

Project Research Dossier

Fhenix / CoFHE: product evidence before token valuation

RESEARCH DISCUSSION DRAFT | 30 SEP 2026 | jun_deu

Scope and conclusion

Primary-source review as of 30 September 2026. Fhenix is a candidate for pre-token research, not a priced token recommendation. No official native-token sale terms or active ICO/TGE were identified in the reviewed sources. This is a bounded finding, not proof that no announcement exists elsewhere. Private venture funding is documented; it is not a public token sale. Recheck eligibility before submission. The product warrants further technical review, while token valuation remains indeterminate. [1-4]

What the project builds

Fhenix describes CoFHE as infrastructure for computing on encrypted values in EVM applications. Its current positioning is confidential DeFi infrastructure rather than simply the earlier standalone L2 narrative. The official FAQ lists Ethereum Sepolia, Arbitrum Sepolia and Base Sepolia deployments, with mainnet to follow. Documentation provides a client SDK and Solidity FHE library. These are inspectable integration surfaces, not evidence of mainnet adoption or revenue. [1,2]

Tokenomics: separate missing data from zero

The reviewed sources do not establish a native-token contract, total supply, initial circulating supply, sale price, allocations, vesting/cliffs or emissions. Consequently actual FDV, circulating market cap and calendar unlocks cannot be calculated. Do not substitute a similarly named traded token or a demo token. Product fees or venture funding do not establish future tokenholder rights. Required next evidence: issuer-confirmed chain/contract, supply ledger, recipient allocations, vesting contracts and a description of any value-capture mechanism.

How to model the long game

Let total supply be T , circulating supply C and price P : $FDV = P \times T$; circulating cap = $P \times C$; $FDV/circulating\ cap = T/C$. The table below is a sensitivity exercise, not Fhenix tokenomics. A cliff releases supply at a date; a linear schedule spreads release across a period. Neither tells us how much will be sold or what price will do.

Illustrative scenario	Circulating / total	FDV / circ. cap	Interpretation
Thin initial float	10%	10.0x	Small float magnifies dilution sensitivity
Larger initial float	20%	5.0x	Same total supply, more units circulating
Cliff: 10% -> 25%	+15% of total	4.0x after cliff	Circulating units rise 2.5x (+150%)
Linear release	15% over 12 months	Depends on $C(t)$	1.25% of total per month

All scenarios are hypothetical. Ratios assume a common price; none is a price forecast or a published Fhenix allocation.

Evidence, risks and disclosure

Verification and security boundaries

The official site names Guy Zyskind as founder and Guy Itzhaki as CEO. Those are company statements, not independent background verification. The public GitHub organization and source repositories make code review possible; repository visibility alone does not prove deployment safety. The confidential-contracts README says the contracts are under development and unaudited, with an audit planned before v1.0.0. This warning applies to that repository/version context, not automatically every Fhenix component. The CoFHE contracts README also recommends version pinning. [1,3,4]

Risks and evidence that would change the view

Technical: review access control, operator permissions, decryption availability and the exact deployed version. The confidential-contracts README identifies operator transfer authority and decryption delays. Privacy: encrypted amounts are not full anonymity; the dual-mode design still exposes sender, recipient and timing. Execution: testnet functionality does not establish mainnet performance, sustainable fees or demand. Governance/incentives: token rights and supply distribution are unverified. Legal/compliance: privacy features alone establish neither regulatory compliance nor non-compliance. [3,5]

Decision gates

Before strengthening the research conclusion, obtain: (1) audit scope, commit hash and remediation evidence matching deployed contracts; (2) reproducible mainnet latency/cost and adoption evidence; (3) custody/decryption trust assumptions and failure recovery; (4) official token rights and supply schedules, if a token is announced. A useful follow-up is whether each claim is supported by an actual deployment, a reviewed implementation, or only a roadmap.

Disclosure and method

The author confirms participation in Fhenix points/testnet activities only. No future token entitlement, airdrop, cash value or compensation is assumed from that participation. This research was prepared with AI assistance for jun_deu as a contribution to The Republic quest, which displays a potential 75-VP reward subject to approval. Method: review the linked official pages and public repository documentation; no smart-contract execution, security audit or private-team verification was performed. Not financial advice.

Primary sources

[1] Fhenix official site and FAQ

<https://www.fhenix.io/>

[2] CoFHE documentation

<https://cofhe-docs.fhenix.zone/>

[3] Confidential contracts: README and security notes

<https://github.com/FhenixProtocol/fhenix-confidential-contracts>

[4] CoFHE Solidity contracts

<https://github.com/FhenixProtocol/cofhe-contracts>

[5] Dual-mode token design and privacy boundary

<https://www.fhenix.io/blog/why-dual-mode-tokens-are-inevitable>