



1. Overview and Purpose of HPP DAO

1.1 Definition of HPP DAO

HPP DAO is a decentralized governance organization responsible for decision-making across the House Party Protocol ecosystem.

HPP DAO enables collective decision-making through token-based governance mechanisms, covering:

- Protocol operations
- Ecosystem expansion
- Resource allocation

HPP DAO operates not through arbitrary decisions of a single entity, but strictly in accordance with predefined governance procedures and rules.

1.2 Background

HPP is designed as an AI-first blockchain and data infrastructure, built to support a diverse and evolving ecosystem of stakeholders.

As the protocol matures:

- technical, economic, and operational decisions become increasingly complex
- centralized decision-making introduces structural limitations

HPP DAO is established to address these limitations by:

- decentralizing decision-making
- ensuring long-term sustainability
- improving predictability across governance processes

1.3 Objectives

The objectives of HPP DAO are as follows:

- decentralization of core protocol decision-making
- alignment of stakeholder interests within the ecosystem
- establishment of transparent and verifiable governance processes
- long-term stability and scalability of the protocol
- continuous evolution of governance itself

1.4 Core Governance Principles

HPP DAO is guided by the following principles:

- Explicitness
 - All governance procedures, authorities, and conditions must be clearly defined and documented in advance.
- Predictability
 - Participants must be able to anticipate governance outcomes and their potential impact.
- Gradual Evolution
 - Governance structures evolve progressively in alignment with the protocol's maturity.
- Accountability
 - Approved proposals must be executable, and execution outcomes must be traceable.
- Principle of Least Authority
 - Each governance layer exercises only the minimum authority necessary to fulfill its role.

1.5 Scope of Application

HPP DAO holds decision-making authority over matters that affect the protocol as a whole.

- The detailed scope and limitations of this authority are defined in subsequent sections
- This document serves as the highest-level governance framework for HPP DAO

2. Governance Scope & Authority

2.1 Purpose

This section defines the scope and limitations of the decision-making authority exercised by HPP DAO.

- Authority is limited strictly to explicitly defined areas
- Any authority not defined within this document is not implicitly granted

The purpose of this section is to:

- prevent misuse of governance authority
- ensure a predictable decision-making environment for participants

2.2 Scope of Decision-Making

HPP DAO holds authority over the following areas:

- establishment and modification of governance rules and procedures
- modification of core protocol parameters
- approval of treasury allocation and usage
- approval of protocol upgrades and structural changes
- governance-related policy decisions

2.3 Boundaries of Authority

HPP DAO decision-making is limited to matters that impact the protocol at a systemic level.

HPP DAO does not:

- intervene in individual user behavior
- manage individual applications
- control operations of external projects

All DAO decisions must be:

- actionable
- clearly defined
- executable

Declarative or ambiguous proposals without defined execution scope are not considered valid governance actions.

2.4 Limitations

HPP DAO does not exercise direct authority over:

- actions restricted by applicable laws or regulations
- unilateral changes to external systems
- bypassing predefined automated execution mechanisms
- direct control over individual user assets

2.5 Separation of Governance and Operations

HPP DAO functions as a strategic and policy-level decision-making body.

- operational execution
- technical implementation
- infrastructure maintenance

are not direct responsibilities of the DAO.

The DAO may:

- approve or restrict operational authority

but does not replace operational entities.

2.6 On-chain and Off-chain Governance

HPP DAO governance is executed through a combination of:

- off-chain processes → discussion, analysis, consensus formation
- on-chain processes → binding approval and execution

The authority and effect of each layer are defined in subsequent sections.

2.7 Conditions for Authority

All governance actions are valid only if:

- predefined procedures are followed
- decisions are recorded in a verifiable manner

Any decision made outside of defined governance processes is not recognized as an official DAO decision.

2.8 Accountability

All executed decisions approved by HPP DAO are considered:

→ collective decisions of the DAO

- individual participants exercise voting and opinion rights
- execution outcomes are attributed to the DAO as a whole

This structure prevents concentration of responsibility in a single entity.

3. Governance Architecture

3.1 Accountability

This section defines the structural layers of HPP DAO governance and their respective roles.

HPP DAO adopts a multi-layer governance architecture rather than a single-step process.

The architecture is designed to ensure:

- decision quality
- execution reliability
- process efficiency
- data integrity across governance activities

3.2 Governance Layers

HPP DAO governance consists of four primary layers:

- Forum Layer
- Voting Layer
- Execution Layer
- Integration Layer

Each layer is complementary and does not function independently.

3.3 Forum Layer

The Forum Layer is responsible for:

- initial proposal discussions
- problem definition
- risk evaluation
- community feedback

Key characteristics:

- non-binding
- prerequisite for Voting Layer

Operational details are defined in the [Forum](<https://forum.hpp.io/>)

3.4 Voting Layer

The Voting Layer is the formal decision-making stage of HPP DAO.

Key functions:

- approval or rejection of proposals
- validation of governance conditions

Voting outcomes:

- transition proposals into executable state

Voting may be conducted:

- on-chain or off-chain

depending on governance rules.

3.5 Execution Layer

The Execution Layer is responsible for implementing approved proposals.

Principles:

- no execution without approval
- full traceability
- adherence to predefined execution logic

Execution may include:

- timelock mechanisms
- controlled execution flows

Detailed policies are defined in the Execution & Timelock Policy.

3.6 Integration Layer

The Integration Layer connects governance activity with incentive mechanisms.

Core functions:

- aggregation of governance activities
- conversion of activity into XP
- calculation of user contribution
- linkage to staking reward system

3.7 XP System

XP represents quantified participation in HPP DAO.

XP reflects:

- proposal participation
- discussion contribution
- governance engagement

XP does not:

- grant governance authority

It functions solely as:

- participation metric

- reward signal

3.8 Staking Reward Integration

XP data is integrated into staking rewards.

Reward design considers:

- capital contribution (staking)
- participation contribution (XP)

This creates a balance between:

→ capital-based participation

→ activity-based contribution

3.9 Inter-layer Relationship

- Forum Layer → prerequisite for Voting
- Voting Layer → triggers Execution
- Execution Layer → feeds results into Integration
- Integration Layer → records and aggregates

Integration Layer does not alter governance decisions.

3.10 Hybrid Architecture

HPP DAO operates with a hybrid structure:

- off-chain → efficiency & discussion
- on-chain → trust & execution

The Integration Layer ensures data consistency between both.

3.11 Resilience Design

The system is designed to avoid:

- single points of failure
- dependency on a single metric or activity

All aggregation logic must remain verifiable.

3.12 Extensibility

The governance system is designed to support:

- new activity types
- new reward mechanisms
- new metrics

All structural changes must be approved through governance processes.

4. Token & Voting Power Design

4.1 Purpose

This section defines the role of the governance token and the mechanism for determining voting power within HPP DAO.

HPP DAO adopts a token-based governance model while ensuring that:

- token ownership alone does not automatically grant full governance authority
- governance participation reflects both commitment and responsibility

The design aims to ensure:

- legitimacy of decision-making
- predictability of outcomes
- long-term governance stability

4.2 Role of the Governance Token

The HPP governance token serves as the foundational unit of governance participation.

It enables:

- eligibility to participate in governance voting
- qualification for proposal submission
- alignment of economic interests with governance outcomes

The governance token is distinct from:

- payment tokens
- protocol usage fees

4.3 Definition of Voting Power

Voting Power represents the influence a participant can exert in governance decisions.

- Voting Power is determined based on the amount of HPP tokens staked
- Voting Power applies only to proposal approval or rejection
- Voting Power does not grant direct execution authority

4.4 Calculation of Voting Power

Voting Power is calculated as follows:

- based on the amount of staked HPP tokens at the snapshot moment
- fixed at the beginning of the voting period

During voting:

- token transfers do not affect Voting Power
- all calculations are verified either on-chain or off-chain depending on the voting mechanism

4.5 Future Adjustments

The token and Voting Power design is subject to evolution.

Possible adjustments include:

- changes to calculation methods
- introduction of weighting mechanisms
- structural separation of voting rights

All changes must:

- follow governance procedures
- be publicly announced
- include sufficient review periods before implementation

5. Proposal Types & Classification

5.1 Purpose

This section defines the classification of proposals within HPP DAO.

The objective is to:

- differentiate proposals based on risk and impact
- ensure efficient and stable decision-making
- avoid applying uniform standards to fundamentally different proposal types

5.2 Definition of a Proposal

A Proposal is a structured request for an official decision by HPP DAO.

A valid proposal must:

- be clearly defined
- be executable upon approval or lead to execution

The following are not considered proposals:

- informal opinions
- general discussions
- non-binding suggestions

5.3 Proposal Categories

HPP DAO classifies proposals into four types:

- Protocol Proposal
- Treasury Proposal
- Governance Proposal
- Meta Proposal

Each category differs in:

- purpose
- impact scope
- required governance conditions

5.4 Protocol Proposal

Protocol Proposals relate to changes in the core protocol.

Examples include:

- modification of core parameters
- addition or removal of features
- structural upgrades

Characteristics:

- requires high technical review
- has system-wide impact

5.5 Treasury Proposal

Treasury Proposals relate to the allocation and usage of DAO funds.

Examples include:

- development funding
- ecosystem incentives
- partnership expenditures

Requirements:

- clear purpose of fund usage
- defined execution plan

5.6 Governance Proposal

Governance Proposals relate to changes in governance structure and rules.

Examples include:

- modification of voting rules
- adjustment of proposal lifecycle
- governance parameter changes

These proposals:

- have long-term impact
- require careful review

5.7 Meta Proposal

Meta Proposals are non-binding proposals used for signaling.

They are used for:

- preliminary discussion
- sentiment gathering
- strategic direction

Meta Proposals:

- do not trigger execution
- serve as inputs for future formal proposals

5.8 Requirements by Proposal Type

Each proposal type may have different requirements, including:

- submission criteria
- Voting Power thresholds

- Quorum
- voting period

Detailed parameters are defined in the Voting Rules.

5.9 Evolution of Classification

The classification framework is not fixed.

Changes may include:

- introduction of new proposal types
- modification of existing categories

All changes must be approved through Governance Proposals.

5.10 Multi-Type Proposals

A proposal may fall under multiple categories.

In such cases:

- classification is determined by the highest level of risk or impact
- if unclear, the proposal is treated as a Governance Proposal

5.11 Position in Governance System

This section serves as a prerequisite for:

- Proposal Lifecycle
- Voting Rules

Proposal classification determines:

→ applicable governance procedures

5.12 Discussion Categories (Forum Reference)

For structured discussion, proposals are typically categorized into:

- A. Governance & DAO Operations
- B. Protocol & Network Parameters
- C. Treasury & Funding
- D. Ecosystem & Growth
- E. Product & Integration Feedback
- F. Signaling & Temperature Check

Each category reflects:

- scope of discussion
- likelihood of transition to Voting

6. Proposal Lifecycle

6.1 Purpose

This section defines the full lifecycle of a proposal, from initial discussion to execution and integration.

The lifecycle ensures:

- transparency
- predictability
- execution reliability

All proposals must follow this defined lifecycle.

6.2 Lifecycle Overview

The HPP DAO Proposal Lifecycle consists of five phases:

- Phase 1: Discussion
- Phase 2: Formalization
- Phase 3: Voting
- Phase 4: Execution
- Phase 5: Integration

Each phase must be completed before progressing to the next.

6.3 Phase 1: Discussion

Conducted in the Forum Layer.

Purpose:

- define the problem
- collect feedback
- evaluate risks and alternatives

Characteristics:

- non-binding
- informal stage

6.4 Phase 2: Formalization

The proposal is structured into a formal format.

Requirements:

- must follow the Proposal Template (recommended standard)
- proposal type must be clearly defined

Outcome:

→ ready for Voting Layer

6.5 Phase 3: Voting

Formal decision-making phase.

Possible outcomes:

- Approved
- Rejected

Only Approved proposals proceed to Execution.

Voting results:

- are final
- cannot be altered

6.6 Phase 4: Execution

Implementation of approved proposals.

Execution principles:

- no execution beyond approved scope
- adherence to predefined logic
- verifiable outcomes

Execution is handled via the Execution Layer.

6.7 Phase 5: Integration

Final stage of the lifecycle.

Includes:

- recording governance participation
- recording execution results
- updating XP system

Outputs are used for:

- reward distribution
- governance analytics

6.8 Proposal States

A proposal may exist in the following states:

- Draft
- In Discussion
- Formalized
- Voting Active
- Approved
- Rejected
- Executed
- Integrated

State transitions must be clearly defined.

6.9 Termination Conditions

A proposal lifecycle may terminate if:

- it is rejected during Voting
- it fails to meet Formalization requirements

Terminated proposals:

- may be resubmitted
- must clearly indicate revisions

6.10 Exception Handling

In case of:

- technical errors
- external disruptions

The following principles apply:

- minimize exceptions

- ensure full transparency
- maintain immutable records

Exceptions do not retroactively alter past results.

6.11 System Role

The Proposal Lifecycle defines:

- the minimum governance process
- the structural backbone of DAO decision-making

All proposals must adhere to this lifecycle.

7. Voting Rules

7.1 Purpose

This section defines the rules governing proposal voting within HPP DAO.

Voting Rules ensure:

- legitimacy
- consistency
- predictability

All proposal outcomes are determined based on these rules.

7.2 Scope

Voting Rules apply to:

- all proposals within HPP DAO

Certain parameters may vary depending on proposal type.

7.3 Voting Mechanism

HPP DAO adopts a token-based voting system.

Voting may be conducted:

- on-chain
- off-chain

Each proposal must specify:

- the voting method used
- the corresponding governance effect

7.4 Voting Power

Voting Power is:

- based on governance token holdings (staking-based)
- fixed at the snapshot moment

Token movement during voting does not affect results.

7.5 Voting Period

Voting Period:

- varies by proposal type
- must balance participation and efficiency

Each proposal must define its Voting Period.

7.6 Quorum

Quorum is the minimum participation threshold required for a valid vote.

Defined as:

- a percentage of total Voting Power

If Quorum is not met:

→ proposal is automatically rejected

Quorum may vary depending on proposal type.

7.7 Approval Threshold

Approval Threshold defines the minimum level of support required for approval.

Applied after Quorum is met.

Possible thresholds include:

- simple majority
- supermajority

7.8 Result Determination

A proposal is approved only if:

- Quorum is met

- Approval Threshold is met

Otherwise, the proposal is rejected.

7.9 Invalid Voting

Voting results may be invalidated in cases of:

- system errors
- incorrect Voting Power calculation

Invalidation is handled through governance procedures.

7.10 Participation Constraints

- each address may vote only once per proposal
- Voting Power cannot be duplicated or split
- automated voting may be restricted

7.11 Result Publication

After voting:

- results are publicly recorded
- records are immutable

Summary results may be shared via the Forum.

7.12 Rule Changes

Voting Rules may only be modified through Governance Proposals.

Changes must:

- be announced in advance
- include a review period
- not apply retroactively

7.13 System Role

Voting Rules form:

→ the core validation mechanism of governance decisions

All outcomes must be interpreted based on these rules.

8. Execution & Timelock Policy

8.1 Purpose

This section defines the procedures and principles for executing approved proposals within HPP DAO.

The Execution Policy is designed to ensure:

- reliability of governance decisions
- security of execution
- predictability of outcomes

Timelock mechanisms act as a safeguard between approval and execution.

8.2 Scope

This policy applies to:

- all proposals that have reached the Approved state

Execution conditions may vary depending on:

- proposal type
- risk level
- impact scope

8.3 Definition of Execution

Execution refers to the process of translating an approved proposal into actual state changes.

Execution may include:

- smart contract interactions
- parameter updates
- asset transfers
- system configuration changes

Execution must strictly adhere to the approved scope.

8.4 Role of the Execution Layer

The Execution Layer serves as the technical interface responsible for implementing approved proposals.

It operates under the following principles:

- no execution without prior approval
- deterministic execution based on voting results
- full traceability of execution outcomes

The Execution Layer does not:

- reinterpret governance decisions
- modify approved proposals

8.5 Purpose of Timelock

Timelock introduces a delay between approval and execution.

Its purpose is to:

- allow stakeholders time to react
- mitigate unexpected risks
- provide a reflection period before irreversible actions

Timelock is considered a core component of governance safety.

8.6 Timelock Configuration

Timelock duration and application may vary depending on:

- proposal type
- risk level

General principles:

- high-impact proposals → longer timelock
- low-risk proposals → shorter timelock

Specific parameters are defined:

- within Voting Rules
- or at the proposal level

8.7 Execution Authority

- Execution is performed through:
 - authorized contracts
 - predefined system mechanisms

No single entity should:

- hold exclusive execution authority

The system must minimize:

- single points of failure

8.8 Execution Failure Handling

In the event of execution failure:

- partial execution must be prevented
- failure causes must be recorded
- re-execution conditions must be defined

Execution failure does not:

- invalidate the voting result

Re-execution requires governance-level decision or predefined recovery logic.

8.9 Execution Record

All execution outcomes must be:

- recorded immutably
- verifiable

Records must include:

- execution timestamp
- execution target
- execution status

8.10 Integration with Integration Layer

After execution:

- results are transmitted to the Integration Layer

The Integration Layer processes:

- execution success or failure
- governance participation records (XP reflection)

Execution itself does not directly determine rewards.

8.11 Policy Updates

Execution & Timelock Policy may only be modified through Governance Proposals.

Changes must:

- be announced in advance

- include a review period
- not apply retroactively

8.12 System Role

This policy serves as:

→ the final safeguard of governance decisions

It ensures that:

- decisions are executed securely
- execution remains predictable and verifiable

9. Integration, XP & Reward Policy

9.1 Purpose

This section defines how governance activities are recorded, quantified, and reflected in the reward system.

The Integration Layer connects:

→ governance participation

→ incentive mechanisms

The objective is to:

- encourage meaningful participation
- balance capital-based and activity-based contributions

9.2 Role of the Integration Layer

The Integration Layer:

- collects governance activity data
- maintains data consistency
- processes participation metrics

Data sources include:

- Forum Layer
- Voting Layer
- Execution Layer

The Integration Layer does not:

- perform governance decisions
- influence voting outcomes

9.3 Definition of XP

XP (Experience Points) is a metric representing governance participation.

XP is:

- recorded per user or address
- used as a signal of contribution

XP does not:

- grant governance authority

9.4 XP-Eligible Activities

XP may be assigned to:

- participation in proposal discussions
- proposal submission
- voting participation
- contribution to execution
- other governance-related activities

XP allocation rules must be:

- predefined
- transparent

9.5 Reward Integration

XP may be integrated into the staking reward system.

Reward calculations may consider:

- staking amount
- staking duration
- governance participation (XP)

The system is designed to:

→ balance capital contribution and active participation

9.6 Data Utilization

Integration data may be used for:

- reward distribution
- governance participation analytics
- governance system improvements

No personally identifiable information is required.

9.7 Data Integrity & Security

The Integration Layer must ensure:

- immutability of recorded data
- prevention of unauthorized modification
- transparent correction procedures in case of errors

9.8 Policy Updates

XP and Reward policies may only be modified through Governance Proposals.

Changes must:

- be announced in advance
- include review periods
- not apply retroactively

9.9 System Role

This policy serves as:

→ the incentive engine of HPP DAO

It ensures:

- sustained participation
- alignment between governance and rewards

10. Forum & Communication Policy

10.1 Purpose

This section defines the official communication channels and operational principles of HPP DAO.

The policy aims to:

- maintain high-quality discussions
- ensure governance reliability
- balance openness with structure

10.2 Official Communication Channel

The official governance channel is the Forum.

The Forum is used for:

- proposal discussions
- governance announcements
- record keeping

Other channels (e.g., Discord, Telegram) are:

- supplementary only

All official records must reside in the Forum.

10.3 Role of the Forum

The Forum serves as:

→ the entry point of governance

All proposals must:

- undergo discussion in the Forum before voting

Forum discussions:

- are non-binding
- influence decision quality

10.4 Post Categories

Forum posts are categorized as:

- Proposal Discussion
- Formal Proposal
- Governance Update
- Meta Discussion

Each post must be placed in the appropriate category.

10.5 Posting Guidelines

Posts must be:

- Clear
- Concise
- Structured

The following should be avoided:

- emotional language
- personal attacks
- repetitive arguments

Proposal posts should:

- follow the Proposal Template (recommended)
- include a summary at the top

10.6 Participation Principles

Forum participation is open to all.

Participants are expected to:

- engage in fact-based discussion
- respect other participants
- provide constructive feedback

The purpose of discussion is:

→ consensus formation and improvement of proposals

10.7 Signal-to-Noise Management

To maintain discussion quality:

- repetitive or low-value posts may be limited
- off-topic content may be redirected

The Forum must remain:

→ a governance-focused environment

10.8 Moderation Principles

Moderation follows a minimal intervention approach.

Moderation may be applied in cases of:

- policy violations

- spam or malicious behavior
- disruption of governance discussions

All moderation actions must be:

- transparent
- recorded

10.9 External Communication

External channels may be used for:

- outreach
- informal discussion

However:

- all critical discussions must be summarized in the Forum
- official decisions cannot be made outside the Forum

10.10 Announcements

All governance updates must be:

- published in the Forum
- clearly titled
- accompanied by summaries

Announcements must be distinguished from discussions.

10.11 Record Retention

Forum content is part of governance history.

- deletion or modification is restricted
- major proposals and results must be permanently preserved

10.12 Policy Updates

This policy may only be modified through Governance Proposals.

Changes must:

- be announced in advance
- not apply retroactively

10.13 System Role

This policy serves as:

→ the communication backbone of HPP DAO

It ensures:

- transparency
- discussion quality
- governance integrity

11. Forum & Communication Policy

11.1 Purpose

This section defines the principles of transparency and accountability within HPP DAO.

These principles ensure:

- trust in governance
- long-term sustainability

11.2 Transparency Principles

All governance activities must be:

- Verifiable
- publicly accessible

The following must be disclosed:

- proposal content and discussions
- voting results and participation data
- execution outcomes

Transparency must not depend on discretionary decisions.

11.3 Governance Records

All proposals are recorded across:

- Forum
- Voting
- Execution

Each stage must:

- have clearly defined states
- be immutably recorded

11.4 Voting Transparency

Voting results must include:

- approval vs rejection ratios
- quorum status
- final outcome

Results must be:

- presented without interpretation
- preserved in original form

11.5 Execution Verification

Execution outcomes must be:

- Traceable
- Verifiable

Information must include:

- execution status
- execution target
- execution timestamp

Failures or delays must be disclosed.

11.6 Transparency of Rewards

XP and reward calculations must be:

- based on transparent criteria
- verifiable

Reward distributions may be:

- disclosed in aggregated form

11.7 Accountability Model

Governance decisions are:

→ collectively owned by the DAO

Participants:

- contribute through voting and discussion
- do not bear individual legal responsibility

11.8 Error & Dispute Handling

In case of errors:

- correction processes must be transparent
- records must be preserved

Disputes are resolved through:

→ governance procedures

11.9 Accessibility

All governance documents must be:

- publicly accessible
- regularly updated

Historical versions must be:

- preserved

11.10 Change Log

All governance documents must include:

- change date
- summary of changes
- approval process

Change history must be publicly available.

11.11 System Role

This section serves as:

→ the foundation of trust in HPP DAO

It ensures:

- legitimacy of governance
- accountability of decisions
- transparency of the entire system

Disclaimer

Preamble

This Disclaimer applies to the HPP DAO governance platform provided by House Party Labs Limited (hereinafter the "Company") and all functions offered therethrough (including the on-chain voting function; hereinafter the "Governance Service").

The Governance Service is provided to users who have staked HPP (hereinafter "Participants"). General matters relating to staking are governed by the HPP Terms & Conditions, and personal information processing is governed by the HPP Privacy Policy; in the event of any conflict of interpretation with this Disclaimer, the relevant document shall prevail.

Participants acknowledge that they have read and understood this Disclaimer, and by accessing or participating in the Governance Service, they shall be deemed to have agreed to all provisions herein.

Article 1. Non-Binding Nature and Limitation of Effect of Governance Votes

- Governance votes conducted through the DAO voting system within the Governance Service (hereinafter "Governance Votes") constitute a collective expression of intent by Participants, serve as an important reference for operational and protocol-related decision-making, and shall not be legally binding on the Company.
- The approval of a vote does not guarantee the immediate or automatic implementation of the relevant proposal. The implementation of voting results may vary depending on (i) technical feasibility, (ii) compliance with applicable laws and regulations, (iii) the Company's reasonable judgment and internal policies, and (iv) whether the emergency intervention right set forth in Article 5 is exercised.
- The Company reserves the right to make the final decision on whether to implement voting results in whole, in part, or in a modified form.
- Participants acknowledge and agree that participation in governance does not confer any legally enforceable right to compel the Company to take any specific action.
- Participants understand that their participation in Governance Votes and the results thereof may affect the protocol or ecosystem, and shall evaluate the consequences on their own before participating.

Article 2. Limitation of Liability Regarding Smart Contract Execution

- Certain Governance Vote proposals may be automatically executed through smart contracts deployed on a public blockchain network.

- The Company shall not make any express or implied warranty that such smart contracts will be executed accurately, completely, or as intended.
- The Company shall not be liable for any execution failures, delays, partial executions, or unintended outcomes arising from the following causes; provided, however, that this shall not apply in cases of willful misconduct or gross negligence on the part of the Company:
 - Network congestion or failure
 - Software bugs or vulnerabilities in smart contract code
 - Gas fee fluctuations or insufficient gas
 - Failure of third-party protocols
 - Other technical or operational causes beyond the reasonable control of the Company
- Participants expressly assume all risks associated with the execution of smart contracts.

Article 3. Suspension, Modification, and Termination of the Governance Service

- The Company may suspend, modify, or terminate the Governance Service in whole or in part without prior notice to Participants for technical, legal, or security reasons.
- In the event of suspension, modification, or termination of the Governance Service, the method of handling any ongoing or unperformed procedures shall be determined by the Company at its reasonable discretion.
- The Company shall not be liable for any loss of anticipated benefits or loss of time and effort invested by Participants resulting from the suspension, modification, or termination of the Governance Service.

Article 4. Use of Third-Party Services

- Participants may use services provided by third parties, such as wallets, in the course of using the Governance Service. The Company makes no warranty whatsoever regarding the operation, security, availability, or accuracy of such third-party services.
- The Company shall not be liable for any losses incurred by Participants due to failures, hacking, phishing, or misinformation of third-party services.

Article 5. Emergency Intervention Right of the Company

- The Company retains the right to suspend, nullify, or refuse to implement voting results (hereinafter the "Emergency Intervention Right") where it reasonably determines that any of the following applies:
 - The voting result is the product of malicious acts such as vote manipulation, Sybil Attacks, Flash Loan Attacks, or collusion
 - Implementation of the voting result would require or facilitate conduct that is unlawful under the applicable laws of the relevant jurisdiction

- The voting result would cause the Company to materially breach its obligations under applicable regulations
- Other comparably significant grounds exist
- When exercising the Emergency Intervention Right, the Company shall notify the community of such fact and the reasons therefor in advance or without delay after the exercise, to the extent practicable; provided that notification may be delayed where necessary for security reasons.

Article 6. Publicity and Irreversibility of On-Chain Data

- Governance Vote records and wallet addresses are permanently recorded on the blockchain, and the Company cannot delete or modify them.
- Participants acknowledge and agree to the following:
 - Wallet address-based voting history may be tracked, analyzed, or disclosed by third parties
 - Anonymity may be lost if a wallet address is linked to the holder's real name or identity
 - The act of Governance Voting itself becomes a permanent public record
- Participants acknowledge that even if they exercise their right to deletion or correction under the Privacy Policy, records on the blockchain are technically impossible to delete or modify.

Article 7. Legal Nature of Governance Voting Rights

- Governance voting rights are functional rights provided incidental to HPP tokens or staking, and serve as a means for Participants to express collective opinions regarding protocol operations.
- Governance voting rights do not confer any rights that constitute securities, including but not limited to profit-sharing rights, dividend claims, or shareholder voting rights.
- Nothing in this Disclaimer shall be construed to mean that governance voting rights, HPP tokens, or staked assets constitute securities, investment contracts, or other regulated financial instruments.
- The Company does not owe any fiduciary duty to Participants as a trustee, agent, partner, or in any analogous capacity.

Article 8. Participant Responsibility for Compliance with Local Laws

- Access to and participation in the Governance Service may be subject to the laws and regulations of the country or region in which each Participant is located.
- Participants bear sole responsibility for verifying on their own whether their participation in the Governance Service complies with all applicable laws and regulations of their own country, including those relating to securities, virtual assets, taxation, and financial services.

- The Company does not represent or warrant that this Governance Service is lawful or permitted in any particular country or region, and may restrict access by residents of sanctioned countries or Participants in certain jurisdictions.
- The Company shall not be liable for consequences arising from a Participant's failure to comply with the laws of their own country.

Article 9. Governing Law and Jurisdiction

- All disputes, objections, or claims arising in connection with this Disclaimer and the Governance Service (including questions regarding their existence, validity, or termination) shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the British Virgin Islands (BVI), excluding its conflict of laws principles; provided, however, that the mandatory consumer protection rights under the laws of the Participant's country of habitual residence shall not be excluded.
- Each Participant irrevocably consents to the exclusive jurisdiction of the courts of the British Virgin Islands for the resolution of such disputes.