

# Project Research Dossier — Tempo

Primary-source due diligence on a pre-token payments-focused Layer 1. Reviewed against Tempo's official website, verified GitHub organization, protocol repository, and security policy.

## Eligibility / scope note

In the official Tempo sources reviewed for this dossier, I did not find an active ICO/TGE, public token sale, or a published native-token allocation/vesting schedule. Because those economics are not disclosed, this report does not invent FDV, circulating supply, emissions, or unlock assumptions.

## 1. What Tempo builds — and why it matters

Tempo describes itself as a payments-first Layer 1 blockchain, incubated by Stripe and Paradigm, designed for stablecoin payments at scale. The core thesis is that general-purpose chains can make payments compete with unrelated activity for blockspace and force users into wallet/gas abstractions that are poorly matched to payment workflows.

Its protocol design includes TIP-20, an enshrined token standard for payment-oriented stablecoins; dedicated payment lanes; native fee sponsorship and batching through Tempo Transactions; passkey-compatible authentication; and low, predictable fees paid in stablecoins. The public repository also describes sub-second finality targets under normal conditions and EVM compatibility. The project is therefore not merely another EVM chain: it is explicitly optimizing the transaction model around payroll, remittances, merchant settlement, machine payments and other high-frequency stablecoin use cases.

## 2. Tokenomics: FDV, circulating supply, allocations, vesting and emissions

**Current conclusion:** official tokenomics are not yet decision-useful because they are not publicly disclosed in the sources reviewed. I found no official total supply, circulating supply, token allocation table, vesting schedule, cliff schedule, emissions curve, public-sale price, or TGE date. As a result, neither FDV nor circulating market capitalization can be calculated responsibly.

This absence is itself material. A future token could still introduce validator incentives, governance, staking, ecosystem rewards or other claims on network economics, but assigning percentages today would be speculation. Any investment decision should therefore treat tokenomics as an unresolved dependency rather than assume that network adoption automatically maps to token value.

## 3. Unlock and dilution risk

Because no official allocation or vesting schedule is published, there is no defensible unlock calendar to model. The key dilution risk is therefore **information risk**: when tokenomics are eventually published, large team/investor allocations, short cliffs, aggressive emissions, or a low initial float could materially change the investment case. The appropriate trigger for updating this dossier is the first official publication of total supply, initial circulating supply, allocation percentages and vesting terms.

## 4. Team and verification signals

The strongest verifiable signal is not a marketing biography but the project's technical footprint. Tempo's GitHub organization is verified against tempo.xyz. Its main protocol repository is public and actively maintained, with thousands of commits and extensive Rust code, protocol TIPs, SDKs, test infrastructure and developer tooling. The official GitHub organization states that Tempo was incubated by Stripe and Paradigm. These are stronger signals than anonymous-team claims because they are independently inspectable through the code and organization history.

Security remains unfinished rather than 'solved': Tempo's own security policy says the blockchain is still undergoing audit and currently has no active bug bounty. That is a meaningful caveat for a payments chain expected to carry real-value stablecoin flows.

## 5. Key risks

| Risk                        | Why it matters                                                                                                                                                                                           |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Token economics             | No official supply, allocation, vesting, emissions or TGE schedule is available in the reviewed primary sources. This prevents valuation and unlock modeling.                                            |
| Security / audit            | The official security policy states that audits are still in progress and there is no active bug bounty. Mainnet/payment infrastructure raises the cost of protocol defects.                             |
| Execution                   | A payments-specific L1 must win integrations and recurring transaction volume, not only developer interest. Stablecoin issuers and payment providers have high switching and compliance requirements.    |
| Centralization / governance | Purpose-built infrastructure can depend on a relatively concentrated set of operators, issuers or governance actors. The eventual validator and governance economics need to be assessed when finalized. |
| Competitive                 | Tempo competes with mature stablecoin rails on Ethereum/L2s, Solana, Tron and vertically integrated fintech networks. Better UX alone does not guarantee distribution.                                   |
| Regulatory                  | Stablecoin payments touch issuer controls, sanctions, KYC/AML and jurisdiction-specific payment rules. Tempo's compliance-oriented design may help institutions but also introduces policy dependencies. |

## 6. Decision-useful conclusion

Tempo has a credible product thesis and unusually strong primary-source verification for an early tokenless network: a live technical stack, public code, payment-specific protocol design, stablecoin-denominated fees, and visible development activity. However, the investment case cannot yet be completed because the economic layer is missing. Without official token supply, distribution, vesting and emissions, any token valuation would be narrative-first rather than evidence-first.

**My current stance:** technically promising, economically incomplete. I would continue monitoring protocol adoption and security progress, but I would not assign a token valuation until official tokenomics and an unlock schedule are published. The first update to this dossier should occur immediately when those primary-source documents appear.

## 7. Disclosure

I currently hold no Tempo token position because no publicly traded native token is identified in the official sources reviewed. I received no compensation from the Tempo team for this research. This dossier was prepared for a rewarded Republic research quest; that campaign incentive is disclosed here.

### Primary sources reviewed

**Tempo official website**

<https://tempo.xyz/>

**Verified Tempo GitHub organization**

<https://github.com/tempoxyz>

**Tempo protocol repository**

<https://github.com/tempoxyz/tempo>

**Tempo security policy**

<https://github.com/tempoxyz/tempo/security>

**Tempo docs repository**

<https://github.com/tempoxyz/docs>

**Machine Payments Protocol (Tempo/Stripe)**

<https://github.com/tempoxyz/mpp>

**Research standard:** Claims in this dossier are intentionally limited to primary sources. Missing information is labeled as missing rather than inferred.