MiCA White Paper

SERV (Open Serv)

Version 1.0
Nov 2025

White Paper in accordance with Markets in Crypto Assets Regulation (MiCAR)
for the European Economic Area (EEA).

Purpose: seeking admission to trading in EEA.

Prepared and Filed by LCX.com

NOTE: THIS CRYPTO-ASSET WHITE PAPER HAS NOT BEEN APPROVED BY ANY COMPETENT AUTHORITY IN ANY MEMBER STATE OF THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AREA. THE PERSON SEEKING ADMISSION TO TRADING IS SOLELY RESPONSIBLE FOR THE CONTENT OF THIS CRYPTO-ASSET WHITE PAPER ACCORDING TO THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AREA'S MARKETS IN CRYPTO-ASSET REGULATION (MICA).

This white paper has been prepared in accordance with the requirements set forth in Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2024/2984, ensuring that all relevant reporting formats, content specifications, and machine-readable structures outlined in Annex I of this regulation have been fully mapped and implemented, particularly reflected through the Recitals, to enable proper notification under the Markets in Crypto-Assets Regulation (MiCAR).

00 TABLE OF CONTENT

01 DATE OF NOTIFICATION

2025-11-17

COMPLIANCE STATEMENTS

02 This crypto-asset white paper has not been approved by any competent authority in any Member State of the European Economic Area. The offeror of the crypto-asset is solely responsible for the content of this crypto-asset white paper.

Where relevant in accordance with Article 6(3), second subparagraph of Regulation (EU) 2023/1114, reference shall be made to ‘person seeking admission to trading’ or to ‘operator of the trading platform’ instead of ‘offeror’.

03 This crypto-asset white paper complies with Title II of Regulation (EU) 2023/1114 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 The crypto-asset referred to in this white paper may lose its value in part or in full, may not always be transferable and may not be liquid.

05 Not Applicable

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

SUMMARY

07 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 (36) or any other offer document pursuant to Union or national law.

08 Characteristics of the crypto-asset

The SERV token is a fungible, non-redeemable digital token operating on the Ethereum blockchain, implemented using the widely adopted ERC-20 standard. As a cryptographically secured crypto-asset, SERV is designed to support the OpenServ protocol — a decentralized Web3 infrastructure for building and deploying agentic applications (“aApps”) powered by autonomous AI agents. Within the protocol, SERV functions as a transaction-enabling asset (used to pay for on-chain agent execution and resource usage) and as a mechanism to distribute incentives and coordinate activity across various protocol participants, including developers, validators, and service integrators.

SERV does not represent a claim to any underlying asset, fiat currency, or commodity, nor is it intended to provide access to specific goods or services under predefined contractual conditions. It also does not constitute equity, ownership, or voting rights in the issuer or affiliated organizations, and it does not grant holders any dividend rights or legal entitlement to profit. As such, it does not qualify as a financial instrument within the scope of MiFID II, nor as an e-money token (EMT), asset-referenced token (ART), or utility token as defined under Article 3(1) of Regulation (EU) 2023/1114. Consequently, SERV is formally classified as an “Other Crypto-Asset” under Title II of MiCA.

The token is fully transferable, divisible, and can be freely exchanged across digital asset trading venues and decentralized finance (DeFi) environments that support ERC-20 compatibility. Its supply is capped by smart contract logic, and its price is determined by market dynamics without any embedded redemption right, fixed return, or price stabilization mechanism. Additionally, a portion of protocol revenues — derived from usage fees and application-layer activity — may be used to buy back SERV tokens from the open market, which is intended as a non-guaranteed, discretionary mechanism to support long-term alignment between platform growth and token value. This mechanism is executed programmatically or under community-defined guidelines, without constituting a price floor or guarantee of liquidity.

09 Not applicable

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

This MiCA whitepaper does not relate to a new issuance or public offering of the SERV token. The SERV token was created and deployed as an ERC-20 standard fungible crypto-asset on the Ethereum blockchain in late 2024 and has since been made available for trading on regulated crypto-asset trading platforms. Rather than serving as an issuance prospectus, this whitepaper is prepared in the context of the admission of SERV to trading on a regulated crypto-asset trading platform operated by LCX AG.

LCX AG, a registered exchange and custodian based in Liechtenstein, facilitates the listing and trading of SERV in accordance with the regulatory obligations defined under the Markets in Crypto-Assets Regulation (MiCA). LCX is not the issuer or sponsor of the SERV token and does not exercise control over its supply, governance, or token economics. The responsibility of LCX is limited to ensuring that the token is admitted to trading on its platform in a manner that is compliant with MiCA's provisions on transparency, investor protection, and market integrity.

This whitepaper is published under Article 6(1) of MiCA to ensure that investors and market participants have access to standardized, fair, and clear information about the features, risks, and rights associated with the SERV token. As SERV is already in circulation and traded across both centralized and decentralized platforms, its listing on LCX does not involve any fundraising, token sale, or initial offering event. No SERV tokens are being issued or distributed as part of the admission process.

The trading of SERV on LCX's regulated venue occurs under open market conditions. Prices are determined by supply and demand dynamics among market participants, without any pre-fixed valuation or minimum subscription thresholds. LCX supports trading pairs such as SERV/EUR to enhance liquidity and accessibility for users operating in fiat and crypto markets.

Total offer amount	Not applicable
Total number of tokens to be offered to the public	Not applicable
Subscription period	Not applicable
Minimum and maximum subscription amount	Not applicable
Issue price	Not applicable
Subscription fees (if any)	Not applicable
Target holders of tokens	Not applicable
Description of offer phases	Not applicable
CASP responsible for placing the token (if any)	Not applicable
Form of placement	Not applicable
Admission to trading	LCX AG, Herrengasse 6, 9490 Vaduz, Liechtenstein

A. PART A - INFORMATION ABOUT THE OFFEROR OR THE PERSON SEEKING ADMISSION TO TRADING

A.1 Name

LCX

A.2 Legal Form

AG

A.3 Registered Address

Herrengasse 6, 9490 Vaduz, Liechtenstein

A.4 Head Office

Herrengasse 6, 9490 Vaduz, Liechtenstein

A.5 Registration Date

24.04.2018

A.6 Legal Entity Identifier

529900SN07Z6RTX8R418

A.7 Another Identifier Required Pursuant to Applicable National Law

FL-0002.580.678-2

A.8 Contact Telephone Number

+423 235 40 15

A.9 E-mail Address

legal@lcx.com

A.10 Response Time (Days)

020

A.11 Parent Company

Not applicable

A.12 Members of the Management Body

Full Name	Business Address	Function
Monty C. M. Metzger	Herrengasse 6, 9490 Vaduz, Liechtenstein	President of the Board
Katarina Metzger	Herrengasse 6, 9490 Vaduz, Liechtenstein	Board Member
Anurag Verma	Herrengasse 6, 9490 Vaduz, Liechtenstein	Director of Technology

A.13 Business Activity

LCX provides various crypto-asset services under Liechtenstein's Token and Trusted Technology Service Provider Act ("Token- und Vertrauenswürdige Technologie-Dienstleister-Gesetz" in short "TVTG") also known as the Blockchain Act. These include custody and administration of crypto-assets, offering secure storage for clients' assets and private keys. LCX operates a trading platform, facilitating the matching of buy and sell orders for crypto-assets. It enables both crypto-to-fiat and crypto-to-crypto exchanges, ensuring compliance with AML and KYC regulations. LCX also supports token placements, marketing crypto-assets on behalf of offerors.

Under MiCA, LCX is classified as a Crypto-Asset Service Provider (CASP). LCX is not yet formally supervised under MiCA until the license is granted by the competent authority.

Under the TVTG framework, LCX provides:

- TT Depositary – Custody and safekeeping of crypto-assets.
- TT Trading Platform Operator – Operation of a regulated crypto-asset exchange.
- TT Exchange Service Provider – Crypto-to-fiat and crypto-to-crypto exchange.
- Token Issuer – Marketing and distribution of tokens.
- TT Transfer Service Provider – Crypto-asset transfers between ledger addresses.
- Token Generator & Tokenization Service Provider – Creation and issuance of tokens.
- Physical Validator – Enforcement of token-based rights on TT systems.
- TT Verification & Identity Service Provider – Legal capacity verification and identity registration.
- TT Price Service Provider – Providing aggregated crypto-asset price information.

A.14 Parent Company Business Activity

Not applicable

A.15 Newly Established

false

A.16 Financial Condition for the past three Years

LCX AG has a strong capital base, with CHF 1 million (approx. 1,126,000 USD) in share capital (Stammkapital) and a solid equity position (Eigenkapital) in 2023. The company has experienced fluctuations in financial performance over the past three years, reflecting the dynamic nature of the crypto market. While LCX AG recorded a loss in 2022, primarily due to a market downturn and a security breach, it successfully covered the impact through reserves. The company has remained financially stable, achieving revenues and profits in 2021, 2023 and 2024 while maintaining break-even operations.

In 2023 and 2024, LCX AG strengthened its operational efficiency, expanded its business activities, and upheld a stable financial position. Looking ahead to 2025, the company anticipates positive financial development, supported by market uptrends, an inflow of customer funds, and strong business performance. Increased adoption of digital assets and service expansion are expected to drive higher revenues and profitability, further reinforcing LCX AG's financial position.

A.17 Financial Condition Since Registration

LCX AG has been financially stable since its registration, supported by CHF 1 million in share capital (Stammkapital) and continuous business growth. Since its inception, the company has expanded its operations, secured multiple regulatory registrations, and established itself as a key player in the crypto and blockchain industry.

While market conditions have fluctuated, LCX AG has maintained strong revenues and break-even operations. The company has consistently reinvested in its platform, technology, and regulatory compliance, ensuring long-term sustainability. The LCX Token has been a fundamental part of the ecosystem, with a market capitalization of approximately $200 million USD and an all-time high exceeding $500 million USD in 2022. Looking ahead, LCX AG anticipates continued financial growth, driven by market uptrends, increased adoption of digital assets, and expanding business activities.

B. 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

True

B.2 Name

OpenServ Ltd.

B.3 Legal Form

Private limited company (Ltd).

B.4 Registered Address

71–75 Shelton Street, Covent Garden, London WC2H 9JQ, United Kingdom

B.5 Head Office

71–75 Shelton Street, Covent Garden, London WC2H 9JQ, United Kingdom

B.6 Registration Date

23 February 2024

B.7 Legal Entity Identifier

Not available

B.8 Another Identifier Required Pursuant to Applicable National Law

Company No. 15515519 (UK)

B.9 Parent Company

Not applicable

B.10 Members of the Management Body

OpenServ is led by its founding team and key executives: Tim Hafner – Founder & Chief Executive Officer (responsible for overall strategy and operations) [OBJ]; Lucas Hafner – Co-Founder (leading ecosystem development and partnerships) [OBJ]; Andres Korin – Chief Financial Officer (responsible for financial management and compliance) [OBJ]; Ryan Dennis – Head of Marketing (responsible for growth, communications and community engagement) [OBJ]. The Issuer does not have a separate supervisory board; its founders and executives collectively oversee corporate decisions and the direction of the project. To date, the management has guided OpenServ from its inception in 2023 through the launch of the SERV token and platform MVP, drawing on experience in AI, blockchain (e.g., prior work on projects like Bittensor), venture development, and finance.

B.11 Business Activity

OpenServ Ltd is an early-stage company and has a limited financial track record. Since its incorporation in 2024, the Issuer's operations have been funded by the founders and the modest proceeds of its initial token sale (see Section D.10) – it has no significant revenue to date, as the OpenServ platform is still in its launch phase. The company's activities (AI platform development and community programs) are inherently R&D-focused and currently operate at a net loss (as expected for a startup in the development stage). No audited financial statements are yet publicly available. However, the Issuer maintains sufficient working capital from the token sale and founder contributions to meet its anticipated needs for at least the next 12 months of operation. There is no debt financing and no material contingent liabilities on the company's balance sheet. (Prospective token holders should note that the financial viability of the Issuer is largely dependent on the future success of the OpenServ platform and token

ecosystem, and that as a private company OpenServ Ltd is not subject to public financial reporting obligations.)

B.12 Parent Company Business Activity

Not applicable

C. 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

LCX AG

C.2 Legal Form

AG

C.3 Registered Address

Herrengasse 6, 9490 Vaduz, Liechtenstein

C.4 Head Office

Herrengasse 6, 9490 Vaduz, Liechtenstein

C.5 Registration Date

24.04.2018

C.6 Legal Entity Identifier

529900SN07Z6RTX8R418

C.7 Another Identifier Required Pursuant to Applicable National Law

FL-0002.580.678-2

C.8 Parent Company

Not Applicable

C.9 Reason for Crypto-Asset White Paper Preparation

LCX is preparing this MiCA-compliant whitepaper for SERV (OPEN SERV) to enhance transparency, regulatory clarity, and investor confidence. While SERV has its classification as "Other Crypto-Assets", LCX is providing this document to support its role as a Crypto-Asset Service Provider (CASP) and ensure compliance with MiCA regulations in facilitating SERV trading on its platform.

C.10 Members of the Management Body

Full Name	Business Address	Function
Monty C. M. Metzger	Herrengasse 6, 9490 Vaduz, Liechtenstein	President of the Board
Katarina Metzger	Herrengasse 6, 9490 Vaduz, Liechtenstein	Board Member
Anurag Verma	Herrengasse 6, 9490 Vaduz, Liechtenstein	Director of Technology

C.11 Operator Business Activity

LCX provides various crypto-asset services under Liechtenstein's Token and Trusted Technology Service Provider Act ("Token- und Vertrauenswürdige Technologie-Dienstleister-Gesetz" in short "TVTG") also known as the Blockchain Act. These include custody and administration of crypto-assets, offering secure storage for clients' assets and private keys. LCX operates a trading platform, facilitating the matching of buy and sell

orders for crypto-assets. It enables both crypto-to-fiat and crypto-to-crypto exchanges, ensuring compliance with AML and KYC regulations. LCX also supports token placements, marketing crypto-assets on behalf of offerors.

Under MiCA, LCX is classified as a Crypto-Asset Service Provider (CASP). LCX is not yet formally supervised under MiCA until the license is granted by the competent authority.

Under the TVTG framework, LCX provides:

- TT Depositary – Custody and safekeeping of crypto-assets.
- TT Trading Platform Operator – Operation of a regulated crypto-asset exchange.
- TT Exchange Service Provider – Crypto-to-fiat and crypto-to-crypto exchange.
- Token Issuer – Marketing and distribution of tokens.
- TT Transfer Service Provider – Crypto-asset transfers between ledger addresses.
- Token Generator & Tokenization Service Provider – Creation and issuance of tokens.
- Physical Validator – Enforcement of token-based rights on TT systems.
- TT Verification & Identity Service Provider – Legal capacity verification and identity registration.
- TT Price Service Provider – Providing aggregated crypto-asset price information.

C.12 Parent Company Business Activity

Not Applicable

C.13 Other persons drawing up the white paper under Article 6 (1) second subparagraph MiCA

Not Applicable

C.14 Reason for drawing up the white paper under Article 6 (1) second subparagraph MiCA

Not Applicable

D. PART D - INFORMATION ABOUT THE CRYPTO-ASSET PROJECT

D.1 Crypto-Asset Project Name

OPEN SERV

D.2 Crypto-Assets Name

OPEN SERV

D.3 Abbreviation

SERV

D.4 Crypto-Asset Project Description

OpenServ is a decentralized AI infrastructure protocol designed to support the creation, deployment, and interoperability of autonomous software agents (“AI agents”) and agent-powered applications. The project aims to foster a developer-friendly and permissionless environment where users can build agentic applications (“aApps”) capable of performing advanced reasoning, decision-making, and automated workflows. OpenServ provides a full-stack platform featuring several integrated layers: a Cognition Framework for enabling contextual understanding and long-term memory in AI agents; a Collaboration Protocol that facilitates multi-agent interoperability across different environments; and an Integration Layer that connects agents to external systems and data sources spanning Web2, Web3, and traditional enterprise software.

To streamline development and adoption, OpenServ also includes an Agent Marketplace for discovering agentic applications and a No-Code Agent Builder that allows non-technical users to create and deploy AI solutions. The protocol supports flexible agent deployment via familiar interfaces such as messaging platforms or browser extensions, expanding accessibility to AI-powered automation. OpenServ’s broader ecosystem is designed to evolve through community-led development, open research, and incubation efforts (e.g., through the Appcelerator program).

The SERV token, deployed as a fungible ERC-20 crypto-asset, operates as the native medium of exchange and incentive mechanism within the OpenServ ecosystem. It is used to facilitate on-chain agent operations and protocol-level coordination. The SERV token does not grant access to specific goods or services, nor does it confer ownership, profit rights, or claims against any legal entity. As such, SERV qualifies as an “Other Crypto-Asset” under Title II of Regulation (EU) 2023/1114. Its use is governed entirely by the decentralized technical infrastructure of the protocol and is not subject to any discretionary control or guaranteed value model.

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

The SERV project is a collaborative effort involving the core developers, the issuing foundation, and a decentralized community of node operators and users. Key parties include:

Full Name	Business Address	Function
OpenServ Inc. (OpenServ Ltd	London, UK	Project Initiator & Core Developer

Open-Source Developer Community	Global	Contributors
Ethereum Network Validators	Global	Blockchain Infrastructure Providers.

D.6 Utility Token Classification

false

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

Not applicable

D.8 Plans for the Token

Not applicable

D.9 Resource Allocation

Not applicable

D.10 Planned Use of Collected Funds or Crypto-Assets

Not applicable

E. 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

ATTR

E.2 Reasons for Public Offer or Admission to Trading

LCX is filing this MiCA-compliant white paper for SERV to provide full disclosure under the new regulatory framework, and SERV has been classified as "other crypto-asset" under MICA. The aim is to boost investor confidence and clarity regarding SERV's features, risks, and legal status. By aligning with MiCA's high disclosure standards, LCX strengthens its position as a regulated exchange and facilitates broader market access for SERV within the European Economic Area [obj].This initiative is expected to remove uncertainty for institutional participants and comply with evolving EU rules, thereby supporting broader adoption of SERV and integration into regulated financial ecosystems [obj]. In summary, the admission is pursued to list SERV in a fully compliant manner, allowing European users to trade SERV on a transparent, regulated venue with all necessary information provided upfront.

E.3 Fundraising Target

Not applicable

E.4 Minimum Subscription Goals

Not applicable

E.5 Maximum Subscription Goal

Not applicable

E.6 Oversubscription Acceptance

Not applicable

E.7 Oversubscription Allocation

Not applicable

E.8 Issue Price

Not applicable

E.9 Official Currency or Any Other Crypto-Assets Determining the Issue Price

Not applicable

E.10 Subscription Fee

Not applicable

E.11 Offer Price Determination Method

Not applicable

E.12 Total Number of Offered/Traded Crypto-Assets

1,000,000,000 SERV (fixed maximum supply). As of September 2025, approximately 672 million SERV are in circulation [obj]. The remaining tokens (circa 328 million) are held by the Issuer in various allocations (team, treasury, community rewards) subject to vesting schedules (see Part G.5 and G.12 for tokenomics). No further tokens beyond the 1 billion maximum can be created under the token's smart contract.

E.13 Targeted Holders

ALL

E.14 Holder Restrictions

Not applicable

E.15 Reimbursement Notice

Not applicable

E.16 Refund Mechanism

Not applicable

E.17 Refund Timeline

Not applicable

E.18 Offer Phases

Not applicable

E.19 Early Purchase Discount

Not applicable

E.20 Time-Limited Offer

Not applicable

E.21 Subscription Period Beginning

Not applicable

E.22 Subscription Period End

Not applicable

E.23 Safeguarding Arrangements for Offered Funds/Crypto-Assets

Not applicable

E.24 Payment Methods for Crypto-Asset Purchase

SERV/EUR

E.25 Value Transfer Methods for Reimbursement

Not applicable

E.26 Right of Withdrawal

Not applicable

E.27 Transfer of Purchased Crypto-Assets

Not applicable

E.28 Transfer Time Schedule

Not applicable

E.29 Purchaser's Technical Requirements

Not applicable

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

Not applicable

E.31 CASP identifier

Not applicable

E.32 Placement Form

NTAV

E.33 Trading Platforms name

LCX AG

E.34 Trading Platforms Market Identifier Code (MIC)

LCXE

E.35 Trading Platforms Access

SERV is widely traded on numerous cryptocurrency exchanges globally. SERV is not confined to any single trading venue; it can be accessed by retail and institutional investors worldwide through dozens of exchanges. LCX Exchange now supports SERV trading (pair SERV/EUR). To access SERV trading on LCX, users must have an LCX account and complete the platform's KYC verification, as LCX operates under strict compliance standards. Trading on LCX is available via its web interface and APIs to verified customers.

E.36 Involved Costs

Not applicable

E.37 Offer Expenses

Not applicable

E.38 Conflicts of Interest

Not Applicable

E.39 Applicable Law

Not applicable –As such, SERV itself is not governed by a single national legal framework. The applicable laws depend on the jurisdictions where it is traded or utilized. However, in relation to the admission to trading of SERV on LCX Exchange, the laws of Liechtenstein apply in accordance with Regulation (EU) 2023/1114 (MiCA) and other applicable EU financial regulations.

E.40 Competent Court

In case of disputes related to services provided by LCX, the competent court is: The Courts of Liechtenstein, with jurisdiction in accordance with Liechtenstein law and applicable EU regulations

F. PART F - INFORMATION ABOUT THE CRYPTO-ASSETS

F.1 Crypto-Asset Type

Other Crypto-Asset

F.2 Crypto-Asset Functionality

The SERV token is a fungible crypto-asset (ERC-20) that performs several key roles within the OpenServ protocol infrastructure. Its primary function is to serve as a medium of exchange and coordination unit across various decentralized services enabled by the platform. Within the OpenServ ecosystem, SERV is used as a transactional token to enable certain protocol-level actions — such as triggering autonomous agent operations, interacting with advanced AI features, or accessing specialized agentic workflows. These uses are governed by smart contracts and may involve fees or internal token flows denominated in SERV, depending on application design and developer configuration.

Additionally, SERV functions as an incentive token within the platform's internal reward architecture. For example, developers of popular agent-based applications ("aApps") or contributors to ecosystem programs may receive SERV-based rewards as determined by transparent, protocol-driven rules or promotional campaigns. These rewards are discretionary and tied to measurable contributions, not contractual entitlements.

To align long-term network growth with token utility, OpenServ has implemented an automated mechanism where a portion of protocol-level revenues (e.g., from AI app usage) may be periodically allocated to market operations that include the repurchase and removal of SERV from circulation. This mechanism is embedded in protocol logic and does not guarantee value preservation or returns for holders. It is designed to incentivize platform usage rather than provide passive income or profit rights.

Importantly, SERV does not provide holders with any rights to governance, dividends, ownership, or access to specific services in the sense defined under Article 3(1)(8) of Regulation (EU) 2023/1114. It is not a utility token, electronic money token, or asset-referenced token. SERV does not grant holders enforceable legal claims against the issuer or any other party. Rather, it serves as a protocol-native coordination asset whose role is confined to on-chain economic operations, internal incentives, and ecosystem signaling.

The token is freely transferable, divisible, and tradable across regulated venues and decentralized markets. Its market value is determined by supply-demand dynamics and platform usage trends, without any representation of backing assets or external guarantees. In line with its design and use, SERV qualifies as an "Other Crypto-Asset" under Title II of MiCAR..

F.3 Planned Application of Functionalities

The SERV token is already integrated into OpenServ's early-stage platform and functions as a transactional and incentive asset. It is currently used to facilitate agent-based operations and to support ecosystem engagement through discretionary reward programs, such as developer bounties or community initiatives.

Looking ahead, OpenServ may introduce additional protocol-level functionalities involving SERV, including optional participation in decentralized governance models, discretionary staking mechanisms for developer accountability or enhanced user features, and broader interoperability across incubated projects. These planned applications remain subject to ongoing technical development and regulatory evaluation.Importantly, SERV does not confer any legal rights to access services, share in revenues, or participate in governance by default. All future uses will remain protocol-based and non-contractual, reinforcing SERV's role as an

internal coordination tool within the OpenServ ecosystem, consistent with its classification as an “Other Crypto-Asset” under MiCA.

F.4 Type of white paper

OTHR

F.5 The type of submission

NEWT

F.6 Crypto-Asset Characteristics

SERV is a fungible ERC-20 token on the Ethereum blockchain, created with a fixed total supply of 1,000,000,000 tokens in 2024. The token contract is immutable in terms of issuance, with no minting or inflation features. It does not impose any transfer fees or automatic burn mechanisms. Any reduction in circulating supply (such as token burns) is executed manually and is not guaranteed or programmed.

Transactions involving SERV are settled through Ethereum’s Proof-of-Stake consensus, with standard network fees paid in ETH. SERV can be held, transferred, and interacted with using any Ethereum-compatible infrastructure, and may also be bridged to other networks. Ethereum mainnet is recognized as the token’s canonical chain.

The token contract is non-upgradeable and minimal in function, currently secured via a multisig wallet held by the Issuer, which retains limited admin control (e.g., transfer pause in emergencies). No minting, balance modification, or token reconfiguration is possible. Future decentralization of contract control may occur subject to technical and regulatory conditions.

SERV does not represent ownership, governance rights, or claims to assets or profits. It is not an ART, EMT, or utility token under MiCA. Its classification as an “Other Crypto-Asset” reflects its role as a protocol-native coordination and incentive token, with value determined solely by market dynamics.

F.7 Commercial name or trading name

SERV

F.8 Website of the issuer

openserv.ai

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

2025-12-17

F.10 Publication date

2025-12-17

F.11 Any other services provided by the issuer

Not applicable

F.12 Language or languages of the white paper

English

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

Not available (none currently assigned)

F.14 Functionally Fungible Group Digital Token Identifier, where available

Not applicable

F.15 Voluntary data flag

true

F.16 Personal data flag

false

F.17 LEI eligibility

false

F.18 Home Member State

Liechtenstein

F.19 Host Member States

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

G. PART G - INFORMATION ON THE RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS ATTACHED TO THE CRYPTO-ASSETS

G.1 Purchaser Rights and Obligations

Holders of SERV obtain control over a fungible blockchain-based token deployed on Ethereum. This includes the ability to store SERV in compatible wallets, transfer it freely on supported networks or exchanges, and interact with smart contracts or services that accept it within the OpenServ ecosystem. These capabilities are technological in nature and enforced by blockchain infrastructure, not through contractual rights or obligations vis-à-vis the Issuer or any affiliated entity. SERV may be used within the OpenServ platform to access protocol-level functionalities—such as triggering agentic services or participating in future token-based mechanisms like staking or governance voting—if and when such features are introduced. These uses are governed entirely by the smart contract logic and platform design and do not confer enforceable claims to access, participation, or outcomes. Purchasers do not acquire any ownership interest, equity, or voting rights in OpenServ Ltd. They are not entitled to dividends, revenue sharing, or any form of financial return from the Issuer or other parties. SERV does not represent a debt instrument or entitlement to redemption. Obligations of token holders are limited to self-custody and lawful use. Users must manage their private keys securely and acknowledge that token loss resulting from user error is unrecoverable. Use of SERV on centralized exchanges or the OpenServ platform may be subject to additional terms of service, which users accept through participation. In essence, holding SERV provides users with the permission to engage in token transfers and interact with compatible applications, without imposing or guaranteeing any legal obligations on the Issuer or other parties. All utility is contingent on decentralized network operations and adoption, not contractual enforcement or issuer-backed promises.

G.2 Exercise of Rights and Obligation

SERV does not confer traditional contractual rights; its use is governed by smart contract logic and decentralized network protocols. The exercise of rights primarily refers to a holder's ability to use the token as intended within the OpenServ ecosystem or on supported Ethereum-based applications. A SERV holder may exercise these permissions by transferring tokens, initiating transactions to access agentic services, or interacting with decentralized applications that accept SERV. All such actions are executed through Ethereum transactions signed with the holder's private key, placing full responsibility on the user to manage access and usage. No involvement or approval from the Issuer is required for these transactions, and the Ethereum network processes them automatically via its consensus mechanism.

If future platform features such as staking or governance participation are introduced, holders would engage with them by submitting SERV through compatible smart contracts. These interactions, including potential voting or delegation, would be protocol-governed and optional. In the absence of such actions, SERV remains passive in the holder's address without expiration or forfeiture.

Obligations related to SERV use are largely off-chain and depend on users maintaining control of their wallet credentials and complying with applicable legal frameworks, such as anti-money laundering (AML) and sanctions compliance. The protocol itself imposes no enforcement mechanism beyond the inherent technical and economic constraints of the blockchain, such as gas fees and transaction validation. If optional corporate actions are introduced—such as contract upgrades, token migrations, or community initiatives—participation would be exercised by following technical instructions (e.g., signing a transaction), with no obligation to act.

G.3 Conditions for Modifications of Rights and Obligations

The functional parameters of SERV are defined by its fixed, non-upgradable smart contract deployed on Ethereum. The Issuer does not have the ability to mint new tokens, modify balances, or unilaterally change token mechanics. Any fundamental modification—such as a

contract upgrade or chain migration—would require deploying a new token contract and offering holders a swap. Those who choose not to participate would retain their original tokens, though they may lose platform support.

Platform-level updates, such as changes in how SERV is used within OpenServ applications, may be introduced by the Issuer through software releases. These updates affect application logic, not the token's underlying structure. Future governance participation by SERV holders may be considered, but no such mechanism is currently live.As SERV operates on Ethereum, any changes to the underlying network (e.g. forks or protocol upgrades) may impact the token's functionality. In such cases, the Issuer intends to follow the canonical Ethereum chain. Additionally, legal or regulatory changes may affect SERV's use in specific jurisdictions, but these external factors do not alter the token's technical properties.

G.4 Future Public Offers

Not applicable

G.5 Issuer Retained Crypto-Assets

Not applicable

G.6 Utility Token Classification

No

G.7 Key Features of Goods/Services of Utility Tokens

Not applicable

G.8 Utility Tokens Redemption

Not applicable

G.9 Non-Trading Request

True

G.10 Crypto-Assets Purchase or Sale Modalities

Not applicable

G.11 Crypto-Assets Transfer Restrictions

Not applicable

G.12 Supply Adjustment Protocols

The total supply of SERV is fixed at 1,000,000,000 tokens and was fully minted at launch in late 2024. The smart contract includes no minting capability, inflationary functions, or mechanisms to increase supply. As such, the maximum supply is immutable and cannot be adjusted upward. However, the circulating supply evolves over time based on scheduled token unlocks and token burns.

At launch, 25% of the total supply (250 million SERV) was distributed via public sale, with an additional ~16.5% from team, treasury, and community allocations becoming available shortly after. Approximately 58.5% of tokens were initially locked under vesting arrangements. As of September 2025, around 67% of total supply is in circulation, following programmed vesting events. Future unlocks are predefined and occur over a 36-month period via smart contracts or on-chain tracked schedules. The next major release is planned for February 2027, comprising approximately 1.33% of the total supply.

The SERV supply may also decrease through token burns initiated by the OpenServ platform. A discretionary buyback-and-burn mechanism is in place, whereby a portion of platform revenues is used to acquire SERV from the open market and send it to an irrecoverable (burn) address or lock it in a non-circulating contract. This mechanism is non-guaranteed and depends entirely on protocol usage and available revenues. Current burn activity is limited, reflecting the early development phase of the platform.

Additionally, Ethereum's EIP-1559 protocol reduces ETH supply via base fee burning. While this does not affect SERV directly, it may influence the cost of executing transactions involving SERV due to gas price fluctuations.

In summary, SERV's total supply is fixed, and the only supply adjustments occur through scheduled vesting unlocks and optional burns. These changes are transparent, non-inflationary, and governed by on-chain rules or discretionary platform operations.

G.13 Supply Adjustment Mechanisms

SERV's supply is governed by two primary mechanisms: time-based vesting and discretionary burns. Vesting unlocks are executed through smart contracts or time-locked wallets and govern the gradual release of team, treasury, and community allocations. These releases follow pre-defined schedules—typically monthly or quarterly—and are not subject to any conditions other than the passage of time. For example, team tokens were structured to unlock linearly over 24–36 months, with upcoming releases such as the final tranche scheduled for February 2027. All unlocks are transparent and observable via on-chain tools and public documentation.

In addition to vesting, SERV's circulating supply may decrease through discretionary token burns. OpenServ has implemented a mechanism to allocate a portion of platform revenues—currently 20%—towards the buyback and destruction of SERV tokens. These burn events are publicly executed on-chain and may be subject to external verification, though actual burn volumes depend entirely on platform usage and revenue generation. There is no automatic burn logic embedded in the token's smart contract.

Any significant change to the token's structure—such as migration to a new smart contract—would involve a transparent, opt-in process. In such a case, SERV holders would be given the option to swap tokens, but no automatic conversion or forced supply modification would occur. No reverse splits, re-denominations, or supply-altering changes are planned, and any future adjustments would be publicly disclosed and community-informed.

G.14 Token Value Protection Schemes

False

G.15 Token Value Protection Schemes Description

Not Applicable

G.16 Compensation Schemes

False

G.17 Compensation Schemes Description

Not Applicable

G.18 Applicable Law

Not applicable – As such, SERV itself is not governed by a single national legal framework. The applicable laws depend on the jurisdictions where it is traded or utilized. However, in

relation to the admission to trading of SERV on LCX Exchange, the laws of Liechtenstein apply in accordance with Regulation (EU) 2023/1114 (MiCA) and other applicable EU financial regulations.

G.19 Competent Court

Not applicable - As SERV (SERV) is a decentralized, open-source crypto-asset with no central issuer or governing entity, it does not fall under the jurisdiction of any specific legal framework. In case of disputes related to services provided by LCX, the competent court is: The Courts of Liechtenstein, with jurisdiction in accordance with Liechtenstein law and applicable EU regulations.

H. PART H – INFORMATION ON THE UNDERLYING TECHNOLOGY

H.1 Distributed ledger technology

The SERV token operates on the Ethereum blockchain, which is a decentralized, public distributed ledger using the Proof-of-Stake consensus mechanism (more details in H.4). Ethereum provides the infrastructure for recording token balances and transfers in a tamper-resistant manner across a globally distributed network of nodes. Every SERV transaction is a transaction on Ethereum's ledger, meaning it is propagated to thousands of nodes and validated by Ethereum's validators. Ethereum's DLT is designed to be secure and censorship-resistant: no single entity controls the network, and transaction finality is achieved typically within a few epochs (with probabilistic finality after a few minutes given PoS chain properties). As an ERC-20 token, SERV leverages the Ethereum Virtual Machine (EVM) – a runtime environment on the blockchain that executes smart contracts. The token's smart contract (the code that defines SERV's behavior) is stored and executed on Ethereum's ledger, ensuring that token operations follow the programmed rules consistently. Key attributes of Ethereum DLT in this context:

Transparency: All SERV token transactions and the token contract code are publicly viewable on Ethereum's ledger (e.g., via block explorers like Etherscan).

Immutability: Once transactions are confirmed into Ethereum blocks and finalized, they cannot be altered. This means token transfers and total supply are history that cannot be retroactively changed, providing certainty of ownership records.

Security: Ethereum's large number of validators and its economic security assumptions (stake slashing for malicious behavior) protect the network from double-spend attacks or other consensus attacks, as long as an attacker doesn't control a majority of staked ETH.

Scalability & Throughput: Ethereum currently handles on the order of ~15-30 transactions per second globally. SERV transfers are simple ERC-20 transfers, which are relatively lightweight, but Ethereum's capacity is shared by many applications. At times of congestion, gas prices (fees) rise and transactions may be delayed. Ethereum's roadmap (including sharding and Layer-2 solutions) aims to expand throughput. For instance, the Base network (Optimistic Rollup) where SERV is also present offers higher TPS by batching transactions and settling on Ethereum.

Smart Contract Capability: Ethereum's ledger not only tracks token balances but also can enforce complex logic via smart contracts. OpenServ may introduce additional smart contracts (beyond the token contract) on Ethereum or L2s to handle staking or other functionalities. These, too, will run on DLT, inheriting Ethereum's security and constraints.

SERV Whitepaper: SERV whitepaper

Public block explorer: https://etherscan.io/

SERV Main repository: https://github.com/openserv-labs

SERV Developer portal: https://www.openserv.ai/dev

H.2 Protocols and Technical Standards

SERV adheres to the ERC-20 token standard, which is the de facto technical standard for fungible tokens on Ethereum [obj]. The ERC-20 standard defines the functions and events a token contract should have (such as transfer, transferFrom, balanceOf, Approval events, etc.), ensuring compatibility with wallets, exchanges, and other smart contracts. The SERV token contract's code is based on the well-audited OpenZeppelin ERC-20 implementation, which includes standard safeguards (e.g., preventing overflow). In terms of network protocols, Ethereum uses a peer-to-peer gossip protocol for block propagation and transaction propagation; it runs on the ETH2.0 protocol (often referred to as the Beacon Chain for PoS consensus and the execution layer for EVM). Ethereum's technical standards relevant to SERV include:

EVM (Ethereum Virtual Machine): The runtime in which the ERC-20 contract executes. SERV's contract respects EVM standards for gas usage and state changes.

ABI (Application Binary Interface): The way in which off-chain applications interact with the token contract. The ERC-20 ABI is standard, so any application can use SERV's contract ABI to query balances or execute transfers.

Wallet Standards: SERV can be held in any wallet supporting ERC-20. There are standards like EIP-55 (checksumed addresses) that Ethereum wallets use to minimize errors in addresses, relevant to sending SERV.

Interoperability Standards: Should OpenServ integrate with other protocols (for example, if SERV is used in DeFi protocols like Uniswap, or if it becomes part of an index or cross-chain bridge), it relies on standards like EIP-2612 (permit function for gas-less approval, though currently SERV's contract does not implement EIP-2612, only basic approvals) or specific bridge protocols (like the official Base bridge for Layer-2 transfers of SERV).

Optimism (OP Stack) for Base: On the Base L2, the token follows the Optimism standard for token bridging (the "canonical token" standard for bridging ERC-20s), which ensures that the Base representation of SERV is one-to-one backed by mainnet SERV locked in the bridge. This involves the standard bridge contracts (ERC-20 bridge with lock/mint functions).

DNS/ENS: Not directly applicable to the token, but if OpenServ uses Ethereum Name Service (ENS) for addresses or domain integration, it adheres to those protocols.

Consensus Protocol: (Detailed in H.4, but to mention here) Ethereum's current consensus is Proof-of-Stake (PoS) with Casper/Beacon Chain finality. This replaced Proof-of-Work in September 2022, dropping energy consumption by ~99.95% [obj] [obj]. The consensus protocol is relevant because it underlies transaction finality and network security for SERV transfers.

Security Standards: Ethereum employs keccak-256 hashing for addresses and transaction integrity, and ECDSA (secp256k1 curve) for transaction signature verification. SERV tokens benefit from these cryptographic standards ensuring that only holders with the correct private key can authorize transfers. The token contract does not introduce custom cryptography; it relies on Ethereum's base security.

H.3 Technology Used

The OpenServ platform is built with a combination of on-chain and off-chain technologies:

On-chain: Ethereum smart contracts (Solidity) for the token and any token-related features (the core token contract and potentially small auxiliary contracts). These run on the Ethereum blockchain (and optionally Base L2 for scaling).

Off-chain: OpenServ's AI agent infrastructure runs off-chain in cloud or user environments. The agents communicate with each other and the platform's backend using typical web protocols (REST APIs, potentially decentralized messaging in future). The platform likely uses cloud computing and machine learning frameworks (like Python-based ML libraries, etc.) off-chain to handle the heavy AI tasks (which are not feasible on-chain). The integration layer may use APIs (e.g., pulling data from social platforms via their APIs, as implied by mention of LunarCrush data usage).

Integration with Telegram: The mention of Telegram distribution means OpenServ uses Telegram's API to deploy AI bots in chat – this part is not on DLT but part of the off-chain technology stack.

Programming languages: Off-chain, the team likely uses languages suited for AI (Python, etc.) and for agent orchestration. On-chain, Solidity for contracts.

SDK: OpenServ Labs has published an open-source SDK in TypeScript (@openserv/sdk) which developers use to build agents. This SDK likely handles communication between agent code and the OpenServ platform (making calls to the OpenServ backend and possibly to Ethereum if needed).

The web interface and no-code builder: These are standard web applications (likely using frameworks like React or similar, though specifics aren't given). They connect to user wallets (e.g., via web3 libraries) when needed to handle SERV transactions (like prompting a MetaMask transaction if a user pays in SERV).

Storage: For agent data and results, possibly a combination of centralized DB and decentralized storage (the context doesn't specify IPFS or similar, but given the ethos, they might plan to integrate decentralized storage for agent knowledge sharing).

Security tech: Multi-signature wallet (like a Gnosis Safe) may be used by the team to hold treasury tokens securely (ensuring no single person can misuse them).

Compliance tech: Because MiCA compliance is in view, LCX uses on-chain analytics and KYC systems to monitor token flows; these aren't part of the token's tech, but part of the environment.

Summarily, the technology used by the token is Ethereum blockchain tech, while the OpenServ platform leverages a modern tech stack combining AI software, cloud services, and standard web3 integration tools . This blend allows the project to harness blockchain's strengths (security, decentralization for token transactions) and traditional computing's strengths (scalability and flexibility for AI processing).

H.4 Consensus Mechanism

Ethereum's current consensus mechanism is Proof-of-Stake (PoS), implemented via the Ethereum Beacon Chain and Casper FFG finality. After "The Merge" in September 2022, Ethereum switched from Proof-of-Work to PoS, dramatically improving energy efficiency [OBJ] [OBJ]. In PoS, validators (instead of miners) take turns proposing and attesting to blocks of transactions. Validators are required to stake 32 ETH each as collateral, which can be slashed (partially forfeited) if they act dishonestly or go offline excessively. Blocks are produced roughly every 12 seconds in "slots", and a committee of validators votes on the validity of each block. Finality is reached when supermajority (2/3) of validators attest to a checkpoint, after which that state is considered final (cannot be reverted barring >1/3 of stake attacking).

Key properties of Ethereum's PoS consensus relevant to SERV:

Speed and Finality: Transactions (including SERV token transfers) typically get included in a block in under a minute (depending on gas price paid), and finality is achieved within 2 epochs (~13 minutes) with >99.9% probability final. This is a huge improvement over the probabilistic finality of PoW, which often considered ~6 blocks (~1.5 minutes) "secure", but even then not absolutely final. Now after finality, reorgs are practically impossible.

Security assumptions: An attacker would need to control 51% (technically >66% to break finality) of staked ETH to censor or alter Ethereum's ledger, which is economically unfeasible at scale (with Ethereum's market cap, this is tens of billions of USD, plus the fact that an attempt would be noticed and lead to slashing). Ethereum's PoS has been stable since the Merge and has resisted attacks; it has built-in crypto-economic penalties and rewards to maintain honest participation [OBJ] [OBJ].

No Mining: Because there is no mining, validators receive no block rewards in the form of new SERV (they get rewards in ETH only). There is no relationship between SERV and consensus, except that using SERV requires transactions which must be baked into blocks by validators. Validators are indifferent to which tokens are transacted – they just include valid transactions as per the fee market.

Transaction inclusion and ordering: Ethereum uses a fee mechanism (EIP-1559) where users specify a max fee and tip for validators. Transactions with higher priority fees tend to be included faster. This means if the OpenServ platform triggers many SERV transactions, those users will compete with others for block space by paying ETH fees. There's a risk of front-running and MEV (Miner/Maximal Extractable Value) on Ethereum – e.g., if someone sees a large SERV transaction in the mempool, they might attempt an arbitrage. These are general Ethereum considerations and not unique to SERV.

Validator decentralization: Ethereum currently has thousands of validators distributed globally, though there is some centralization in staking pools. Efforts are ongoing to further decentralize (with solutions like distributed validator tech). For now, a few large entities (exchanges, staking services) control a sizable portion of stake. This raises some centralization concerns (e.g., Lido, Coinbase, etc., together have significant share). It's not critical for an ERC-20 like SERV specifically, but generally for Ethereum's health.

H.5 Incentive Mechanisms and Applicable Fees

Ethereum's PoS network incentive structure is such that validators are rewarded in ETH for proposing and attesting blocks, and they earn transaction fees (tips) plus protocol issuance. With EIP-1559, a base fee is burned (in ETH) and only the tip is given to validators. This has implications:

For each SERV transfer, the sender must pay a gas fee in ETH. A typical ERC-20 transfer costs around 40,000 gas. If gas price is, say, 20 gwei (0.00000002 ETH), and ETH is valued at some amount, that could be a few cents to a few dollars. Part of that fee is burned and part

goes to validators. As such, there's a small deflationary effect on ETH with each SERV transaction, but that doesn't directly affect SERV except tying usage to a minor ETH burn.

There are no native incentives or fees within the SERV smart contract itself. Unlike some tokens that implement reflection fees or similar, SERV transfers 100% of value to the recipient (minus Ethereum gas in ETH).

The OpenServ platform's incentive model for token holders is off-chain: as described, they will use platform revenue to buy/burn SERV (this is an economic incentive for holding tokens – as usage grows, supply might decrease). Also, holders who stake or participate might earn rewards in SERV from the allocated community pool (the ~12.8% community airdrop/allocation is likely meant for such incentives) [OBJ].

For AI agents, if users pay in SERV for services, presumably the platform or agent developers receive those tokens as revenue, aligning incentives for developers to improve their agents (since more usage = more tokens earned, and hopefully token value rises with demand).

Spam prevention & security: Ethereum's gas fees act as a natural spam deterrent – it costs real value to send transactions, so attackers cannot flood the network with infinite free transactions. There's no additional spam prevention needed for SERV beyond Ethereum's own.

No staking yields from protocol: Holding SERV alone does not yield more SERV automatically (unless a third-party yield farm or something is set up; none is official). If governance staking is introduced, the incentive to stake might be voting power or share of some community pool distribution, but that's speculative future.

Fees on platform vs network: Within the OpenServ application, they might charge a fee (say, 1 SERV per use of a certain agent) – that's a platform usage fee (revenue for developers/issuer) and distinct from network fees which are in ETH. This means using SERV in-app might involve two layers of fees: the app's fee (in SERV, which might be partially burned or given to devs) and the network fee (in ETH to execute the token transfer or interaction on-chain). To mitigate UX issues, OpenServ might implement meta-transactions or off-chain credit systems for microtransactions, resorting to on-chain only when necessary.

Monetary policy of Ethereum: As part of incentive discussion: Ethereum's issuance of ETH to validators is about ~4.3% annual pre-burn, often net ~0% or deflationary post-burn depending on usage. This means Ethereum's native token ETH has its own economy which can indirectly impact SERV – e.g., if Ethereum fees become very high due to a bull market, using SERV becomes expensive, possibly hindering small transactions. On the flip side, if Ethereum becomes deflationary (burning more ETH than issuing), ETH price might rise, again making gas more expensive. These external factors could influence how OpenServ structures their usage of SERV (perhaps encouraging batching of transactions or L2 use).

H.6 Use of Distributed Ledger Technology

True

H.7 DLT Functionality Description

SERV is a fungible crypto-asset implemented as an ERC-20 token on the Ethereum blockchain. Ethereum functions as the underlying distributed ledger technology, providing secure, decentralized transaction processing and immutable record-keeping. The DLT enables SERV holders to transfer tokens, interact with smart contracts, and engage in platform-specific functionalities such as agent-based services within the OpenServ ecosystem. Each transaction is recorded on-chain and validated through Ethereum's Proof-of-Stake consensus mechanism.

Ethereum's DLT ensures transparency, auditability, and resilience, with transaction data publicly accessible via blockchain explorers like Etherscan. The SERV token does not rely on any proprietary ledger infrastructure and inherits all core DLT functionalities from Ethereum's mainnet environment, including finality, censorship resistance, and compatibility with decentralized applications.

H.8 Audit

True

H.9 Audit Outcome

The SERV token smart contract underwent an independent security audit conducted by Cyberscope, with key findings made publicly available. The audit confirmed that the ERC-20 implementation adheres to a fixed-supply model, includes no minting or inflationary features, and does not contain any backdoors or administrative overrides beyond transfer pausing functionality . No critical or high-severity vulnerabilities were identified. Minor recommendations primarily focused on optimization and clarity of the implementation. The full audit report is accessible on Cyberscope's platform, providing transparency to developers, users, and stakeholders. Future audits may be undertaken in the event of smart contract migration or deployment of additional protocol components.

Audit link: Cyberscope Audit Report

I. PART I – INFORMATION ON RISKS

I.1 Offer-Related Risks

Market Volatility and Liquidity Risk: The price of SERV may fluctuate significantly due to limited liquidity, speculative trading, or broader market sentiment, which may result in substantial losses or slippage during trades.

Regulatory Risk: SERV may be classified differently across jurisdictions outside the EEA, potentially facing trading restrictions, reclassification, or delistings that could impact accessibility and value.

Exchange and Platform Risk: Trading of SERV relies on third-party platforms, which may experience technical issues, security breaches, or insolvency, affecting holders' ability to trade or access their assets.

Listing and Admission Risk: Admission to trading does not ensure permanent availability; SERV could be suspended or delisted if it fails to meet platform or regulatory standards, impacting liquidity and exposure.

Information Availability Risk: Delays or failures in communicating material updates, along with misinformation in the broader market, could result in uninformed investment decisions and short-term price volatility.

Concentration of Holdings Risk: A large portion of SERV is held by early stakeholders, and post-vesting sales could place downward pressure on the token's price, particularly in low-liquidity conditions.

General Market Risk: SERV's value is influenced by overall crypto and AI market trends; broader downturns can adversely impact its price regardless of project-specific developments.

I.2 Issuer-Related Risks

Execution and Operational Risk: The Issuer is a newly formed startup still in active development. Delays, technical failures, or inability to deliver planned features—such as the AI agent marketplace—could reduce demand for SERV and negatively affect its utility and value.

Financial and Going Concern Risk: The Issuer may be operating at a financial loss and is dependent on initial funding. If it cannot raise additional capital through investors or revenue, it may need to reduce operations or shut down, which could eliminate the practical utility of SERV.

Team and Key Person Risk: The Issuer relies heavily on a small founding team. Loss or unavailability of key personnel, or gaps in execution capacity, could disrupt the project's development and undermine its long-term success.

Ecosystem Adoption Risk: The viability of SERV depends on successful platform adoption by developers and users. Failure to attract a community or business use cases may result in low transaction volume, weakening demand for SERV within the ecosystem.

Legal and Regulatory Risk: The Issuer operates in sectors subject to evolving regulations. Future legal challenges—such as data, privacy, or IP compliance related to AI—could impose significant costs or force platform changes, thereby affecting SERV's utility.

Governance and Centralization Risk: The Issuer and core team currently hold significant influence over platform parameters and token reserves. This centralization poses risks of misaligned decisions or potential conflicts of interest, particularly if on-chain governance is introduced without checks on insider control.

Third-Party Dependency Risk: The platform's performance depends on external infrastructure providers (e.g., APIs, hosting services, data layers). Service degradation, pricing changes, or API access restrictions from key vendors could reduce platform reliability or functionality.

Competitive Risk: The AI and crypto integration space is rapidly evolving. Competing projects offering similar services or more attractive token models could capture user and developer interest, undermining OpenServ's market position and impacting SERV's relevance.

I.3 Crypto-Assets-Related Risks

Smart Contract Vulnerabilities / Hacks: Although SERVChain is a permissioned system, it is Price Volatility Risk that SERV may experience extreme and sudden price fluctuations, particularly due to low market capitalization and thin trading volumes, which can lead to rapid value loss without warning.

Liquidity and Trading Venue Risk: Limited trading venues and low liquidity may hinder the ability to buy or sell SERV at desired prices, increasing the risk of slippage or being unable to exit large positions quickly.

Custodial and Self-Custody Risk: Holding SERV on exchanges exposes users to counterparty risk (e.g., exchange failure), while self-custody requires secure private key management; loss of access or compromise may result in irreversible loss of tokens.

Smart Contract Risk: Although SERV's token contract is standard, other smart contracts interacting with it (e.g., for DeFi use) may contain vulnerabilities, potentially leading to theft or permanent loss of SERV tokens.

Consensus and Network Risk: SERV relies on Ethereum's infrastructure; issues like critical bugs, high gas fees, or hypothetical network attacks could disrupt functionality, reduce usability, or undermine confidence in the token.

Regulatory Risk (Token-Specific): Future regulatory changes may reclassify tokens like SERV, restrict usage, or introduce complex taxation rules (e.g., microtransaction tax), potentially reducing demand or deterring usage.

Cybersecurity Risk: The SERV ecosystem may face broader cybersecurity threats such as phishing, DNS hijacking, or vulnerabilities in Layer-2 infrastructure, which could result in user losses or network manipulation.

Fork and Airdrop Risk: If the underlying blockchain forks, SERV could split into multiple versions, creating confusion, volatility, or divergence in value—especially if only one version is supported going forward.

I.4 Project Implementation-Related Risks

Product Development Risk: The platform's roadmap involves technically complex features (e.g. multi-agent systems, marketplaces, agent builders), and there is a risk that some components may be delayed, scaled down, or not implemented as planned, potentially reducing adoption and token utility.

Adoption and Network Effect Risk: The success of the platform relies on widespread adoption by developers and users. If the project fails to achieve sufficient traction, or if alternatives become more appealing, SERV's ecosystem demand and relevance could diminish.

AI Domain Risk: Operating in a rapidly evolving and sensitive technological area, the platform could face challenges from regulatory changes, ethical concerns, or technical obsolescence—especially if AI agents produce inaccurate or non-compliant results.

Scalability Risk: The platform's infrastructure must support high-volume agent interactions and microtransactions. Limitations in throughput, especially for on-chain operations, could create performance bottlenecks or cost inefficiencies that impair user experience.

External Dependency Risk: Certain platform features may depend on third-party APIs, data sources, or external AI service providers. Changes in access, pricing, or service availability could disrupt functionality or increase operational costs.

Team and Organizational Risk: Scaling the team and operations introduces risk around project management, technical execution, and regulatory compliance. Mismanagement or lack of coordination could delay development or introduce vulnerabilities.

Community and Governance Risk: If community governance is introduced, there may be risks of contentious votes, low participation, or manipulation by large token holders. Disputes between the team and token holders could delay decision-making and affect implementation priorities.

I.5 Technology-Related Risks

Smart Contract Risk: While SERV's core token contract is simple and audited, any future smart contracts (e.g., staking, vesting) may contain bugs or vulnerabilities. Exploits could result in loss or locking of user funds, and even perceived risk may cause market panic.

Blockchain Infrastructure Risk: SERV operates on a public blockchain that, while secure, may still be affected by theoretical protocol-level bugs, cryptographic failures, or large-scale network outages that could disrupt operations and confidence.

Consensus and Reorganization Risk: Although improbable on major chains, consensus failures or attacks (e.g., on Layer-2 systems) could lead to transaction reordering, double-spending, or data inconsistencies that impact SERV's reliability.

Quantum Computing Risk: While a long-term concern, advances in quantum computing could compromise current cryptographic standards. If not mitigated through protocol upgrades, such developments could allow attackers to forge transactions.

Integration and API Risk: The platform may rely on various third-party APIs and services. Changes, outages, or attacks targeting those integrations could disrupt functionality or lead to data leaks affecting platform users.

User Interface and Operational Risk: Errors by users—such as sending tokens to incorrect addresses—or compromised user interfaces (e.g., phishing via DNS hijacking) can lead to irreversible losses and reduced trust in the platform.

Scalability and Performance Risk: The AI features within OpenServ may demand significant computing resources. In cases of rapid growth or traffic spikes, performance bottlenecks could hinder functionality, user experience, or responsiveness.

Interoperability and Bridge Risk: If SERV or its related services interact across chains or via cross-chain bridges, such integrations may expose the platform to additional vulnerabilities common in interoperability tools.

I.6 Mitigation Measures

Smart Contract Security: The token contract is based on audited, standardized code and has no critical vulnerabilities, reducing the likelihood of exploitable bugs.

Blockchain Infrastructure Choice: Deployment on a widely adopted proof-of-stake blockchain enhances network security, stability, and energy efficiency.

Administrative Controls: Multi-signature access for admin functions mitigates the risk of unilateral actions or mismanagement of contract permissions.

Token Vesting and Allocation Controls: Team and treasury tokens are subject to structured vesting schedules, helping to prevent large-scale token dumping and aligning incentives.

User Self-Custody and Decentralized Access: Support for self-custody wallets and decentralized trading avenues reduces reliance on intermediaries and central custodians.

AI Agent and Platform Safety Measures: AI functions are likely restricted through sandboxing and permission layers to reduce the risk of unsafe or unauthorized actions.

Continuous Development and Patchability: The issuer commits to updating the platform promptly in case of technical vulnerabilities, ensuring continued operational security.

Community Engagement and Transparency: Open community channels and transparent code repositories encourage reporting of bugs and third-party audits for better oversight.

Scalability and Network Resilience: Load management, fallback systems, and potential Layer-2 solutions help ensure smooth operation during high demand or cost surges.

Market Surveillance and Anomaly Detection: Trading activity is monitored to detect suspicious behavior, with mechanisms to pause trading if necessary to protect market integrity.

Sustainable Tokenomics: A deflationary model tied to actual platform usage promotes long-term value without relying on unsustainable inflationary rewards.

Contingency and Emergency Response: Contract pause functions and clear communication protocols are in place to respond to critical incidents or network forks efficiently.

J. PART J - INFORMATION ON THE SUSTAINABILITY INDICATORS IN RELATION TO ADVERSE IMPACT ON THE CLIMATE AND OTHER ENVIRONMENT-RELATED ADVERSE IMPACTS

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

J.1 Information on principal adverse impacts on the climate and other environment-related adverse impacts of the consensus mechanism

The SERV token functions on a public blockchain network that uses a Proof-of-Stake (PoS) consensus mechanism, which is widely regarded as more energy-efficient than Proof-of-Work (PoW) systems. Instead of relying on computational mining, PoS validators secure the network based on staked assets, resulting in lower energy consumption overall. Although this design reduces environmental impact, it still entails energy use, which varies depending on validator infrastructure, operational efficiency, and geographic factors. The SERV token does not operate its own blockchain or maintain an independent validator network. Its transaction processing, security, and finality are entirely supported by the existing PoS-based public blockchain it utilizes. Accordingly, any environmental impact associated with SERV is inherently linked to the energy footprint of that broader network, rather than stemming from token-specific activities.

General information	
S.1 Name *Name reported in field A.1*	LCX
S.2 Relevant legal entity identifier Identifier referred to in field A.2	529900SN07Z6RTX8R418
S.3 Name of the crypto-asset Name of the crypto-asset, as reported in field D.2	SERV
S.4 Consensus Mechanism The consensus mechanism, as reported in field H.4	The crypto-asset's Proof-of-Stake (PoS) consensus mechanism, introduced with The Merge in 2022, replaces mining with validator staking. Validators must stake at least 32 ETH every block a validator is randomly chosen to propose the next block. Once proposed the other validators verify the blocks integrity. The

	network operates on a slot and epoch system, where a new block is proposed every 12 seconds, and finalization occurs after two epochs (~12.8 minutes) using Casper-FFG. The Beacon Chain coordinates validators, while the fork-choice rule (LMD-GHOST) ensures the chain follows the heaviest accumulated validator votes. Validators earn rewards for proposing and verifying blocks, but face slashing for malicious behavior or inactivity. PoS aims to improve energy efficiency, security, and scalability, with future upgrades like Proto-Danksharding enhancing transaction efficiency.
S.5 Incentive Mechanisms and Applicable Fees Incentive mechanisms to secure transactions and any fees applicable, as reported in field H.5	The crypto-asset's PoS system secures transactions through validator incentives and economic penalties. Validators stake at least 32 ETH and earn rewards for proposing blocks, attesting to valid ones, and participating in sync committees. Rewards are paid in newly issued ETH and transaction fees. Under EIP-1559, transaction fees consist of a base fee, which is burned to reduce supply, and an optional priority fee (tip) paid to validators. Validators face slashing if they act maliciously and incur penalties for inactivity. This system aims to increase security by aligning incentives while making the crypto-asset's fee structure more predictable and deflationary during high network activity.
S.6 Beginning of the period to which the disclosure relates	2024-05-18
S.7 End of the period to which the disclosure relates	2025-05-18
Mandatory key indicator on energy consumption	
S.8 Energy consumption Total amount of energy used for the validation of transactions and the maintenance of the integrity of the distributed ledger of transactions, expressed per calendar year	538.42495 kWh per year
Sources and methodologies	
S.9 Energy consumption sources and Methodologies Sources and methodologies used in relation to the information reported in field S.8	For the calculation of energy consumptions, the so called "bottom-up" approach is being used. The nodes are considered to be the central factor for the energy consumption of the network. These assumptions are made on the basis of empirical findings through the use of public information sites, open-source crawlers and crawlers developed in-house. The main

	determinants for estimating the hardware used within the network are the requirements for operating the client software. The energy consumption of the hardware devices was measured in certified test laboratories. When calculating the energy consumption, we used - if available - the Functionally Fungible Group Digital Token Identifier (FFG DTI) to determine all implementations of the asset of question in scope and we update the mappings regularly, based on data of the Digital Token Identifier Foundation.

J.2 Supplementary information on principal adverse impacts on the climate and other environment-related adverse impacts of the consensus mechanism

Not applicable