CRYPTO RISK METRICS
DON'T TRUST. VERIFY.

White paper drafted under the European Markets in Crypto-Assets Regulation (EU) 2023/1114 for FFG XR0JSKLNZ

Preamble

00. Table of Contents

01. Date of notification

This white paper was notified on 2026-08-03.

02. Statement in accordance with Article 6(3) of Regulation (EU) 2023/1114

This crypto-asset white paper has not been approved by any competent authority in any Member State of the European Union. The person seeking admission to trading of the crypto-asset is solely responsible for the content of this crypto-asset white paper.

03. Compliance statement in accordance with Article 6(6) of Regulation (EU) 2023/1114

This crypto-asset white paper complies with Title II of Regulation (EU) 2023/1114 of the European Parliament and of the Council and, to the best of the knowledge of the management body, the information presented in the crypto-asset white paper is fair, clear and not misleading and the crypto-asset white paper makes no omission likely to affect its import.

04. Statement in accordance with Article 6(5), points (a), (b), (c), of Regulation (EU) 2023/1114

The crypto-asset referred to in this crypto-asset white paper may lose its value in part or in full, may not always be transferable and may not be liquid.

05. Statement in accordance with Article 6(5), point (d), of Regulation (EU) 2023/1114

As defined in Article 3(9) of Regulation (EU) 2023/1114 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 31 May 2023 on Markets in Crypto-Assets – amending Regulations (EU) No 1093/2010 and (EU) No 1095/2010 and Directives 2013/36/EU and (EU) 2019/1937 – a utility token is "a type of crypto-asset that is only intended to provide access to a good or a service supplied by its issuer". This crypto-asset does not qualify as a utility token, as its intended use goes beyond providing access to a good or service supplied solely by the issuer.

06. Statement in accordance with Article 6(5), points (e) and (f), of Regulation (EU) 2023/1114

The crypto-asset referred to in this white paper is not covered by the investor compensation schemes under Directive 97/9/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council or the deposit guarantee schemes under Directive 2014/49/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council.

Summary

07. Warning in accordance with Article 6(7), second subparagraph, of Regulation (EU) 2023/1114

Warning: This summary should be read as an introduction to the crypto-asset white paper. The prospective holder should base any decision to purchase this crypto-asset on the content of the crypto-asset white paper as a whole and not on the summary alone. The offer to the public of this crypto-asset does not constitute an offer or solicitation to purchase financial instruments and any such offer or solicitation can be made only by means of a prospectus or other offer documents pursuant to the applicable national law. This crypto-asset white paper does not constitute a prospectus as referred to in Regulation (EU) 2017/1129 of the European Parliament and of the Council or any other offer document pursuant to Union or national law.

08. Characteristics of the crypto-asset

The RENDER crypto-asset referred to in this white paper is a crypto-asset other than EMTs and ARTs and is implemented on the Solana network as a token under the SPL token standard, with a legacy implementation on the Ethereum network under the ERC-20 token standard, according to the DTI FFG shown in section F.14, as of 2026-07-09. The RENDER token does not have a fixed maximum supply. The first activity of the crypto-asset on Ethereum can be viewed on 2019-02-12 (transaction hash: 0x639503d71bd6a3ac3a2535a4925ec34f37e490432875a7535601317c1eaeeac6, source: https://etherscan.io/tx/0x639503d71bd6a3ac3a2535a4925ec34f37e490432875a7535601317c1eaeeac6, accessed 2026-07-09). The RENDER token became available on the Solana network following the network upgrade on 2023-10-31 (signature: 3e9rkaFJSfpLrSVoogXPp17qWEQhegWCHGP4KhhivgnPfCY2Crym9Xy6X2SUkx4b3my5Hmv6yGoCYu96FBRAGeih, source: https://solscan.io/tx/3e9rkaFJSfpLrSVoogXPp17qWEQhegWCHGP4KhhivgnPfCY2Crym9Xy6X2SUkx4b3my5Hmv6yGoCYu96FBRAGeih, accessed 2026-07-09). The on-chain record precedes the completion of the network upgrade from Ethereum to Solana by two days, the upgrade having been announced as complete on 2023-11-02 (source: https://medium.com/render-token/render-network-completes-successful-upgrade-to-solana-3d7947b60aed, accessed 2026-07-31). The crypto-asset was originally issued under the ticker RNDR on the Ethereum network and, following the migration of the network to Solana, was rebranded to RENDER. The legacy RNDR token remains relevant solely in connection with the migration process, while RENDER is the current native token of the Render Network.

The Render Network is a decentralised marketplace for graphics processing unit (GPU) computing. It connects creators requiring rendering or artificial intelligence computation with node operators who provide GPU computing capacity. Jobs are priced in fiat-equivalent terms and settled in RENDER, enabling creators to access distributed computing resources while allowing node operators to monetise otherwise idle GPU capacity.

The RENDER token is used to pay for rendering and computation jobs on the network, to reward node operators for completing those jobs, and to participate in governance through the Render Network Proposal (RNP) process.

The crypto-asset does not grant any legally enforceable or contractual rights or obligations to its holders or purchasers. Any functionalities accessible through the underlying technology are purely technical or operational in nature and do not confer rights comparable to ownership, profit participation, governance, or similar entitlements known from traditional financial instruments.

09. Information about the quality and quantity of goods or services to which the utility tokens give access and restrictions on the transferability

As defined in Article 3(9) of Regulation (EU) 2023/1114 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 31 May 2023 on Markets in Crypto-Assets – amending Regulations (EU) No 1093/2010 and (EU) No 1095/2010 and Directives 2013/36/EU and (EU) 2019/1937 – a utility token is “a type of crypto-asset that is only intended to provide access to a good or a service supplied by its issuer”. This crypto-asset does not qualify as a utility token, as its intended use goes beyond providing access to a good or a service supplied solely by the issuer.

10. Key information about the offer to the public or admission to trading

Crypto Risk Metrics GmbH is seeking admission to trading on the Payward Global Solutions LTD ("Kraken") platform in the European Union in accordance with Article 5 of Regulation (EU) 2023/1114 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 31 May 2023 on Markets in Crypto-Assets, and amending Regulations (EU) No 1093/2010 and (EU) No 1095/2010 and Directives 2013/36/EU and (EU) 2019/1937. The admission to trading is not accompanied by a public offer of the crypto-asset.

Part A – Information about the offeror or the person seeking admission to trading

A.1 Name

Crypto Risk Metrics GmbH is the person seeking admission to trading.

A.2 Legal form

The legal form of Crypto Risk Metrics GmbH is 2HBR, which corresponds to "Gesellschaft mit beschränkter Haftung".

A.3 Registered address

The registered address of Crypto Risk Metrics GmbH is Lange Reihe 73, 20099 Hamburg,

Germany,

federal state of Hamburg.

A.4 Head office

The head office is identical to the registered address.

A.5 Registration date

Crypto Risk Metrics GmbH was registered on 2018-12-03.

A.6 Legal entity identifier

The Legal Entity Identifier (LEI) of Crypto Risk Metrics GmbH is 39120077M9TG0O1FE242.

A.7 Another identifier required pursuant to applicable national law

The national identifier of Crypto Risk Metrics GmbH is HRB 154488.

A.8 Contact telephone number

+4915144974120

A.9 E-mail address

info@crypto-risk-metrics.com

A.10 Response time (Days)

Crypto Risk Metrics GmbH will respond to investor enquiries within 30 calendar days.

A.11 Parent company

Crypto Risk Metrics GmbH has no parent company.

A.12 Members of the management body

Identity	Function	Business Address
Tim Zölitz	Chairman	Lange Reihe 73, 20099 Hamburg, Germany

A.13 Business activity

Crypto Risk Metrics GmbH is a technical service provider that supports regulated entities in fulfilling their regulatory requirements. Among other services, Crypto Risk Metrics GmbH acts as a data provider for ESG data under Article 66(5). In light of the requirements set out in Articles 4(7), 5(4) and 66(3) of Regulation (EU) 2023/1114 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 31 May 2023 on Markets in Crypto-Assets, and amending Regulations (EU) No 1093/2010 and (EU) No 1095/2010 and Directives 2013/36/EU and (EU) 2019/1937, Crypto Risk Metrics GmbH aims to provide central services for crypto-asset white papers.

A.14 Parent company business activity

Crypto Risk Metrics GmbH does not have a parent company. Accordingly, no business activity of a parent company is to be reported in this section.

A.15 Newly established

Crypto Risk Metrics GmbH has been established since 2018-12-03 and is therefore not newly established (i.e. more than three years).

A.16 Financial condition for the past three years

Crypto Risk Metrics GmbH, founded in 2018 and based in Hamburg (HRB 154488), has undergone several strategic shifts in its business focus since incorporation. Due to these changes in business model and operational direction over time, the financial figures from earlier years are only comparable to a limited extent with the company's current commercial activities. The present business model – centred on regulatory technology and risk analytics in the context of the MiCA framework – has been developed progressively and can realistically be considered fully operational since approximately 2024.

The company's financial trajectory over the past three years reflects the transition from exploratory development towards market-ready product delivery. Profit or loss after tax for the last three financial years is as follows:

2024 (unaudited): loss of EUR 50,891.81

2023 (unaudited): loss of EUR 27,665.32

2022: profit of EUR 104,283.00

The profit in 2022 resulted primarily from legacy consulting activities, which were discontinued as part of the company's repositioning.

The losses in 2023 and 2024 resulted from strategic investments in the development of proprietary software infrastructure, regulatory frameworks, and compliance technology for the MiCA ecosystem. During those periods, no substantial commercial revenues were expected, as resources were directed towards preparing the platform for market entry in a regulated environment.

A fundamental repositioning of the company occurred in 2023 and especially in 2024, when the focus shifted towards providing risk management, regulatory reporting, and supervisory compliance solutions for financial institutions and crypto-asset service providers. This marked a material shift in business operations and monetisation strategy.

Based on preliminary unaudited management information for the financial year 2025, revenues are expected to have exceeded EUR 800,000, while preliminary net profit is expected to exceed EUR 100,000.

These figures are not audited and are not based on a finalised annual financial statement. Accordingly, they remain subject to finalisation and may differ from the figures ultimately reported in the annual financial statements.

With the regulatory environment now taking shape and the platform commercially validated, it is assumed that the effects of the strategic developments will continue to materialise in 2026. The company foresees further scalability of its technology and growing market demand for regulatory compliance tools in the European crypto-asset sector.

No public subsidies or governmental grants have been received to date; all operations have been financed through shareholder contributions and internally generated resources. Crypto Risk Metrics has never accepted any payments in tokens from projects it has worked with and – due to its internal Conflicts of Interest Policy – never will.

A.17 Financial condition since registration

Not applicable. The company has been established for more than three years and its financial condition over the past three years is provided in Part A.16 above.

Part B – Information about the issuer, if different from the offeror or person seeking admission to trading

B.1 Issuer different from offeror or person seeking admission to trading

Yes, the issuer is different from the person seeking admission to trading.

B.2 Name

The Render Network Foundation

B.3 Legal form

The legal form of The Render Network Foundation is K575, which corresponds to "Foundation company".

B.4 Registered address

The registered address of The Render Network Foundation is c/o Leeward Management Limited, Suite 3119, 9 Forum Lane, Camana Bay, PO Box 144, George Town, KY1-9006,

Cayman Islands,

KY1

B.5 Head office

The head office address of The Render Network Foundation is c/o Leeward Management Limited, Suite 3119, 9 Forum Lane, Camana Bay, PO Box 144, George Town, KY1-9006,

Cayman Islands,

KY1

B.6 Registration date

The Render Network Foundation was registered on 2024-10-24.

B.7 Legal entity identifier

213800EE7YY4XV9TD695

B.8 Another identifier required pursuant to applicable national law

Not applicable.

B.9 Parent company

Not applicable.

B.10 Members of the management body

Identity	Function	Business Address
Trevor Harries-Jones	Director	c/o Leeward Management Limited, Suite 3119, 9 Forum Lane, Camana Bay, PO Box 144, George Town, KY1-9006, Cayman Islands
Tristan Relly	Head of operations	c/o Leeward Management Limited, Suite 3119, 9 Forum Lane, Camana Bay, PO Box 144, George Town, KY1-9006, Cayman Islands
Andrew Hyde	Head of communications	c/o Leeward Management Limited, Suite 3119, 9 Forum Lane, Camana Bay, PO Box 144, George Town, KY1-9006, Cayman Islands

B.11 Business activity

The principal activity is the stewardship and oversight of the Render Network protocol. This includes administering the Render Network Proposal (RNP) governance process, overseeing the emission of RENDER tokens under the Burn-and-Mint Equilibrium (BME) model, managing token unlocks, administering the Foundation treasury, and supporting ecosystem development through grant programmes.

B.12 Parent company business activity

Not applicable.

Part C – Information about the operator of the trading platform in cases where it draws up the crypto-asset white paper and information about other persons drawing the crypto-asset white paper pursuant to Article 6(1), second subparagraph, of Regulation (EU) 2023/1114

C.1 Name

Not applicable since Crypto Risk Metrics GmbH is not a trading platform.

C.2 Legal form

Not applicable since Crypto Risk Metrics GmbH is not a trading platform.

C.3 Registered address

Not applicable since Crypto Risk Metrics GmbH is not a trading platform.

C.4 Head office

Not applicable since Crypto Risk Metrics GmbH is not a trading platform.

C.5 Registration date

Not applicable since Crypto Risk Metrics GmbH is not a trading platform.

C.6 Legal entity identifier

Not applicable since Crypto Risk Metrics GmbH is not a trading platform.

C.7 Another identifier required pursuant to applicable national law

Not applicable since Crypto Risk Metrics GmbH is not a trading platform.

C.8 Parent company

Not applicable since Crypto Risk Metrics GmbH is not a trading platform.

C.9 Reason for crypto-asset white paper preparation

Not applicable since Crypto Risk Metrics GmbH is not a trading platform.

C.10 Members of the management body

Not applicable since Crypto Risk Metrics GmbH is not a trading platform.

C.11 Operator business activity

Not applicable since Crypto Risk Metrics GmbH is not a trading platform.

C.12 Parent company business activity

Not applicable since Crypto Risk Metrics GmbH is not a trading platform.

C.13 Other persons drawing up the crypto-asset white paper according to Article 6(1), second subparagraph, of Regulation (EU) 2023/1114

Not applicable since Crypto Risk Metrics GmbH is not a trading platform.

C.14 Reason for drawing the white paper by persons referred to in Article 6(1), second subparagraph, of Regulation (EU) 2023/1114

Not applicable since Crypto Risk Metrics GmbH is not a trading platform.

Part D – Information about the crypto-asset project

D.1 Crypto-asset project name

Long Name: "Render Token", Short Name: "RENDER" according to the Digital Token Identifier Foundation (www.dtif.org, DTI see F.13, FFG DTI see F.14 as of 2026-07-09).

D.2 Crypto-assets name

Long Name: "Render Token" according to the Digital Token Identifier Foundation (www.dtif.org, DTI see F.13, FFG DTI see F.14 as of 2026-07-09).

D.3 Abbreviation

Short Name: "RENDER" according to the Digital Token Identifier Foundation (www.dtif.org, DTI see F. 13, FFG DTI see F.14 as of 2026-07-09).

D.4 Crypto-asset project description

According to publicly available information (sources: https://rendernetwork.com/; https://renderfoundation.com/, accessed 2026-07-09), the Render Network is a decentralised marketplace for GPU computing. Its stated objective is to connect creators who require high-performance rendering or artificial intelligence computation with node operators who supply otherwise idle GPU capacity, so that computing work is completed at lower cost than conventional in-house rendering while hardware owners monetise unused equipment. Since the completion of the community-approved network upgrade on 2023-11-02, the network settles on the Solana blockchain, after earlier deployments on Ethereum (source: https://medium.com/render-token/render-network-completes-successful-upgrade-to-solana-3d7947b60aed, accessed 2026-07-09).

The principal components of the project are the rendering marketplace itself, in which jobs are submitted, priced in fiat-equivalent terms, escrowed and released to node operators on verified completion; the Burn-and-Mint Equilibrium payment model, under which tokens paid for work are burned and new tokens are emitted on a predefined declining schedule (source: https://know.rendernetwork.com/basics/burn-mint-equilibrium, accessed 2026-07-09); the Render Network Proposal (RNP) governance process, through which token holders propose and vote on changes to the network (source: https://rndr.gitbook.io/render-network-foundation-governance, accessed 2026-07-09); and a compute subnet extending the network beyond rendering to artificial intelligence workloads.

The project was initiated and initially financed by OTOY, Inc., a Delaware technology corporation, which conducted the original issuance of the RENDER token in 2017. Since 2023 the project has been stewarded by The Render Network Foundation, a Cayman Islands foundation company, which administers governance, token emissions, unlocks and ecosystem grants; as part of the

Foundation's creation, control of the core Render Network protocol repositories and of the Render Network brand was transferred to the Foundation, while OTOY, Inc. continues to provide engineering and product development services to it (sources: https://medium.com/render-token/announcing-the-render-network-foundation-d8ef74c364a1; https://bounties.rendernetwork.com/privacy, accessed 2026-07-09). The RENDER token is the payment and governance instrument of this ecosystem. It does not represent a shareholding, profit participation or claim against either entity. The long-term evolution of the project depends on governance outcomes and technical, economic and regulatory considerations, and all future developments remain subject to change.

D.5 Details of all natural or legal persons involved in the implementation of the crypto-asset project

Name of person	Type of person	Business address of person	Domicile of company
The Render Network Foundation	Other person involved in implementation	c/o Leeward Management Limited, Suite 3119, 9 Forum Lane, Camana Bay, PO Box 144, KY1-9006, George Town	Cayman Islands
OTOY, Inc.	Other person involved in implementation	1010 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1604, Los Angeles, CA 90017, United States	United States
RenderLabs	Other person involved in implementation	Cannot be found	Cannot be found
Jules Urbach	Other person involved in implementation	1010 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1604, Los Angeles, CA 90017, United States	United States
Alissa Grainger	Other person involved in implementation	1010 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1604, Los Angeles, CA 90017, United States	United States
Trevor Harries-Jones	Other person involved in implementation	c/o Leeward Management Limited, Suite 3119, 9 Forum Lane, Camana Bay, PO Box 144, KY1-9006, George Town	Cayman Islands
Tristan Relly	Other person involved in implementation	c/o Leeward Management Limited, Suite 3119, 9 Forum Lane, Camana Bay, PO Box 144, KY1-9006, George Town	Cayman Islands
Ryan Shea	Other person involved in implementation	c/o Leeward Management Limited, Suite 3119, 9 Forum Lane, Camana Bay, PO Box 144, KY1-9006, George Town	Cayman Islands
Andrew Hyde	Other person involved in implementation	c/o Leeward Management Limited, Suite 3119, 9 Forum Lane, Camana Bay, PO Box 144, KY1-9006, George Town	Cayman Islands
Silvia Lacayo		Cannot be found	

Name of person	Type of person	Business address of person	Domicile of company
	Other person involved in implementation		Cannot be found

D.6 Utility Token Classification

As defined in Article 3(9) of Regulation (EU) 2023/1114 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 31 May 2023 on Markets in Crypto-Assets – amending Regulations (EU) No 1093/2010 and (EU) No 1095/2010 and Directives 2013/36/EU and (EU) 2019/1937 – a utility token is "a type of crypto-asset that is only intended to provide access to a good or a service supplied by its issuer". This crypto-asset does not qualify as a utility token, as its intended use goes beyond providing access to a good or a service supplied solely by the issuer.

D.7 Key Features of Goods/Services for Utility Token Projects

As defined in Article 3(9) of Regulation (EU) 2023/1114 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 31 May 2023 on Markets in Crypto-Assets – amending Regulations (EU) No 1093/2010 and (EU) No 1095/2010 and Directives 2013/36/EU and (EU) 2019/1937 – a utility token is "a type of crypto-asset that is only intended to provide access to a good or a service supplied by its issuer". This crypto-asset does not qualify as a utility token, as its intended use goes beyond providing access to a good or a service supplied solely by the issuer.

D.8 Plans for the token

This section provides an overview of the historical developments related to the RENDER crypto-asset and a description of planned or anticipated project milestones as publicly communicated. All forward-looking elements are subject to significant uncertainty. They do not constitute commitments, assurances or guarantees, and may be modified, delayed or discontinued at any time.

There is no single formally published roadmap for the RENDER token; project plans are developed and communicated through the Render Network Proposal (RNP) process, the Foundation's publications and the project's public repositories (sources: https://renderfoundation.com/roadmap; https://github.com/rendernetwork/RNPs, accessed 2026-07-09).

Past milestones:

- Public Token Sale (October 2017): OTOY, Inc. conducted the public sale of RNDR tokens at a price of USD 0.25 per token.

- Private Token Sale (January 2018 to May 2018): Additional RNDR tokens were sold through a private sale at USD 0.25 per token, with bonus allocations ranging from 2.5% to 30%.

- Token Migration (March 2018): The total minted supply was set at 536,870,912 RNDR, and holders migrated their tokens on a 1:1 basis to the current Ethereum smart contract.

- Public Network Launch (27 May 2020): The Render Network was launched publicly following a closed beta phase.

- Burn-and-Mint Equilibrium Approved (January 2023): RNP-001 was approved through community governance, introducing the Burn-and-Mint Equilibrium emissions model.

- Establishment of the Render Network Foundation (2023): The Render Network Foundation was announced as the steward of the protocol and its governance framework.

- Migration to Solana (November 2023): RNP-002 completed the migration of the network from Ethereum to Solana. The token ticker changed from RNDR to RENDER while maintaining a 1:1 migration process.

- Foundation Emissions Allocation (2023): RNP-003 approved the allocation of 4,560,000 RENDER from the first year of Burn-and-Mint Equilibrium emissions to the Foundation.

- Upgrade Incentive Programme (November 2023 to October 2024): Under RNP-006, incentive allocations encouraged holders to migrate from RNDR to RENDER. The programme concluded after more than 350 million RNDR had been upgraded.

- Formal Registration of the Render Network Foundation (24 October 2024): The Render Network Foundation was formally registered in the Cayman Islands under registration number CR-394943. A Legal Entity Identifier (LEI) was subsequently issued on 24 November 2025.

- Establishment of RenderLabs (2025): RenderLabs was established as a commercial entity focused on artificial intelligence and distributed computing applications.

- Year 3 Emissions Allocation Approved (December 2025): RNP-022 approved the third-year emissions allocations under the Burn-and-Mint Equilibrium model.

Future milestones:

- Continued Governance Development (From 2026 onwards): The Render Network community may continue to propose and approve protocol upgrades, emissions adjustments, infrastructure enhancements, ecosystem integrations, and additional functionality through the Render Network Proposal (RNP) governance process. The scope, timing and implementation of future proposals remain subject to community governance and may be modified, delayed or not implemented.

Note: All future milestones are subject to significant uncertainty, including but not limited to technical feasibility, regulatory developments, market adoption, and community governance decisions. The project may modify, delay, or discontinue any of these initiatives at any time. Past implementation or performance outcomes do not constitute an indication of future results, and any such changes may materially affect the characteristics, availability, or perceived value of the RENDER crypto-asset for its holders.

D.9 Resource allocation

Based on information from various third-party and industry sources, it is reported that the crypto-asset project associated with the RENDER token has been financed through public and private token sales, together with a subsequent strategic venture capital financing round.

According to publicly referenced information, OTOY, Inc. conducted a public RNDR token sale in October 2017 followed by a private token sale between January and May 2018, both at a stated price of USD 0.25 per token. Project publications indicate that 117,843,239 RNDR, approximately 21.95% of the 536,870,912 total minted supply, had been allocated since the public token sale of October 2017. The project's published allocation framework separately describes 25% of supply as sold, 10% as held in the RNDR Reserve and 65% as held in escrow. Public sources have not consistently disclosed the aggregate proceeds, and early reporting referring to a fundraising target of approximately USD 134,000,000 cannot be reconciled with the subsequently published allocation data and should not be regarded as the amount actually raised.

According to publicly available information, the project subsequently completed a strategic financing round of approximately USD 30,000,000, announced in December 2021 and reportedly led by Multicoin Capital, with participation from Alameda Ventures, Sfermion, Solana Foundation, and angel investors Vinny Lingham and Bill Lee. Public reporting also identifies additional strategic supporters, including Borderless Capital, Kenetic Capital and DFG, although the amounts, dates and terms of their participation have not been consistently disclosed.

Public sources further indicate that, following the transition to the Burn-and-Mint Equilibrium framework, governance approved ecosystem emissions of 9,126,804 RENDER for the first year and 5,905,580 RENDER for the second year. Of the first-year emissions, 4,560,000 RENDER were allocated to the Render Foundation and 1,140,000 RENDER were reserved as migration incentives for holders upgrading RNDR to RENDER. Undistributed emissions are reported to remain locked by the Foundation for future use.

However, all such information is derived exclusively from public announcements, portfolio disclosures, press releases, transparency reports, and third-party publications. The issuer, foundation, or entities associated with the RENDER crypto-asset have not independently confirmed the occurrence, precise amounts, valuation, legal structure, or contractual terms of these reported financing rounds. As a result, the referenced investment amounts, investor participation, and any implied cumulative funding figures cannot be independently verified and should be considered indicative only.

D.10 Planned use of collected funds or crypto-assets

Not applicable, as this white paper serves the purpose of admission to trading and is not associated with any fundraising activity for the crypto-asset project.

Part E – Information about the offer to the public of crypto-assets or their admission to trading

E.1 Public offering or admission to trading

Crypto Risk Metrics GmbH is the person seeking admission to trading.

E.2 Reasons for public offer or admission to trading

The purpose of seeking admission to trading is to enable the crypto-asset to be listed on a regulated platform in accordance with the applicable provisions of Regulation (EU) 2023/1114 and Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2024/2984. The white paper has been drawn up to comply with the transparency requirements applicable to trading venues.

E.3 Fundraising target

Not applicable, as this white paper is written to seek admission to trading, not for the initial offer to the public.

E.4 Minimum subscription goals

Not applicable, as this white paper is written to seek admission to trading, not for the initial offer to the public.

E.5 Maximum subscription goals

Not applicable, as this white paper is written to seek admission to trading, not for the initial offer to the public.

E.6 Oversubscription acceptance

Not applicable, as this white paper is written to seek admission to trading, not for the initial offer to the public.

E.7 Oversubscription allocation

Not applicable, as this white paper is written to seek admission to trading, not for the initial offer to the public.

E.8 Issue price

Not applicable, as this white paper is written to seek admission to trading, not for the initial offer to the public.

E.9 Official currency or any other crypto-assets determining the issue price

Not applicable, as this white paper is written to seek admission to trading, not for the initial offer to the public.

E.10 Subscription fee

Not applicable, as this white paper is written to seek admission to trading, not for the initial offer to the public.

E.11 Offer price determination method

Not applicable, as this white paper is written to seek admission to trading, not for the initial offer to the public.

E.12 Total number of offered/traded crypto-assets

The RENDER token does not have a fixed immutable maximum supply. The legacy RNDR token was launched with an initial maximum supply of 536,870,912 tokens. Following community approval of RNP-001, the network adopted a Burn-and-Mint Equilibrium model under which tokens used to pay for rendering and compute jobs are burned and new tokens are emitted according to a predefined declining schedule approved through governance. According to the Render Foundation's published supply statistics, the reported maximum supply was 644,168,762 RENDER and 1,461,453 RENDER had been cumulatively burned through job payments as at 2026-07-09. The reported maximum supply is established through governance rather than an immutable smart contract limit, and future governance decisions may modify the emission schedule or supply parameters. According to the Render Foundation's published supply statistics, the circulating supply was 554,436,417 RENDER as at 2026-07-09.

Consequently, the circulating and total supply of RENDER may change over time through token emissions, token burns and governance decisions, which may affect the market value and liquidity of the crypto-asset.

E.13 Targeted holders

The admission of the crypto-asset to trading is open to all types of investors.

E.14 Holder restrictions

Holder restrictions are subject to the rules applicable to the crypto-asset service provider, as well as to any additional restrictions such provider may impose.

E.15 Reimbursement notice

Not applicable, as this white paper is written to seek admission to trading, not for the initial offer to the public.

E.16 Refund mechanism

Not applicable, as this white paper is written to seek admission to trading, not for the initial offer to the public.

E.17 Refund timeline

Not applicable, as this white paper is written to seek admission to trading, not for the initial offer to the public.

E.18 Offer phases

Not applicable, as this white paper is written to seek admission to trading, not for the initial offer to the public.

E.19 Early purchase discount

Not applicable, as this white paper is written to seek admission to trading, not for the initial offer to the public.

E.20 Time-limited offer

Not applicable, as this white paper is written to seek admission to trading, not for the initial offer to the public.

E.21 Subscription period beginning

Not applicable, as this white paper is written to seek admission to trading, not for the initial offer to the public.

E.22 Subscription period end

Not applicable, as this white paper is written to seek admission to trading, not for the initial offer to the public.

E.23 Safeguarding arrangements for offered funds/crypto-assets

Not applicable, as this white paper is written to seek admission to trading, not for the initial offer to the public.

E.24 Payment methods for crypto-asset purchase

Not applicable, as this white paper is written to seek admission to trading, not for the initial offer to the public.

E.25 Value transfer methods for reimbursement

Not applicable, as this white paper is written to seek admission to trading, not for the initial offer to the public.

E.26 Right of withdrawal

Not applicable, as this white paper is written to seek admission to trading, not for the initial offer to the public.

E.27 Transfer of purchased crypto-assets

Not applicable, as this white paper is written to seek admission to trading, not for the initial offer to the public.

E.28 Transfer time schedule

Not applicable, as this white paper is written to seek admission to trading, not for the initial offer to the public.

E.29 Purchaser's technical requirements

Not applicable, as this white paper is written to seek admission to trading, not for the initial offer to the public.

E.30 Crypto-asset service provider (CASP) name

Not applicable, as this white paper is written to seek admission to trading, not for the initial offer to the public.

E.31 CASP identifier

Not applicable, as this white paper is written to seek admission to trading, not for the initial offer to the public.

E.32 Placement form

Not applicable, as this white paper is written to seek admission to trading, not for the initial offer to the public.

E.33 Trading platforms name

The admission to trading is sought on Payward Global Solutions LTD ("Kraken").

E.34 Trading platforms Market identifier code (MIC)

The Market Identifier Code (MIC) of Payward Global Solutions LTD ("Kraken") is PGSL.

E.35 Trading platforms access

The token is expected to be listed on the trading platform operated by Payward Global Solutions LTD ("Kraken"). Access to this platform depends on regional availability and user eligibility under Kraken's terms and conditions. Investors should consult Kraken's official documentation to determine whether they meet the requirements for account creation and token trading.

E.36 Involved costs

The costs involved in accessing the trading platform depend on the specific fee structure and terms of the respective crypto-asset service provider. These may include trading fees, deposit or withdrawal charges, and network-related gas fees. Investors are advised to consult the applicable fee schedule of the chosen platform before engaging in trading activities.

E.37 Offer expenses

Not applicable, as this white paper is written to seek admission to trading, not for the initial offer to the public.

E.38 Conflicts of interest

MiCA-compliant crypto-asset service providers shall have strong measures in place in order to manage conflicts of interest. Due to the broad audience this white paper addresses, potential investors should always check the conflicts-of-interest policy of their respective counterparty.

Crypto Risk Metrics GmbH has established, implemented, and documented comprehensive internal policies and procedures for the identification, prevention, management, and documentation of conflicts of interest in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements. These internal measures are actively applied within the organisation. For the purposes of this specific assessment and the crypto-asset covered by this white paper, a token-specific review has been conducted by Crypto Risk Metrics GmbH. Based on this individual review, no conflicts of interest relevant to this crypto-asset have been identified at the time of preparation of this white paper.

E.39 Applicable law

Not applicable, as this white paper is written to seek admission to trading, not for the initial offer to the public.

E.40 Competent court

Not applicable, as this white paper is written to seek admission to trading, not for the initial offer to the public.

Part F – Information about the crypto-assets

F.1 Crypto-asset type

The crypto-asset described in the white paper is classified as a crypto-asset under the Markets in Crypto-Assets Regulation (MiCA) but is neither classified as an electronic money token (EMT) nor an asset-referenced token (ART). It is a digital representation of value that can be stored and transferred using distributed ledger technology (DLT) or similar technology, without embodying or conferring any rights to its holder. The crypto-asset does not aim to maintain a stable value by referencing an official currency, a basket of assets, or any other underlying rights. Instead, its valuation is entirely market-driven, based on supply and demand dynamics, and it is not subject to any stabilisation mechanism. It is neither pegged to any fiat currency nor backed by any external assets, which distinguishes it from EMTs and ARTs. Furthermore, the crypto-asset is not categorised as a financial instrument, deposit, insurance product, pension product, or any other regulated financial product under EU law. It does not grant financial rights, corporate voting rights, or any contractual claims to its holders, and therefore remains outside the scope of regulatory frameworks applicable to traditional financial instruments.

F.2 Crypto-asset functionality

According to publicly available information (source: https://know.rendernetwork.com/, accessed 2026-07-09), RENDER is an SPL token on the Solana network, with legacy RNDR representation on Ethereum (ERC-20). Its primary functions are payment for rendering and artificial intelligence computation services on the Render Network and participation in protocol governance.

Under the Burn-and-Mint Equilibrium model, creators pay for rendering and computation jobs in RENDER. Tokens used to pay for completed jobs are burned, while new tokens are emitted according to a governance-approved emission schedule to reward node operators (source: https://know.rendernetwork.com/basics/burn-mint-equilibrium, accessed 2026-07-09).

RENDER is also used to participate in governance of the Render Network through the Render Network Proposal (RNP) process, under which token holders may vote on proposals relating to the protocol (source: https://rndr.gitbook.io/render-network-foundation-governance, accessed 2026-07-03). These governance functions are technical in nature and do not constitute governance rights over any legal entity.

Beyond payment and protocol governance, RENDER has no further protocol-level functionality as at the date of this white paper. It does not provide any entitlement to ownership, profit participation, revenue sharing, redemption, or staking rewards, is not used to pay network transaction fees on Solana or Ethereum, and does not participate in the consensus mechanism of either network. Legacy RNDR tokens on Ethereum remain exchangeable for RENDER on a 1:1 basis through the official migration mechanism.

The functionality of the RENDER token depends on the continued operation and development of the Render Network and the underlying blockchain infrastructure and may change through future governance decisions.

F.3 Planned application of functionalities

Future milestones:

- Continued Governance Development (From 2026 onwards): The Render Network community may continue to propose and approve protocol upgrades, emissions adjustments, infrastructure enhancements, ecosystem integrations, and additional functionality through the Render Network Proposal (RNP) governance process. The scope, timing and implementation of future proposals remain subject to community governance and may be modified, delayed or not implemented.

Note: All future milestones are subject to significant uncertainty, including but not limited to technical feasibility, regulatory developments, market adoption, and community governance decisions. The project may modify, delay, or discontinue any of these initiatives at any time. Past implementation or performance outcomes do not constitute an indication of future results, and any such changes may materially affect the characteristics, availability, or perceived value of the RENDER crypto-asset for its holders.

A description of the characteristics of the crypto asset, including the data necessary for classification of the crypto-asset white paper in the register referred to in Article 109 of Regulation (EU) 2023/1114, as specified in accordance with paragraph 8 of that Article

F.4 Type of crypto-asset white paper

The white paper type is "Other crypto-assets" (i.e. OTHR).

F.5 The type of submission

The type of submission is MODI (Modified white paper).

F.6 Crypto-asset characteristics

The tokens are crypto-assets other than EMTs and ARTs that are available on the Solana and Ethereum blockchains. The tokens are fungible (up to 18 digits after the decimal point on Ethereum and up to 8 digits after the decimal point on Solana). The crypto-asset constitutes a digital representation recorded on distributed ledger technology and does not confer ownership, governance, profit participation, or any other legally enforceable rights. Any functionalities associated with the token are limited to potential technical features within the relevant platform environment. These functionalities do not represent contractual entitlements and may depend on future development decisions, technical design choices, and operational conditions. The crypto-asset does not embody intrinsic economic value. Instead, its value, if any, is determined exclusively by market dynamics, such as supply, demand, and liquidity in secondary markets.

F.7 Commercial name or trading name

Long Name: "Render Token" according to the Digital Token Identifier Foundation (www.dtif.org, DTI see F.13, FFG DTI see F.14 as of 2026-07-09).

F.8 Website of the issuer

https://renderfoundation.com/

F.9 Starting date of offer to the public or admission to trading

2025-10-20

F.10 Publication date

2025-10-20

F.11 Any other services provided by the issuer

No such services are currently known to be provided by the issuer. However, it cannot be excluded that additional services exist or may be offered in the future outside the scope of Regulation (EU) 2023/1114.

F.12 Language or languages of the crypto-asset white paper

EN

F.13 Digital token identifier code used to uniquely identify the crypto-asset or each of the several crypto assets to which the white paper relates

6WNRFWT13; RQGSSPQ03

F.14 Functionally fungible group digital token identifier

XR0JSKLNZ

F.15 Voluntary data flag

This white paper has been submitted on a mandatory basis under Regulation (EU) 2023/1114.

F.16 Personal data flag

Yes, this white paper contains personal data as defined in Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (the GDPR).

F.17 LEI eligibility

The issuer is eligible for a Legal Entity Identifier (LEI).

F.18 Home Member State

Germany

F.19 Host Member States

Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden

Part G – Information on the rights and obligations attached to the crypto-assets

G.1 Purchaser rights and obligations

The crypto-asset does not grant any legally enforceable or contractual rights or obligations to its holders or purchasers. Any functionalities accessible through the underlying technology are of a purely technical or operational nature and do not constitute rights comparable to ownership, profit participation, governance, or similar entitlements known from traditional financial instruments. Accordingly, holders do not acquire any legally enforceable claim against the issuer of the crypto-asset or any third party.

G.2 Exercise of rights and obligations

As the crypto-asset does not confer any legally enforceable rights or obligations, there are no applicable procedures or conditions for their exercise. Any interaction or functionality that may be available within the project's technical infrastructure – such as participation mechanisms or protocol-level features – serves operational purposes only and does not create, evidence, or constitute any contractual or statutory entitlement.

G.3 Conditions for modifications of rights and obligations

As the crypto-asset does not confer any legally enforceable rights or obligations, there are no conditions or mechanisms for modifying such rights or obligations. Adjustments to the technical protocol, smart contract logic, or related systems may occur in the ordinary course of development or maintenance. Such changes do not alter the legal position of holders, as no contractual rights exist and no rights arise under applicable law or regulation. Holders should not interpret technical updates or governance-related changes as amendments to legally binding entitlements.

G.4 Future public offers

Information on future offers to the public of crypto-assets was not available at the time of writing of this white paper (2026-07-09).

G.5 Issuer retained crypto-assets

The Render Network Foundation receives RENDER through governance-approved allocations under the network's emission model. Under RNP-003, 4,560,000 RENDER from the first year of emissions were allocated to the Foundation to support protocol development, ecosystem growth and grants (source: https://github.com/rendernetwork/RNPs/blob/main/RNP-003.md, accessed 2026-07-09).

The Foundation has not publicly disclosed its current aggregate RENDER holdings. Although it publishes information on bridge escrow balances and undistributed emissions, these figures do not represent the Foundation's total holdings and cannot be used to determine the amount of RENDER currently retained by the Foundation (source: https://stats.renderfoundation.com/, accessed 2026-07-09).

Consequently, the amount of RENDER currently retained by the issuer cannot be determined with certainty from publicly available information.

G.6 Utility token classification

No – the crypto-asset project does not concern utility tokens as defined in Article 3(9) of Regulation (EU) 2023/1114.

G.7 Key features of goods/services of utility tokens

Not applicable, as the crypto-asset described herein is not a utility token.

G.8 Utility tokens redemption

Not applicable, as the crypto-asset described herein is not a utility token.

G.9 Non-trading request

The admission to trading is sought.

G.10 Crypto-assets purchase or sale modalities

Not applicable, as this white paper is written to seek admission to trading, not for the initial offer to the public.

G.11 Crypto-assets transfer restrictions

The crypto-assets themselves are not subject to any technical or contractual transfer restrictions and are generally freely transferable. However, crypto-asset service providers may impose restrictions on buyers or sellers in accordance with applicable laws, internal policies or contractual terms agreed with their clients.

G.12 Supply adjustment protocols

No – there are no fixed protocols that can increase or decrease the supply of the crypto-asset in response to changes in demand as of 2026-07-09.

However, it is possible to decrease the circulating supply by transferring crypto-assets to so-called "burn addresses". These are addresses from which the tokens are no longer intended to be transferred or accessed, effectively removing them from circulation.

G.13 Supply adjustment mechanisms

Not applicable.

G.14 Token value protection schemes

No – the crypto-asset does not have any mechanisms or schemes in place that aim to stabilise or protect its market value. Its value is determined solely by market supply and demand, and may be subject to significant volatility.

G.15 Token value protection schemes description

Not applicable, as the crypto-asset in scope does not have any value protection scheme in place.

G.16 Compensation schemes

No – the crypto-asset does not have any compensation scheme.

G.17 Compensation schemes description

Not applicable, as the crypto-asset in scope does not have any compensation scheme in place.

G.18 Applicable law

This white paper is submitted in the context of an application for admission to trading on a trading platform established in the European Union. Accordingly, this white paper shall be governed by the laws of the Federal Republic of Germany.

G.19 Competent court

Any disputes arising in relation to this white paper or the admission to trading may be brought before the competent courts in Hamburg, Germany.

Part H – information on the underlying technology

H.1 Distributed ledger technology (DLT)

The crypto-asset in scope is implemented on the Ethereum and Solana networks following the standards described below.

H.2 Protocols and technical standards

The crypto-asset that is the subject of this white paper is available on multiple DLT networks. These include: Ethereum and Solana. In general, when evaluating crypto-assets, all implementations across different networks must always be taken into account, as spillover effects can be adverse for investors.

The following applies to Ethereum:

The crypto-asset operates on a defined set of protocols and technical standards that are intended to ensure its security, decentralisation, and functionality. Key items are set out below.

1. Network protocols

Ethereum operates as a decentralised, peer-to-peer network. Nodes communicate using the DevP2P networking stack, with RLPx as the encrypted transport layer for peer-to-peer messages.

Transaction ordering and finality are secured through a Proof-of-Stake (PoS) consensus mechanism. Validators on the Beacon Chain propose blocks, attest to them, and finalise them through Casper FFG operating on top of the LMD-GHOST fork-choice rule. Smart contract execution is performed by the Ethereum Virtual Machine (EVM), which interprets EVM bytecode within the gas limits set by the protocol and by the transaction sender.

2. Transaction and address standards

Ethereum addresses are 20-byte identifiers, derived as the last 20 bytes of the Keccak-256 hash of the uncompressed elliptic-curve public key (excluding the 0x04 prefix). They are commonly

represented as 40-character hexadecimal strings with a 0x prefix and an optional EIP-55 mixed-case checksum.

The protocol currently supports the following transaction types:

- Type 0: legacy transactions (pre-EIP-1559).

- Type 1: access-list transactions (EIP-2930).

- Type 2: dynamic-fee transactions with base-fee burning (EIP-1559).

- Type 3: blob-carrying transactions (EIP-4844), introduced with the Dencun upgrade on 2024-03-13.

- Type 4: set-code transactions (EIP-7702), introduced with the Pectra upgrade on 2025-05-07, allow externally owned accounts (EOAs) to authorise delegated code execution during transactions, without permanently converting the account into a smart contract. This enables features such as transaction batching, sponsored gas payments and delegated signing.

3. Blockchain data structure and block standards

The Ethereum state consists of accounts (externally owned accounts and smart contracts) together with their associated storage and code, organised in Modified Merkle Patricia Tries to allow efficient verification.

Each block contains:

- a block header, comprising the parent hash, state root, transactions root, receipts root, timestamp, gas limit, gas used, and the proposer's signature, among other fields;

- the ordered list of transactions, including smart-contract executions and value transfers; and

- blob commitments, where applicable, referring to data published to the data availability layer under EIP-4844.

Block size is not fixed in bytes. It is constrained by a per-block gas limit, which is adjustable within protocol-defined bounds and currently targets approximately 60 million gas following EIP-7935 (Fusaka, activated on 2025-12-03). EIP-7825 (Fusaka) also introduces a per-transaction gas cap of 16,777,216 gas to improve block composability and resilience against denial-of-service patterns.

The data availability layer used by Layer 2 rollups, introduced through EIP-4844, was further developed by EIP-7691 (Pectra, 2025-05-07), which raised the maximum number of blob commitments per block, and by EIP-7594 (Fusaka, 2025-12-03), which introduced Peer Data Availability Sampling (PeerDAS). PeerDAS enables nodes to verify that blob data has been published by sampling small portions of it, rather than downloading every blob in full. Following PeerDAS,

Ethereum uses Blob Parameter Only (BPO) forks, introduced by EIP-7892, to adjust blob targets and maxima between major upgrades.

4. Upgrade and improvement standards

Ethereum protocol upgrades are coordinated through the Ethereum Improvement Proposal (EIP) process. EIPs are published openly, reviewed by core developers and the wider community, and bundled into named hard-fork upgrades. The most recent network upgrades are the Pectra upgrade (2025-05-07) and the Fusaka upgrade (2025-12-03). The next named upgrade currently under preparation by the Ethereum core developers is referred to as Glamsterdam.

The following applies to Solana:

The crypto-asset is implemented on the Solana blockchain, a decentralised distributed-ledger network designed to support transaction processing and the execution of on-chain programs. The network relies on a set of technical protocols, cryptographic standards, and program frameworks intended to enable secure transaction validation, deterministic execution of instructions, and interoperability across the Solana ecosystem. The most relevant technical standards and protocols are outlined below.

1. Network Architecture and Core Protocols

The Solana network is structured as a peer-to-peer validator network in which independent nodes maintain the distributed ledger and process transactions.

- Solana uses Proof-of-History (PoH) as a cryptographic timing and ordering mechanism, while validator participation and voting are stake-weighted under its Proof-of-Stake model and Tower BFT consensus process.

- Tower BFT: A Byzantine fault tolerant consensus mechanism, derived from PBFT, that governs validator voting and block confirmation.

- Turbine: A block propagation protocol that distributes blocks across the validator network by splitting them into smaller data fragments (“shreds”) and transmitting them through a layered tree-based structure.

- Gulf Stream: A transaction forwarding mechanism that routes transactions directly to upcoming block producers and thereby limits the need for a global transaction mempool.

- Sealevel: A parallel transaction execution engine that enables non-conflicting transactions and programs to execute simultaneously across multiple processing threads.

Together, these mechanisms support transaction processing while maintaining a synchronised and verifiable ledger state across participating validator nodes.

2. Address and Cryptographic Standards

Accounts and transactions on the Solana network rely on defined cryptographic primitives and address formats.

- Account Addresses: Accounts are identified by 32-byte addresses. Externally controlled accounts typically use Ed25519 key pairs, while program-derived addresses (PDAs) are deterministically derived off-curve addresses that do not correspond to a private key.

- Transaction Signatures: Transactions are authorised through Ed25519 signatures associated with the account owner's keypair.

- Hashing: Sequential SHA-256 hashing is used within the Proof-of-History mechanism to generate a verifiable ordering of events.

- Program Derived Addresses (PDAs): Deterministically generated addresses derived through hashing procedures that ensure the resulting address does not correspond to a private key, thereby enabling secure program-controlled accounts.

These cryptographic mechanisms provide the basis for transaction authentication, deterministic account control, and verifiable execution of on-chain instructions.

3. Networking and Data Transmission Standards

Communication between validator nodes and network participants follows defined networking protocols and technical constraints.

- QUIC is used for transaction ingress and TPU-related forwarding paths on Solana validators, alongside other networking channels used across the cluster.

- UDP-based propagation: Utilised for distributing block fragments ("shreds") across the network through the Turbine protocol.

- Transaction size limits: The maximum transaction size of approximately 1,232 bytes is aligned with the IPv6 minimum transmission unit (MTU) after accounting for network headers, and is intended to enable atomic transmission without fragmentation.

- JSON-RPC interfaces: Standardised APIs used by wallets, applications, and infrastructure providers to submit transactions and query blockchain state.

These standards support interoperability between network nodes, developer infrastructure, and user-facing applications interacting with the Solana ledger.

4. Token and Program Standards (Solana Program Library)

Tokens on Solana are commonly implemented using either the original Token Program or the Token Extension Program (Token-2022), each of which defines standardised token behaviour through on-chain program logic.

Within this framework:

- A token type is represented by a mint account, which defines parameters such as total supply and mint authority.

- Individual token balances are stored in token accounts, which hold balances associated with a specific mint and owner address.

- Interactions with tokens occur through instructions executed by the relevant token program rather than through separate token-specific smart contracts.

These programmatic standards enable consistent token management across the Solana ecosystem. Projects may also integrate metadata functionality, for example through the Metaplex Token Metadata Program or, where applicable, through Token-2022 metadata extensions.

5. Protocol Development and Improvement Standards

Technical changes to the Solana protocol may be proposed and discussed through Solana Improvement Documents (SIMDs). These proposals document suggested modifications to protocol behaviour, economic parameters, or technical limits. Accepted changes may be implemented through updates to validator software and related developer tooling used by network participants.

H.3 Technology used

The crypto-asset that is the subject of this white paper is available on multiple DLT networks. These include: Ethereum and Solana. In general, when evaluating crypto-assets, all implementations across different networks must always be taken into account, as spillover effects can be adverse for investors.

The following applies to Ethereum:

1. Decentralised Ledger: The Ethereum blockchain acts as the decentralised ledger and execution environment for ETH transactions and smart-contract operations, including ERC-20 token transfers, maintaining an append-only record of transfers and account balances to support transparency and verifiable settlement.

2. Account Model: Ethereum uses two account types: externally owned accounts (EOAs), which are controlled through private keys, and contract accounts, which are controlled through deployed smart contract code. Following the Pectra upgrade on 2025-05-07, EOAs can additionally authorise delegated code execution through EIP-7702 transactions without permanently converting the account into smart contracts.

3. Private Key Management: Users must securely store the private keys and recovery material associated with their wallets. Loss or compromise of a private key may result in irreversible loss of access to the associated ETH or ERC-20 token balance.

4. Cryptographic Integrity: Ethereum uses ECDSA over the secp256k1 elliptic curve for key generation and digital signatures on the execution layer. Keccak-256 hashing is used for transaction hashing, state hashing and address derivation. Ethereum addresses are derived from the last 20 bytes of the Keccak-256 hash of the public key. On the consensus layer, BLS (Boneh-Lynn-Shacham) signatures are used to aggregate validator attestations under the Proof-of-Stake consensus mechanism.

The following applies to Solana:

1. Solana-Compatible Wallets: The tokens are generally supported by wallets compatible with Solana's token programs.

2. Decentralised Ledger: The Solana blockchain acts as a decentralised ledger for all token transactions, with the intention of preserving a tamper-resistant record of token transfers and ownership in order to ensure both transparency and security.

3. SPL Token Program: Tokens on Solana are commonly implemented using either the original Token Program or the Token Extension Program (Token-2022), which provide standardised on-chain logic for token creation, issuance, transfer, and account management. Unlike the ERC-20 model on Ethereum, where a project typically deploys its own token contract, Solana tokens generally rely on shared token-program infrastructure, which promotes a high degree of standardisation across the ecosystem.

4. Blockchain Scalability: Solana is designed to support high transaction throughput and comparatively low transaction fees, with the intention of enabling efficient token transfers and related on-chain operations.

Security Protocols for Asset Custody and Transactions:

1. Private Key Management: To safeguard their token holdings, users must securely store their wallet's private keys and recovery phrases.

2. Cryptographic Integrity: Solana uses Ed25519 digital signatures to authenticate transactions submitted by authorised signers, thereby supporting the integrity and verifiability of token transfers.

H.4 Consensus mechanism

The crypto-asset that is the subject of this white paper is available on multiple DLT networks. These include: Ethereum and Solana. In general, when evaluating crypto-assets, all implementations across different networks must always be taken into account, as spillover effects can be adverse for investors.

The following applies to Ethereum:

Ethereum uses a Proof-of-Stake (PoS) consensus mechanism introduced with The Merge on 2022-09-15, which replaced the previous Proof-of-Work consensus model. The PoS mechanism is implemented through Gasper, combining Casper-FFG for finality with the LMD-GHOST fork-choice rule for chain selection. Validators participate in consensus by staking ETH through the Beacon Chain. Validators are pseudo-randomly selected to propose new blocks, while other validators attest to the validity of proposed blocks. The network operates using 12-second slots grouped into epochs of 32 slots. Under normal network conditions, finality is typically achieved after two epochs, approximately 12.8 minutes, through Casper-FFG. The LMD-GHOST fork-choice rule determines the canonical chain based on the accumulated weight of validator attestations. Validators that engage in certain malicious behaviour, such as equivocation or contradictory attestations, may be subject to slashing penalties, while offline validators may incur inactivity penalties. Subsequent network upgrades, including Dencun (2024-03-13), Pectra (2025-05-07) and Fusaka (2025-12-03), introduced protocol changes affecting Ethereum's consensus mechanism and Layer 2 functionality.

The following applies to Solana:

Solana uses a combination of Proof-of-History (PoH) and Proof-of-Stake (PoS). The core concepts of the mechanism are intended to work as follows:

Core Concepts

1. Proof-of-History (PoH):

PoH is a cryptographic ordering and timing mechanism that provides evidence that data existed in a particular sequence and that time passed between proofs.

Verifiable Delay Function (VDF): PoH relies on a sequential hash-based proof process that Solana describes as VDF-like. This sequence of hashes provides a verifiable order of events, enabling the network to efficiently agree on the sequence of transactions.

2. Proof-of-Stake (PoS):

Validator Selection: Leader slots are assigned through the network's leader schedule, which is stake-weighted. The more SOL staked, the higher the chance of being selected to validate transactions and produce new blocks.

Delegation: Token holders can delegate their SOL tokens to validators, earning rewards proportional to their stake while contributing to the network's security.

Consensus Process

1. Transaction Validation:

Transactions are broadcasted to the network and collected by validators. Each transaction is validated to ensure it meets the network's criteria, such as having correct signatures and sufficient funds.

2. PoH Sequence Generation:

A validator generates a sequence of hashes using PoH, each containing a timestamp and the previous hash. This process creates a historical record of transactions, establishing a cryptographic clock for the network.

3. Block Production:

The network uses PoS to select a leader validator based on their stake. The leader is responsible for bundling the validated transactions into a block. The leader validator uses the PoH sequence to order transactions within the block, ensuring that all transactions are processed in the correct order.

4. Consensus and Finalisation:

Other validators vote on the ledger state associated with the block. A block may first become confirmed and later finalised once it reaches the network's strongest confirmation state.

Security and Economic Incentives

1. Incentives for Validators:

Block Rewards: Validators earn rewards for producing and validating blocks. These rewards are distributed in SOL tokens and are proportional to the validator's stake and performance.

Transaction Fees: Validators also earn transaction fees from the transactions included in the blocks they produce. These fees provide an additional incentive for validators to process transactions efficiently.

2. Security:

Staking: Staking provides economic alignment, and Solana documentation notes that slashing has been discussed as a future mechanism for intentional malicious behaviour, but is not implemented yet.

Delegated Staking: Token holders can delegate their SOL tokens to validators, intended to enhance network security and decentralisation. Delegators share in the rewards and are incentivised to choose reliable validators.

3. Economic Penalties:

Slashing (planned): Validators can be penalised for malicious behaviour, such as double-signing or producing invalid blocks. This penalty, known as slashing, results in the loss of a portion of the staked tokens, discouraging dishonest actions.

H.5 Incentive mechanisms and applicable fees

The crypto-asset that is the subject of this white paper is available on multiple DLT networks. These include: Ethereum and Solana. In general, when evaluating crypto-assets, all implementations across different networks must always be taken into account, as spillover effects can be adverse for investors.

The following applies to Ethereum:

Ethereum's Proof-of-Stake (PoS) mechanism secures the network through validator incentives and protocol-defined penalties. Validators are required to stake ETH in order to participate in block proposal and attestation activities. A minimum of 32 ETH is required to activate a validator. Following the Pectra upgrade on 2025-05-07, EIP-7251 increased the maximum effective balance per validator from 32 ETH to 2,048 ETH. Validators may receive protocol-defined rewards for proposing blocks, attesting to valid blocks and participating in sync committees. Rewards consist of newly issued ETH and transaction-related fees. Transaction fees on Ethereum follow the mechanism introduced by EIP-1559, under which each transaction includes a base fee that is burned at the protocol level and an optional priority fee paid to the validator proposing the relevant block. Validators that engage in certain malicious behaviour, including equivocation or contradictory attestations, may be subject to slashing penalties. Validators that fail to participate correctly in consensus activities may also incur inactivity penalties. These mechanisms are intended to support validator participation and the economic security of the Ethereum network.

The following applies to Solana:

1. Validators:

Validators participate in block production and voting under Solana's stake-weighted model. They may receive staking-related rewards and a share of transaction-fee income. Under Solana's fee model, the base fee is split between burn and validator compensation, while any prioritisation fee is paid to the validator.

Transaction Fees: Validators earn a portion of the transaction fees paid by users for the transactions they include in the blocks. This is intended to provide an additional financial incentive for validators to process transactions efficiently and maintain the network's integrity.

2. Delegators:

Delegated Staking: Token holders who do not wish to run a validator node can delegate their SOL tokens to a validator. In return, delegators share the rewards earned by the validators. This is intended to encourage widespread participation in securing the network and to support decentralisation.

3. Economic Security:

Solana staking documentation notes slashing as a possible future mechanism for intentional malicious conduct, but states that slashing is not implemented in the protocol today. Economic alignment instead currently arises primarily from staking participation, validator performance incentives, and the opportunity cost of locking capital in staking positions.

Fees Applicable on the Solana Blockchain

1. Transaction Fees:

Solana transactions require fees in SOL. The fee model consists of a base fee and, where used, an optional prioritisation fee. The base fee compensates signature verification work and is split between burn and validator compensation, while any prioritisation fee is paid to the validator.

2. Rent Fees:

Solana accounts that store on-chain state must satisfy the rent-exemption threshold, which is linked to the amount of data stored. This mechanism is intended to support efficient use of network state and account storage resources.

3. Program Execution Costs:

Deploying and interacting with on-chain programs may involve transaction fees and, where relevant, compute-related prioritisation fees and account-storage requirements. These mechanisms are intended to allocate network resources in proportion to use.

H.6 Use of distributed ledger technology

No – DLT is not operated by the issuer, the offeror, the person seeking admission to trading, or any third party acting on their behalf.

H.7 DLT functionality description

Not applicable, as the DLT is not operated by the issuer, the offeror, the person seeking admission to trading, or any third party acting on their behalf.

H.8 Audit

Given the breadth of the term “technology”, it cannot be confirmed that all elements or aspects of the technology employed have undergone a comprehensive and systematic technical examination. Accordingly, no comprehensive audit of the technology used can be confirmed. This white paper focuses primarily on risk-related aspects and therefore does not imply, nor should it be interpreted as implying, that a full assessment or audit of all technological elements has been conducted.

H.9 Audit outcome

Not applicable, as no comprehensive audit of the technology used has been conducted or can be confirmed.

Part I – Information on risks

I.1 Offer-related risks

1. Regulatory and Compliance

Regulatory frameworks applicable to crypto-asset services in the European Union and in third countries are evolving. Supervisory authorities may introduce, interpret, or enforce rules that affect (i) the eligibility of this crypto-asset for admission to trading, (ii) the conditions under which a crypto-asset service provider may offer trading, custody, or transfer services for it, or (iii) the persons or jurisdictions to which such services may be provided. As a result, the crypto-asset service provider admitting this crypto-asset to trading may be required to suspend, restrict, or terminate trading or withdrawals for regulatory reasons, even if the crypto-asset itself continues to function on its underlying network.

2. Trading venue and connection risk

Trading in the crypto-asset depends on the uninterrupted operation of the trading venues on which it is listed and, where applicable, on its technical connections to external liquidity sources or venues. Interruptions such as system downtime, maintenance, faulty integrations, API changes, or failures at an external venue can temporarily prevent order placement, execution, deposits, or withdrawals, even when the underlying blockchain is functioning. In addition, trading platforms in emerging markets may operate under differing governance, compliance, and oversight standards, which can increase the risk of operational failures or disorderly market conditions.

3. Market formation and liquidity conditions

The price and tradability of the crypto-asset depend on actual trading activity on the venues to which the service provider is connected, whether centralised exchanges (CEXs) or decentralised exchanges (DEXs). Trading volumes may at times be low, order books thin, or liquidity concentrated on a single venue. In such conditions, buy or sell orders may not be executed in full or may be executed only at a less favourable price, resulting in slippage.

Volatility: The market price of the crypto-asset may fluctuate significantly over short periods, including for reasons that are not linked to changes in the underlying project or protocol. Periods of limited liquidity, shifts in overall market sentiment, or trading on only a small number of CEXs or DEXs can amplify these movements and lead to higher slippage when orders are executed. As a result, investors may be unable to sell the crypto-asset at or close to a previously observed price, even where no negative project-specific event has occurred.

4. Counterparty and service provider dependence

The admission of the crypto-asset to trading may rely on several external parties, such as connected centralised or decentralised trading venues, liquidity providers, brokers, custodians, or technical integrators. If any of these counterparties fail to perform, suspend their services, or apply internal restrictions, the trading, deposit, or withdrawal of the crypto-asset on the listing crypto-asset service provider can be interrupted or halted.

Quality of counterparties: Trading venues and service providers in certain jurisdictions may operate under regulatory or supervisory standards that are lower or differently enforced than those applicable in the European Union. In such environments, deficiencies in governance, risk management, or compliance may remain undetected, which increases the probability of abrupt service interruptions, investigations, or forced wind-downs.

Delisting and service suspension: The crypto-asset's availability may depend on the internal listing decisions of these counterparties. A delisting or suspension on a key connected venue can materially reduce liquidity or make trading temporarily impossible on the admitting service provider, even if the underlying crypto-asset continues to function.

Insolvency of counterparties: If a counterparty involved in holding, routing, or settling the crypto-asset becomes insolvent, enters restructuring, or is otherwise subject to resolution measures, assets held or processed by that counterparty may be frozen, become temporarily unavailable, or be recoverable only in part or not at all, which can result in losses for clients whose positions were maintained through that counterparty. This risk applies in particular where client assets are held on an omnibus basis or where segregation is not fully recognised in the counterparty's jurisdiction.

5. Operational and information risks

Due to the irrevocability of blockchain transactions, incorrect transaction approvals or the use of wrong networks or addresses will typically make the transferred funds irrecoverable. Because trading may also rely on technical connections to other venues or service providers, downtime or faulty code in these connections can temporarily block trading, deposits, or withdrawals even when the underlying blockchain is functioning. In addition, different groups of market participants may have unequal access to technical, governance, or project-related information, which can lead to information asymmetry and place less informed investors at a disadvantage when making trading decisions.

6. Market access and liquidity concentration risk

If the crypto-asset is only available on a limited number of trading platforms or through a single market-making entity, this may result in reduced liquidity, greater price volatility, or periods of inaccessibility for retail holders.

I.2 Issuer-related risks

1. Insolvency of the issuer

As with any commercial entity, the issuer may face insolvency risks. These may result from insufficient funding, low market interest, mismanagement, or external shocks (e.g. pandemics,

armed conflicts). In such a case, ongoing development, support, and governance of the project may cease, potentially affecting the viability and tradability of the crypto-asset.

2. Legal and regulatory risks

The issuer operates in a dynamic and evolving regulatory environment. Failure to comply with applicable laws or regulations in relevant jurisdictions may result in enforcement actions, penalties, or restrictions on the project's operations. These may negatively impact the crypto-asset's availability, market acceptance, or legal status.

3. Operational risks

The issuer may fail to implement adequate internal controls, risk management, or governance processes. This can result in operational disruptions, financial losses, delays in updating the white paper, or reputational damage.

4. Governance and decision-making

The issuer's management body is responsible for key strategic, operational, and disclosure decisions. Ineffective governance, delays in decision-making, or lack of resources may compromise the stability of the project and its compliance with MiCA requirements. High concentration of decision-making authority or changes in ownership/control can amplify these risks.

5. Reputational risks

The issuer's reputation may be harmed by internal failures, external accusations, or association with illicit activity. Negative publicity can reduce trust in the issuer and impact the perceived legitimacy or value of the crypto-asset.

6. Counterparty dependence

The issuer may depend on third-party providers for certain core functions, such as technology development, marketing, legal advice, or infrastructure. If these partners discontinue their services, change ownership, or underperform, the issuer's ability to operate the project or maintain investor communication may be impaired. This could disrupt project continuity or undermine market confidence, ultimately affecting the crypto-asset's value.

I.3 Crypto-assets-related risks

1. Valuation risk

The crypto-asset does not represent a claim, nor is it backed by physical assets or legal entitlements. Its market value is driven solely by supply and demand dynamics and may fluctuate significantly. In the absence of fundamental value anchors, such assets can lose their entire market value within a very short time. Historical market behaviour has shown that some types of crypto-

assets have become worthless. Investors should be aware that this crypto-asset may lose all of its value.

2. Market volatility risk

Crypto-asset prices can fluctuate sharply due to changes in market sentiment, macroeconomic conditions, regulatory developments, or technology trends. Such volatility may result in rapid and significant losses. Holders should be prepared for the possibility of losing the full amount invested.

3. Liquidity and price-determination risk

Low trading volumes, fragmented trading across venues, or the absence of active market makers can restrict the ability to buy or sell the crypto-asset. In such situations, it is not guaranteed that an observable market price will exist at all times. Spreads may widen materially, and orders may only be executable under unfavourable conditions, which can make liquidation costly or temporarily impossible.

4. Crypto-asset security risk

Loss or theft of private keys, unauthorised access to wallets, or failures of custodial or exchange service providers can result in the irreversible loss of assets. Because blockchain transactions are final, recovery of funds after a compromise is generally impossible.

5. Fraud and scam risk

The pseudonymous and irreversible nature of blockchain transactions can attract fraudulent schemes. Typical forms include fake or unauthorised crypto-assets imitating established ones, phishing attempts, deceptive airdrops, or social-engineering attacks. Investors should exercise caution and verify the authenticity of counterparties and information sources.

6. Legal and regulatory reclassification risk

Legislative or regulatory changes in the European Union or in the Member State where the crypto-asset is admitted to trading may alter its legal classification, permitted uses, or tradability. In third countries, the crypto-asset may be treated as a financial instrument or security, which can restrict its offering, trading, or custody.

7. Absence of investor protection

The crypto-asset is not covered by investor-compensation or deposit-guarantee schemes. In the event of loss, fraud, or insolvency of a service provider, holders may have no access to recourse mechanisms typically available in regulated financial markets.

8. Counterparty risk

Reliance on third-party exchanges, custodians, or intermediaries exposes holders to operational failures, insolvency, or fraud of these parties. Investors should conduct due diligence on service providers, as their failure may lead to the partial or total loss of held assets.

9. Reputational risk

Negative publicity related to security incidents, misuse of blockchain technology, or associations with illicit activity can damage public confidence and reduce the crypto-asset's market value.

10. Community and sentiment risk

Because the crypto-asset's perceived relevance and expected future use depend largely on community engagement and the prevailing sentiment, a loss of public interest, negative coverage or reduced activity of key contributors can materially reduce market demand.

11. Macroeconomic and interest-rate risk

Fluctuations in interest rates, exchange rates, general market conditions, or overall market volatility can influence investor sentiment towards digital assets and affect the crypto-asset's market value.

12. Taxation risk

Tax treatment varies across jurisdictions. Holders are individually responsible for complying with all applicable tax laws, including the reporting and payment of taxes arising from the acquisition, holding, or disposal of the crypto-asset.

13. Anti-money-laundering and counter-terrorist financing risk

Wallet addresses or transactions connected to the crypto-asset may be linked to sanctioned or illicit activity. Regulatory responses to such findings may include transfer restrictions, reporting obligations, or the freezing of assets on certain venues.

14. Market-abuse risk

Due to limited oversight and transparency, crypto-assets may be vulnerable to market-abuse practices such as spoofing, pump-and-dump schemes, or insider trading. Such activities can distort prices and expose holders to sudden losses.

15. Legal ownership and jurisdictional risk

Depending on the applicable law, holders of the crypto-asset may not have enforceable ownership rights or effective legal remedies in cases of disputes, fraud, or service failure. In certain jurisdictions, access to exchanges or interfaces may be restricted by regulatory measures, even if on-chain transfer remains technically possible.

16. Concentration risk

A large proportion of the total supply may be held by a small number of holders. This can enable market manipulation, governance dominance, or sudden large-scale liquidations that adversely affect market stability, price levels, and investor confidence.

I.4 Project implementation-related risks

As this white paper relates to admission to trading of the crypto-asset, the risk description below reflects general implementation risks typically associated with crypto-asset projects and relevant for the crypto-asset service provider. The party admitting the crypto-asset to trading is not involved in the project's implementation and does not assume responsibility for its governance, funding, or execution.

Delays, failures, or changes in the implementation of the project as outlined in its public roadmap or technical documentation may negatively impact the perceived credibility or usability of the crypto-asset. This includes risks related to project governance, resource allocation, technical delivery, and team continuity.

Key-person risk: The project may rely on a limited number of individuals for development, maintenance, or strategic direction. The departure, incapacity, or misalignment of these individuals may delay or derail the implementation.

Timeline and milestone risk: Project milestones may not be met as announced. Delays in feature releases, protocol upgrades, or external integrations can undermine market confidence and affect the adoption, use, or value of the crypto-asset.

Delivery risk: Even if implemented on time, certain functionalities or integrations may not perform as intended or may be scaled back during execution, limiting the crypto-asset's practical utility.

I.5 Technology-related risks

As this white paper relates to admission to trading of the crypto-asset, the following risks concern the underlying distributed ledger technology (DLT), its supporting infrastructure, and related technical dependencies. Failures or vulnerabilities in these systems may affect the availability, integrity, or transferability of the crypto-asset.

1. Blockchain dependency risk

The functionality of the crypto-asset depends on the continuous and stable operation of the blockchain(s) on which it is issued. Network congestion, outages, or protocol errors may temporarily or permanently disrupt on-chain transactions. Extended downtime or degradation in network performance can affect trading, settlement, or the usability of the crypto-asset.

2. Smart contract vulnerability risk

The smart contract that defines the crypto-asset's parameters or governs its transfers may contain coding errors or security vulnerabilities. Exploitation of such weaknesses can result in unintended token minting, permanent loss of funds, or disruption of token functionality. Even after external audits, undetected vulnerabilities may persist due to the immutable nature of deployed code.

3. Wallet and key-management risk

The custody of crypto-assets relies on secure private key management. Loss, theft, or compromise of private keys results in irreversible loss of access. Custodians, trading venues, or wallet providers may be targeted by cyberattacks. Compatibility issues between wallet software and changes to the blockchain protocol (e.g. network upgrades) can further limit user access or the ability to transfer the crypto-asset.

Outdated or vulnerable wallet software:

Users relying on outdated, unaudited, or unsupported wallet software may face compatibility issues, security vulnerabilities, or failures when interacting with the blockchain. Failure to update wallet software in line with protocol developments can result in transaction errors, loss of access, or exposure to known exploits.

4. Network security risks

Attack risks: Blockchains may be subject to denial-of-service (DoS) attacks, 51% attacks, or other exploits targeting the consensus mechanism. These can delay transactions, compromise finality, or disrupt the accurate recording of transfers.

Centralisation concerns: Despite claims of decentralisation, a relatively small number of validators, storage providers, stake, storage power, or similar network-relevant concentration factors may increase the risk of collusion, censorship, or coordinated network downtime, which can affect the resilience and operational reliability of the crypto-asset.

5. Bridge and interoperability risk

Where tokens can be bridged or wrapped across multiple blockchains, vulnerabilities in bridge protocols, validator sets, or locking mechanisms may result in loss, duplication, or misrepresentation of assets. Exploits or technical failures in these systems can instantly impact circulating supply, ownership claims, or token fungibility across chains.

6. Forking and protocol-upgrade risk

Network upgrades or disagreements among node operators or validators can result in blockchain "forks", where the blockchain splits into two or more incompatible versions that continue separately from a shared past. This may lead to duplicate token representations or incompatibilities between exchanges and wallets. Until consensus stabilises, trading or transfers may be disrupted or misaligned. Such situations may be difficult for retail holders to navigate, particularly when trading platforms or wallets display inconsistent token information.

7. Economic-layer and abstraction risk

Mechanisms such as gas relayers, wrapped tokens, or synthetic representations may alter the transaction economics of the underlying token. Changes in transaction costs, token demand, or utility may reduce its usage and weaken both its economic function and perceived value within its ecosystem.

8. Spam and network-efficiency risk

High volumes of low-value ("dust") or automated transactions may congest the network, slow validation times, inflate ledger size, and raise transaction costs. This can impair performance, reduce throughput, and expose address patterns to analysis, thereby reducing network efficiency and privacy.

9. Front-end and access-interface risk

If users rely on centralised web interfaces or hosted wallets to interact with the blockchain, service outages, malicious compromises, or domain expiries affecting these interfaces may block access to the crypto-asset, even while the blockchain itself remains fully functional. Dependence on single web portals introduces a critical point of failure outside the DLT layer.

10. Decentralisation claim risk

While the technical infrastructure may appear distributed, the actual governance or economic control of the project may lie with a small set of actors. This disconnect between marketing claims and structural reality can lead to regulatory scrutiny, reputational damage, or legal uncertainty – especially if the project is presented as 'community-governed' without substantiation.

I.6 Mitigation measures

None.

Part J – Information on the sustainability indicators in relation to adverse impact on the climate and other environment-related adverse impacts

J.1 Adverse impacts on climate and other environment-related adverse impacts

S.1 Name

Crypto Risk Metrics GmbH

S.2 Relevant legal entity identifier

39120077M9TG0O1FE242

S.3 Name of the crypto-asset

Render Token

S.4 Consensus Mechanism

The crypto-asset that is the subject of this white paper is available on multiple DLT networks. These include: Ethereum and Solana. In general, when evaluating crypto-assets, all implementations across different networks must always be taken into account, as spillover effects can be adverse for investors.

The following applies to Ethereum:

Ethereum uses a Proof-of-Stake (PoS) consensus mechanism introduced with The Merge on 2022-09-15, which replaced the previous Proof-of-Work consensus model. The PoS mechanism is implemented through Gasper, combining Casper-FFG for finality with the LMD-GHOST fork-choice rule for chain selection. Validators participate in consensus by staking ETH through the Beacon Chain. Validators are pseudo-randomly selected to propose new blocks, while other validators attest to the validity of proposed blocks. The network operates using 12-second slots grouped into epochs of 32 slots. Under normal network conditions, finality is typically achieved after two epochs, approximately 12.8 minutes, through Casper-FFG. The LMD-GHOST fork-choice rule determines the canonical chain based on the accumulated weight of validator attestations. Validators that engage in certain malicious behaviour, such as equivocation or contradictory attestations, may be subject to slashing penalties, while offline validators may incur inactivity penalties. Subsequent network upgrades, including Dencun (2024-03-13), Pectra (2025-05-07) and Fusaka (2025-12-03), introduced protocol changes affecting Ethereum's consensus mechanism and Layer 2 functionality.

The following applies to Solana:

Solana uses a combination of Proof-of-History (PoH) and Proof-of-Stake (PoS). The core concepts of the mechanism are intended to work as follows:

Core Concepts

1. Proof-of-History (PoH):

PoH is a cryptographic ordering and timing mechanism that provides evidence that data existed in a particular sequence and that time passed between proofs.

Verifiable Delay Function (VDF): PoH relies on a sequential hash-based proof process that Solana describes as VDF-like. This sequence of hashes provides a verifiable order of events, enabling the network to efficiently agree on the sequence of transactions.

2. Proof-of-Stake (PoS):

Validator Selection: Leader slots are assigned through the network's leader schedule, which is stake-weighted. The more SOL staked, the higher the chance of being selected to validate transactions and produce new blocks.

Delegation: Token holders can delegate their SOL tokens to validators, earning rewards proportional to their stake while contributing to the network's security.

Consensus Process

1. Transaction Validation:

Transactions are broadcasted to the network and collected by validators. Each transaction is validated to ensure it meets the network's criteria, such as having correct signatures and sufficient funds.

2. PoH Sequence Generation:

A validator generates a sequence of hashes using PoH, each containing a timestamp and the previous hash. This process creates a historical record of transactions, establishing a cryptographic clock for the network.

3. Block Production:

The network uses PoS to select a leader validator based on their stake. The leader is responsible for bundling the validated transactions into a block. The leader validator uses the PoH sequence to order transactions within the block, ensuring that all transactions are processed in the correct order.

4. Consensus and Finalisation:

Other validators vote on the ledger state associated with the block. A block may first become confirmed and later finalised once it reaches the network's strongest confirmation state.

Security and Economic Incentives

1. Incentives for Validators:

Block Rewards: Validators earn rewards for producing and validating blocks. These rewards are distributed in SOL tokens and are proportional to the validator's stake and performance.

Transaction Fees: Validators also earn transaction fees from the transactions included in the blocks they produce. These fees provide an additional incentive for validators to process transactions efficiently.

2. Security:

Staking: Staking provides economic alignment, and Solana documentation notes that slashing has been discussed as a future mechanism for intentional malicious behaviour, but is not implemented yet.

Delegated Staking: Token holders can delegate their SOL tokens to validators, intended to enhance network security and decentralisation. Delegators share in the rewards and are incentivised to choose reliable validators.

3. Economic Penalties:

Slashing (planned): Validators can be penalised for malicious behaviour, such as double-signing or producing invalid blocks. This penalty, known as slashing, results in the loss of a portion of the staked tokens, discouraging dishonest actions.

S.5 Incentive Mechanisms and Applicable Fees

The crypto-asset that is the subject of this white paper is available on multiple DLT networks. These include: Ethereum and Solana. In general, when evaluating crypto-assets, all implementations across different networks must always be taken into account, as spillover effects can be adverse for investors.

The following applies to Ethereum:

Ethereum's Proof-of-Stake (PoS) mechanism secures the network through validator incentives and protocol-defined penalties. Validators are required to stake ETH in order to participate in block proposal and attestation activities. A minimum of 32 ETH is required to activate a validator. Following the Pectra upgrade on 2025-05-07, EIP-7251 increased the maximum effective balance per validator from 32 ETH to 2,048 ETH. Validators may receive protocol-defined rewards for proposing blocks, attesting to valid blocks and participating in sync committees. Rewards consist of newly issued ETH and transaction-related fees. Transaction fees on Ethereum follow the mechanism introduced by EIP-1559, under which each transaction includes a base fee that is burned at the protocol level and an optional priority fee paid to the validator proposing the relevant block. Validators that engage in certain malicious behaviour, including equivocation or contradictory attestations, may be subject to slashing penalties. Validators that fail to participate correctly in consensus activities may also incur inactivity penalties. These mechanisms are intended to support validator participation and the economic security of the Ethereum network.

The following applies to Solana:

1. Validators:

Validators participate in block production and voting under Solana's stake-weighted model. They may receive staking-related rewards and a share of transaction-fee income. Under Solana's fee

model, the base fee is split between burn and validator compensation, while any prioritisation fee is paid to the validator.

Transaction Fees: Validators earn a portion of the transaction fees paid by users for the transactions they include in the blocks. This is intended to provide an additional financial incentive for validators to process transactions efficiently and maintain the network's integrity.

2. Delegators:

Delegated Staking: Token holders who do not wish to run a validator node can delegate their SOL tokens to a validator. In return, delegators share the rewards earned by the validators. This is intended to encourage widespread participation in securing the network and to support decentralisation.

3. Economic Security:

Solana staking documentation notes slashing as a possible future mechanism for intentional malicious conduct, but states that slashing is not implemented in the protocol today. Economic alignment instead currently arises primarily from staking participation, validator performance incentives, and the opportunity cost of locking capital in staking positions.

Fees Applicable on the Solana Blockchain

1. Transaction Fees:

Solana transactions require fees in SOL. The fee model consists of a base fee and, where used, an optional prioritisation fee. The base fee compensates signature verification work and is split between burn and validator compensation, while any prioritisation fee is paid to the validator.

2. Rent Fees:

Solana accounts that store on-chain state must satisfy the rent-exemption threshold, which is linked to the amount of data stored. This mechanism is intended to support efficient use of network state and account storage resources.

3. Program Execution Costs:

Deploying and interacting with on-chain programs may involve transaction fees and, where relevant, compute-related prioritisation fees and account-storage requirements. These mechanisms are intended to allocate network resources in proportion to use.

S.6 Beginning of the period to which the disclosure relates

2024-08-16

S.7 End of the period to which the disclosure relates

2025-08-16

S.8 Energy consumption

983.59572 kWh/a

S.9 Energy consumption sources and methodologies

The energy consumption of this crypto-asset is aggregated across multiple components. To determine the energy consumption of the crypto-asset, the energy consumption of the Ethereum and Solana networks is first calculated. A proportion of each network's energy consumption is then attributed to the crypto-asset based on its level of activity on the respective network. When calculating the energy consumption, the Functionally Fungible Group Digital Token Identifier (FFG DTI) is used, where available, to identify all implementations of the crypto-asset within scope. These mappings are updated regularly based on data provided by the Digital Token Identifier Foundation. The information regarding the hardware used and the number of network participants is based on assumptions that are verified to the best of our ability using empirical data. In general, network participants are assumed to act in an economically rational manner. As a precautionary principle, conservative assumptions are applied where uncertainty exists, resulting in higher estimates of potential adverse impacts.

S.10 Renewable energy consumption

26.5813674570 %

S.11 Energy intensity

0.00001 kWh

S.12 Scope 1 DLT GHG emissions – Controlled

0.00000 tCO2e/a

S.13 Scope 2 DLT GHG emissions – Purchased

0.32790 tCO2e/a

S.14 GHG intensity

0.00000 kgCO2e

S.15 Key energy sources and methodologies

To determine the proportion of renewable energy usage, the locations of the nodes are determined using public information sites, open-source and in-house-developed crawlers. Where no information is available on the geographic distribution of nodes, comparable reference networks are used, taking into account similarities in incentivisation structure and consensus mechanism. This geographic information is then combined with publicly available data from Our World in Data. The resulting intensity is calculated as the marginal energy consumption with respect to one additional transaction.

Ember (2025); Energy Institute, Statistical Review of World Energy (2024), with major processing by Our World in Data. "Share of electricity generated by renewables - Ember and Energy Institute" [dataset]. Underlying sources: Ember, "Yearly Electricity Data Europe"; Ember, "Yearly Electricity Data"; Energy Institute, "Statistical Review of World Energy". Retrieved from: https://ourworldindata.org/grapher/share-electricity-renewables

S.16 Key GHG sources and methodologies

To determine GHG emissions, the locations of the nodes are determined using public information sites, open-source crawlers, and crawlers developed in-house. Where no information is available on the geographic distribution of nodes, comparable reference networks are used, taking into account similarities in incentivisation structure and consensus mechanism. This geographic information is then combined with publicly available data from Our World in Data. The resulting intensity is calculated as the marginal emission intensity with respect to one additional transaction.

Ember (2025); Energy Institute, Statistical Review of World Energy (2024), with major processing by Our World in Data. "Carbon intensity of electricity generation – Ember and Energy Institute" [dataset]. Underlying sources: Ember, "Yearly Electricity Data Europe"; Ember, "Yearly Electricity Data"; Energy Institute, "Statistical Review of World Energy". Retrieved from: https://ourworldindata.org/grapher/carbon-intensity-electricity. Licensed under CC BY 4.0.

CRYPTO RISK METRICS
DON'T TRUST. VERIFY.