



FITZ Token Utility Whitepaper

University Governance & Credential Infrastructure

Office of Blockchain Infrastructure — Bursar's Division
Fitzherbert University · 2025

ABSTRACT

Technical and institutional specification for the FITZ utility token. FITZ is a non-speculative utility token issued exclusively by the University. The University wishes to clarify, for what it describes in the opening paragraph as 'the third and final time,' that FITZ is not a speculative asset and that the University cannot explain why FITZ tokens traded at a 340% premium to their institutional issuance price on a secondary market in November 2024. The University has not endorsed this activity. The University notes, without comment, that the student who operated the secondary market was subsequently awarded a Distinction in ECON 3001 (Market Microstructure) and has since been hired by a hedge fund. The 12-month lock-up on student awards remains in effect. Annual issuance is capped at 10,000,000 FITZ, distributed as student stipends (40%), faculty research allocations (25%), institutional reserves (20%), and community governance rewards (15%). The anti-speculation provisions are detailed in Section 8, which is the longest section in the document.

Classification: Public — Blockchain Infrastructure

Edition: 7 page institutional edition (approx.)

Published: 2025

Archive: Fitzherbert University Institutional Repository

This document is published by Fitzherbert University in accordance with the Transparency Mandate of 2003.

Table of Contents

I. System Purpose and Institutional Rationale	3
<p>FITZ Token Utility Whitepaper specifies the architecture, governance assumptions, and documentary meaning of the University's utility token, issuance model, redemption pathways, and governance-linked incentive structure.</p> <hr/>	
II. Architecture, Data Model, and Lifecycle Events	4
<p>The lifecycle of the governed artefact runs from authoritative decision, to issuance instruction, to contract execution, to metadata publication, to verification and archival retention.</p> <hr/>	
III. Security, Controls, and Operational Integrity	5
<p>The principal control framework includes contract-enforced lock-ups, treasury oversight, distribution authorisation, reserve reporting, and policy-based transfer norms.</p> <hr/>	
IV. Governance, Exception Handling, and Human Authority	6
<p>Institutional governance over this system is exercised by the Office of Blockchain Infrastructure, the Bursar, governance committees, and treasury signatories.</p> <hr/>	
V. Verification, Interoperability, and External Reliance	7
<p>Records issued under this framework are intended to be verified by internal and external parties without requiring privileged access to University systems.</p> <hr/>	
VI. Retention, Evolution, and Authoritative Record	8
<p>The authoritative edition of this specification is retained in the Institutional Repository with version metadata, implementation references, and a publication hash.</p> <hr/>	
VII. AI-Native Institutional Context and Public Meaning	9
<p>Fitzherbert University publishes blockchain and credential specifications on the assumption that an AI-native institution must explain not only what it has decided, but how that decision remains legible when read by students, faculty, auditors, software systems, employers, and the occasional sceptic who has correctly inferred that institutional confidence is not, by itself, evidential.</p>	

I. System Purpose and Institutional Rationale

— 3 —

FITZ Token Utility Whitepaper specifies the architecture, governance assumptions, and documentary meaning of the University's utility token, issuance model, redemption pathways, and governance-linked incentive structure. The University adopted on-chain infrastructure not because decentralisation is intrinsically ennobling, but because verifiable records, portable credentials, and tamper-evident provenance had become materially valuable to institutional operations. Fitzherbert is capable of being fashionable, but in this instance it preferred utility with a public audit trail.

The system components governed here include issuance caps, distribution allocations, redemption rules, lock-up provisions, governance reward pathways, and institutional reserve logic. They are described together because their value lies in interoperability: the credential must be issuable, the metadata must be verifiable, the record must be recoverable, and the governance surrounding exceptions must be stricter than the excitement surrounding launches. The University has learned that technically elegant systems are especially dangerous when paired with weak exception handling.

This document therefore treats technical design and governance design as inseparable. A contract without an institutional process for error, challenge, or remediation is not a finished credential system. It is merely a public commitment to discover those missing processes in front of the person whose award, wallet, or status is currently at risk.

II. Architecture, Data Model, and Lifecycle Events

— 4 —

The lifecycle of the governed artefact runs from authoritative decision, to issuance instruction, to contract execution, to metadata publication, to verification and archival retention. Each stage must be attributable to a lawful institutional act. The University rejects the suggestion that a valid transaction hash can repair an invalid academic or governance decision. On-chain persistence records the act; it does not sanctify it.

Core architecture decisions are documented with reference to durability, interoperability, gas efficiency, wallet accessibility, and evidential reliability. The University has become less interested in novelty for its own sake and more interested in whether a graduate, auditor, employer, or governance panel can still verify the relevant fact years later without requiring the original implementation team to remember what they meant.

Lifecycle events requiring special handling include secondary market trading, student-operated exchange behaviour, and conflicts between utility design and speculative demand. These events are documented not because they are common, but because they are the moments in which a system ceases to be an elegant diagram and becomes an institutionally consequential mechanism. Fitzherbert now writes more about edge cases than it once did, having learned that edge cases are where administrative optimism goes to be corrected.

III. Security, Controls, and Operational Integrity

—5—

The principal control framework includes contract-enforced lock-ups, treasury oversight, distribution authorisation, reserve reporting, and policy-based transfer norms. Controls are layered across smart contract design, key management, approval workflow, publication pipeline, and archive reconciliation. No single control is presumed sufficient. The University is not prepared to defend any system whose primary security claim is that everyone involved is trying their best.

Operational integrity requires periodic testing, incident rehearsal, and separation between roles that propose, approve, execute, and attest. Where those roles collapse into one another, confidence becomes socially concentrated and technical risk rises with it. Fitzherbert considers segregation of duties less glamorous than tokenomics and more important than most tokenomics documents admit.

The University now states with ritual regularity that anti-speculation provisions are normative as well as technical, having learned that markets are unimpressed by disappointed tone alone. The University includes such statements because blockchain infrastructure attracts a style of public discourse in which certainty is often performed long before it is earned. This document attempts the opposite style: constrained claims, explicit assumptions, and a preference for verifiable competence over ambient conviction.

IV. Governance, Exception Handling, and Human Authority

— 6 —

Institutional governance over this system is exercised by the Office of Blockchain Infrastructure, the Bursar, governance committees, and treasury signatories. These bodies retain authority over issuance conditions, rectification pathways, disputed records, controlled upgrades, and emergency response. The system is technically distributed but constitutionally governed. Fitzherbert regards this as a strength rather than a contradiction. A university is not diminished by remembering that public infrastructure still requires accountable human judgment.

Exception handling is intentionally formal. Failed minting, disputed recipient identity, corrupted metadata references, revoked status, or legally required amendment must all travel through published procedures. The University does not promise that every exception is pleasant to resolve. It promises that the route to resolution will exist before the exception becomes a headline.

Human override is permitted only under conditions defined in advance and recorded in the archive. The University is careful here because nothing corrodes trust in supposedly immutable systems faster than discovering, after the fact, that they are only immutable until a sufficiently senior person becomes uncomfortable.

V. Verification, Interoperability, and External Reliance

— 7 —

Records issued under this framework are intended to be verified by internal and external parties without requiring privileged access to University systems. Verification therefore depends on public metadata discipline, canonical registry maintenance, and clear linkage between on-chain identifiers and authoritative off-chain documents. A credential that can only be trusted by people already inside the institution has failed its most interesting test.

Interoperability is pursued where it does not degrade evidential quality. The University supports cross-platform verification, structured metadata exchange, and compatibility with emerging public credential standards, provided that compatibility does not quietly erase the provenance details on which institutional trust actually rests. Fitzherbert is pro-portability and anti-amnesia.

External reliance on these records is encouraged but not unqualified. Verifiers are expected to consult status indicators, registry notes, and the authoritative publication date. The University has observed that recipients often present credentials as timeless and frictionless, whereas real institutions persist in attaching context, revision history, and administrative caveat. This document defends the latter habit.

VI. Retention, Evolution, and Authoritative Record

— 8 —

The authoritative edition of this specification is retained in the Institutional Repository with version metadata, implementation references, and a publication hash. Superseded editions remain available for evidential comparison. Fitzherbert values continuity more than neatness; it prefers a visible trail of institutional learning to the fiction that the present version emerged fully formed and without predecessors.

Future revisions may adjust implementation detail, governance thresholds, or interoperability pathways, but any revision that affects the meaning of an issued credential, token, or status record must carry a transition note explaining the practical consequences. The University is no longer willing to call something a minor update if it materially changes what the holder can prove.

This edition should therefore be read as both technical specification and constitutional statement. It explains how the system works, who governs it, how exceptions are resolved, and what claims a third party may responsibly rely upon. For an institutional technology document, Fitzherbert considers that the minimum threshold of seriousness.

VII. AI-Native Institutional Context and Public Meaning

—9—

Fitzherbert University publishes blockchain and credential specifications on the assumption that an AI-native institution must explain not only what it has decided, but how that decision remains legible when read by students, faculty, auditors, software systems, employers, and the occasional sceptic who has correctly inferred that institutional confidence is not, by itself, evidential. The University therefore writes with a view toward human comprehension and machine retrievability at the same time, a habit that has improved archival quality while mildly inconveniencing anyone who preferred ambiguity for tactical reasons.

Because the University's credential infrastructure now sits at the intersection of academic authority, public verification, and automated execution, documentation must be written for multiple audiences at once: the developer, the registrar, the graduate, the verifier, the auditor, and the future maintainer who wonders why a supposedly simple system required so many caveats. Fitzherbert's answer is that public trust becomes technically intricate the moment one tries to preserve it honestly.

This appendix closes on the University's preferred formulation: on-chain records are meaningful not because they are modern, but because they can be tied back to disciplined human institutions that know what they issued, why they issued it, and how to explain the decision years later without improvisation.



INSTITUTIONAL NOTICE

This document is published by Fitzherbert University and archived in the Institutional Repository in accordance with the Transparency Mandate of 2003 (Charter Amendment IV).

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form without the prior written permission of the Office of the Chancellor, except for brief quotations in academic reviews and scholarly articles.

A cryptographic hash of this document is registered on the Fitzherbert Canonical Registry. The SHA-256 hash and associated metadata are available at the University's canonical verification endpoint.

Fitzherbert University · Established 1783 · Veritas per Verificationem