



NOVEMBER 16, 2017

SEC Chairman Sounds Death Knell for ICOs?

Remarks Resonate with International Regulators

At a recent securities law conference, Jay Clayton, the Chair of the Securities and Exchange Commission, challenged the received wisdom that initial coin offerings are not subject to regulation as securities sales. Although Mr. Clayton's November 10 remarks were prefaced as "unscripted" and accompanied by the customary disclaimer that his statements were his own and did not necessarily reflect the views of the other commissioners or the SEC staff, in the days following the speech, the worldwide market price for Bitcoin (the most widely followed cryptocurrency) sank more than 20 percent.

While cryptocurrencies such as Bitcoin and Ethereum generally are recognized as currencies rather than as investment securities, over the past few years, hundreds of millions of dollars have been raised by selling hybrid forms of these digital assets, variously referred to as "tokens" or "utility tokens." Similar to a traditional stored-value card, these tokens can be used to buy services or products on a network or platform once its development is completed and, therefore, they have some qualities of a currency. But to finance the development of the network that makes the tokens (or their related "smart contracts") operational, developers often presell tokens in an ICO, usually at a graduated discount to the value they are intended to represent when the project is complete. In these cases, the token has no value until network development is finished, and the token takes on more characteristics of a security; that is, the token purchaser expects to realize a return based on the development efforts of the issuer's management.

Recognizing the legal risks relating to token presales, issuers have begun conducting ICOs as exempt offerings, frequently using a SAFT (a Simple Agreement for Future Tokens) issued only to "accredited investors." Overstock's widely anticipated ICO for its tZero token is structured this way, together with an assurance that its platform to trade tokens will be compliant with the SEC's Regulation ATS.

It is assumed that no material management effort will be required to maintain a platform once it goes live and that thereafter the predominant motivation for obtaining tokens will be to acquire the goods or services that the platform offers rather than investment returns. What is not necessarily understood, however, is the extent to which ongoing management efforts may be required to provide or continue to improve the products or services or how their quality might drive demand for the tokens. It is conceivable, for example, that a speculator would acquire tokens betting on the future demand for the products or services that the tokens can buy.

When Mr. Clayton likened tokens to securities, he didn't make clear whether he was referring only to tokens sold during a platform's development stage or also once a platform has launched, so an aspiring coin issuer must consider carefully the application of the securities laws to its proposed program.

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

In the days following the Chair’s remarks, a number of regulators, including the Dutch securities regulator, the German BaFin, and the European Securities and Markets Authority, issued additional warnings regarding ICOs. This week, the Monetary Authority of Singapore issued a Guide to Digital Token Offerings, warning that digital tokens may constitute “capital markets products” under Singapore’s securities law. The Australian Securities and Investments Commission also issued similar advice two months after the SEC issued its July 2017 report on The DAO (covered in our alert “[Cyber-Currency Still Not a Security](#)”).

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. PAPAZIAN	SPAPAZIAN@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
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