



AUGUST 2017

Cyber-Currency Still Not a Security — DAO Tokens Deemed Investment Contracts

The Securities and Exchange Commission issued a release concerning its investigation of The DAO, a “decentralized autonomous organization ... executed on a distributed ledger” that issued DAO Tokens in exchange for Ether (known by the code name ETH), a virtual currency used on the Ethereum Blockchain.

Transferable in several venues, DAO Tokens authorized their holders to vote on matters of company governance, as well as whether The DAO should engage “Contractors” to undertake “projects” to earn profits for The DAO. Any profits might be distributed to DAO Token holders as “rewards,” payable in ETH.

The SEC determined, without difficulty, that the DAO Tokens exhibited classic elements of an investment contract and therefore constituted securities because they represented investments “in a common enterprise with a reasonable expectation of profits to be derived from entrepreneurial or managerial efforts of others.” Although DAO Token holders were entitled to vote on The DAO’s ordinary business matters, *i.e.*, whether to engage Contractors for particular projects, the SEC found the holders’ management influence constrained by the company’s structure. The holders therefore depended upon (and were subject to individual preferences of) administrators referred to as “Curators,”

as well as the company’s founders, for the success of the enterprise.

Notwithstanding that DAO tokens and cyber-currencies are creatures of the same milieu, it’s clear from the “what is a security” standpoint that a DOA Token is less closely related to a cyber-currency than it is to capital stock. The DAO founder likened buying DAO Tokens to “buying shares in a company and getting ... dividends,” whereas the SEC relies on a Financial Action Task Force definition of “virtual currency” as, “a digital representation of value that can be digitally traded and functions as: (1) a medium of exchange; (2) a unit of account; or (3) a store of value” Currently, however, few are acquiring Bitcoins or Ether to purchase popcorn at a movie theater and, to many, “store of value” is synonymous with “speculative investment.”

So, to distinguish the two, the emphasis may be upon whether a cyber-currency investor is expecting appreciation (or at least absence of depreciation) based upon market action wholly divorced from operational success of the enterprise that issued the digital asset. But the distinction may become harder to maintain,

This publication may constitute “Attorney Advertising” under the New York Rules of Professional Conduct and under the law of other jurisdictions.

especially as terminology becomes less precise and functionality of the digital coin expands.

In the release, the SEC said that offerings of instruments such as DAO Tokens to raise capital have been referred to as “Initial Coin Offerings” or “Token Sales.” Already, the distinction between digital currency and digital tokens is being lost in their names, while the currencies increasingly include value-added features that could cause the assets to take on equity-like characteristics. For example, if a crypto-currency can be used to buy services or goods from its issuer, demand

for the services or goods, reflecting the success of the enterprise, might affect demand for and therefore the value of, the currency.

Meanwhile, the markets for these digital creatures have become as frothy as the quantum vacuum.

This alert is a publication of Loeb & Loeb and is intended to provide information on recent legal developments. This alert does not create or continue an attorney client relationship nor should it be construed as legal advice or an opinion on specific situations.

© 2017 Loeb & Loeb LLP. All rights reserved.

Capital Markets Practice

NORWOOD P. BEVERIDGE, JR	NBEVERIDGE@LOEB.COM	212.407.4970
ROBERT CALDWELL	RCALDWELL@LOEB.COM	+852 3923 1115
GIOVANNI CARUSO	GCARUSO@LOEB.COM	212.407.4866
ANGELA CHAN	ACHAN@LOEB.COM	+852 3923 1176
ROY CHOI	RKCHOI@LOEB.COM	+852 3923 1138
ROBERT CHUNG	RCHUNG@LOEB.COM	310.282.2216
STEPHEN H. COHEN	SCOHEN@LOEB.COM	212.407.4279
ANGELA M. SANTORO DOWD	ADOWD@LOEB.COM	212.407.4097
ALLAN B. DUBOFF	ADUBOFF@LOEB.COM	310.282.2141
ROSS D. EMMERMAN	REMMERMAN@LOEB.COM	312.464.3357
DAVID C. FISCHER	DFISCHER@LOEB.COM	212.407.4827
STEVEN E. HURDLE, JR.	SHURDLE@LOEB.COM	310.282.2187
CHRISTOPHER J. KELLY	CKELLY@LOEB.COM	310.282.2263
WALLACE LAU	WLAU@LOEB.COM	+852 3923 1128
FRANK LEE	FLEE@LOEB.COM	212.407.4825
JADA SOYUN LEE	JSLEE@LOEB.COM	+852 3923 1150

JC LEE	JCLEE@LOEB.COM	+852 3923 1146
DAVID J. LEVINE	DLEVINE@LOEB.COM	212.407.4923
BARRY T. MEHLMAN	BMEHLMAN@LOEB.COM	212.407.4812
RIMA R. MOAWAD	RMOAWAD@LOEB.COM	212.407.4052
MITCHELL S. NUSSBAUM	MNUSSBAUM@LOEB.COM	212.407.4159
SIMONA S. PAPAIZIAN	SPAPAIZIAN@LOEB.COM	212.407.4941
ROGER C. PENG	RPENG@LOEB.COM	+86 10 5954 3552
RONELLE C. PORTER	RPORTER@LOEB.COM	212.407.4110
FRAN M. STOLLER	FSTOLLER@LOEB.COM	212.407.4935
ALLEN Z. SUSSMAN	ASUSSMAN@LOEB.COM	310.282.2375
LILI TAHERI	LTAHERI@LOEB.COM	212.407.4160
LAWRENCE VENICK	LVENICK@LOEB.COM	+86 10 5954 3688
MILKA WONG	MWONG@LOEB.COM	+852 3923 1168
TAHRA T. WRIGHT	TWRIGHT@LOEB.COM	212.407.4122
CANDICE YANG	CYANG@LOEB.COM	+86 10 5954 3556
JAMES ZHANG	JZHANG@LOEB.COM	+86 10 5954 3557