

# WESEE.INFO

We See  
We Seed  
We Seize  
Web 3.0 DAO-TOKENIZER  
Whitepaper

Feb 6, 2026 - V 0.1

## Executive Summary

We See is an on-chain, autonomous tool for coordinating early-stage venture proposals through transparent rules, arbitration & token-based execution.

Venture financing & tokenized fundraising are commonly shaped by opaque negotiations, off-chain trust & informal enforcement. Decisions about proposal approval, valuation & token issuance are difficult to audit & weakly enforced once agreements are reached, creating misalignment between entrepreneurs, reviewers & participants.

We See introduces a blockchain-native alternative that encodes proposal submission, arbitration & token issuance directly into smart contracts. Entrepreneurs submit proposals on-chain, nominate arbitrators & define evaluation conditions upfront. Acceptance or rejection is executed through transparent & verifiable rules without intermediaries, backend systems, or service operators.

In addition to arbitrators, trusted participants & investors may influence outcomes based on their observable on-chain track record, allowing reputation & historical behavior to shape collective decision-making.

Approved proposals trigger deterministic token minting & allocation according to predefined rules. Tokens represent the outcome of an evaluated proposal rather than a speculative instrument.

We See is designed as a tool, not a service. It operates through a static, open-source frontend connected directly to blockchain networks via user-controlled wallets, without servers, user accounts, or activity logging.

# 1. Problem Definition

Early-stage venture formation, proposal evaluation & tokenized fundraising suffer from a fundamental structural problem: **decision-making & enforcement are weakly defined, poorly observable & largely off-chain**. In most venture & tokenization workflows, proposals are evaluated through informal negotiations, private communications & discretionary judgment. Even when blockchain infrastructure is used for token issuance or fundraising, the critical steps—proposal review, acceptance criteria, arbitration & approval—remain external to the chain. As a result, outcomes are difficult to verify, disputes are hard to resolve & trust is concentrated in individuals rather than encoded rules.

This gap becomes more severe when tokenization is involved. Tokens are often minted & distributed before a clear, enforceable evaluation process exists. Decisions about **who approves a proposal, under what conditions & with what authority** are rarely transparent or reproducible. Once tokens are issued, there is typically no on-chain trace that explains why a proposal was accepted, who approved it, or what obligations were implied at the time of approval.

Arbitration, when present, is usually informal. Reviewers or advisors may exist, but their role is undefined at the protocol level. Their compensation, authority & decision boundaries are negotiated off-chain, making the process opaque & inconsistent. Participants & investors have no reliable way to assess whether approvals are credible, biased, or systematically enforced.

At the same time, platforms that attempt to formalize venture processes often introduce centralized services, backend systems, user accounts & discretionary controls. These models reintroduce trust assumptions, operational risk, data custody concerns & regulatory exposure—contradicting the original motivation for using blockchain-based systems. The absence of a **neutral, autonomous & verifiable coordination mechanism** for proposal submission, arbitration & token issuance creates repeated failure modes:

- proposals cannot be audited after approval,
- decision-makers cannot be held accountable by design,
- investors & participants lack visibility into process legitimacy,
- platforms become trusted intermediaries instead of neutral tools.

In short, the problem is not fundraising, token minting, or smart contract execution.

The problem is that **venture decisions themselves are not encoded, verifiable, or enforceable on-chain**.

## 2. Proposed Solution

**We See** is an EVM-based, blockchain-native, autonomous venture coordination protocol designed to formalize proposal evaluation, arbitration & tokenized venture formation directly on-chain. The protocol is built natively on EVM-compatible blockchains & operates entirely through smart contracts & publicly verifiable transactions.

Rather than functioning as a platform, marketplace, or custodial service, We See acts as an on-chain process engine that defines how venture proposals are submitted, reviewed, approved or rejected, and-if approved-tokenized. All critical interactions occur on-chain, without backend servers, user accounts, or discretionary platform operators. At its core, We See introduces a standardized on-chain flow in which: an entrepreneur submits a proposal, a predefined arbitrator or jury set is referenced by cryptographic identity, review & decision outcomes are recorded on-chain & token issuance or capital-related actions are triggered only upon explicit approval.

Arbitrators (or jurors) are identified by known addresses, publicly declared terms & explicit decision authority. Their acceptance, rejection, or conditional approval of a proposal is itself an auditable on-chain action. Arbitration compensation-whether fixed, token-based, or percentage-based-is defined upfront & enforced programmatically by smart contracts.

Investors & participants do not rely on platform assurances. Instead, they evaluate process legitimacy: who reviewed a proposal, under what conditions & with what outcome. Over time, arbitrators accumulate reputational weight based on their observable decision history, allowing trust to emerge from verifiable behavior rather than centralized governance or branding.

Upon approval, We See enables direct on-chain tokenization. Tokens may be minted, allocated, and-subject to predefined constraints-introduced into controlled market environments. The protocol does not govern venture operations or fund usage; it governs **when & under what conditions** tokenization & related actions are permitted.

Crucially, We See is designed as a tool, not a service. Anyone may host the interface, inspect or deploy the contracts, or build auxiliary services around the protocol. We See does not collect user data, operate centralized infrastructure, or act as a counterparty in venture transactions.

In essence, We See transforms venture formation from an informal, trust-heavy process into a rule-defined, autonomous & auditable EVM-based workflow-where decisions precede tokenization, authority is explicit & legitimacy is verifiable by design.

## 3. Actors, Roles & Decision Processes

We See defines a clear separation between **evaluation for publication**, **evaluation for investment & protocol enforcement**. Each actor operates within an explicitly bounded domain & no role substitutes or overrides another.

### 3.1 Core Actors

#### **Proposal Creator (Entrepreneur)**

The proposal creator initiates a venture proposal by submitting it on-chain. This submission includes:

- the proposed venture description,
- the intended arbitrator(s) or jury structure,
- arbitration scope & conditions,
- disclosure rules & documentation references.

Submission alone does not grant any right to token issuance, fundraising, or execution. All subsequent actions are conditional on independent evaluation & approval.

#### **Arbitrator / Jury**

Arbitrators (or juries) are designated evaluators responsible for determining **whether a proposal is eligible to be published, tokenized, or advanced to subsequent phases**. Their role includes:

- accepting or rejecting the mandate to evaluate a proposal,
- reviewing the proposal against predefined criteria,
- approving, rejecting, or deferring progression to a specific phase.

Arbitrators do **not** decide how much capital a proposal should attract, nor do they invest by default. Their authority is limited to **permissioning & validation, not economic preference**.

In later phases, arbitrators may also act as **bounded oracles**, confirming whether predefined real-world or off-chain conditions have been met-only where such confirmation is unavoidable.

#### **Participants / Investors**

Participants are economic actors who **directly evaluate proposals after publication** & decide:

- whether to participate,
- how much capital to commit,
- at which phase or valuation to engage.

Unlike arbitrators, participants:

- perform independent economic & risk assessment,
- are not bound by protocol-defined evaluation criteria,
- may choose to invest, abstain, or exit based on personal judgment.

Participants do not rely on the platform's reputation. Instead, they assess:

- the content of the published proposal,
- the identity & historical behavior of arbitrators,
- the structure of tokenization & capital flow,
- observable on-chain signals & prior outcomes.

Investment is an explicit act of choice, not a protocol-enforced outcome.

### **Protocol (Autonomous Layer)**

The protocol functions as a strictly non-discretionary coordination layer. It:

- enforces process order,
- validates role permissions,
- executes declared outcomes,
- prevents unauthorized state transitions.

The protocol does not evaluate proposals, does not rank projects & does not influence investment decisions. It only enforces what actors have explicitly agreed upon.

## 3.2 Proposal Evaluation vs. Investment Evaluation

We See explicitly separates two distinct forms of evaluation:

### **Eligibility Evaluation (by Arbitrators)**

Determines whether a proposal may be published, tokenized, or advanced.

### **Investment Evaluation (by Participants)**

Determines whether capital should be committed & at what scale.

These evaluations are independent, sequential & non-substitutable.

## 3.3 Decision & Interaction Flow

### **1. Proposal Submission**

The entrepreneur submits a proposal specifying arbitrators, terms & conditions.

### **2. Arbitrator Acceptance**

Arbitrators explicitly accept or reject the mandate. Rejection terminates that evaluation path.

### **3. Eligibility Decision**

Arbitrators approve, reject, or defer the proposal for a defined phase or scope.

### **4. Publication & Tokenization Eligibility**

Upon approval, the proposal becomes visible & eligible for token-based interaction.

### **5. Participant Evaluation & Capital Commitment**

Participants independently evaluate the published proposal & decide whether & how to invest.

### **6. Conditional Oracle Interaction (If Required)**

In later stages, arbitrators may confirm specific real-world conditions when protocol logic requires external validation.

## **3.4 Authority Boundaries**

- Arbitrators cannot force investment.
- Participants cannot override eligibility rules.
- Entrepreneurs cannot self-authorize progression.
- The protocol cannot reinterpret decisions.

Each authority is explicit, limited & enforced.

## **3.5 Trust Formation Through Action**

We See does not assign trust scores or centralized reputation. Instead:

- arbitrators build credibility through consistent, observable decisions,
- participants follow arbitrators they trust,
- legitimacy is from historical behavior, not platform endorsement.

Trust is voluntary, composable & reversible.

## **3.6 Section Summary**

This section establishes that:

- eligibility evaluation & investment evaluation are separate,
- arbitrators gate progression, not capital allocation,
- participants directly assess & choose investments,
- oracle roles are minimal & conditional,
- all authority is explicit & enforceable.

We See replaces ambiguous venture judgment with **structured permissioning & free economic choice**.

## 4. Tokenomics (WeSee Token – WST)

The WeSee Token (WST) is the native utility & coordination token of the WeSee protocol, initially issued on the Binance Smart Chain (BSC). The token is designed to fund the development of an open-source decentralized tooling stack while enabling long-term alignment between protocol users, service providers & contributors-without enforcing mandatory commercial relationships. The primary economic role of WST is not profit distribution, dividend generation, or financial entitlement. Instead, it functions as a **protocol access, priority & scarcity instrument**.

### Token Supply & Funding Target

The token supply is defined with a clear capital objective. The intended fundraising range is:

- **USD 200,000 – 300,000**

Token pricing, supply size & sale structure are calibrated to meet this funding target while maintaining sufficient liquidity & long-term utility. No inflationary minting is planned beyond the initial issuance unless explicitly governed by protocol-level decisions.

### Use of Funds

Funds raised through WST issuance are allocated to:

- development of the WeSee open-source protocol,
- implementation of smart contracts & on-chain workflows,
- security reviews & audits,
- tooling, documentation & developer infrastructure,
- public deployment & ecosystem bootstrapping.

There is no obligation to distribute revenue or profits back to token holders.

### Utility-Based Demand Model

WST derives value from **protocol utility**, not from speculative promises. Holding, locking, or staking WST provides **priority access** to specific protocol-level capabilities, including but not limited to:

- proposal submission rights,
- arbitrator participation eligibility,
- service-provider registration,
- access to advanced tooling or execution paths,
- higher visibility or prioritization within protocol workflows.

These benefits are optional & role-based. No participant is forced into a commercial relationship with the protocol.

## Staking & Locking Mechanics

Certain protocol actions require participants to either:

- **STAKE** a defined amount of WST for a fixed or variable period, or
- **LOCK** tokens into smart contracts as a commitment signal.

Staked or locked tokens:

- remain non-transferable during the lock period,
- reduce circulating supply,
- increase market scarcity,
- signal long-term alignment with the protocol.

This mechanism creates economic pressure in favor of holders **without direct payment flows** from the protocol.

## Burn Mechanisms

In specific scenarios, protocol interactions may require **token burning** instead of fees. Token burning:

- permanently removes tokens from circulation,
- benefits all remaining holders via scarcity,
- avoids direct revenue extraction or transactional dependency.

Burn-based access is intentionally used where neutrality & non-commercial positioning are preferred.

## Service Provider Economics

Entities or individuals offering services within the WeSee ecosystem (e.g. arbitrators, tooling providers, infrastructure operators) may be required to:

- hold a minimum amount of WST,
- stake WST as a trust & commitment signal,
- burn WST to activate or extend service capabilities.

This ensures fair competition, open participation & market-driven pricing-without centralized licensing or gatekeeping.

## No Guaranteed Returns

WST:

- does not represent equity or ownership,
- does not guarantee profit or yield,
- does not imply revenue sharing,
- does not constitute an investment contract.

Any value appreciation is an indirect consequence of protocol adoption, token scarcity & utility demand.

## Economic Philosophy

The WeSee tokenomics model is intentionally designed to:

- fund open-source infrastructure,
- align incentives without coercion,
- reward long-term participation through scarcity,
- avoid forced monetization or rent extraction.

Economic value is created by **usage constraints & commitment requirements**, not by selling services to token holders.

## 5. Technical Details

The WeSee protocol is designed as an open, self-executing technical system whose behavior is fully defined by smart contracts & publicly verifiable blockchain state. It is delivered as software & protocol logic, not as a hosted or managed service. All critical actions-proposal registration, validation flows, arbitration outcomes, token issuance & execution permissions-are enforced on-chain & do not rely on discretionary control, backend enforcement, or trusted operators.

### On-Chain Core

The on-chain layer defines the canonical state of the system. This layer governs:

- proposal creation & lifecycle states,
- arbitrator (jury) designation, acceptance & decision logic,
- approval thresholds & conditional branching,
- token minting, allocation, staking, locking & burning,
- phase-based permissions & execution constraints.

Once deployed, these rules execute deterministically according to contract logic. There are no administrative shortcuts or off-chain overrides.

### Interaction Model

All interactions occur through user-controlled wallets. There are:

- no platform accounts,
- no custody of assets,
- no identity abstraction beyond cryptographic addresses.

Roles within the protocol-such as proposer, arbitrator, participant, or service provider-are inferred entirely from on-chain actions & token state.

### Client-Side Interface

The reference interface is implemented as a static client-side application (HTML / CSS / JavaScript). Its role is limited to:

- presenting on-chain state,
- preparing transactions,
- submitting signed interactions to the blockchain.

The interface does not:

- store user data,
- require backend services,
- enforce protocol rules independently of smart contracts.

Any party may host, fork, modify, or replace this interface. There is no canonical or privileged frontend.

## Data & Privacy Boundaries

The protocol itself does not process or retain personal or off-chain data. All authoritative data:

- exists on public blockchains,
- is readable & auditable by anyone,
- follows the transparency guarantees of the underlying network.

Optional off-chain data exchange (such as proposal documentation) is external to the protocol & occurs by mutual agreement between participants.

## Operation & Deployment

The system does not assume a single operator. Smart contracts may be deployed once or multiple times. Interfaces may be hosted by anyone.

Indexing, analytics & monitoring tools may be built independently by third parties. No deployment or operator has protocol-level authority over others.

## Upgrades & Versioning

Protocol evolution occurs through explicit versioning. New versions require:

- new contract deployments,
- explicit user adoption,
- clear differentiation from previous versions.

There is no forced migration & no implicit upgrade path.

## Responsibility Boundaries

WeSee defines & publishes protocol logic. It does not:

- operate the protocol on behalf of users,
- intermediate transactions,
- guarantee outcomes,
- assume legal or commercial responsibility for participant interactions.

Use of the protocol constitutes interaction with open-source software & public blockchain infrastructure.

## 6. Legal & Open-Source Positioning

The WeSee protocol is published & distributed as open-source software & autonomous smart contract logic. It is positioned as a **technical tool** rather than a managed service, platform, or intermediary. This positioning is intentional & foundational to both the legal & operational design of the project.

### Open-Source Nature

All core components of the protocol—including smart contracts & reference client interfaces—are released under a permissive open-source license. This allows any party to:

- inspect & verify the code,
- deploy independent instances,
- modify or extend functionality,
- use the software for commercial or non-commercial purposes.

No exclusive rights are retained over usage or deployment of the protocol.

### Non-Custodial & Non-Intermediary Role

The protocol does not:

- custody user assets,
- manage funds on behalf of participants,
- intermediate transactions,
- make discretionary decisions.

All interactions occur directly between users & the blockchain through self-executing code. Control of keys, assets & decisions remains entirely with participants.

### Tool, Not Service Distinction

WeSee does not operate a continuous service relationship with users. Specifically:

- there is no account provisioning,
- no ongoing operational obligation,
- no dependency on the availability of a central operator,
- no expectation of service-level guarantees.

The protocol functions as software that users may choose to interact with, deploy, or ignore.

## Autonomous Execution & Responsibility

Protocol behavior is defined by deterministic smart contracts. Outcomes result from:

- user-initiated transactions,
- predefined contract logic,
- public blockchain consensus.

Responsibility for actions, compliance & consequences rests with the interacting parties-not with the protocol authors or code publishers.

## Jurisdictional Neutrality

As open-source software deployed on public blockchains, the protocol itself does not enforce jurisdictional constraints. Participants are responsible for:

- determining the legality of their actions,
- complying with applicable laws & regulations,
- assessing regulatory exposure in their own jurisdictions.

The protocol does not provide legal, financial, or regulatory assurances.

## Token Positioning

Any token associated with the protocol:

- does not represent equity or ownership,
- does not imply profit rights,
- does not guarantee financial returns.

Tokens function as protocol-level utility & coordination instruments within the defined technical system.

## No Investment or Advisory Representation

Nothing in the protocol, documentation, or associated materials constitutes:

- investment advice,
- financial advice,
- solicitation of securities,
- or a recommendation to participate.

Users interact with the protocol at their own discretion & risk.

## Summary of Legal Positioning

In summary, WeSee is positioned as:

- open-source software,
- autonomous smart contract infrastructure,
- a technical coordination tool.

It is explicitly not positioned as:

- a financial service provider,
- an investment vehicle,
- a managed platform,
- or a legal intermediary.

This positioning defines the boundaries of responsibility, control & liability within the WeSee ecosystem.

## 7. Call to Action

The WeSee protocol is published as an open, autonomous system. Its rules, assumptions & boundaries are intentionally explicit. Participation is not required, encouraged through incentives, or enforced through dependency. It is a voluntary decision based on alignment with the model described in this document.

### For Builders & Developers

If you are interested in:

- decentralized coordination mechanisms,
- on-chain arbitration & decision flows,
- token-based access control without custodianship,
- open-source financial & governance tooling,

you are invited to review, deploy, audit, or extend the protocol. No permission is required to experiment, fork, or build on top of the system.

### For Arbitrators & Domain Experts

If you possess expertise relevant to proposal evaluation, arbitration, or real-world validation:

- you may participate as an arbitrator under the rules defined by the protocol,
- your role is governed by on-chain commitments & observable behavior,
- reputation & trust emerge from track record, not designation.

Participation is optional & non-exclusive.

### For Participants & Token Holders

If you choose to acquire or hold protocol tokens:

- you do so to gain access, priority, or participation rights defined by the system,
- not to receive guaranteed returns, income, or ownership.

Your influence within the ecosystem emerges from usage, commitment & demonstrated alignment-not from promises made outside the protocol.

### For Independent Operators

If you wish to:

- host interfaces,
- build analytics or monitoring tools,

- provide infrastructure or auxiliary services,  
you may do so independently. The protocol does not grant exclusive operational roles.

## Next Steps

The immediate next steps for the protocol are:

- public deployment of initial smart contracts,
- publication of reference interfaces & documentation,
- open review & iteration based on real-world usage.

All further evolution is expected to occur through transparent iteration rather than predetermined claims.

## Final Note

WeSee is not a platform to be joined. It is a tool to be used, tested, ignored, or replaced. Those who find the model useful may participate. Those who do not are under no obligation to do so.