

Project Research Dossier

ClawChain (CLAW) - Pre-TGE / Fair-Launch Research
Prepared by squad members: dendi4 & mr.jayden0053 | 1 October 2026

Research question: Does ClawChain show enough verifiable product progress and sufficiently conservative token distribution to justify deeper diligence before any future launch?

1. Project Goal & Current State

ClawChain describes itself as a Substrate-based Layer 1 for autonomous AI-agent economies. Its stated design includes agent identity/DIDs, reputation, verifiable activity receipts, task/service markets, quadratic governance, a hybrid gas-quota model and NPoS staking. The official repository reports a live testnet and 12 live custom pallets, with additional modules planned. The repository also exposes node/runtime code, documentation and SDKs, which makes the technical claims more inspectable than a pitch-only project.

Eligibility check: official tokenomics state "No VC allocation" and describe the project as community-driven rather than venture-backed. The official repository still presents CLAW through testnet/mainnet-launch documentation rather than an active public sale. I found no current official sale/TGE announcement in the primary materials reviewed. Because the roadmap is mutable, this pre-TGE/pre-raise status should be re-checked immediately before submission.

Official repository: <https://github.com/clawinfra/claw-chain>

Official tokenomics: <https://github.com/clawinfra/claw-chain/blob/main/docs/tokenomics.md>

2. Tokenomics & Dilution

Allocation	Share	Release / vesting
Community airdrop	40% / 400M	25% immediate; 75% linear over 12 months
Validator rewards	30% / 300M	Continuous block/era rewards
Treasury	20% / 200M	10% immediate; 90% over 24 months
Founding contributors	10% / 100M	6-month cliff; then 24-month linear vest

Supply: 1,000,000,000 CLAW. **FDV:** not calculable pre-TGE because no verified market token price exists. **Circulating supply at launch:** not fully specified in the reviewed primary docs. At minimum, the schedules imply immediate availability from 25% of the community pool (100M) and 10% of treasury (20M), before considering validator issuance or exact genesis mechanics. Therefore a precise launch-circulation figure should not be invented.

Dilution model: the largest scheduled early release is the community pool. Its 300M locked remainder streams over 12 months, while 180M of the treasury streams over 24 months. Founders have a 6-month cliff, after which 100M vests linearly over 24 months. This avoids an immediate founder unlock, but creates a new dilution stream beginning at month 6. Validator emissions add continuing supply.

Inflation: official tokenomics list 5.0% in year 1, declining to a 2.0% floor from year 7 onward. Because the document also labels total supply as 1B while describing new minting, the relationship between the 1B figure and ongoing issuance needs clarification before valuation.

3. Team & Code Verification

The official CONTRIBUTORS file identifies the founding contributor as **Clawd (@clawd - Bowen's Agent)**, tied to GitHub handle **bowen31337**, and credits that contributor with the initial whitepaper, tokenomics design, repository setup and community coordination. At the last stated update in that file, no additional core or active contributors were listed. This is transparent, but it also indicates strong key-person concentration.

The repository itself is public and shows substantial implementation surface: runtime/node code, chain specification, 12 live custom pallets, SDKs and a public testnet endpoint. This is positive evidence of shipped engineering. However, repository activity is not equivalent to an independent security review.

Contributor registry: <https://github.com/clawinfra/claw-chain/blob/main/CONTRIBUTORS.md>

Repository / source code: <https://github.com/clawinfra/claw-chain>

4. Audit / Contract Verification

I did not find a published independent third-party protocol audit in the primary materials reviewed. The tokenomics say treasury funds may finance security audits, and an audit-attestation pallet is described as planned, but neither statement substitutes for an external audit of the live runtime. The project is a native L1, so there is no single production ERC-20 contract address to verify in the materials reviewed. The official testnet RPC is published in the repository.

Due-diligence implication: before any capital commitment, require (1) an independent runtime/consensus audit, (2) final genesis chain specification, (3) verified mainnet endpoints, and (4) final on-chain allocation/vesting state.

5. Key Risks

Risk	Assessment
Team concentration	Only one founding contributor is identified in the official contributor registry; execution and continuity risk are high until the contributor base broadens.
Security	No independent protocol audit was located in the reviewed primary sources. A custom L1 with staking, governance, escrow and identity modules has a large attack surface.
Token supply ambiguity	The docs call 1B the total supply while also describing ongoing inflation. Final monetary-policy semantics need clarification.
Launch dilution	At least 120M tokens appear scheduled for immediate release from community + treasury pools, with substantial linear unlocks thereafter; exact launch circulation remains unspecified.
6-month founder cliff	Founder tokens are initially locked, which reduces day-one pressure, but a 24-month founder vesting stream begins after month 6.
Adoption / market risk	The thesis depends on autonomous agents needing a dedicated L1. Technical delivery does not prove durable demand or fee generation.
Roadmap freshness	The repository roadmap can become stale. Pre-TGE/pre-raise eligibility must be re-confirmed before submitting this dossier or participating financially.

6. Interpretation & Conclusion

ClawChain is interesting as a research candidate because it combines a working public codebase and testnet with unusually explicit draft tokenomics. The distribution is more community-heavy than many VC-backed launches: 40% community, 30% validator rewards, 20% treasury and 10% founding contributors, with no stated VC allocation. The founder cliff and linear vesting reduce immediate insider liquidity.

The strongest reasons **not** to form investment conviction yet are equally clear: a concentrated founding team, no independent audit located, unclear final launch circulation, and an unresolved tension between a stated 1B total supply and ongoing inflation. My conclusion is therefore **watchlist / deeper diligence**, not an investment recommendation. The next gating evidence should be an external security audit, final genesis/token state and confirmed launch status.

7. Disclosure

dendi4: No position in CLAW; no compensation from ClawChain; this research was prepared for a Republic/Legion quest that may award participation rewards if approved.

mr.jayden0053: No position in CLAW; no compensation from ClawChain; this research was prepared for the same Republic/Legion quest and may earn participation rewards if approved.

Primary Sources Used

ClawChain official repository: <https://github.com/clawinfra/claw-chain>

Tokenomics: <https://github.com/clawinfra/claw-chain/blob/main/docs/tokenomics.md>

Contributors: <https://github.com/clawinfra/claw-chain/blob/main/CONTRIBUTORS.md>

All factual project claims in this dossier were derived from the project's own public repository and documentation reviewed on 1 October 2026. No influencer threads or secondary market summaries were used.