the price deviation of DAI, MakerDAO's governance system came into play, where an executive vote was held to increase the stability fee. The intended outcome was to force Collateralized Debt Position (CDP) holders to buy DAI off the market in order to close out CDPs and avoid higher interest rates. However, this led to DAI trading at a premium, resulting in more executive votes to adjust the stability fee to match secondary market demand. A significant event in MakerDAO's history was when the price of ETH tanked from $200 to $80 over the course of 12 hours due to global market conditions and longs being liquidated. This resulted in a scenario where MakerDAO's liquidation bots were not configured to dynamically adjust gas prices in the case of network congestion, leading to a user losing 30,000 ETH and the Maker system being in debt for around $4m. In this critical situation, the protocol had two choices: trigger global settlement (shutting down MakerDAO) or dilute MKR holders, which is the governance token of MakerDAO, by minting more tokens and selling the proceeds to cover the debt. An executive vote led to the decision of diluting MKR holders rather than shutting down the system, demonstrating the system's resilience and self-sustaining nature. This event led to the introduction of USDC as collateral for DAI, bridging the gap between legacy and traditional financial systems. This reflected a shift in MakerDAO's ideology and the beginning of multi-collateral DAI. The resilience and autopoietic features of MakerDAO are evident in its ability to adapt and evolve in response to various challenges and market conditions.

Tornado Cash DAO: since August 2022, Tornado Cash, a popular Ethereum smart-contract mixer, has faced several significant events that have demonstrated its resilience and autopoietic characteristics. In August 2022, Tornado Cash was sanctioned by the U.S. Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) for its role in laundering over $455 million worth of cryptocurrency stolen by the North Korean-linked hacking organization Lazarus Group. Despite this, Tornado Cash continued to operate due to its unique qualities including its non-custodial nature, smart contract-encoded design, and decentralized development team. These features have made sanctions compliance more complicated than in past situations, with most of Tornado Cash's smart contracts designed in a way that they cannot be changed or destroyed by anyone, including the Tornado Cash DAO. In November 2022, OFAC modified its sanctions against Tornado Cash, with the new sanctions including the protocol's founders, associated developers, and the Tornado Cash DAO. The revised sanctions also updated the definition of the individuals and entities that make up Tornado Cash. However, this move was seen by some as a tacit surrender to the lawsuit filed by crypto lobbyist Coin Center, which was suing OFAC for the sanctions against Tornado Cash on the grounds that it harms those who seek to transact privately on the blockchain without criminal intentions. The updated sanction list also included Tornado Cash's governance token contract. It is noteworthy for the purpose of this paper that, despite OFAC's repressive action, Tornado Cash continued to operate seamlessly. In another significant event, the Tornado Cash DAO was attacked by an unidentified attacker or group of attackers who proposed a malicious proposal that hid a code function, granting them fake votes. This allowed them to handle some aspects of Tornado Cash, such as the withdrawal of locked Torn tokens. This attack resulted in a drop in Torn prices by as much as 40%. Despite this, the attack did not impact the actual Tornado Cash protocol, demonstrating the protocol's resilience. The community responded by proposing changes to revert the modifications made by

the attacker. All these events highlight the autopoietic nature of Tornado Cash DAO, which is its ability to maintain its functionality and continue operations despite external pressures or attacks. Its decentralized structure, non-custodial nature, and smart contract-encoded design allow it to adapt and respond to these challenges, reinforcing its resilience and highlighting the strengths of decentralized systems.

6. Analytical Tools for DAOs as Complex Systems

Considering that DAOs, for the reasons reported in the previous paragraphs, can be considered complex systems with numerous interacting elements, they could be studied using a variety of tools and techniques taken from the field of the study of complex systems. Here are some examples of these tools:

- Network Analysis: DAOs operate through a network of members who interact with each other and the organization's underlying smart contracts. Network analysis can help understand the structure, dynamics, and patterns of these interactions. Tools for network analysis include graph theory tools and software like Gephi.
- Agent-Based Modeling (ABM): ABM is a computational method that enables a researcher to create, analyze, and experiment with models composed of agents that interact within a network. This can be useful in understanding the behavior of individual participants in a DAO and how their actions impact the overall organization.
- Game Theory: game theory can be used to study strategic interactions within a DAO. It can help predict how members might behave in response to the rules and incentives set by the DAO's smart contracts.
- Econometrics: econometric tools can be used to study the economic behavior and outcomes in a DAO. These tools include statistical methods to analyze economic data, which can be useful in understanding the financial dynamics of a DAO.
- Simulation Software: tools like NetLogo or AnyLogic can be used to simulate complex system behaviors. They can be used to model and predict various scenarios in a DAO based on its rules and member behaviors.
- Blockchain Analytics: given that DAOs operate on blockchain technology, blockchain analytics tools can be used to study transaction data, contract interactions, and other relevant data. Tools like Etherscan or blockchain explorers for other specific blockchains can be used to gather and analyze this data.
- Smart Contract Analysis: tools for analyzing the smart contract code can help understand the rules and logic that govern the DAO. This can be done using formal verification tools, smart contract auditing tools, or programming language analysis tools.
- Sentiment Analysis: given that much of the communication in a DAO happens online, tools for sentiment analysis can be used to understand the sentiments and opinions of DAO members. This can be done using Natural Language Processing (NLP) tools and software.
- Data Visualization Tools: visualization tools like D3.js, Tableau, or Power BI can be used to visually represent data about the DAO, making it easier to understand and interpret.
- Ethnographic Tools: DAOs are not just about code and transactions, but also about people and culture. Ethnographic research tools, like participant observation and interviews, can be used to understand the social dynamics within a DAO.

7. Conclusion

All things considered, the concept of autopoiesis provides a valuable lens for understanding the dynamics of DAOs as a complex system. It highlights their self-organizing and self-sustaining nature, which is a

fundamental aspect of their design and operation. This perspective can enhance our understanding of the inherent resilience and adaptability of DAOs, crucial for their long-term sustainability. However, it also raises questions about the stability and predictability of these systems, given their capacity for self-change and evolution. Despite the challenges, DAOs continue to be explored as a means of decentralized governance and decision-making, empowering communities to collaborate and manage resources in a more democratic and transparent manner.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgment

I would like to thank Prof. Massimo Franceschet for his guidance and support throughout the development of this work.

References

[1] H. Maturana and F. Varela, *Autopoiesis and Cognition: The Realization of the Living*, D. Reidel Publishing Company, 1980.
[2] H. Maturana and F. Varela, "Autopoiesis: The organization of the living," in *Autopoiesis and Cognition: The Realization of the Living*, H. Maturana and F. Varela, Eds. D. Reidel Publishing Company, 1973, pp. 59–138.
[3] N. Luhmann, *Social Systems*, Stanford University Press, 1995.
[4] F. Capra and P. L. Luisi, *The Systems View of Life: A Unifying Vision*, Cambridge University Press, 2014.
[5] R. Whitaker, "Autopoiesis and cognition in the game of life," *Artificial Life*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 543–556, 2017.
[6] V. Buterin, "A next-generation smart contract and decentralized application platform," *White Paper*, vol. 3, no. 37, 2014.
[7] D. Tapscott and A. Tapscott, *Blockchain Revolution: How the Technology Behind Bitcoin Is Changing Money, Business, and the World*, Penguin, 2016.
[8] W. Mougayar, *The Business Blockchain: Promise, Practice, and Application of the Next Internet Technology*, John Wiley and Sons, 2016.
[9] K. Christidis and M. Devetsikiotis, "Blockchains and smart contracts for the internet of things," *IEEE Access*, vol. 4, pp. 2292–2303, 2016.
[10] K. Werbach, *The Blockchain and the New Architecture of Trust*, MIT Press, 2018.
[11] Q. DuPont, "Experiments in algorithmic governance: A history and ethnography of "The DAO," a failed decentralized autonomous organization," *Bitcoin and Beyond*, pp. 157–177, 2017.
[12] R. Catlow and P. Rafferty, *Radical Friends: Decentralised Autonomous Organisations and the Arts*, Torque Editions, 2022.
[13] M. Mitchell, *Complexity: A Guided Tour*, Oxford University Press, 2009.
[14] Q. DuPont and B. Maurer, "Ledgers and law in the blockchain," *King's Review*, vol. 23, 2015.
[15] J. Mihm, "MakerDAO: Stability in the world of crypto," *Harvard Business Review Digital Articles*, pp. 2–5, 2019.