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THE IMPACT OF REGULATORY MEASURES IMPOSED ON INITIAL COIN OFFERINGS IN THE UNITED STATES MARKET ECONOMY

Joseph D. Moran

With the emergence of Initial Coin Offerings (ICO) in the United States financial market, numerous authorities in various countries across the globe have taken regulatory measures that provide clarity and investor protection.¹ Regulators, central banks, and major financial institutions have offered guidance to, acted upon, and provided rules to entities offering cryptocurrencies to both general (“retail”) and accredited investors² on various blockchain technology-based platforms.³ In 2017 alone, both U.S. domestic and foreign companies raised billions of dollars in revenue (“funding or “capital”) from ICOs, surpassing amounts raised by private equity groups (e.g., venture capitalists) through the traditional Initial Public Offering (IPO) method of raising capital.⁴

² Securities Act of 1933, § 2(a)(15), 15 U.S.C. § 78(c) (2012) (recognizing an “accredited investor” as someone who is financially sophisticated and has a reduced need for protection of regulatory disclosure filings; for example, an individual, bank, insurance company, broker or trust); Accredited Investors, SEC.gov, https://www.sec.gov/fast-answers/answers-accredhtm.html (last updated Nov. 27, 2017).
While a vast majority of the companies participating in ICOs have so far been tech startups, the promising technology of blockchains5 and smart contracts6 has caught the attention of well-established companies, many of whom have adopted the technology to streamline operations by removing layers of unnecessary procedural steps in business transactions, while offering customers greater transparency.7

Part I of this Note will explain ICOs generally, and explore the underlying technology that accompanies them.8 Part I will then examine the market impact that ICOs have on the economy, and provide examples of major enterprises that have begun to implement the technology within their structures.9 Lastly, Part I will explain the various methods, approaches and opinions that major financial institutions - including federal regulators and global central banks - have taken regarding ICOs and the distributed ledger technology that serves as their platform.10

Part II of this Note will compare the different ways in which tokens are offered in ICOs, whether they are “utility tokens” or “security tokens,” and examine the risks associated with each offering structure.11 Part II will further provide a legal framework that both regulators and legal practitioners have recommended for entities to incorporate into their decision-making when offering tokens through a public exchange (“offering” or “funding”), as well as touch on the impact that regulations may have on secondary markets that trade digital currencies.12 Part II will then compare the various stances foreign jurisdictions have taken on ICOs with those the United States has taken, and will lastly discuss the likely future of ICOs, noting opinions from leading players in

5 Infra Part I. Section B.
6 Infra Part I. Section B.
8 Infra Part I.
9 Infra Part I, Section C.
10 Infra Part I, Section D.
11 Infra Part II.
12 Infra Part II, Section C.
the technology and financial services industry.\textsuperscript{13}

I. UNDERSTANDING INITIAL COIN OFFERINGS

An Initial Coin Offering (ICO) is a sale of digital assets (“coins” or “tokens”) to the public\textsuperscript{14} by an entity seeking to raise capital.\textsuperscript{15} The sale is administered and recorded via “distributed ledger technology” on a blockchain, which is an immutable, decentralized ledger composed of a series (“chain”) of transactions (“blocks”) that network participants verify.\textsuperscript{16} The tokens, described on a company’s white paper,\textsuperscript{17} may be issued as either “utility tokens,” which grant the token holder access to some sort of application or future service in the entity,\textsuperscript{18} or as “security tokens,” which operate similar to traditional securities and grant the investor shares representing an equity or investment in a company.\textsuperscript{19} In most cases, token purchasers may resell their tokens in secondary markets, where the tokens will fluctuate in value.\textsuperscript{20} The entities involved can be any organization or enterprise, however most of the early issuers have been tech startups looking to fundraise new projects or services.\textsuperscript{21} To understand ICOs requires an understanding of the reason they were created in the first place, followed by an understanding of the technological underpinnings they encompass.

\textsuperscript{13} Infra Part II, Sections D & E.


\textsuperscript{16} See MELANIE SWAN, BLOCKCHAIN: BLUEPRINT FOR A NEW ECONOMY 19–20 (2015) (“The blockchain is the decentralized transaction ledger that is part of a larger computing infrastructure that must also include many other functions such as storage, communication, file serving, and archiving.”); Jorge Pesok, SEC’s Blockchain Stance Will Likely Impact Exchanges, LAW360 (Sept. 9, 2017, 2:10 PM), https://www.law360.com/articles/952055/sec-s-blockchain-stance-will-likely-impact-exchanges.

\textsuperscript{17} See generally Alex Lashkov, How to Write a Good White Paper, HACKERNOON (Oct. 23, 2017), https://hackernoon.com/how-to-write-a-good-white-paper-for-ico-tips-and-examples-42d71c3fa4fe (describing a White Paper as an offering memorandum that describes the services and products that will be offered by the company, as well as the token holders rights and interests).

\textsuperscript{18} Pesok, supra note 16.

\textsuperscript{19} Vigna, supra note 4, at B16.

\textsuperscript{20} Joel S. Telpner & Thomas M. Ahmadifar, ICOs, the DAO, and the Investment Company Act of 1940, FACTIVA, Nov. 1, 2017, at 5.

A. So . . . Who Invented The Initial Coin Offering, And Why?

In 2013 at the San Jose Bitcoin conference, J.R. Willett, a panelist, pitched an idea to a room full of mostly computer programming developers and interested “techies” looking to learn about the developing phenomenon of Bitcoin. In the time, little was known about Bitcoin other than that it was a form of digital cash that was traded anonymously by participants on a web-based network. Willett began to explain his idea that anyone with the urge or plan to create a protocol layer on top of Bitcoin with new features and services could gather a group of developers and trusted individuals and, similar to the structure of Kickstarter, provide an address in which people could help fund the idea or project by sending coins for a stake in the new protocol.

At the time of this event, Willett, a Seattle-based software engineer, had been developing this idea for more than a year. Back in January of 2012, on the Bitcoin Talk forum, he published a white paper explaining:

We claim that the existing bitcoin network can be used as a protocol layer, on top of which new currency layers with new rules can be built . . . We further claim that the new protocol layers . . . will provide initial funds to hire developers to build software which implements the new protocol layers, and . . . will richly reward early adopters of the new


23 See Nathaniel Popper, Into the Bitcoin Mines, N.Y. TIMES, Dec. 22, 2013, at BU1 (“Today, all of the machines dedicated to mining Bitcoin have a computing power about 4,500 times the capacity of the United States government’s mightiest supercomputer, the IBM Sequoia . . . The computing capacity of the Bitcoin network has grown by around 30,000 percent since the beginning of the year.”); see also Anthony Cuthbertson, Bitcoin Mining on Track to Consume All of the World’s Energy by 2020, Newsweek (Dec. 11, 2017, 10:07 AM), http://www.newsweek.com/bitcoin-mining-track-consume-worlds-energy-2020-744036 (stating that as of December 2017, the “Bitcoin Network” is estimated to consume as much energy as 159 individual countries, or the equivalent of the entire country of Denmark, which consumes 33 terawatts of electricity annually, according to the Bitcoin Energy Consumption Index. If Bitcoin continues on its current trajectory, the network will “consume as much energy as the U.S. by 2019, and . . . the entire world by the end of 2020,” according to Digiconomist).

24 See generally Pressroom, Kickstarter, https://www.kickstarter.com/press?ref=hello (last visited May 24, 2018). Kickstarter is a funding platform for projects created by individuals who set funding goals and deadlines and open their platform up to the public to invest by pledging money to the project usually for some sort of reward in the project. If the project succeeds in reaching its funding goal, all investors credit cards are charged when time expires. If the project falls short of its funding goal, no one is charged. Funding on Kickstarter is “all-or-nothing.” See generally Id.

25 Shin, supra note 22.

26 Id.
It would take five years before the idea in Willett’s White Paper would become a trend that would result in over $6 billion of capital raised in 2017 alone, leaving venture capitalists and the rest of the private equity market scrambling to make sense of the what the future will hold for this new disruption in the market: the Initial Coin Offering.

B. Technological Underpinnings

ICOs rely on a blockchain or “blockchain technology” as the platform upon which they operate. The blockchain is an immutable, distributed and decentralized database that allows for peer-to-peer transfers of digital assets on a network without the need for an intermediary, such as a central governing authority or a bank. The typical blockchain structure requires an entire network of participants to cooperate in order to make additions of new information to the blockchain. Key characteristics of a blockchain include an ability to add, authenticate, and track transactions via member nodes on a network, employ cryptographic techniques to prevent hackers from manipulating transactions.

---

27 Id.
29 Shin, supra note 22.
31 See Gideon Greenspan, The Blockchain Immutability Myth, MULTICHAIN (May 4, 2017), https://www.multichain.com/blog/2017/05/blockchain-immutability-myth/ (describing “immutable” in the blockchain context as “the global log of transactions, which is created by consensus between the chain’s participants.”).
32 See What is a Distributed Ledger?, COINDESK, https://www.coindesk.com/information/what-is-a-distributed-ledger/ (last visited May 24, 2018) (stating that “a distributed ledger is a database held and updated independently by each participant (or node) in a large network.”).
35 Telpner & Ahmadifar, supra note 20, at 5.
36 See generally Michael D’Aliessi, How Does the Blockchain Work, MEDIUM (June 1, 2016), https://medium.com/@micheledaliessi/how-does-the-blockchain-work-98c8cd01d2ae. A “node” is a computer connected to the blockchain network. Each node, which can represent an individual or entity, maintains a copy of the blockchain. To add new information to a blockchain, the nodes must work independently to verify the proposed addition. See generally Id.
37 See Kevin Werbach & Nicolas Cornell, Contracts Ex Machina, 67 DUKE L.J. 313, 328 (2017) (discussing monetary rewards for nodes that solve cryptographic puzzles making
and allow for many other applications apart from merely providing a platform to transfer digital currencies, or “cryptocurrencies.” One of the most common use cases for the blockchain is to store records of digital currency transactions on a digital wallet, which is a software program that stores both public and private keys, and serves as an interface allowing “users [to] monitor their balance, send money and conduct [additional] operations.”

Individuals and entities can also use blockchain technology as a means for conducting business to business transactions using smart contracts. Smart contracts are cryptographic “if/then” software programs, or “digital agreements” that rely on specific triggering mechanisms to automatically self-execute (e.g., make a payment) when a certain condition is met. Smart contracts consist of three key elements that allow them to work: [1] they are coded into a programming language, [2] they entail a system upon which contracting parties may connect to one another (e.g., a blockchain), and [3] they rely on at least one third party source, or “oracle,” for performance. An informative use case involving smart contracts is the Decentralized Autonomous Organization (“DAO” or “The DAO”) offering.

The DAO, an unincorporated “for-profit” organization that German Corporation Slock.it and Slock.it’s co-founders created, operated on the

---


39 Reggie O'Shields, Smart Contracts: Legal Agreements for the Blockchain, 21 N.C. BANKING INST. 177, 179 (2017). Blockchain is used to transact in Bitcoin or Ether, the native currency of another digital currency platform, Ethereum. See id. (“Blockchain is the technology underlying the cryptocurrency, or electronic money, Bitcoin.”); Vigna, supra note 4, at B16; Ryan Surujnath, Off the Chain: A Guide to Blockchain Derivatives Markets and the Implications on Systemic Risk, 22 FORDHAM J. CORP. & FIN. L., 257, 263–64 (2017) (discussing blockchain design for electronic currencies).

40 See Stephen Small, Bitcoin: The Napster of Currency, 37 HOU. J. INT’L L. 581, 588 (2015) (comparing a public key to an email address and a private key to a pin number for a debit card, which are both stored in a digital wallet).


43 Id.

44 Telpner & Ahmadifar, supra note 20, at 5.

Ethereum blockchain and allowed investors to both launch their projects on a blockchain following DAO approval, and receive funding from The DAO through an exchange of The DAO’s tokens for Ether.\textsuperscript{46} The DAO’s White Paper, or “offering memorandum,” posited that The DAO “would use smart contracts . . . to solve governance issues inherent in traditional corporations” through a blockchain that “formalized, automated and enforced using software” with certain contractual terms.\textsuperscript{47}

In addition to those The DAO offering highlighted, smart contracts also offer other practical solutions.\textsuperscript{48} For instance, rather than needing to maintain records of paper contracts, and periodically invoice customers for payments for certain services, smart contracts create code that provides instantaneous verification on a distributed computer platform, saving both money and time typically wasted on paying trusted intermediaries or unnecessary human interactions that often go awry.\textsuperscript{49} In the process of an ICO, smart contracts may allow for the exchange of digital tokens for other forms of virtual currency.\textsuperscript{50}

Individuals and entities can also use blockchain technology for asset tracking and supply chain management, securities ledgers,\textsuperscript{51} and voting systems and prediction markets.\textsuperscript{52} Blockchains may also be used for applications in the financial services universe, in the real estate and healthcare markets, for insurance transactions, and beyond.”\textsuperscript{53}

\textsuperscript{46} Telpner & Ahmadifar, supra note 20, at 5 (recognizing that Ether is “the currency [used on the platform] Ethereum, [and] has emerged as the primary currency for ICOs due to Ethereum’s popularity among developers.”).


\textsuperscript{48} O’Shields, supra note 39, at 181–82.

\textsuperscript{49} Meredith Hobbs, Once Shadowy Blockchain Is a New Practice for Morris Manning & Martin, DAILY REP, Oct. 16, 2017, at 1.

\textsuperscript{50} Aubrey K. Noonan, Bitcoin or Bust: Can One Really “Trust” One’s Digital Assets?, 7 EST. PLAN. & CMTY PROP. L. J. 583, 593 (2015); Telpner & Ahmadifar, supra note 20, at 5.

\textsuperscript{51} Governor Markell Launches Delaware Blockchain Initiative, PRNEWSWIRE (May 2, 2016, 9:30 AM), http://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/governor-markell-launches-delaware-blockchain-initiative-300260672.html. Securities ledgers allow securities to legally be used on a blockchain to track who owns certain shares. See generally Id. (initiating a record keeping program to identify blockchain owners).

\textsuperscript{52} Andrea Tinianow & Caitlin Long, supra note 42.

\textsuperscript{53} Telpner & Ahmadifar, supra note 20, at 5; see also Garry Gabison, Policy Considerations for the Blockchain Technology Public and Private Applications, 19 SMU SCI. & TECH. L. REV. 327, 329 (2016); S.H. Spencer Compton & Diana Schottenstein, Questions and Answers About Using Blockchain Technology in Real Estate Practice, 33 PRAC. REAL EST. LAWYER 5, 7 (2017); Angela Walsh, The Path of the Blockchain Lexicon (and the Law), 36 REV. BANKING & FIN. L. 713, 737 (2017) (stating blockchain technology has potential to change the insurance industry due to ability to track things in a reliable and
Virtual currency, also referred to as “digital currency” or “cryptocurrency,” is the underlying form of money that individuals and entities use to support their transactions that take place on a blockchain.\(^\text{54}\) There are well over a thousand cryptocurrencies; the two most popular being Bitcoin\(^\text{55}\) and Ether.\(^\text{56}\) Cryptocurrency is designed to be transferred securely and anonymously — thanks to the science of cryptography.\(^\text{57}\) Cryptography secures legible information using algorithmic code and a peer-to-peer validation process wherein participants confirm the authenticity of transactions by signing a cryptographic key, which eliminates the possibility for third party attempts to hack the blockchain by impersonating one of the participants.\(^\text{58}\) Once the participants sign the key, the only way for changes to be made to the transaction is if the participants digitally approve the changes via cryptographic signatures,\(^\text{59}\) which authenticate both the participants’ identities as well as the content of their transaction.\(^\text{60}\) Invalidated efforts by third parties attempting to amend the chain will be rejected.\(^\text{61}\) Participants can add multiple transactions onto blocks, which are chained to, and referenced by one another via their cryptographic signatures.\(^\text{62}\) This open process of previously-validating transactions on the blockchain both eliminates the need for an intermediary or third party auditor, and provides transparency to users through a chain of verified blocks confirming

\(^{54}\) Paul Vigna & Michael J. Casey, supra note 1, at 219 (2015) (explaining that bitcoin is the virtual currency which legitimizes blockchain through transactions).

\(^{55}\) Telpner & Ahmadifar, supra note 20, at 5; see also Lee A. Sheppard, supra note 1, at 1027 (describing bitcoin as most widely accepted by merchants and favored by bitcoin miners).

\(^{56}\) Telpner & Ahmadifar, supra note 20, at 5; Cryptocurrency Market Capitalizations, Coinmarketcap (Nov. 17, 2017), https://coinmarketcap.com/all/views/all/.


\(^{60}\) Saunders, supra note 58, at 948.

\(^{61}\) Alan Cohn, Travis West & Chelsea Parker, Smart After All: Blockchain, Smart Contracts, Parametric Insurance, and Smart Energy Grids, 1 GEO. L. TECH. REV. 273, 278 (2017); Krone & Bernstein, supra note 59, at 146.

\(^{62}\) Larissa Lee, New Kids on the Blockchain: How Bitcoin’s Technology Could Reinvent the Stock Market, 12 HASTINGS BUS. L. J. 81, 100–01 (2016).
who owned what and when.63

A Bitcoin transaction, for example, is traceable all the way back to the point of its creation.64 Participants can be ensured that their transactions will be verified because validators, or “miners”65 will have confirmed the transactions for incentives, usually amounting to small financial rewards from outside resources unrelated to the underlying transaction.66 The more miners the better, as they essentially act as the sole validation process of the blockchain structure by working in consensus to monitor the transactions.67 Although only users who possess the cryptographic key underlying the transaction can transfer Bitcoins, there is still a reliance on the public nature of a community of network participants to act independently to monitor the blockchain by accepting only correct chains of transfers to put forward for any given block.68

The Bitcoin blockchain, as well as Ethereum, which was created after the Bitcoin blockchain to standardize the coding for creating a token, are examples of open-consensus, public blockchains, where anyone with the applicable software is able to view the ledger.69 These popular blockchains70 offer a system that is both resilient and resistant to corruption or attacks on single or groups of nodes; by design, when one node is corrupted or hacked, the rest still work.71 While public blockchains are both large and now ubiquitous amongst cryptocurrency transactions taking place all over the world, certain companies

63 Ronald L. Chichester, Wide Open Spaces, 80 TEX. B.J. 228, 229 (2017).
65 Kelsey L. Penrose, Banking on Bitcoin: Applying Anti-Money Laundering and Money Transmitter Laws, 18 N.C. BANKING INST. 529, 531–33 (2014). Miners are often ordinary people who connect to the Bitcoin network from their computers via a mining software program. Id.
66 Cohn, West & Parker, supra note 61, at 279; See generally Bitcoin, STACK EXCHANGE, https://bitcoin.stackexchange.com/questions/64355/bitcoin-block-reward-for-a-tiny-transaction(last visited May 24, 2018) (showing that the current reward for a successful completion of a block is 12.5 bitcoins).
67 Shakow, supra note 15, at 1387. The Bitcoin blockchain is updated every ten minutes. Id.
68 Id.
69 Id.
70 Bryant Nielsen, Review of the 6 Major Blockchain Protocols, RICHTOPIA, https://richtopia.com/emerging-technologies/review-6-major-blockchain-protocols (last visited May 24, 2018). Other popular blockchains include: Ripple, which supports cryptocurrencies, fiat currency, commodity and other value units like mobile minutes or frequent flier miles, etc.; Hyperledger, which focuses on international business transactions; Corda, developed for recording, supervising and synchronizing financial agreements amongst regulated financial institutions; and Symbiont, created for institutional finance and contractual-based. Id.
also implement private, or closed-permission blockchains. Private blockchains use the same technology as public blockchains, however, a single entity administers them. This results in more control for the entity to restrict permission or allow access to only approved, or invited users. Private blockchains are attractive because they require less computational power to maintain a given ledger and offer more privacy for transactions. Private blockchains operate in a fully private space, such as a private server or cloud-based environment.

Both public and private blockchains offer promising technology for a wide range of industries seeking to develop and implement blockchains to support transactions that take place across various business structures. As companies are beginning to realize such benefits, more are beginning to roll out blockchain networks into production, the impact of which is being felt in large part by the financial services industry in a very significant way.

C. Market Impact

Coin offerings had a significant impact on the 2017 market. Over the past year, 382 ICOs were successfully completed, and they raised more than $6 billion. This amounts to more than sixty times the roughly $100 million raised in 2016. With roughly $2 billion raised in the third quarter and $3.1 in the fourth quarter, the revenues ICOs have raised have quickly come to surpass

72 Cohn, West, & Parker, supra note 61, at 279; R. Tyler Smith, Public and Private Blockchains: Enemies or Allies? Why the Enterprise Ethereum Alliance will prove the latter, MEDIUM (Feb. 28, 2017), https://medium.com/@rtylersmith/public-and-private-blockchains-enemies-or-allies-45f050c38fc0.
73 Cohn, West, & Parker, supra note 61, at 277.
74 Id.; R. Tyler Smith, supra note 72.
76 Alan Cohn, Travis West, & Chelsea Parker, supra note 61, at 275; Stephen J. Bigelow, Private Cloud (internal cloud or corporate cloud), TECHTARGET, http://searchcloudcomputing.techtarget.com/definition/private-cloud (last updated Nov. 2017); see also Rajashekara V. Maiya, Public, Private or Hybrid Blockchain: What does it mean?, DATA QUEST INDIA (May 10, 2017), http://www.dqindia.com/public-private-or-hybrid-blockchain-what-does-it-mean/ (describing how a combination of the characteristics of public and private blockchains produces the hybrid blockchain, which allows network members to decide whether transactions should remain public, or be restricted to a narrower group of members).
77 Praveen Jayachandran, supra note 75.
78 Zaitsev, supra note 28.
79 Id.
traditional venture-capital (VC) and Private Equity (PE) fundraising. The total market capitalization for cryptocurrencies increased by nearly $600 billion from $17.7 billion to $612.9 billion—over the past year, exceeding as much as $650 billion on December 21st. This aggregate value includes roughly 1,335 combined cryptocurrencies and results in a 2,700% increase over the year. By comparison, it has taken decades for the S&P 500 to deliver the same returns. The increase in Bitcoin capitalization—including the trading of Bitcoin futures on various exchanges—from $15.5 billion to $236 billion heavily influenced this vigorous growth. The remaining amount came from alternate coin, or “altcoin,” capitalization, which totaled $376.2 billion, with a large concentration amongst the top ten valued cryptocurrencies. Coin offerings will likely continue to surpass their VC and PE counterparts if they continue on their trajectory. The largest individual fundraisings came from the startup company Protocol Labs, and the Hyundai Digital Asset Currency (Hdac) project. Protocol Labs raised $257 million in September 2017 for a computer-memory marketplace called Filecoin, while the Hdac project raised $258 million for a hybrid project that creates a continuous “developing information platform based on blockchain and the Internet of Things (IoT).”

80 Id.; Vigna, supra note 4, at B16.
81 Zaitsev, supra note 28.
85 Zaitsev, supra note 28.
87 Zaitsev, supra note 28.
88 Vigna, supra note 4, at B16.
89 Jay G. Baris, et al., Speech at the Practicing Law Institute SEC Webinar (Sept. 14, 2017). To offer guidance to future ICOs that want to be in compliance with securities laws, Protocol Labs is also producing the Simple Agreements for Future Tokens (SAFT), or promissory notes, which are convertible into either preferred stock of the issuer, tokens, or both. Id.
90 Zaitsev, supra note 28.
in 2017,

[O]ffers an ecosystem with public and private keys for interacting with the devices around us, the number of which will continue to grow [e.g. smartphones, smart cars, televisions, refrigerators, etc.] . . . and creates a reliable, confidential, comprehensive, and controllable system of communications, which will make it possible to perform quick transactions, and increase the convenience of all types of payments: taxes, settlements with clients, investments, loans, etc.91

However, Dragon Corp., a Macau company formed to issue tokens used by VIP junket operators by offering credit on behalf of casino operators, and which aims to raise $500 million in an ICO despite China’s recent ban on cryptocurrencies, may rival these record numbers.92

These offerings usually include exchanges of fiat currency (e.g. USD, Euro, Yen, Pound Sterling, etc.) or other tokens like Bitcoin, Ether or FileCoin that issuers privately pre-sell to select investors prior to an ICO.93 An example of a private fundraising method includes the ICO of Metal Pay, a blockchain based app similar to Venmo that raised a $3 million round of token sales limited to “accredited” investors who have personal relationships with the firm.94 While some consider the addition of ICOs into the market economy as a healthy change of pace and a positive addition of free flow of capital, others are wary of the impact their involvement may soon have on the economy as a whole.95 Take the hedge fund concept of “flipping,” for example, which is when big name investors receive preferential treatment and large discounts by investing in a presale, and then cash out immediately after the ICO to realize a quick return.96

While legal, this short-term, pre-purchasing strategy will most likely contribute

91 Id.
93 Baris, et al., supra note 89.
96 Kharif, supra note 95; Ashour Iesho, Hedge Funds are Investing Big Sums into ICOs, BITCOINIST (Oct. 5, 2017, 11:00 AM), http://bitcoinist.com/hedge-funds-are-investing-big-sums-into-icos/.
to an “overwhelming amount of low grade ICOs,” a result similar to what occurred to IPOs during the IPO boom in the 1990s.

The July 2017 offering by social messaging company Kik Interactive Inc. provides a concrete example of how hedge funds can benefit disproportionally by getting in early through a presale. Although the company raised $100 million from more than 10,000 contributors of 117 countries, three hedge funds—Blockchain Capital, Pantera Capital and Polychain Capital—together contributed $50 million in a presale the summer before the actual ICO. In doing so, these three hedge funds alone received a thirty percent discount on their Kin tokens, which could be used for commerce with Kik. Per the terms set out in the White Paper, Blockchain, Pantera and Polychain could sell up to fifty percent of their Kin at any time, granting them the benefit of profiting whether the price of Kin either suffered a large drop in value, or continued to rise. Meanwhile, regular investors were unable to reap such benefits in the event of a cash out.

While ICOs clearly are impacting the market in many ways, so too is the blockchain technology that embodies them. In many industries, large, well-established organizations have begun to consider incorporating blockchain into their business models, in addition to ICOs for fundraising for new ideas or projects. Take the banking and financial services industries for instance, where in a period of a few months near the end of 2017, investment bank giant Goldman Sachs filed a patent application for a private blockchain for foreign exchange trading; stock exchange operator Nasdaq filed a patent outlining a

100 Kharif, supra note 95.
101 Kharif, supra note 95; See Kin, TOKENMARKET, https://tokenmarket.net/blockchain/ethereum/assets/kin/ (last visited May 24, 2018) (defining “Kin” the cryptocurrency offered by Kik Interactive to Investors and stating “Kin cryptocurrency will first power a digital economy inside of Kik, and then will serve as the basis of interoperability with other digital services in the Kin Ecosystem.”).
102 Kharif, supra note 95.
103 Id.
104 Id.
106 Id.
107 Sheppard, supra note 1, at 1027.
desire to store asset ownership data on a blockchain; and credit card powerhouse Visa launched an initial phase of a business-to-business payments system using the blockchain startup “Chain.” Additionally, the Australian Securities Exchange (ASX) announced on December 7, 2017 that it would replace its registry, clearing, and settlement system with blockchain technology Digital Asset Holding developed, a company Blythe Masters, a former J.P. Morgan banker, heads. According to Dominic Stevens, ASX Chief Executive and Managing Director, the move “will enable our customers to develop new services and reduce their costs . . . and put Australia at the forefront of innovation in financial markets.”

Over sixty companies—including Hewlett Packard Enterprise, Intel and Microsoft—are partners of the private R3 consortium building and operating distributed ledger applications for their businesses, and now over twenty global banks are members of a Singapore and Hong Kong blockchain-based trade network that aims to digitalize trade finance and set “new global standards” for the industry. Other notable and similar industry players that have publicly announced plans to utilize blockchain-based technology in the month of November 2017 alone include credit card company Mastercard, investment bank Morgan Stanley, insurance giant Prudential, and one of the Big Four auditors KPMG.

In the food industry, IBM, one of the world’s largest information technology

---

109 Id.
111 Id.
112 See R3’s Corda partner network grows to over 60 companies, R3 (Nov. 13, 2017), https://www.r3.com/blog/2017/11/13/r3s-corda-partner-network-grows-to-over-60-companies-including-hewlett-packard-enterprise-intel-and-microsoft/ (stating that R3 “counts over 100 banks, insurance companies, financial institutions, regulators, trade associations and technology companies as members.”).
116 Id.
117 Id.
companies, has sought to form a consortium with large food suppliers—including Walmart, the largest grocer in the United States, Nestlé, and Dole—to use blockchain to create an audit trail for food safety. 118 Even the entertainment industry has solicited the use of blockchain technology to modernize certain business structures. 119 Telecom conglomerate Comcast filed for a patent in November 2017 that outlined a blockchain database that would store customer viewing and identifying data. 120 In Hollywood, Christopher Woodrow, who has financed and produced movies—including Oscar-winning *Birdman*—announced plans to launch a blockchain-based token called MovieCoin in early 2018. 121 Woodrow explained that MovieCoin would appreciate based on the success of films financed from it, as well as be tradable in secondary markets. 122 In explaining the company, Woodrow stated, “we’re in the process of putting together a slate of projects that will include A-list movie stars, top-tier directors, seasoned and established producers, and that will form the initial slate for MovieCoin.” 123 Further, celebrities including boxer Floyd Mayweather, heiress Paris Hilton, musician DJ Khaled, 124 and rapper The Game have each promoted particular ICOs, 125 ranging from a company aiming to transform the cannabis industry 126 to one claiming to offer predictions for sporting events, the stock market, and “even the weather.” 127 These celebrity endorsements have garnered enough attention for the Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC” or “the Commission”) to step in and respond by issuing one of only a short list of
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cryptocurrency-related official statements on the matter.\(^{128}\)

D. Regulators Are Cracking Down

Such marketplace ubiquity has caught the attention of U.S. regulatory authorities, central banks, and major financial institutions.\(^{129}\) On October 17, 2017, the U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) released a primer on virtual currencies that explains the CFTC’s anti-fraud and anti-manipulation jurisdiction over virtual currencies in interstate commerce that may involve commodity or futures interests, or derivatives contracts.\(^{130}\) The primer addresses the CFTC’s 2015 finding that Bitcoin and other virtual currencies (e.g. Ethereum) “are properly defined as commodities” (e.g. gold, silver, oil, or a currency which includes services, rights, and certain interests) as opposed to fiat currencies under Section 1(a)(9) of the Commodity Exchange Act (CEA).\(^{131}\)

While the CFTC has taken at least four enforcement actions in this area, it has also permitted two competing Bitcoin futures Exchanges – Chicago Mercantile Exchange (CME) and CBOE Futures Exchange (CFE)\(^{132}\) – to self-certify
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\(^{129}\) Id.


\(^{132}\) Bitcoin futures contracts at CME and Cboe, REUTERS (Dec. 15, 2017, 2:10 PM), https://www.reuters.com/article/uk-bitcoin-futures-contracts/bitcoin-futures-contracts-at-cme-and-cboe-idUSKBN1E92K9. Trading on CFE began on December 10, 2017, carries a contract equal to one bitcoin, and is priced off a daily auction at 4 p.m. eastern time on the cryptocurrency exchange Gemini. CME trading began on December 18, 2017, carries a contract equal to five bitcoins, and is priced off an index of prices from four cryptocurrency exchanges (not including Gemini). Id. The CFTC forced the futures contracts to be margined at over forty percent, meaning that investors will need to offer up roughly half the cost of the contract, significantly higher than the single digit margins required by most futures exchange contracts. Futures Fundamentals: Characteristics, INVESTOPEDIA (Dec. 1, 2017), https://www.investopedia.com/university/futures/futures4.asp (explaining that the
contracts for Bitcoin futures products. Additionally, the CFTC has permitted another Bitcoin Exchange, The Cantor Exchange, to self-certify a contract for binary options. This will allow all three Exchanges to list for trading Bitcoin derivatives, and is subsequent to prior approvals for a Swap Execution Facility (SEF) and North American Derivatives Exchange Inc. (NADEX), a designated contract market (DCM), to offer swaps and Bitcoin binary options, respectively. While the primer poses potential risks (operational, speculative, cybersecurity, and fraud and manipulation) of virtual currency, it also includes language on potential benefits that Chairman Chris Giancarlo may have influenced from a statement in the spring of 2016 that blockchain and distributed ledger technology “has the potential to link networks of legal record-keeping the same way the Internet connects networks of data and information.” Giancarlo announced on January 4, 2017 that the CFTC’s Market Risk Advisory Committee will hold future meetings to consider further the self-certification process of new products and operational rules proposed by DCMs under both the CEA and CFTC regulations.

Lastly, while the CFTC classifies foreign exchanges and currencies as “commodities,” under Section 1(a)(9), it has refrained from classifying cryptocurrencies as foreign exchanges and currencies, falling in line with other regulators—like FinCen and the IRS—in treating cryptocurrencies like commodities or other assets, rather than foreign currencies. In an enforcement action against Bitfinex, a Hong-Kong based Bitcoin exchange, the CFTC brought the action under the “retail commodity” provisions of the CEA rather than the “retail foreign exchange” provisions, which has a significantly longer delivery period (twenty–eight days versus two days) for commodities that are not foreign exchanges and currencies. The CFTC’s authority over certain
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types of foreign exchange transactions is addressed in the “Treasury Amendment,” which was added to the Commodity Exchange Act in 1974 when the CFTC was created.\textsuperscript{141}

High-ranking members of the U.S. Federal Reserve ("the Fed") also made public statements on the impact that cryptocurrencies will have on the central banking system. Chairwoman Janet Yellen remarked in an appearance on Capitol Hill that the U.S. Central Bank expects cryptocurrencies and blockchain technology to impact significantly future payments and banking systems.\textsuperscript{142} Randal Quarles, the Fed’s vice chair for supervision, hinted that central banks are far from embracing cryptocurrencies as a legitimate means for paying for things, noting potential dangers to the financial system because of a lack of institutional support, vulnerability to hackers, and abuse from money launderers and terrorist groups.\textsuperscript{143}

Regarding tax-related matters, the IRS relies on its March 2014 issuance of Notice 2014-21, which holds that tokens issued from ICOs are to be treated as property, as opposed to a form of currency, for federal tax purposes because they generate revenue when sold.\textsuperscript{144} If companies use tokens for compensation of employees or other service providers, the IRS deems the tokens taxable income.\textsuperscript{145} Many blockchain-based companies settle in tax havens such as the British Virgin Islands for this reason.\textsuperscript{146} Further, the IRS requires investors to

\begin{itemize}
\item Dunn v. CFTC, 519 U.S. 465 (1997). Congress has amended the Treasury Amendment and CEA several times during the last nearly thirty years to expand and clarify the CFTC’s authority over certain types of foreign exchange transactions (rolling spot, FX options, FX NDFs, FX Swaps, etc.). \textit{Id.}
\item I.R.S. Notice 2014-21.
\item See Meredith Hobbs, \textit{supra} note 49, at 1 (noting the IRS considers that money, which is taxable income, a securities offering because it considers tokens and other cryptocurrencies as property that generates revenue when sold); Report of Investigation Pursuant to Section 21(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934: The DAO, \textit{Exchange Release No. 81207} (July 25, 2017).
\item Meredith Hobbs, \textit{supra} note 49, at 1; \textit{see C.R.S., Tax Havens: International Tax Avoidance & Evasion}, 2015 WL 333185, at *4 (identifying the British Virgin Islands as a
report all transactions made on cryptocurrency exchanges, and to pay taxes on all capital gains acquired through such trading.\textsuperscript{147} Even though Section 1031 of the Internal Revenue Code (IRC) allows taxpayers to exchange, rather than sell, real and personal property, like virtual currency, with one another in a tax-free exchange if the exchange is “like-kind” and includes a transfer of “one business of investment asset for another,” the taxpayers must still report the exchange on an IRS Form 8824, regardless of whether or not the taxpayers recognize any gain on the exchange.\textsuperscript{148} Many crypto-investors incorrectly rely on Section 1031 to be exempt from having to report crypto-exchanges, thinking that exchanges involving different cryptocurrencies (e.g., Bitcoin for Ethereum, or vice versa) qualifies as a 1031 exchange of like-kind property and thus is tax-free.\textsuperscript{149} However, the IRS has not clarified this yet and thus relying on such logic may be ill-advised.\textsuperscript{150} In November 2016, a federal judge issued a summons to Coinbase Inc., a cryptocurrency exchange database, to identify all U.S. customers who transferred cryptocurrency from 2013 to 2015 to allow the IRS to make cryptocurrency owners report the value of their cryptocurrency wallets to the federal government.\textsuperscript{151} Investors who make transactions on these exchanges must report any short-term or long-term capital gains or losses on a Form 1099 that the IRS would ultimately review.\textsuperscript{152}

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) chimed in when it released a set of consumer protection principles on October 18, 2017 to address the issues of protecting consumers’ financial data that financial institutions and companies participating in ICOs sometime share.\textsuperscript{153} In the private-public sector,
the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority (FINRA) released an Investor Alert in August 2017 that aimed to inform investors about the potential risks of participating in ICOs.\footnote{Initial Coin Offerings: Know Before You Invest, FINRA, http://www.finra.org/investors/alerts/initial-coin-offerings-know-before-you-invest (last updated Aug. 31, 2017).}

However, the SEC offered the most impactful guidance to the crypto-community in its Report of Investigation issued on July 25, 2017. In the Report, the SEC took a stance for the first time on ICOs regarding the Spring 2016 coin offering by The DAO, a for-profit entity that sponsored digital start-up projects by creating and holding assets by selling “DAO Tokens” to investors through ICOs. The DAO proposed to use the tokens to fund “projects” from which investors receive earnings as a return on their investment. DAO representatives known as “curators” would oversee the projects and shepherd them through an evaluation and selection process. Investors could then re-sell their DAO Tokens to realize profits in a secondary market that supported the trading of DAO Tokens.\footnote{Id.} The SEC caught wind of the matter when issues arose after a cyber attack diverted roughly $150 million of total Ether from The DAO offering to an Ethereum blockchain address the cyber attacker controlled. In its Report, the SEC applied the Howey test, and determined that DAO Tokens were securities and therefore within the agency’s purview. The United States Supreme Court previously articulated the Howey test in \textit{SEC v. W.J. Howey Co.}, when it determined whether a particular instrument is an “investment contract,” and therefore, a “security” subject to the Securities Act of 1933 (“1933 Act”).\footnote{See \textit{SEC v. W.J. Howey Co.}, 328 U.S. 293, 298–99 (1946) (articulating the four factors of an investment contract); Press Release, U.S. Sec. & Exch. Comm’n, SEC Issues Investigative Report on DAO Tokens, supra note 155.}

The \textit{Howey} test sets out the following four elements that must be present for...
an asset to be a security: (1) an investment of money (2) in a common enterprise (3) with a reasonable expectation of profits (4) to be derived from the entrepreneurial or managerial efforts of others. The SEC analyzed the offering and determined the following:

The DAO, an unincorporated organization, was an issuer of securities, and information about The DAO was ‘crucial’ to the DAO Token holders’ investment decision . . . The DAO was ‘responsible for the success or failure of the enterprise,’ and accordingly was the entity about which the investors needed information material to their investment decision.

Joel S. Telpner and Thomas M. Ahmadifar of the law firm Sullivan & Worcester LLP broke down this analysis differently by applying the facts of the DAO offering to the Howey factors:

The DAO Tokens fulfilled the test for an investment contract because the investors invested money in The DAO in the form of Ether, with a reasonable expectation of profits in the form of dividends from projects paid for with pooled money, and because the investors relied on the efforts of The DAO’s Curators to select projects for investment.

The application of the fourth factor caused confusion because the investors voted on what projects to fund, leaving many legal practitioners to question whether it was solely an effort by the investors that resulted in an expectation of profits, or if “the managerial efforts of others” also played a role. The SEC reasoned that the voting rights afforded investors “did not provide them with meaningful control over the enterprise” because the investors did not have a clear ability to vote for contracts, and they were so geographically scattered that their ability to communicate with one another was limited.

Although the SEC clarified in the DAO Report that a security is still a security regardless of whether it may entail some innovative, technological characteristics, the SEC’s guidance only applied to the DAO Token, which clearly met the first three elements of Howey, and albeit more questionably, the fourth element as well. Thus, the SEC did not answer the question of whether all tokens are securities, and suggested a seemingly vague “facts-and-
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circumstances” test for future investigations. This lack of clarity has left the market in an uncomfortable position of only being able to speculate as to what the SEC will do next following its warning. It is fair to assume that most financial market players will await major regulatory enforcement actions to provide more guidance, which the market got a taste of in the SEC’s first enforcement action against two companies - REcoin Group and DRC World - and their founder, Maksim Zaslavskiy, for violating anti-fraud and registration provisions of securities law for offering tokens that were backed by non-existent assets. Zalavksiy allegedly solicited money from investors in exchange for tokens in his companies. In doing so, he purportedly tied the tokens to investments in diamonds and real estate that would supposedly appreciate in value. The SEC alleged that both schemes were completely fraudulent with no real investments or supporting infrastructure backing the assets.

Following these actions taken, the Commission attempted to clear up another potential loophole by issuing a statement on November 1, 2017 regarding the many celebrities (and other individuals) who have touted certain ICOs and virtual tokens. The Commission stated that “[A]ny celebrity or other individual who promotes a virtual token or coin that is a security must disclose the nature, scope, and amount of compensation received in exchange for the promotion,” and that a failure to do so violates the anti-touting provisions and, potentially, the anti-fraud provisions of the federal securities laws. The SEC warned investors that paid promotions may influence celebrity endorsements, and that individuals who seek to invest in celebrity-touted ICOs should conduct research about the relationship between a company and its promoter before...
making such an investment.\textsuperscript{177}

Moreover, the SEC Division of Enforcement, in conjunction with its new Cyber Unit\textsuperscript{178} issued a cease and desist order against Munchee Inc., a California-based company that sold tokens to investors to fund its blockchain-based food review service after the SEC found that its conduct constituted an unregistered offering of securities.\textsuperscript{179} Halting Munchee Inc.’s ICO, the SEC argued that the “MUN tokens” Munchee Inc. offered constituted “securities,” and were thus within its purview because Munchee Inc. falsely led investors to believe that “efforts by the company and others would lead to an increase in value of the tokens” that would eventually be available to trade on secondary markets and capable of generating a return on investment.\textsuperscript{180} This statement came nearly a week after the SEC filed a similar fraud suit against the organizer of PlexCoin, another token sale involving U.S. investors.\textsuperscript{181}

These actions should give legal practitioners, companies contemplating ICOs, and investors an idea that the SEC is not taking this new way of raising capital lightly, and that the regulatory measures that surround ICOs will seemingly continue to become more defined.\textsuperscript{182} However, there is still much to be seen about just how defined such measures will be. For instance, one can only imagine that the recent statement by the CFTC – indicating that tokens are commodities and thus within their purview – will likely entail official language on a potential partnership between the SEC and the CFTC in pursuing enforcement matters surrounding ICOs.\textsuperscript{183} Further, the SEC made a firm and somewhat surprising statement regarding cryptocurrencies when it rejected on
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similar grounds two Bitcoin ETFs in March 2017: the Winklevoss Bitcoin Trust (COIN ETF) on March 10, and the SolidX Bitcoin Trust on March 28. The basis of the SEC’s rejection was that the ETFs lacked both regulatory oversight and “surveillance-sharing” agreements available for the SEC to enter into in order to monitor potential market manipulation. In its analysis, the SEC pointed out that with respect to previously approved commodity-trust exchange traded products (ETP), such as ETFs listed for trading, there have always been “regulated markets for trading futures on the underlying commodity . . . and the ETP-listing exchange has entered into surveillance-sharing agreements with . . . those markets” to prevent potential manipulation. In other words, the SEC is seemingly announcing that there may be higher chance for an ETF of this kind to get SEC approval with a futures contract on Bitcoin listed on a CFTC-regulated exchange.

It is important to note that the SEC agreed in its Disapproval Order that Bitcoin is a commodity. While most ETFs, like COIN and SolidX, are registered under the 1933 Act and the Securities Exchange Act 1934 (“1934 Act”), most are also registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (“1940 Act”), which applies to pooled investment vehicles primarily engaged in investing, reinvesting and holding securities.
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185 Bats BZX Exch., Exchange Act Release No. 34-80206, at 2–3, 6 (Mar. 10, 2017). The Trust was set up to have its shares track the price of bitcoins, the Trust’s only asset, on the Gemini Exchange, a separately owned and operated exchange. Id.
186 NYSE Arca, Exchange Act Release No. 34-80319, at 2, 44 (Mar. 28, 2017). The Trust was set up to have its shares track the price of bitcoins, its primary asset, as measured by the TradeBlock XBX Index. Id.
191 INVESTMENT COMPANY ACT OF 1940, 15 U.S.C. § 3(c)(1)(E)(10)(B) (2012); What is an
registered under the 1940 Act because they, like other commodity-based ETFs, did not purport to invest or reinvest and hold securities, instead planning to list and trade commodities like gold, silver, oil and natural gas. The SEC, in abstaining from contesting the distinction between both ETFs being commodity-based ETFs rather than security-based ETFs, portrayed that it does not view Bitcoin as a “security.” This approach indicates that the SEC views Bitcoin as a “commodity,” which likely means that the SEC will view other major cryptocurrencies (e.g. Litecoin, Ripple, Ether, etc.) as commodities.

The SEC agreed to consider a “petition for review” of Bats (BZX) Exchange, the operator of the Winklevoss Exchange on which the ETF would trade, filed in March 2017. While this may provide some hope to would-be investors looking to access Bitcoin on a regulated and transparent exchange, the Disapproval Order hinged on the underlying Bitcoin market structure itself as opposed to any specific detail of the ETF design. Therefore, it offers a high bar for future approval because it is ultimately the unregulated structure of the Bitcoin market that separates it and makes it alluring to investors; if the structure changed, Bitcoin might lose its appeal. In the meantime, both investors and issuers alike are left only to guess as to when the SEC will either approve an ETF holding cryptocurrencies or register an ICO.
Part II of this Note will examine the types of tokens that may fall outside the scope of federal securities laws, and whether or not they will soon be regulated. Part II will further analyze the secondary markets that trade digital currencies, and provide a recommended legal framework for companies issuing ICOs to follow. Part II will then summarize the various stances taken by foreign jurisdictions, and discuss what the future may hold for ICOs.

II. UTILITY TOKENS V. SECURITY TOKENS

Not only did J.R. Willet invent the idea behind an ICO, but he also completed the first ICO in July 2013, raising over $600,000 from investors to fund the creation of a new digital currency called Mastercoin. Although a majority of the earliest ICOs created alternative digital currencies to compete with Bitcoin, Mastercoin built new protocol layers — including a network of currencies, commodities and securities — on top of the Bitcoin platform. This meant that Mastercoin would benefit from Bitcoin’s popularity and large network of users that offered both a high degree of security and a high level of mining power. Investors participated in Mastercoin by sending their Bitcoins to a special address. In return for sending the Bitcoins, the investors received a certain amount of Mastercoins that they hoped would become more valuable in the future, at which point they would sell their Mastercoins to realize a return.

In recent years, this idea has evolved and has become far more complex in the process. Developers have been focusing less on creating alternative digital currencies and more on creating either decentralized applications that offer investors digital goods or services in a company that can be paid for with "utility
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tokens,” or structuring their ICOs so similar to that of an IPO that the tokens offered are “security tokens.”

Conventionally described on a white paper on the issuer’s website, tokens provide investors with an opportunity to have some form of stake in the company. When the token possesses features similar to traditional investment contracts, it is then likely that the token will meet the Howey factors and the court will deem it a security, and the issuing company offering the token(s) to the public will have to register the token(s) with the SEC. Conversely, if the token does not require the issuing company to cede any ownership in the entity to the purchasers, then it is likely that the token will not be a security, and therefore federal securities laws will exempt it. Issuing companies thus need to go into great detail when structuring their offerings if they wish to remain exempt from federal securities laws.

A. Utility Tokens

As a way to side-step potentially difficult transactional costs and allow for innovation and faster development of products and services in the market, many
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214 David M. Otto & Andrea K. Louie, Navigating the Crypto Equity Capital Markets: The Intersection of Securities Law and Cryptocurrency Financing, MARTINDAVIS LLC (Sept. 2017), https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/e826f9_7ab627596ce64ee9a2187a62f1d5400b.pdf (structuring the sale of a token in a way “the SEC is less likely to conclude” a token is a security by “(i) validat[ing] the blockchain network and vot[ing] on the [company’s] issues, and (ii) convert[ing] [the] tokens and deploy[ing] these tokens on the [company’s] blockchain after it goes live.”); Press Release, U.S. Sec. & Exch. Comm’n, SEC Chairman Jay Clayton Statement on Cryptocurrencies and Initial Coin Offerings, supra note 182.
developers often scramble to keep their tokens from conforming to the definition of a “security” and thus remain decentralized and exempt from registering with the SEC prior to an offering.\(^\text{215}\) Such developers maintain that their organization is offering “utility tokens” or tokens more akin to tradable gift cards, software licenses or donation initiatives rather than traditional securities.\(^\text{216}\) “Utility tokens” can be thought of as application-specific tokens that have a primary technical function of offering only services in their company.\(^\text{217}\) A key distinction between utility tokens and other tokens, like digital currencies that possess features and characteristics of debt or equity interest denominated in tokens, is that utility tokens have a “non-incidental utility” with respect to the issuing platform or system.\(^\text{218}\) This distinction keeps them from falling into the category of “securities.”\(^\text{219}\) Some additional features that utility token issuers must refrain from implementing include offering tokens that either bear a coupon or grant investors a right to participate in other investment opportunities.\(^\text{220}\)

An example of a utility token that serves only as a means of exchange inside an application is the Basic Attention Token (BAT), which is a proprietary token Brave, a web browser that automatically blocks ads and trackers, uses.\(^\text{221}\) If users want to use Brave’s ad-free services, they must pay for them on a blockchain
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\(^{218}\) Jay G. Baris, *et al.*, supra note 38, at 11. Such “non-incidental utility” include rights of obtaining future services strictly within the platform or system offering the token, at a favorable rate. These rights may include the ability to sell products, vote on features and functionality, contribute labor or effort, develop or create features, mine tokens, or access or license the system, and charge a respective toll. *Id.*

\(^{219}\) *Id.* (stating tokens that are redeemable for net revenues, or that “grant holders a pro rata portion of a percentage of revenues from contracts entered into on the platform” may also cause them to be deemed securities).

platform with BATs. Brave’s ICO raised over $35 million in Ether from investors who received BATs in return. The Ether provided Brave with capital early on in its developing stage, helping it develop its product while offering investors BATs to either use for the company’s services or hold on to and resell in a secondary market if the demand, and therefore price, go up.

Companies that intend to offer utility tokens must assure investors that their tokens are not an investment in the company, and there are no profits, income, or economic gains that investors should expect when purchasing such tokens in an ICO. Rather, investors should expect only non-incidental utility rights to the company issuing the token. Practitioners have analogized utility tokens as being the fuel that powers limitless, decentralized services and technical applications pursuant to an issuing company. By pre-selling access to a specific service or an application, companies see the potential to generate a large network of dedicated users. If the token issuer does not raise its target amount of money, the issuer may promise to refund the money as a way of instilling trust in the investor.

B. Security Tokens

Alternatively, token issuers may not have to worry about exemptions at all,
and instead intend to offer “security tokens” that entail the features of “utility tokens.” Some practitioners have taken contrary positions to pro-utility token developers and disagree with the notion that ICOs having their tokens categorized as securities is a negative thing, instead taking the stance that token issuers should “not only accept but embrace” the classification. Lindsay Lin, a counsel and program manager at Lightyear.io, a company that leverages the open source Stellar protocol to build digital payments infrastructure and services, contends that “[i]ssuing security tokens under regulatory frameworks such as Regulation D, Regulation S, Regulation A+, and Regulation Crowdfunding is significantly cheaper and faster than conducting an [IPO], and it can significantly reduce legal risk.” Ms. Lin explains that the potential risk of costly defense litigation against seemingly inevitable SEC action down the road is not worth the attempt to sidestep regulatory measures early on by attempting to offer utility tokens.

Not only does an organization intending to offer only utility tokens need to worry about federal securities laws and unlikely exemptions, it must also consider parallel state laws and potential suits brought by investors. Investors may initiate litigation pursuant to Section 12(a)(1) of the Securities Act to obtain monetary damages or contract rescission if the price of the token falls short of the original price of the ICO. Further, private investors also have in their arsenal Rule 10b-5 of the Securities Act, which offers relief from misleading sales tactics or other fraudulent activity. In general, the argument for security
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tokens as opposed to utility tokens is the former better protect investors who may not be able to afford to lose money on high-risk investments by clarifying expectations and rights, and offering recourse in the case of dishonest issuing companies.\textsuperscript{237}

C. A Comprehensive Legal Framework for Companies to Follow

Once a company has decided on whether it intends to offer a utility token or a security token, whether the platform it will use will be an exchange, and whether the company will be an investment company, there are some key implications to consider. On a “Practising Law Institute” Webinar, four legal practitioners summed up a theoretical legal framework for companies considering ICOs to follow.\textsuperscript{238}

The practitioners began by stating that the issuer must structure both its token and offering accordingly during presale analysis, analysis of the actual sale, and in a post sale analysis of whether there will be resale opportunities for holders or reporting by the issuer.\textsuperscript{239} The issuer must also consider any other laws that may apply during these periods.\textsuperscript{240} In analyzing the token, the offering company should apply the \textit{Howey} test, which may not be as easy as it seems at first glance. When considering the first element, “an investment of money,” some key questions may arise, including whether the price is variable and its potential significance.\textsuperscript{241} Consider the floating price in the DAO offering.\textsuperscript{242} First you must consider if the SEC took action, and whether that means that a price must then be fixed to pass this test.\textsuperscript{243} In regards to the second element, “common enterprise,” issuing companies should consider whether or not there is vertical
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commonality amongst tokens or platforms, as the value of the token may cause the value of the company go up.\textsuperscript{244}

When analyzing the third element, “expectation of profits,” issuers should ask themselves if prospective buyers will use the tokens to actually buy into the token or platform along with the services it will offer, or if they will look at this offering speculatively for the potential resale value.\textsuperscript{245} Lastly, the fourth and most controversial element, “the efforts of others,” raises the seminal question of whether voting rights decide if a token will be a security. Many companies and practitioners think that this element does in fact boil down to voting rights, however, this is not necessarily true.\textsuperscript{246} Consider the recent Snap IPO, where Snap sold more than 200 million shares to the public and offered no voting rights, but met the fourth element seemingly without question.\textsuperscript{247}

After evaluating the application of \textit{Howey}, the company must then consider the specific jurisdiction it is in, and whether or not there are “risk mitigants” or other areas of law that apply.\textsuperscript{248} After considering these factors and consulting with a legal specialist, a company should have a fairly decent understanding of whether it is offering a security. If it is a security that the issuing company offers, the company can either register with the SEC or risk relying on exemptions.\textsuperscript{249}

For utility token sales, disclosure of risks and transparency to investors explaining why the token the company is offering is not a security are
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\textsuperscript{248} See \textit{In re Lehman Bros. Sec. & ERISA Litig.}, 799 F. Supp. 2d 258, 305 (S.D.N.Y. 2011) (arguing that a plaintiff may be able to hold a defendant liable for losses for failure to have risk mitigation policies in place).

\textsuperscript{249} See generally Jor Law, \textit{Don’t Panic! US Securities Exemptions for Initial Coin Offerings}, CROWD FUND INSIDER (Aug. 21, 2017, 8:00 AM), https://www.crowdfundinsider.com/2017/08/120850-dont-panic-us-securities-exemptions-initial-coin-offerings (illustrating Common exemptions relied upon for token offerings are Regulation D if offering to accredited investors, Regulation S for offshore offerings, Rule 701 for usage of tokens as compensation, Rule 4(a)(2) for general exemptions, Regulation (c)(f) for crowdfunding, and the non-profit exemption under the 1933 and 1934 Acts for token issuers that are foundations without shareholders, typically require a 501(c)(3) exemption. Additionally, once a token has been sold, issuers need to include Rule 144 compliance information regarding the 12-month holding period compliance for token purchasers, as well as Section 12(g) requiring registration under the 1934 Act if a token is an equity token, and Rule 12g3-2(b) for foreign private issuers).
important. Additionally, a company should consult with third party experts to test the vulnerability and security of their platforms, remembering the reason the SEC’s DAO Report became a notorious use case was because of its smart contract vulnerability in which hackers broke into the code to remove $50 million in digital currency. Lastly, companies should consider the 1940 Act, which may apply when issuers intending to offer utility tokens may inadvertently subject themselves to relevant security laws by pooling assets together.

D. Secondary Markets

As the ICO and blockchain communities continue to wrestle with the decision of either playing it safe and registering their offerings with the SEC, or risking potential enforcement actions from regulators by tip-toeing around compliance measures and attempting to offer unregulated “utility tokens,” legal experts warn of enforcement measures that could be on the horizon that will target not only the ICO, but also token exchanges on the secondary market.

Hours after the SEC ruling that the DAO exchange constituted an unregistered security and was thus subject to regulatory penalties, the Department of Justice (DOJ) and the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (FinCEN) imposed a $110 million penalty against BTC-e, a digital currency trading platform, for an alleged international money laundering scheme and laundering funds. While speaking at a blockchain industry conference in Washington, D.C., Carol Van Cleef, a FinTech attorney, noted that these two events were not isolated, and that the SEC wanted its enforcement action to send a message to third party exchanges that they, too, are not exempt from securities regulations so long as

---


they allow the trading of ‘‘security tokens.’’ Van Cleef spoke to the notion that criminal statutes will always apply to exchanges that act as money service businesses. If the business does not have a license or registration with FinCEN as a money transmitter, then proper regulations and enforcement will follow. The following SEC Rules are ones that apply directly to secondary exchanges: Section 5 and Section 3(a)(1) of the 1934 Act, and Rule 3b-16(a) of the 1934 Act.

E. Foreign Jurisdictions

While the United States is certainly taking an initiative to set out a framework for issuers considering ICOs, many countries have seemed to follow the SEC’s stance on ICO regulation. On August 24, 2017, a staff notice from the Canada Securities Administrators set out a list of guidelines and rules determining that many ICOs appear to fall within the country’s securities definition and are therefore subject to regulation. Singapore’s Monetary Authority, while holding that virtual currencies are neither “money” nor “currency,” published a consultation paper on November 21, 2017 proposing legislation to expand its scope of regulation of virtual currencies. Hong Kong’s financial regulating agency issued a statement on September 5, 2017 warning of applicable securities
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laws that may extend past ICOs to the exchanges that are actually trading the digital tokens. Similarly, Malaysia’s Securities Commission issued a statement on November 6, 2017 stating that the Commission is actively considering regulations and guidelines regarding cryptocurrencies; this occurred after issuing a warning on September 7, 2017 that ICOs may be unregulated and potentially expose investors to risks involving fraudulent activity. While Germany allows ICOs, its Federal Financial Authority released a statement on November 15, 2017 warning investors of the risks associated with ICOs. In Australia, digital currencies will face registration and regulatory guidelines in mid-2018, after the Parliament’s December 7, 2017 amendments to the Anti-Money Laundering and Counter-Terrorism Financing Act of 2006 take effect.

The European Union’s Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA) issued two statements on November 13, 2017 about the risks to investors of ICOs and the rules applicable to firms involved in ICOs. In its alert, ESMA highlighted potential risks to investors of ICOs including fraud or illicit activities, a lack of exit options and extreme price volatilities, and inadequate information. ESMA also addressed firms issuing ICOs and the relevant legislation with which they must comply upon an offering. Other notable countries that have taken stances in line with the U.S. are Chile, Gibraltar, and Taiwan.

---
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On the other hand, some countries have taken different approaches. On September 12, 2017, the United Kingdom’s Financial Conduct Authority took a broad wait-and-see approach to ICO regulation in a published paper on cryptocurrencies, which held that tokens are a “private currency” and issuers operating ICOs may do so on their own interpretation of the law.\footnote{Initial Coin Offerings, FIN. CONDUCT AUTH. (Dec. 9, 2017), https://www.fca.org.uk/news/statements/initial-coin-offerings; see also DISCUSSION PAPER ON DISTRIBUTED LEDGER TECHNOLOGY, FIN. CONDUCT AUTH. 2 (Apr. 2017), https://www.fca.org.uk/publication/discussion/dp17-03.pdf (diagramming policy outlines for how the UK will handle cryptocurrencies). The Financial Conduct Authority will continue to review and assess whether amendments to existing regulations may be required. Moreover, proposed amendments would bring exchange platforms and wallet providers under the arm of existing legislation. Id.}

Switzerland, a nation that is very welcoming to FinTech and cryptocurrencies and therefore a destination hub for issuers looking to avoid their own country’s regulatory measures, deemed that cryptocurrencies are assets rather than securities and token issuers do not require any special approval or license per the Swiss Financial Market Supervisory Authority (FINMA).\footnote{On the regulatory treatment of ICOs issued on September 29, 2017, FINMA noted that it would take a closer look at regulatory measures regarding ICOs.\footnote{Press Release, Cent. Bank of the Russ. Fed’n, On the use of private “virtual currencies” (crypto currency) (Sept. 4, 2017), https://www.cbr.ru/press/pr/?file=04092017_183512if2017-09-04T18_31_05.htm.}} However, in a report on the regulatory treatment of ICOs issued on September 29, 2017, FINMA noted that it would take a closer look at regulatory measures regarding ICOs.\footnote{Finma is investigating ICO procedures, FINMA (Sept. 29, 2017), https://www.finma.ch/en/news/2017/09/20170929-mm-ico.}

In early September 2017, Russia’s Central Bank warned that trading tokens via ICOs poses significant risks to investors and issuing companies alike, and stated that it is temporarily disallowing the trading of cryptocurrencies on official exchanges, as well as the use of crypto technology for clearing and settlement structure.\footnote{Id.} In October, the Bank’s First Deputy Chairperson, Sergei Shvetsov, backed moves to block Bitcoin websites,\footnote{Russian central bank plans to ban
Shvetsov declared that the Central bank and government should regulate ICOs like they do IPOs, but in a facilitated mode, also noting that the country should ensure that legislation is passed which would both the tax and ensure registration amongst cryptocurrency miners.276 In December, Russia’s Ministry of Finance prepared a bill that limits ICOs to raising 1 billion rubles, or about $17.3 million USD, and limits unqualified investors to investing 50,000 rubles, or about $864 USD.277 Russian president Vladimir Putin has called for the development of a new cryptocurrency, the “cryptoruble,” which could be used as legal tender throughout the Russian federation,278 further indicating that he may move to hold an ICO of his own.279

China took perhaps the most drastically different approach on August 28, 2017, when the communist state put a moratorium on ICOs and additionally required mandatory repayment of all proceeds from completed offerings.280 The government committee, which China’s Central Bank leads, issued a list of sixty exchanges that it will investigate, although some have already halted their ICO trades.281 South Korea followed China’s lead less than a month later after the

country’s Financial Services Commission stated that anyone who issues ICOs in the country will face “stern penalties.”

While the many stances of these countries may differ slightly, they all seem to have issued guidance after recognizing token issuers may be operating outside the country in safe havens like Switzerland, which could result in the subjection of foreign laws or regulations on enforcement actions.

F. The Future of ICOS

There is a growing tendency to compare the fast-moving market of ICOs to that of the dotcom craze in the late 1990s, when a combination of pure speculation and overconfidence in the new technology market of internet-based companies led to “fad-based” and reckless investing, and an eventual bubble that could not withstand the pressure of the trillions of dollars that poured into it. Various financial institutions and sophisticated investors are quick to note a string of commonalities of the dotcom days to the present ICO days, with some going as far as to guarantee similar results in the near future.

Bitcoin alone has experienced extreme volatility in its price since its emergence in 2011. Peaking at $32 a share in 2011 to nearly $8,000 in November 2017 to an excess of $20,000 a share in December 2017, Bitcoin has experienced price swings of more than 700% since the start of 2017. This
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is in large part due to intermittent government crackdowns and a multitude of hacks in companies that have been exchanging the virtual currency since its inception. Some see the price volatility combined with the lack of regulatory oversight and asset backing as reason to keep a safe distance from investing in cryptocurrencies such as Bitcoin.

In the banking world, Credit Suisse Group AG Chief Executive, Tidjane Thiam, called Bitcoin “the very definition of a bubble;” and J.P. Morgan Chase & Co. Chief Executive, Jamie Dimon called Bitcoin a “fraud” while threatening to fire any J.P. Morgan employee who decided to trade Bitcoin for being “stupid.” Furthermore, Goldman Sachs Group Inc. Chief Executive, Lloyd Blankfein, told a CNBC reporter “maybe bitcoin is kind of a bubble,” after his company publicly entertained the idea of setting up a trading operation for digital currencies a month earlier. Non-bankers have also voiced their concerns. Billionaire investor and Saudi prince, Alwaleed bin Talal, slammed Bitcoin as being “Enron in the making” and expressed that Bitcoin will implode because of its lack of regulation and control. Even former penny stock broker and international fraudster, Jordan Belfort, better known as the “Wolf of Wall Street” called ICOs “the biggest scam ever” that will “blow up in so many peoples’ faces,” adding that they are far worse than anything he was involved with.

Recent developments of two potentially groundbreaking class-action civil suits arising from one of 2017’s largest and most successful ICOs, a $232 million token sale by Tezos, has produced more opinions and reasons to shun this new and highly debated development in finance. The first civil suit, which
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included a proposed class of approximately 30,000 people and was filed on October 25, 2017, came after a management feud among the leadership of Tezos went public and resulted in a halting of most of the trading of Tezos coins for an infinite amount of time. The delay caused the value of the futures for the digital coin, called “Tezzies,” to tank by nearly half, to the detriment of investors. The complaint alleged that “defendants did not register these Tezzies with the SEC, and many of the representations defendants made regarding the status of the Tezos project in the run-up to the ICO were either exaggerations or outright lies.” The suit cited the July 25, 2017 DAO Report to claim that Tezos violated securities laws by issuing what amounted to an unregistered security, and that the “safe harbor” securities laws – usually granted to forward-looking statements issuers make – do not protect the defendants.

The founders of the Tezos project were hit by a second class action suit less than three weeks later. The second suit accuses the Tezos financiers of being “profit-seeking investors in a security” promoted and conducted by the defendants through an unregistered security offering rather than a charitable fundraiser as defendants are claiming. The suit alleges that the defendants deceptively sold the securities in violation of both state and federal law by issuing the Tezzies as charitable contributions, thereafter pocketing millions of dollars for themselves. The complaint further reads, “due to the many misrepresentations, factual omissions and unlawful activities engaged by the defendants – it appears [participants in the ICO] cannot, and potentially will not, see any return on their investments.”

Arthur and Kathleen Breitman – founders of Tezos and two of four named defendants in the case – attempted to
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skirt securities laws and allege an offering of mere utility tokens.\footnote{Id.} The “purported terms” of the offering characterized the purchase of Tezzies as a “non-refundable donation” and not a speculative investment.\footnote{Id. at 11. Allegedly, Kathleen Breitman compared the purchases of Tezzies to donating to a public television station and receiving a “tote bag” in return. \textit{Id.}} However, the plaintiff in the first suit alleged to have never been shown these terms at any stage during the ICO process.\footnote{Id. at 11–12; \textit{see also} Vigna, supra note 296, at B10 (stating that during the litigation, the money that deal raised sat with the Switzerland-based foundation company in a bank account awaiting to be converted from Bitcoin and Ethereum into government-backed securities).} This example sheds light into some of the potential drawbacks of ICOs, including a lack of transparency into both the credibility and decision-making of management, as well as opaque structures that may not be suitable to handle large sums of money.\footnote{Vigna, supra note 296, at B10.} The case also has potential to set groundbreaking legal precedent and force the SEC to outline an official stance on whether all tokens ICOs issue are indeed securities, which could have ramifications extending far beyond the Tezos case.\footnote{Mark D. Powers, \textit{et al.}, \textit{The SEC and Securities Plaintiffs’ Bar Take Aim at Initial Coin Offerings}, FED. SEC. L. REP., Jan. 4, 2018 at 1. 15, 2018 WL 272897.} According to some practitioners CoinDesk\footnote{About CoinDesk, Inc., COINDESK, https://www.coindesk.com/about/ (last visited May 24, 2018). CoinDesk is a popular web provider on cryptocurrency and blockchain technology news. According to its website, “CoinDesk reaches over 10 million unique visitors who come back 50 million times a month,” and has over 600,000 followers across Twitter, LinkedIn and Facebook. \textit{Id.}} surveyed, the Tezos suits may give more lawyers and litigants much needed confidence to finally press the issue of suing companies after issuing faux utility tokens in ICOs.\footnote{Aaron Stanley, \textit{The Beginning? Tezos Could Open Doors for ICO Litigation}, COINDESK (Nov. 17, 2017, 9:00 AM), https://www.coindesk.com/just-beginning-tezos-lawsuits-mean-ico-litigation/; \textit{see} Mark Powers \textit{et al.}, \textit{The SEC and Securities Plaintiffs’ Bar Take Aim at Initial Coin Offerings}, 2806 FED. SEC. L. REP. 11, 11-16 (2018) (discussing the possibility of increased amounts of plaintiffs lawsuits against issuers of ICOs based on SEC report 21(a) which was used in the Tezos case to allege improper issuance of “securities”); \textit{see also} Complaint at 33, Leidel v. Coinbase, Inc. 2017 WL 2374269 (S.D. Fla. June 1, 2017) (No. 9:16CV81992).} Sara Hanks, co-founder and CEO of CrowdCheck, a consultancy that offers compliance, disclosure, and due diligence assistance for crowdfunding campaigns, said in an interview, “we know a number of plaintiffs’ lawyers around the country who are just basically collecting lists of ICOs and going ‘Hmm, I’m going to sue these people.’”\footnote{Stanley, supra note 310.} This interest also seems to be coming from lawyers in similar technology-based facets of the economy that entail lax regulation and deceptive practices from bad actors.\footnote{Jennifer Bennett, \textit{Initial Coin Offerings Attract New Audience: Trial Lawyers,}
firm, which has filed numerous class actions against fantasy sports services, stated, “[W]e see this as the next area where consumers could get harmed by some bad actors taking advantage of the lack of oversight or by pushing the envelope.” Tezos may just be the prototypical defendant for such a lawsuit because the company has clear ties to the U.S. and has attracted a large number of investors to its offering. Joe Fleming, an attorney at Block & Leviton, a law firm, which launched an investigation of its own into Tezos, explained in an interview:

[,the ICO most appealing to a plaintiff lawyer would be large in terms of total money raised, have a strong U.S. nexus, would have promoters and participants in the ICO who are U.S.-based, and the tokens that it would issue would reflect a claim on the share of the company’s future revenue...[and] Tezos certainly checks a lot of those boxes.]

For ICO issuers with similar structure schemes looking to reconsider their token offerings to shield themselves from liability, it may be too late. A company with substantial U.S. involvement, or U.S. entities that participate in the sale of unregistered securities, like Tezos, may already be potentially liable for probable attacks from likeminded law firms. David Silver, the lawyer who brought the second Tezos civil suit and believes his case could serve as a springboard for future ICO litigation, stated, “[T]his is a leak in a dam that is about to come falling down.” However, an important safeguard for companies offering ICOs may be to shelter themselves in safe haven jurisdictions that traditionally offer lax regulations such as Delaware, or overseas or foreign jurisdictions such as Switzerland. Also, ICOs raising money in Bitcoin and Ether rather than fiat currency renders collectability an issue. Class-action lawsuits require finding
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enough dissatisfied token holders seeking to pursue legal recourse, something that is never an easy task. On the other end of the spectrum, some people like prominent financial analyst Max Keiser, and Fundstrat founder, Tom Lee, continue to look past potential setbacks and view Bitcoin in the broader picture as both a secure asset and long-term investment for interested consumers, traders and investors alike. On his eponymously named financial program broadcast, Keiser noted, “[A]ll key Bitcoin metrics, including price, zooming higher. $7,000 will soon fall. $10,000 is a fait accompli,” while Lee, a well known Wall Street strategist, explained in an interview with Business Insider a theory that Bitcoin trading is evolving as a market that allows a main store of value that will rival the gold market. In the interview, Lee stated that Bitcoin “represents a store of value because it is an encrypted database, that for seven years has not been hacked,” also adding, “that is a way to store value. And if personal information is our gold, Bitcoin is our digital gold.” Additionally, exchange operator CME Group Inc. shifted trader focus after it announced plans to offer a Bitcoin futures contract, which would allow Wall Street traders to bet on Bitcoin prices and hedge against volatility. While the CFTC reviews the exchange’s plans, such steps as this may be crucial to Bitcoin’s emergence into institutional and retail markets. Bitcoin futures are “the perfect product for an institutional investor who does not want to hold bitcoin but wants to trade it” said Arthur Hayes, founder and chief executive of BitMEX, a Bitcoin-derivatives exchange in Hong-Kong. Thus, while some market participants would consider that Bitcoin has had five separate declines in 2017 of more than 20% off recent highs as a reason to avoid trading the cryptocurrency completely, folks akin to Mr. Hayes, also a former market maker at Citigroup, see no reason to stray. “Money has rushed back into
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bitcoin,” said Hayes, adding, “[W]e’re back from where we started a week ago.”

Even though federal regulators have offered guidance to startups and their sponsors issuing ICOs, more guidance may be necessary to clear up many questions and give investors and issuers alike the confidence to remain in United States jurisdictions when offering ICOs. For instance, some foreseeable issues may be the extent to which tax laws apply to the revenue generated from ICOs, and whether state consumer protection laws apply to misleading statements in company white papers. Further, issues regarding unfair federal advertising laws and anti-money laundering laws that require registration with federal bank regulators and ‘know your customer’ compliance programs, may arise.

An additional concern related to the fast moving market of issuing and exchanging cryptocurrencies is that it has become an attractive target for cybercriminals to pursue new and unprecedented ways to monetize from malicious activity. The SEC recognized this vulnerability and subsequently created the Cyber Unit Enforcement Division to pin down cyber-related misconduct affecting blockchain and ICO companies, primarily focusing on illegal market manipulation schemes, hacking, cyber-related threats, and other securities violations due to fraudulent activity. Kapersky Lab, an antivirus and internet security software company, also reacted to threats facing the crypto-community. Kapersky stated that it protected 1.65 million users from malicious cryptocurrency miners that often used ransomware techniques that encrypted files and required victims to pay a ransom in cryptocurrency to
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recover them. Kapersky predicts that 2018 will bring even more advanced money-making schemes. This includes web-mining and increased ransomware attacks that will correlate with the rise of miners. Kapersky also believes the ICO hysteria will decline next year due to a series of company failures to create funded products, which will lead to more careful scrutiny of investment products and negatively affect the exchange rate of cryptocurrencies. Kapersky believes, “[w]e will see a decrease in the absolute number of phishing and hacking attacks targeting ICO, smart contracts and wallets.”

Whatever the case may be, the ever-growing concern of cyber security as it applies to ICOs will simultaneously spark an increase in developments among companies to attempt to combat cyber risks, creating somewhat of a war against opportunistic hackers. One example of a company getting ahead of the curve is Fujitsu Laboratories Ltd., a research and development company in the field of information technology that developed “ConnectionChain,” a security technology that safely connects blockchains by enhancing the capability of smart contracts used on exchanges. With the technology currently available, one would be hard pressed to not believe that more companies will follow this lead.

III. CONCLUSION

ICOs continue to saturate the financial market economies of the world, pouring billions of dollars into various industries. As they, along with their accompanying technology, blockchain, move full steam ahead in both the primary and secondary financial markets, the common course of business is changing and governments are reacting by adjusting rules and regulations to accommodate their emergence. There is still a legal gray area over what exactly cryptocurrencies are and how regulators and businesses alike should
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handle the issuance and trading of them. The proposed rules, regulations, and eventual laws surrounding cryptocurrencies will most likely need to form around rather than against them, because ICOs offer too many benefits to markets across the globe.\textsuperscript{345} Additionally, for the United States to remain a seminal hub for technological innovation and economic health, the country should continue its due diligence by fully examining ICOs and setting precedent for other countries to follow.\textsuperscript{346} Because ICOs are still in an emerging state, it would be wise to consider that the buzz surrounding them will not go away anytime soon, even if the financial markets are “getting more bubbly” than ever before.\textsuperscript{347}
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