Table 2 Template for white papers for crypto-assets other than asset-referenced tokens or e-money tokens

No	FIELD	CONTENT TO BE REPORTED	FORM AND STANDARDS TO BE USED FOR REPORTING
00	200 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100	Mandatory Statements and Compliance Declarations (Fields 01-06) Summary (Fields 07-10)	Alphanumerical text
	1	Part A - Information about the offeror or the person seeking admission to trading (Fields A.1-A.17)	
		Part B - Information about the issuer (if different from the offeror) (Fields B.1-B.12)	
		Part C - Information about the operator of the trading platform (where applicable) (Fields C.1-C.14)	
		Part D - Information about the crypto-asset project (Fields D.1-D.10)	
		Part E - Information about the offer to the public or admission to trading (Fields E.1-E.40)	
		Part F - Information about the crypto-assets (Fields F.1-F.19)	
		Part G - Information on the rights and obligations attached to the crypto-assets (Fields G.1-G.19)	
		Part H - Information on the underlying technology (Fields H.1-H.9)	
		Part I - Information on risks (Fields I.1-I.6)	
		Part J - Information on sustainability indicators (Field J.1)	
01	Date of notification	Date of notification	2025-09-30

02	Statement in	Regarding offerors:	Predefined
	accordance with Article 6(3) of Regulation (EU) 2023/1114	authority in any Member State of the European Union. The offeror of the crypto-asset is solely responsible for the content of this crypto-asset white paper.'	
		Regarding the persons seeking admission to trading:  '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.'	
		Regarding the operators of trading platforms:  'This crypto-asset white paper has not been approved by any competent authority in any Member State of the European Union. The operator of the trading platform of the crypto-asset is solely responsible for the content of this crypto-asset white paper.'	

)3	Compliance statement in accordance with	'This crypto-asset white paper complies with Title II of Regulation (EU) Predefined 2023/1114 of the European Parliament and of the Council and, to the best alphanumerical text
	Article 6(6) of Regulation (EU)	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.'
	2023/1114	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.'	Predefined alphanumerical text
05	Article 6(5) point		

06	Statement in accordance with	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	Predefined
		of the Council or the deposit guarantee schemes under Directive 2014/49/EU of	(T)
	- E	the European Parliament and of the Council.	
	Regulation (EU)		
	2023/1114		
SUMMAR	Y		

)7	Warning in	Warning	Predefined
	accordance with Article 6(7), second		alphanumerical text
	Regulation (EU) 2023/1114	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 no on the summary alone.	
	I	The offer to the public of this crypto-asset does not constitute an offer of solicitation to purchase financial instruments and any such offer of solicitation can be made only by means of a prospectus or other offer documents pursuant to the applicable national law.	r
	<b>I</b>	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	SYRUP is the governance token of the Maple ecosystem, powering both Maple	Free alphanumerical
	the crypto-asset	Institutional and Syrup.fi platforms. The token serves multiple key functions: i) Governance Rights: SYRUP holders can participate in protocol governance by staking their	text
		tokens and voting on key decisions affecting the ecosystem's future; ii) Staking Mechanism: Token holders can stake SYRUP to receive stSYRUP, a representation of staked SYRUP that enables governance participation and reward accrual. stSYRUP is not a separate token but a mechanism within the SYRUP smart contract.	
		The token does not represent any ownership in any company or entity, nor does it confer any rights to dividends or profit-sharing. It is purely a utility and governance token within the Maple ecosystem.	

09		Free alphanumerical text
		ICAL

Key information	1,100,000,000 is the initial supply at migration (November 2024),	Free alphanumerical
1-76	1,154,930,000 reflects the supply at a specific point (e.g., March 2025,	text
	accounting for 5% inflation), and 1,228,740,800 is a projection. The total	
	number of SYRUP tokens admitted to trading reflects the initial supply plus	
_	inflation to date; exact figures depend on staking participation and governance	
	decisions.	
	Target holders: The token distribution targets both retail and institutional	
	participants in the Maple ecosystem, particularly those interested in	
	participating in protocol governance and institutional lending activities.	

I WI II	Part A - Information about the offeror or the person seeking admission to trading					
A.1	Name	Maple DAO (BVI) Limited	Free alphanumerical text			
A.2	Legal form	Company Limited by Shares	ISO standard 20275 'Financial Services – Entity Legal Forms (ELF)'			
A.3	Registered address	Craigmuir Chambers, Road Town, Tortola, VG 1110, British Virgin Islands	ISO standard 3166-1 alpha 2 country codes and codes for their subdivisions			
			Free alphanumerical text			
A.4	Head office	Craigmuir Chambers, Road Town, Tortola, VG 1110, British Virgin Islands	ISO standard 3166-1 alpha 2 country codes and codes for their subdivisions			
			and			
			Free alphanumerical text			

A.5	Registration date	2023-07-12	ISO 8601 date format (YYYY-MM-DD)
A.6	Legal entity identifier	984500X1FBE3CED5HF70	{LEI}
<b>A</b> .7	Another identifier required pursuant to applicable national law	2128007	Free text
A.8	Contact telephone number	+593999543823	Free alphanumerical text
A.9	E-mail address	legal@maple.finance	Free alphanumerical text
A.10	Response time (Days)	3	{DURATION}

A.11	Parent company	Maple DAO Foundation			Free alphanumerical text
A.12	Members of the management body				Free alphanumerical text presented in a
	management body	Name	Business Address	Function	tabular format
		Maple DAO Foundation	4th Floor, Harbour Place 103 South Church St., George Town, Grand Cayman, KY1-1002, Cayman Islands.	Director	
		David Acutt	South Church St. 916D Georgetown Grand Cayman KY1-9001 Cayman Islands	Director of Maple DAO Foundation	
A.13					Free alphanumerical text

		are executed transparently and in accordance with pre-defined protocols. The Platform leverages off the above-mentioned ecosystem and provides access to institutional yield, empowering users of the Platform (the "Users") to generate yield by connecting their wallets, lending stablecoin funds and earning of interest (the "Project").	
A.14			Free alphanumerical text
A.15	Newly established	true	'true' – Yes 'false' – No

A.16	Financial condition for the past three	1	Free alphanumerical text
	years	traditional revenue but manages a treasury funded by protocol fees and initial token allocations. No audited financial statements are available due to its decentralized structure, but treasury holdings are transparently tracked on-chain.	
A.17	Financial condition since registration	Since registration on July 12, 2023, Maple DAO (BVI) Ltd. has focused on developing the Maple Finance ecosystem. As a decentralized entity, it does not generate traditional revenue but manages a treasury funded by protocol fees and initial token allocations. No audited financial statements are available due to its decentralized structure, but treasury holdings are transparently tracked on-chain.	

Part B	Part B - Information about the issuer, if different from the offeror or person seeking admission to trading					
B.1	Issuer different from false offeror or person seeking admission to trading	'true' – Yes 'false' – No				
B.2	Name	Free alphanumerical text				
В.3	Legal form	ISO standard 20275 'Financial Services – Entity Legal Forms (ELF)'				
B.4	Registered address	ISO standard 3166-1 alpha 2 country codes and codes for their subdivisions and Free alphanumerical text				
B.5	Head office	ISO standard 3166-1 alpha 2 country codes and codes for their subdivisions and Free alphanumerical text				

B.6	Registration date	ISO 8601 date format (YYYY-MM-DD)
B.7	Legal entity identifier	{LEI}
B.8	Another identifier required pursuant to applicable national law	Free text
B.9	Parent company	Free alphanumerical text

B.10	Members of the management body		Free alphanumerical text presented in a tabular format
B.11	Business activity		Free alphanumerical text
B.12	Parent company business activity		Free alphanumerical text
200		perator of the trading platform in cases where it draws up the crypto-asset white crypto-asset white crypto-asset white crypto-asset white paper pursuant to Article 6(1), second subparagraph, of Reg	77 (1.477)
C.1	Name		Free alphanumerical text
C.2	Legal form		ISO standard 20275 'Financial Services – Entity Legal Forms (ELF)'

C.3	Registered address	alp and sub and	ee alphanumerical
C.4	Head office	alp and sub and	ee alphanumerical
C.5	Registration date		O 8601 date format YYY-MM-DD)
C.6	Legal entity identifier	{L	ÆI}

	Another identifier required pursuant to applicable national law	Free text
C.8	Parent company	Free alphanumerical text
	Reason for crypto-Asset white paper Preparation	Free alphanumerical text

1	Members of the Management body	Free alphanumerical text presented in a tabular format
1	Operator business activity	Free alphanumerical text
1	Parent company business activity	Free alphanumerical text

	Other persons drawing up the crypto-asset white paper according to Article 6(1), second subparagraph, of Regulation (EU) 2023/1114		Free alphanumerical text
	Reason for drawing the white paper by persons referred to in Article 6(1), second subparagraph, of Regulation (EU) 2023/1114		Free alphanumerical text
Part D- Inf	ormation about the cr	rypto-asset project	
	Crypto-asset project name		Free alphanumerical text

D.2	Crypto-assets name		Free alphanumerical text
D.3	Abbreviation		Free alphanumerical text
	description	Maple Finance is a decentralized institutional lending platform that enables the development of crypto-native credit infrastructure. The SYRUP token is the governance token that powers two complementary product lines: Maple Institutional (connecting institutional capital to digital asset lending opportunities) and Syrup.fi (a permissionless DeFi protocol democratizing access to institutional-grade yield).	Free alphanumerical text

D.5	Details of all natural or legal persons				Free alphanumerical text presented in a
	involved in the	Name	Business Address	Function	tabular format
	implementation of the crypto-asset project	Maple DAO (BVI) Limited	Craigmuir Chambers, Road Town, Tortola, VG 1110, British Virgin Islands	Protocol Developer	
		Maple Labs Pty. Ltd.	401 28 Powlett St., East Melbourne, VIC 3002	Service Provider	
D.6	Utility Token Classification	true			'true' – Yes 'false' – No
D.7	Goods/Services for Utility Token Projects	Token holders can stake S protocol governance decis management, new product The platform facilitates in revenue from loan service	rough governance rights over YRUP to receive stSYRUP sions, including token distributed launches, and smart contrastitutional lending within defees that may be used for to sholder voting, with no pre-	enabling participation in bution, treasury oct infrastructure upgrades. ecentralized finance, with oken buybacks distributed	
D.8			unch, SYRUP stakers recei		Free alphanumerical text

D.9			Free alphanumerical text
9 A 4 (CONTROL OF A CONTROL OF A	Collected funds or crypto-Assets	Protocol revenue is primarily used for token buybacks, which are distributed to SYRUP stakers alongside planned token inflation. Additional treasury funds may be allocated by governance voting for development and marketing efforts to expand the ecosystem, as described in the token functions documentation.	Free alphanumerical text
Part E - Inj	formation about the o	offer to the public of crypto-assets or their admission to trading	
1	Public offering or admission to trading		'OTPC' - offer to the public 'ATTR' - admission to trading
	offer or admission to trading	The SYRUP token was created through a migration from the previous MPL token at a 1:100 ratio. Admission to trading enables stakeholder participation in governance and aligns with the token's utility function. No new funds are being raised; the token conversion maintains the governance rights of existing holders.	

E.3	Fundraising target		Amount in monetary value {DECIMAL-18/3} Or Numerical {INTEGER-n}
E.4	Minimum subscription goals		Amount in monetary value {DECIMAL-18/3} or Numerical {INTEGER-n}
E.5	Maximum subscription goals		Amount in monetary value {DECIMAL-18/3} or Numerical {INTEGER-n}
E.6	Oversubscription acceptance	false	'true'- Yes 'false' – No

E.7	Oversubscription allocation		Free alphanumerical text
E.8	Issue price		Amount in monetary value {DECIMAL-18/3} } Or Numerical {INTEGER-n}
E.9	Official currency or any other crypto-assets determining the issue price		{CURRENCYCODE_3} or {DTI}
E.10	Subscription fee		Amount in monetary value {DECIMAL-18/3} Or Numerical {INTEGER-n}
E.11	Offer price determination method	Not applicable, SYRUP tokens were distributed through conversion from MPL tokens at a fixed ratio of 1:100. Market forces determine subsequent trading prices.	Free alphanumerical text

1	Total number of offered/traded crypto-assets	134730000	Numerical {INTEGER-n}
E.13	Targeted holders		'RETL' – retail investors 'PROF' – professional investors 'ALL' – all types of investors
E.14			Free alphanumerical text

1		11 /	Predefined alphanumerical text
E.16	Refund mechanism		Free alphanumerical text
E.17		Not applicable, all MPL token holders received SYRUP at the same conversion ratio of 1:100 without discounts or preferential treatment.	Free alphanumerical text
E.18			Free alphanumerical text

E.19	Early purchase	Not applicable, all MPL token holders received SYRUP at the same conversion	Free alphanumerical
E.19	San Carrier		text
E.20	Time-limited offer	false	'true'- Yes 'false' – No
E.21	Subscription period beginning		ISO 8601 date format (YYYY-MM-DD)
E.22	Subscription period end		ISO 8601 date format (YYYY-MM-DD)

E.23	Safeguarding arrangements for offered funds/crypto-Assets		Free alphanumerical text
E.24	for crypto-asset	Not applicable, SYRUP tokens are acquired through conversion from MPL tokens, staking rewards, or secondary market trading rather than direct purchase from the protocol.	Free alphanumerical text
E.25	PROCESSES OF SERVICE ST		Free alphanumerical text
E.26	_		Free alphanumerical text
E.27	purchased crypto-assets	MPL token holders can convert to SYRUP tokens through a migrator smart contract deployed on the Ethereum blockchain. Users connect their wallet to the migrator contract, approve the MPL token transfer, and receive SYRUP tokens in a 1:100 ratio automatically to the same wallet address.	Free alphanumerical text

E.28	Transfer time schedule	2024-11-13	ISO 8601 date format (YYYY-MM-DD)
E.29	requirements	Users need an ERC-20 compatible wallet, such as MetaMask, to hold SYRUP tokens. To participate in staking and governance, users must connect their wallet to syrup.fi through a Web3 browser interface and have sufficient ETH for transaction fees. For governance voting, users must connect their stSYRUP-holding wallet to Snapshot.	Free alphanumerical text
E.30	Crypto-asset service provider (CASP) name		Free alphanumerical text
E.31	CASP identifier		{LEI}
E.32	Placement form		'WITH- with a firm commitment basis 'WOUT' - without a firm commitment basis 'NTAV' - Not applicable

	Trading platforms name		Free alphanumerical text
	Trading platforms  Market identifier  code (MIC)		{MIC}
E.35		Users can access SYRUP tokens on decentralized exchanges by connecting their Ethereum wallets to platforms like Uniswap (app.uniswap.org), and Balancer (balancer.fi). Each platform requires a Web3-compatible wallet with sufficient ETH for transaction fees. SYRUP is also tradable on decentralized exchanges via ERC-20 compatible wallets, subject to Ethereum network fees.	Free alphanumerical text
E.36		Standard Ethereum network gas fees apply when interacting with the token smart contract, staking/unstaking, or trading on decentralized exchanges. These fees vary based on network congestion and are paid directly to the Ethereum network, not to Maple DAO.	Free alphanumerical text

E.37		admission to trading.	Free alphanumerical text and Amount in monetary value {DECIMAL-18/3}
E.38		The development team and early investors may hold SYRUP tokens that were converted from MPL. Their participation in governance voting could potentially influence protocol decisions. The governance framework mitigates this by requiring transparent proposals with sufficient voting periods and quorum requirements.	Free alphanumerical text
E.39	Applicable law		Drop-down list of applicable laws
E.40	Competent court		Free alphanumerical text
Part F - Inj	formation about the c	erypto-assets	
F.1	Crypto-asset type		Free alphanumerical text

F.2	functionality		Free alphanumerical text
F.3	of functionalities		Free alphanumerical text
V		tics of the crypto-asset, including the data necessary for classification of the crypte 109 of Regulation (EU) 2023/1114, as specified in accordance with paragraph 8	
F.4	Type of crypto-asset white paper	OTHR	OTHR
F.5	The type of submission		NEWT = New  MODI = Modify  EROR = Error  CORR = Correction
F.6	characteristics		Free alphanumerical text

		operates through a smart contract deployed to the Ethereum blockchain, governing the creation and transfer of tokens to ensure transparency and compliance with predefined protocols.	
F.7	Commercial name or trading name	Maple DAO (BVI) Limited	Free alphanumerical text
F.8	Website of the issuer	https://docs.maple.finance/	Free alphanumerical text
F.9	Starting date of offer to the public or admission to trading		YYYY-MM-DD
F.10	Publication date	2024-11-01	YYYY-MM-DD

F.11	provided by the issuer	The issuer provides institutional capital market infrastructure through Maple Finance and Syrup.fi platforms, connecting institutional lenders with borrowers in decentralized finance. These lending activities are regulated under applicable lending and financial services laws in relevant jurisdictions.	l l
F.12	Language or languages of the crypto-asset white paper		Closed list of EU languages
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, where available		ISO 24165 Digital Token Identifier

	Functionally fungible group digital token identifier, where available		ISO 24165 FFG DTI
F.15	Voluntary data flag		'true' – voluntary 'false' – mandatory
F.16	Personal data flag		'true' – Yes 'false' – No
F.17	LEI eligibility	true	'true' – eligible 'false' – not eligible

2. Belgium 3. Bulgaria 4. Croatia 5. Cyprus 6. Czech Republic 7. Denmark 8. Estonia 9. Finland 10. France 11. Germany 12. Greece 13. Hungary 14. Ireland 15. Italy 16. Latvia 17. Lithuania 18. Malta 19. Netherlands 20. Poland 21. Portugal 22. Romania 23. Slovakia 24. Slovenia	F.18	Home Member State	Luxembourg	Closed list of EU Member States
25. Spain	F.19	Host Member States	<ol> <li>Belgium</li> <li>Bulgaria</li> <li>Croatia</li> <li>Cyprus</li> <li>Czech Republic</li> <li>Denmark</li> <li>Estonia</li> <li>Finland</li> <li>France</li> <li>Germany</li> <li>Greece</li> <li>Hungary</li> <li>Italy</li> <li>Latvia</li> <li>Lithuania</li> <li>Malta</li> <li>Netherlands</li> <li>Poland</li> <li>Portugal</li> <li>Romania</li> <li>Slovakia</li> <li>Slovenia</li> </ol>	

G.1	Purchaser rights and	SYRUP token holders have the right to stake their tokens to receive stSYRUP,	Free alphanumerical
O.1	obligations	which enables participation in protocol governance decisions. Holders can vote on proposals affecting token distribution, treasury management, product launches, and smart contract infrastructure upgrades. Token holders have no legal or beneficial rights to ownership, revenue, or profits of Maple DAO or its affiliates. Obligations include compliance with applicable laws and the terms of the staking smart contract when participating in governance.	text
G.2		To exercise governance rights, token holders must stake SYRUP on syrup.fi/stake to receive stSYRUP. Voting occurs through Snapshot by connecting a wallet containing stSYRUP. Governance proposals have a 7-day voting window, requiring a quorum to pass. Token holders can unstake and withdraw their SYRUP at any time without lockup periods while retaining any accrued rewards.	Free alphanumerical text
G.3	modifications of rights and		Free alphanumerical text
G.4			Free alphanumerical text
G.5	Issuer retained crypto-assets	134730000	Numerical {INTEGER-n}

G.6	Utility token classification	true	'true' – Yes 'false' – No
G.7	goods/services of utility tokens	SYRUP provides governance rights over the Maple Finance ecosystem. When staked, SYRUP grants access to voting on protocol decisions including token distribution, treasury management, product launches, and infrastructure upgrades. The quality of governance rights is proportional to the amount of SYRUP staked, with one stSYRUP representing one vote in governance decisions.	Free alphanumerical text
G.8	redemption	SYRUP tokens are not redeemed for specific goods or services but provide ongoing utility through governance participation. When staked, they grant governance rights as long as they remain staked. Users can unstake and withdraw their SYRUP tokens at any time.	Free alphanumerical text
G.9	Non-trading request	true	'true' – sought 'false' – not sought
G.10	Crypto-assets purchase or sale modalities	Not applicable; admission to trading is sought.	Free alphanumerical text

G.11	Crypto-assets transfer restrictions	There are no restrictions on the transferability of SYRUP tokens. As standard ERC-20 tokens on the Ethereum blockchain, they can be freely transferred between compatible wallets and traded on various exchanges.	Free alphanumerical text
G.12	Supply adjustment protocols	true	'true' – Yes 'false' – No
G.13	Supply adjustment mechanisms	true	Free alphanumerical text
G.14	Token value protection schemes	false	'true' – Yes 'false' – No

G.15	Token value protection schemes description		Free alphanumerical text
G.16	Compensation schemes		'true' – Yes 'false' – No
G.17	Compensation schemes description		Free alphanumerical text
G.18	Applicable law		Drop-down list of applicable laws
G.19	Competent court		Free alphanumerical text
Part H –	information on the und	derlying technology	
H.1			Free alphanumerical text

		Security: Ethereum employs advanced cryptographic methods to secure transactions and data, making the ledger resistant to tampering.  Smart Contracts: Unlike earlier blockchains, Ethereum introduced programmable smart contracts that automatically execute when predefined conditions are met.  Transparency and Immutability: All transactions on Ethereum are visible to network participants and once confirmed, become virtually immutable.	
H.2	Protocols and technical standards		Free alphanumerical text
Н.3	Technology used	SYRUP tokens can be stored in any ERC-20 compatible wallet, including: Self-custodial wallets: MetaMask, Trust Wallet, Ledger, Trezor Smart contract wallets: Safe (formerly Gnosis Safe), Argent Mobile wallets: Rainbow, Coinbase Wallet For governance participation, users connect their wallet to Snapshot's interface through a Web3 browser connection. The staking interface on syrup.fi is accessible through standard Web3 browser extensions.	Free alphanumerical text
H.4	Consensus mechanism		Free alphanumerical text

		This approach is significantly more energy-efficient than Proof-of-Work systems.  The Ethereum PoS mechanism includes slashing conditions to penalize malicious validators, providing economic security to the network. Transaction finality is typically achieved within minutes, allowing for secure and relatively fast transaction settlement.	
100000000000000000000000000000000000000	mechanisms and applicable fees		

H.6	Use of distributed ledger technology		'true' – Yes, DLT operated by the issuer or a third-party acting on the issuer's behalf 'false' – No, DLT not operated by the issuer or a third-party acting on the issuer's behalf
H.7	1.50		Free alphanumerical text
H.8	Audit	true	'true' – Yes 'false' – No
H.9			Free alphanumerical text

Part I – Inf	Formation on risks	front-running vulnerabilities. Minor issues identified during the audit process were addressed before the final deployment of the contracts.  The token migration contract that facilitated the conversion from MPL to SYRUP at a 1:100 ratio was also audited to ensure the accurate and secure conversion of tokens. The full audit reports are publicly accessible on the Maple Finance GitHub repository.	
I.1	Offer-related risks		Free alphanumerical text
		decisions by tokenholder voting.  Regulatory Risk: Changes in regulatory frameworks could affect the ability to trade or use SYRUP tokens. Future regulations may impact the operation of the protocol or token utility. Cross-border regulatory differences may affect global accessibility.	
I.2	Issuer-related risks	Regulatory Compliance Risks: The structure might present potential regulatory scrutiny as global authorities increasingly focus on offshore crypto issuers. The upcoming implementation of MiCA requirements in the EU, combined with evolving regulations in other jurisdictions, may necessitate some compliance adaptations, possibly requiring resource-intensive structural modifications to the protocol's operations. Under MiCA, SYRUP is classified as a utility token; however, if staking rewards or buybacks are interpreted as profit-sharing,	text

regulators could reclassify it, triggering additional compliance obligations.

Maple DAO monitors regulatory developments to ensure ongoing compliance.

Operational Risks: The dual-product structure of Maple Institutional and Syrup.fi creates operational interdependencies that could affect protocol performance. The management of institutional loan origination requires specialized expertise that may be difficult to scale. The protocol's revenue generation depends on the efficient collection of loan service fees from borrowers, creating potential points of operational failure. Additionally, the decentralized governance model may introduce operational latency in responding to emergent market challenges or opportunities.

Financial Risks: The 5% annualized inflation schedule could create dilutive pressure if not matched by protocol growth. Revenue volatility from institutional lending fluctuations may impact the protocol's ability to sustain SYRUP buybacks. The protocol's financial stability is closely tied to institutional borrower repayment performance, creating concentration risk in revenue sources.

Legal Risks: While a legal opinion indicates SYRUP is not a capital markets product in Singapore, this determination may not extend to other jurisdictions. The smart contract-based governance system operates in a legally ambiguous environment regarding enforceability of on-chain decisions. The protocol's institutional lending activities may implicate various lending regulations across jurisdictions where borrowers operate.

Fraud and Mismanagement Risks: While the SYRUP token utilizes non-custodial, decentralized smart contracts for staking and governance, certain protocol operations retain centralized components that could be vulnerable to mismanagement. The management of protocol treasury funds represents a

potential vector for fraud if governance controls are inadequate. The migration process from MPL to SYRUP tokens created a temporary point of centralized control during the transition. The revenue collection mechanisms require proper implementation to ensure all protocol fees are correctly accounted for and distributed.

Reputational Risks: As a facilitator of institutional lending, Maple Finance's reputation is crucial for attracting both lenders and borrowers. Any credit defaults or underperformance within the lending portfolio could significantly damage market confidence. Association with controversial borrowers might trigger negative market perception. The protocol's position bridging traditional finance and DeFi creates heightened reputational expectations regarding risk management and transparency.

Technology Management Risks: The SYRUP token ecosystem relies on several sophisticated smart contracts, including the ERC-4626 Tokenized Vault Standard implementation. The ongoing maintenance and necessary upgrades to these technical components require consistent technical oversight. Should development resources become constrained or technical expertise diminish, critical updates may be delayed, potentially affecting protocol security or functionality.

Dependency on Key Individuals: The Maple Finance ecosystem's technical architecture and ongoing development may depend on the continued involvement of key technical personnel with specialized knowledge of the protocol's implementation. While the protocol governance is decentralized, the technical expertise needed for implementing governance decisions may be concentrated among a limited group of developers familiar with the codebase.

Conflicts of Interest: The governance system, wherein only stSYRUP holders can participate in protocol decision-making, creates potential scenarios where

		governance participants may prioritize token value appreciation through mechanisms like inflation adjustment over long-term protocol sustainability. This structure requires careful management to ensure governance decisions serve the protocol's long-term viability.  Counterparty Risks: The protocol's revenue stream depends on the ongoing repayment of loans by institutional borrowers. This exposes participants in the ecosystem to counterparty risk. While lending activities are secured according to the protocol's risk parameters, borrower defaults could affect protocol solvency and the ability to continue operations.	
(C-1)	d risks	Market Risk: The SYRUP token, despite its utility functions within the Maple Finance ecosystem, remains susceptible to significant price fluctuations common to digital assets. Market sentiment, macroeconomic factors, and crypto market trends may cause substantial value variations independent of the token's fundamental utility or the protocol's performance.  As a governance token with multiple utility functions, SYRUP faces inherent challenges in market price discovery and valuation consensus. The token's	text
		worth derives from subjective assessments of governance rights, staking rewards, and protocol growth prospects, creating potential for divergent valuation models and price instability.  SYRUP may experience price movements correlated with broader cryptocurrency market trends, potentially undermining diversification benefits for holders. During periods of market-wide volatility, the token could experience price fluctuations irrespective of Maple's operational performance or fundamentals.	

Liquidity Risk: SYRUP may experience periods of limited trading volume, potentially restricting holders' ability to execute large transactions without significant price impact. This could result in increased slippage and execution challenges, particularly during market stress periods.

The staking mechanism, while incentivizing token retention, may lead to substantial portions of the supply being locked, reducing circulating liquidity. Should large stakers suddenly unstake and liquidate positions, market order books may lack sufficient depth to absorb selling pressure.

SYRUP's trading on specific exchanges like Bitstamp Europe S.A. creates potential single points of failure for liquidity provision. Technical issues, regulatory actions, or policy changes affecting these trading venues could temporarily or permanently impair token liquidity.

Custodial Risk: SYRUP holders must independently secure their token access credentials, with any private key compromise potentially resulting in permanent, irrecoverable token loss. The absence of centralized recovery mechanisms places complete security responsibility on individual holders.

While designed as non-custodial, the staking mechanism relies on smart contract integrity. Technical vulnerabilities could potentially restrict access to staked tokens or create unexpected behavior in the stSYRUP relationship.

Token holders face potential technical complications with certain wallet implementations, possibly affecting token visibility, transaction execution, or interaction with staking functions. These compatibility challenges could impair effective token custody and utilization.

Smart Contract Risk: Despite implementing established standards like ERC-4626, the SYRUP token ecosystem remains vulnerable to potential undiscovered bugs or security weaknesses. Smart contract vulnerabilities could lead to token theft, unauthorized minting, or functionality impairment.

Future protocol upgrades necessitated by evolving requirements or security patches introduce execution risk. Implementation errors during upgrades could potentially disrupt token functionality, staking mechanisms, or governance systems.

The token's reliance on external systems for governance and various technical standards creates dependencies on third-party components outside direct protocol control. Vulnerabilities or changes in these dependencies could adversely affect token utility.

Regulatory and Tax Risk: Despite favorable legal opinions in certain jurisdictions like Singapore, the SYRUP token faces potential regulatory reclassification risks as global cryptocurrency regulations evolve. Future regulatory determinations could impose unexpected compliance requirements or operational restrictions.

Token holders face uncertain and potentially complex tax implications regarding staking rewards, governance participation, and token conversions. Tax authorities worldwide continue developing digital asset guidance, creating compliance uncertainty and potential retroactive liability.

The global accessibility of the SYRUP token creates multi-jurisdictional regulatory exposure. Activities permissible in one jurisdiction may violate

	regulations in others, creating complex compliance demands for both the protocol and token holders.	
	Counterparty Risk: The protocol's revenue stream depends on institutional borrowers' loan repayments. Borrower defaults could significantly impact protocol revenue, potentially reducing funds available for token buybacks and ecosystem growth.	
	SYRUP's utility relies partially on third-party integrations for governance execution, and technical infrastructure. Operational issues or business failures among these partners could temporarily or permanently impair certain token functionalities.	
	The protocol's ongoing development requires specialized expertise. Key personnel departures could potentially delay technical improvements, security responses, or ecosystem expansion, affecting token utility and value.  Reputational Risk: SYRUP's utility is linked to Maple Finance's reputation in institutional lending markets. Protocol failures, security incidents, or	
	governance controversies could significantly impact token market perception.  The protocol's institutional lending focus naturally attracts regulatory attention.  Adverse regulatory findings or enforcement actions could substantially damage market confidence and institutional adoption, potentially affecting token utility and value.	
I.4		Free alphanumerical text

Free alphanumerical Technology-related Private Key Management Risk and Loss of Access to Crypto-Assets: risks text SYRUP token holders bear complete responsibility for securing their private keys and wallet credentials. Loss of private keys results in permanent, irreversible forfeiture of token access with no recovery mechanism available. Hardware failure, software corruption, and inadequate backup procedures can lead to complete asset loss. Phishing attacks and social engineering techniques specifically targeting cryptocurrency holders present ongoing security threats. Password-protected wallets risk permanent inaccessibility if credentials are forgotten. Multi-signature security implementations, while enhancing security, introduce additional points of potential access failure. Estate planning complexities create significant inheritance barriers, as tokens controlled by deceased individuals may become permanently inaccessible without proper succession arrangements. Settlement and Transaction Finality: Ethereum-based transactions involving SYRUP tokens could be subject to network confirmation delays during periods of congestion, potentially extending transaction finalization times. Network fee fluctuations may leave transactions with insufficient gas unconfirmed for extended periods or rejected entirely. Blockchain reorganizations, though rare, could temporarily reverse seemingly confirmed transactions. Front-running and sandwich attacks by network validators or observers can manipulate transaction execution order to extract value from SYRUP token transactions, particularly during high-volume trading periods. Cross-chain implementations or bridged token versions would introduce settlement finality vulnerabilities related to relayer networks and external validation mechanisms. Scaling Limitations and Transaction Fees: Ethereum network congestion could impact SYRUP token transaction costs and confirmation times, potentially rendering small transactions economically unfeasible during high-demand periods. Gas fee unpredictability creates transaction planning challenges,

particularly for time-sensitive governance participation or staking operations. The Ethereum blockchain's throughput limitations could constrain protocol growth during periods of rapid adoption. Layer 2 scaling solutions, if implemented, would introduce additional technical complexity and potential interoperability challenges. Implementation of Ethereum protocol upgrades could temporarily disrupt token functionality or require wallet configuration adjustments. Complex contract interactions such as staking or governance participation consume substantially more gas than simple transfers, creating elevated cost barriers during network congestion.

Economic Self-sufficiency and Operational Parameters: The protocol's revenue model depends on sustainable institutional lending demand, which may fluctuate with market conditions independent of governance decisions. The token inflation schedule could create persistent selling pressure if not matched by proportional demand growth. The token buyback mechanism funded by protocol revenue establishes a circular dependency where diminished protocol activity directly impacts token value support. Governance parameters require ongoing optimization, with miscalibrated voting thresholds potentially leading to decision paralysis or insufficient stakeholder representation. The linear reward distribution model for staked tokens creates fixed economic parameters that may prove suboptimal in volatile market conditions. Token value is fundamentally linked to perceived governance utility, creating vulnerability to alternative governance mechanisms or competing protocols. Long-term protocol sustainability requires consistent development funding, creating tension between treasury conservation and necessary technical advancement.

Network Attacks and Cyber Security Risks: The SYRUP token ecosystem could theoretically face disruption from various cyber threats targeting the Ethereum network, including 51% attacks, Sybil attacks, and DDoS attacks. Such attacks could impair transaction processing, compromise consensus integrity, or temporarily disable platform accessibility. Targeted attacks against critical

network infrastructure could disrupt SYRUP token transfers or governance activities during crucial voting periods, potentially affecting protocol-critical decisions.

Consensus Failures or Forks:Ethereum network forks could represent risks to SYRUP token operations, potentially creating duplicate token instances or conflicting transaction histories. Network consensus failures could temporarily freeze token transfers or smart contract interactions. During contentious forks, SYRUP holders may face uncertainty regarding which chain represents legitimate token ownership, potentially requiring complex technical interventions to secure assets across both chains.

Bugs in the Blockchain's Core Code: SYRUP operates on Ethereum's extensively reviewed codebase rather than implementing novel blockchain architecture. The token functionality creates logical separation from underlying protocol code, limiting potential impact of core blockchain vulnerabilities. The transparent design enables continuous security assessment by ecosystem participants beyond issuer-initiated reviews.

Smart Contract Security Risk: Implementation of standardized ERC-4626 architecture leverages extensively audited code patterns with known security properties. The Revenue Distribution Token design builds upon established implementations rather than pioneering untested techniques. The non-custodial architecture limits potential impact of contract vulnerabilities by preserving user key control. The transparent GitHub repositories enable ongoing independent security review.

Dependency on Underlying Technology: The token's implementation on Ethereum benefits from the network's substantial infrastructure redundancy and geographic distribution. The institutional focus naturally incorporates enterprise-grade operational continuity considerations. The governance mechanism enables responsive adaptation to underlying infrastructure evolution without requiring token redesign.

Risk of Technological Disruption: SYRUP's modular smart contract architecture facilitates targeted upgrades addressing emerging technological developments without requiring wholesale redesign. The governance mechanism enables responsive adaptation to technological advancement through transparent decision-making. The ERC-4626 implementation follows contemporary standards positioning the protocol to evolve alongside Ethereum's roadmap. Institutional orientation naturally incorporates long-term technological planning exceeding typical retail-focused projects.

Governance Risk: The requirement that governance participants must stake SYRUP creates economic alignment with protocol health, discouraging decisions that damage long-term sustainability. The transparent Snapshot voting system prevents opaque governance manipulation. The 7-day voting window balances deliberative consideration with decision efficiency. The quorum requirements ensure decisions reflect substantial stakeholder consensus rather than narrow interests.

Anonymity and Privacy Risk: The protocol's institutional focus naturally aligns with appropriate transparency rather than excessive privacy that could facilitate illicit activity. The governance mechanism enables privacy parameter adjustment responding to evolving regulatory frameworks. The on-chain transaction transparency creates auditability appropriate for institutional financial operations. Implementation on Ethereum leverages the network's established privacy-preserving transaction patterns.

Data Corruption: Implementation on Ethereum's immutable ledger prevents retroactive data manipulation through distributed consensus validation. The transparent smart contract execution creates verifiable state transitions resistant to corruption. The non-custodial architecture preserves user control of assets independent of protocol data integrity. Multiple independent blockchain explorers enable cross-validation of critical transaction data.

Third-Party Risks: The non-custodial staking architecture eliminates dependencies on third-party asset custody. Direct smart contract interaction enables participation without intermediary service providers. The transparent protocol operation facilitates independent verification without reliance on third-party attestation. The token's ERC-20 compatibility ensures availability across multiple wallet implementations, preventing single-provider dependencies.

Mitigation measures	i) Smart Contract Security	Free alphanumerical
		text
	Decentralized, non-custodial staking contract with no private key control	
	Implementation of industry-standard ERC-4626 Tokenized Vault Standard	
	ii) Risk Management	
	- 7-day governance voting periods with quorum requirements	
	- Collateral held to secure loans mitigates counterparty credit risk	
	- No lock-up period for staking, allowing immediate exit if needed	
	iii) Operational Safeguards	
	Linear, continuous reward distribution preventing timing exploitation	
	Transparent governance process with forum discussion before voting	
	Separation between lending activities and token governance functions	
		- Collateral held to secure loans mitigates counterparty credit risk - No lock-up period for staking, allowing immediate exit if needed iii) Operational Safeguards  Linear, continuous reward distribution preventing timing exploitation

Part J – Information on the susta impacts	inability indicators in relation to adverse impact on the climate and other environ	ment-related adverse
climate and other environment-related adverse impacts		