



#CRYPTO UTOPIA

The \$20 billion Cambrian explosion of tokenized digital assets, and the emerging infrastructure being built to support them

Suitable only for professional investors



General Disclaimer

Please note that the information and data presented herein is based on reliable sources and, or opinion of Autonomous Research LLP (herein referred to as "Autonomous"). The material within this document has been prepared for information purposes only. This material does not give a Research Recommendation and/or Price Target and thus applicable regulatory Research Recommendation disclosures relating to the same are not included herein. This communication is not a product of the Research department of Autonomous although there may be links or references to Research reports and products.

This communication has been issued and approved for distribution in the U.K. by Autonomous Research LLP only to, and directed at, a) persons who have professional experience in matters relating to investments falling within Article 19(1) of the Financial Services and Markets Act 2000 (Financial Promotion) Order 2005 (the "Order") or b) by high net worth entities and other person to whom it may otherwise lawfully be communicated, falling within 49(1) of the Order – together Relevant Persons. This material is intended only for investors who are "eligible counterparties" or "professional clients", and must not be redistributed to retail investors. This communication is not intended to be acted on or relied upon by retail investors.

Retail investors who through whatever means or media receive this material should note that the services of Autonomous are not available to them and should not rely on the contents to make any investment decision. Autonomous shall not be liable for any loss, including any consequential loss which may result from reliance on the information or incurred in respect of any action taken. You are advised to seek your own legal, tax or financial advice accordingly.

Autonomous makes every effort to use reliable comprehensive information, but makes no representation that is accurate or complete. Autonomous assumes no responsibility to update any of the contents or opinions contained and therefore accepts no responsibility for any actions taken on receipt of this communication. The information contained herein and any opinion expressed does not constitute an offer or an invitation to make an offer to buy or sell any securities or financial instrument or derivative relating thereto. The information is not intended to provide personal recommendation or investment advice and it does not take into account the specific investment objectives, financial situation or particular needs of any specific person. Note that income from securities and other financial instruments as well as their value may fall as well as rise and investors may lose their investments. Past performance is not a guarantee for future performance.

In Europe: Autonomous Research LLP is authorised and regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority in the United Kingdom (500498). Registered in England & Wales No OC343985.

This information is provided for your sole use. For the protection of persons (other than a client) who are not authorised to receive this communication, it may not be reproduced in whole or in part by any means except for the personal reference of the intended recipient. No part of this material may be reproduced, distributed or transmitted or otherwise made available without prior consent of Autonomous. Any unauthorised disclosure is strictly prohibited. Copyright Autonomous Research LLP. All rights reserved. The use of external logos are not authorized by, sponsored by, or associated with the trademark owner. Any trademarks and service marks contained herein are the property of their respective owners.



AUTONOMOUS



Table of Contents

Lex Sokolin

Partner & Global Director
Fintech Strategy

Matt Low

Senior Associate

@autonofintech

next@autonomous.com

With special thanks to:

Latham & Watkins LLP

BITA

Token Data

Coinmetrics

Dalia Research

20|30

I. Growth Of The Crypto Economy

II. From ICO to Liquid Coin: A Quantitative Analysis

III. Emerging Crypto Fund Ecosystem

IV. The Asset Class Opportunity

V. ICO Process & Token Engineering

LATHAM & WATKINS^{LLP}

VI. Regulatory, Legal and Tax Considerations



Executive Summary (1 of 3)

- Welcome! If you are new to Initial Coin Offerings and the Crypto economy, we suggest you read our 2017 primer, *Token Mania*: <https://next.autonomous.com/download-token-mania/>
- 2017 ICOs raised over \$7 billion, and 2018 YTD has followed pace at over \$12 billion
 - While the headline numbers continue to impress and outpace venture capital funding into the equities of companies in the space, the real story is more complicated
 - Two massive projects – Telegram and EOS – were responsible for nearly half of 2018 YTD funds, and highlight the direction of travel for future token offerings
 - Various smart contract platforms have emerged to both facilitate ICOs, as well as be the software platform of choice; for Ethereum, 2% of its marketcap is reinvested back into the space on a monthly basis
 - Alternate means of funding a community, such as forks and airdrops, have proliferated
- The path from ICO to a successful large-cap liquid coin is difficult, with trends and valuation approaches still emerging
 - Scams and fraud constitute as much as 20% of project white papers, over 50% of ICO projects have failed to raise funds or are no longer operational, and phishing and hacking have been responsible for the theft of 15% of all crypto assets by market cap
 - Such statistics make sense in the context of 65% failed Kickstarter projects, 70% failure by venture-backed startups to progress to Series A, 85% failure of DotCom tech IPOs within 10 years
 - Crypto, as an asset class, is still correlated with traditional assets and between the various large capitalization coins; Bitcoin's weakness in early 2018 has been a large sentiment driver across all assets
 - Active ICO token selection and liquid coin selection are not winning strategies over indexing



Executive Summary (2 of 3)

- In order to capitalize on what could be a massive opportunity, over 300 crypto funds have formed to invest in tokens and currencies
 - Funds have been mostly started in 2017 and 2018, with a variety of strategies including Venture, Trading, Quant & Artificial Intelligence, Fund of Funds, Indexes, Token Baskets, Credit and Ecosystem Funds
 - The assets held by these funds is between \$7.5-10 billion, and about \$2-4 billion is also exposed to crypto through traditional vehicles like ETNs, trusts and futures products
 - Assets are highly concentrated with the top 10 funds, and the operating future for the majority of funds, which hold less than \$25 million, will be difficult unless they see another year of large outperformance
 - Increasing diversification, talent and capital entry into the space is a long-term positive for the ecosystem
- The financial industry is working to build tokens into an asset class, which would place the current nascent \$300 billion of market cap as part of the \$10 trillion in global Alternative investments, and eventually as part of the \$500 trillion representing all securities and assets
 - The token economy is on its way to become an asset class, by evolving along the following themes:
 - (1) marrying traditional and crypto custody,
 - (2) creating larger liquidity pools via institutional exchanges,
 - (3) developing decentralized exchanges for ease of use and anti-censorship,
 - (4) tokenizing traditional securities through Security Tokens and enterprise blockchain concurrently,
 - (5) developing traditional product wrappers to lower fees, increase access, and plug into wealth management distribution
 - The current state of crypto infrastructure is still too expensive, inefficient, and subject to multiple points of economic rent-taking by powerful intermediaries



Executive Summary (3 of 3)

- **Engineering a token launch and subsequent project has accumulated all the difficulties of a public ICO process, at a similar price level**

- Unlike private early stage technology firms, crypto projects must manage investor relations, token listing, and various late stage company issues while trying to bootstrap technology product adoption
- A variety of third parties – from legal to corporate advisory to exchanges – have formed in the space to monetize solutions around these needs, driving the all-in price of an ICO process to \$1-5 million, which is in turn passed on to investors through unreasonable valuations
- Token engineering itself requires a detailed understanding of the relevant industry, economy and incentives, as well as token feature design (e.g., staking, burning, collectibles)
- We provide a detailed Taxonomy of digital assets combining several attempts into a cohesive framework

- **Regulatory , Legal and Tax Considerations are key in an evolving field**

- From a strategy perspective, global regulatory approaches follow three directions according to roles the global economy: (1) lowering barrier to entry for crypto projects, like a Crypto Delaware, (2) using regulatory policy and national technology investment as a sovereign sword, (3) relying on regulation as shield for consumer protection as first priority
- Key legal issues include (1) securities law treatment, (2) payment services / money transmission regulations, (3) derivatives regulation, (4) fund regulation, and (5) consumer protection and general legal considerations
- Regulators generally use a technology-neutral approach, focusing on human business activities and not developments in software; however, a distinction between the original cryptocurrencies and second-generation crypto assets is starting to emerge
- Latham & Watkins analyzes and highlights 15 jurisdictions and their current posture on crypto assets

Growth Of The Crypto Economy



Crypto is a massive shift in digital economy: Digital goods can be scarce and users no longer have to be the product

Scarce Real Objects



- Industrial economies are organized around quantities of scarce products, whose pricing is determined by Supply & Demand
- An existence in the physical world implies a positive cost of production, which funds initial investment
- Economic activity around such goods follows, with people paying for the product itself

Free Digital Objects



Scarce Digital Objects



musicoin

The World's first smart cryptocurrency for music

- When digitized, such goods could be copied and distributed with a marginal cost of approaching \$0
- While music labels tried to create costs through DRM, these efforts all collapsed
- As a result, economic activity was replaced with advertising models or freemium, turning user data into the products

- Blockchain technology allows for digital objects to become as scarce as their physical versions
- This scarcity is manufactured through decentralized network activity, governed by micro-economic design frameworks
- Scarce digital goods (music or securities) allow customers to pay for the product again, bootstrapping economic activity



AUTONOMOUS

NEXT

We are on the 4th wave of innovation within crypto themes



Bitcoin

Global macro trade

2008

Store of value
\$7-100 Trillion



Enterprise Blockchain

Private consortia within industries

2014

\$500 Billion of costs
in financial services alone



Decentralized Apps

Smart contracts and ICOs

2015

All digital economies
and their operations



Smart Securities


Institutionalization and tokenization

2018


\$500 Trillion
All asset classes

Tangible progress over 2017: crypto currency ownership at 7%, with 74% of respondents aware of the phenomenon

Engagement with Crypto Assets by Country (up to 05/18)




Daily Active Addresses




- Japan, US and the UK have the highest rate of ownership or intention to buy than any other geography surveyed, hovering around 14% of respondents
- South Korea displays a much higher awareness rate of 88%, but ownership and intention to buy are lower
- This high level of awareness is impressive, but while daily active address use has grown quickly to over 1 million between Bitcoin and Ethereum, usage still pales to Facebook's 1.5 billion daily users

But more is possible – currently, crypto assets still skew to those more likely to be educated and male

Intention by Education Level



Intention by Gender




- Of respondents, 12% of those with high education levels own crypto vs. 4% without
- 40% of those with lower education don't know about crypto, which is an opportunity for social impact

- Statistically, crypto ownership and knowledge is more common among men
- This is an opportunity to enhance women's participation and leadership in the asset



Understanding last 12 months through Supply & Demand

- 2017 ICO funding was a diversification of the Bitcoin capital gain (i.e., 5-10% thereof) into new assets
- 2017 ICOs sold out rounds above traditional fintech comps within minutes due to a low supply and high demand, opportunism, and lack of governance
- As 2018 approached and crypto market caps fell, there was less “free money” to invest into ICOs, and service providers in the space started to market offerings aggressively for large fees
- In turn, when combined with ongoing fraud concerns and tightening regulatory position, investors and media became used to the noise, which they began to ignore
- Similar arbitrage spilled into public and venture markets, with public companies pretending to be associated with blockchain (e.g., Long Island Ice Tea) and corporates selling tokens used in for-profit endeavors (e.g., Kik)
- Now, regular ICOs are under pressure from regulation and fatigue, which must be resolved by regulatory clarity
- Telegram highlights the desire of traditional venture firms to catch up in the space, after many missed the Bitcoin curve, while EOS shows what happens when an ICO absorbs as much demand as possible




- Valuations of projects have become massive as a result: while private fintech companies are already more richly valued than public company equivalents (e.g., OnDeck vs Kabbage), Crypto equivalents are even more expensive while being earlier stage (e.g., Populous)
- Service providers are charging large fees (\$500K-3MM) for what are essentially Seed stage technology projects raising massive capital



Initial funding story is positive: 2018 YTD has seen \$12B in ICO funding, vs. \$7B+ for last year, but ...

Investment in Crypto-Economy (\$MM, End of June 2018)



- First wave of investment from traditional venture firms in Bitcoin associated companies was between 2013 and 2016, with \$400-700 million annually
- Second wave of investment from corporates into enterprise blockchain was between 2015 and 2017, with \$250-400 million annually
- Third wave of public crowdfunding flowed into ICOs, with an unprecedented rise in prices for crypto currencies, with \$7 billion of investment going into the space, 4x greater than equity investment in crypto companies
- Many ICOs formed to take advantage of the “goldrush” and created questions of quality and regulation for tokens




... nearly half of that funding is EOS (\$4.2B) and Telegram (\$1.7B) hiding emerging weakness in the system

Monthly Investment in Crypto-Economy (\$MM)

■ ICOs ■ EOS ■ Telegram

(1) Telegram privately raised \$1.7B from venture investors for tokens in a blockchain ecosystem

(2) EOS has raised over \$4.2B from large community through a year-long ICO to compete with Ethereum



EOS shows the potential for rolling public crowdfunding




Overview

- Much like Ethereum, EOS is a smart contract enabled platform for open-source projects and consumer-facing decentralised applications
- The EOS project is developed by the block.one team, headed by Brendan Blumer as CEO, and CTO, Dan Larimer, known for creating BitShares and Steem and inventing the delegated-proof-of-stake (DPoS) consensus algorithm. The grounds for controversy lie predominantly in the promise of Larimer to deliver on the claims of the platform eliminating transaction fees and its ability to process millions of transactions per second, which mirror similar bold claims made on Steem and BitShares only to find him exit them soon after the ICO completed
- The first 5 months of 2018 have seen more activity in the contributions made to EOS on GitHub than in all 2017, yet the company still had a massive governance crisis within weeks of launch

Year	Days of ICO	Amount Raised
2017	341	\$4,2 Billion

EOS Market Capitalization



- EOS release 2m tokens each day for 341 days to ensure inclusivity amongst the public demanding the token. This staggered approach has driven sustained demand for the token and thus exorbitant market capitalisation figures



Telegram highlights the capital available in private raises



Telegram

Overview


- Telegram is a free encrypted messaging service (web and app) with no ads, much like WhatsApp. Each message thread can host up to 100,000 users making it more of an internal social network, which is favourable amongst crypto investors
- The app is one of the top global social media / chat apps, with over 200 million users, in large part where internet access is limited or closely monitored by the government. The founders originally founded Vkontakte, Russia's largest social network which was acquired by Mail.RU in 2014 for ~\$3B
- The next steps are to launch the Telegram Open Network (TON), an Ethereum-like platform with apps, services, and a store for digital and physical goods. The development of which will be funded by the \$1.7B Telegram raised in two separate rounds from ~175 private investors such as Sequoia Capital and Benchmark Capital

Year
2017

Tokens Issued
12M GRAM

Amount Raised
\$1.7 Billion

Google Trend Analysis for Telegram vs Kik




- Telegram is rapidly gaining market share over its competitors entrenching its place as a dominant player in the social networking arena




Still, ICOs have become a steady function of Ether, with a 2% reinvestment of the market cap per month

Ether Marketcap vs ICO Fundraising (Monthly)



ICO Fundraising as %




- ICO fundraising shows strong correlation to the market cap of Ether
- Yet many variables were correlated in the selected period -- from Ether, to Bitcoin, to media coverage of the space, to Google searches
- Still, it is possible that ICOs catalyzed positive sentiment and caused the price to rise, while a higher price catalyzed more fundraising

- About 2% of Ether or 0.5% of all Crypto is re-invested into ICOs, excluding Telegram and EOS



Non-Ethereum protocols for token offerings also emerging

- While Ethereum is structurally important to the ICO phenomenon, it is seeing competition from two directions
- First, other smart contract protocols are seeing some traction in project launches, though this traction is still quite limited
- Second, protocols are starting to intersect with equity and asset crowdfunding to create a security token wave
- Further, as ICOs raise ETH and then have to sell it in order to fund operations, Ethereum's success creates selling pressure down the line



Examples of Security Token Launch Platforms

TEMPLUM
Regulatory compliant solutions for
Tokenized Asset Offerings as securities
secondary markets.

NEUFUND
THE FIRST EVER COMPANIES TO
TOKENIZE THEIR


POLYMAT
THE SECURITIES TOKEN PLATFORM

tokeny
THE TRUSTED TOKENIZATION
PLATFORM
The end-to-end platform to issue, manage and trade Utility and
Security tokens.



Increasing diversification in the types of ICOs, with apps and vertical use cases supplementing fat protocols


Initial Coin Offerings by Industry (USD Equivalent, \$1MM+ raises, ex EOS/Telegram)






Median ICO in our sample takes home \$12MM; \$19MM if infrastructure, \$13MM if Finance, \$10MM if App

Average vs. Median Proceeds (\$MM)



Median Proceeds per Industry (\$MM)




- Our tracker focuses on ICOs above \$1 million in proceeds, which skews results to be larger, but we would also expect that such projects are more credible and mature
- There is a consistent gap between the average (\$19 million in 2017/2018) and median (\$10 to 12 million) raise, implying a winner-take-all dynamic for fundraising
- Within the project categories, the Fat Protocol offerings are still the highest funded, followed by Financial Services, and Vertical Apps in last place
- But without killer apps and consumer adoption, we suspect that none of the infrastructure will matter




\$50MM+ token offerings were launched across different categories, with the top 15 in each highlighted below

Top Initial Coin Offerings by Industry (\$MM, ex EOS/Telegram)




Rich map of projects by token type and industry emerged






Since field is crowded and attention scarce, new approaches to raising money are evolving



Airdrops, a way to growth-hack a community through free dividends for participants, reached 222 per month in April

- Airdrops are a way of driving project growth and adoption without asking users to pay for access, or to prefund development
- While there's nothing new about sign-up bonuses (e.g., \$100 to open a bank account), this particular version of internet growth-hacking is quite different
- First, some ICOs are reserving 5-10% of their raise to distribute back out to the community, compared to 0.50% per ICO advisor. Markets see this as a legitimate incentive because many investors value protocols on a ratio of Market Value to Transactions. This means that the more transactions within a network, the higher the relative price of the token. For example, EOS surged 45% in anticipation of a planned drop.
- Second, the application of growth hacking to airdrops can tie "free" tokens to bounty tasks, like joining a Telegram group, or downloading a crypto wallet. An example of this is that people who signed up for the Ontology newsletter (project on the NEO blockchain) had received tokens which at one point were worth \$10,000.

Number of airdrops (up to 04/2018)



Companies like Earn.com (formerly 21.co) connect Airdrops as Bounties for growth-hackers



Overview

- Founded in 2013, 21.co was a machine economy play based on cryptocurrency mining; during its first year of operation it commanded 3-4% of all mining power on the Bitcoin network.
- As of 2015, Bitcoin price volatility and expensive operational costs forced 21.co to refocus on a service that rewards users financially for responding to emails and completing tasks. For just \$1, tasks can include providing an Ethereum address, joining a Telegram group, following a Twitter account, and signing up for a newsletter
- Empirically, senders get 30-70% response rates within 24hrs for \$1-\$10 incentives, this is high compared to the typical 1.7% response rate for blind emails. As Airdrops became more relevant in early 2018, Earn became the chassis for growth hacking, and was thereafter acquired by Coinbase

Founded
2013

Amount Raised
\$121
Million

Coinbase Acquisition
\$120
Million

Examples of Earn.com's contact lists

CEO

Get replies from
500+ CEOs for \$40
per reply

Reach active CEOs of companies
with substantial funding or
revenue. Only pay when you get
a response.



VC

Get replies from
300+ VCs for \$100
per reply

Reach venture capitalists across
20+ firms representing \$25B+
in investable capital. Only pay
when you get a response.



Get replies from
100+ cryptocurrency
fund managers for
\$100 per reply

Reach global top cryptocurrency
fund managers and institutional
investors that invest in
cryptocurrency. Only pay when



- Earn.com allows anyone to reach out to 96 different lists of contacts at costs ranging from \$1 to \$100 per interaction
- Fun Facts: 18% of crypto-related posts originate from bounty campaigns, according to Solume, with the largest being Jon McAfee's \$105,000 per tweet



Forks continue to be used to create new currencies and financial assets, but more for governance than experiments

- In software development, forking code means making a copy of it to make proprietary changes separate from the original codebase
- Within crypto assets, which are open source software, each coin or token is also a political entity with an ecosystem of developers, influencers and thinkers. By the nature of communities with immature governance, disagreements about priorities can lead to philosophical splits and thereafter forks in the code, which split off to be managed by a new community. Such a fork is called a hard fork, whereas a soft fork is a patch of the code that everyone in the community adopts.
- Examples of disagreements range from how data is stored (e.g., SegWit), which has implications for mining farms, to how to deal with bankruptcies and theft (e.g., Ethereum Classic)
- However, some actors have led hard forks in order to benefit privately – by increasing personal power over codebases, changing distributions of assets, or simply confusing investors with familiar sounding labels (e.g., BitcoinDark, etc.)
- One surprising development is that the value of a forked network does not necessarily decrease as a result, as implied by Metcalfe's law or by comparison to corporate dividends; instead forked projects can prosper and evolve into valuable alternatives, similar to the unlocking of value through a corporate spin out

BTC Fork Marketcaps (\$B, 05/18)





The largest forks continue to hold philosophical and financial value: 3-5% for ETC and 5-20% for BCH

Largest Fork Marketcaps as % of Parent



From ICO to Liquid Coin: A Quantitative Analysis



Introduction


- In this section, we bracket what could be appropriate market sizes for the sector, highlight further areas of research, and do a quantitative screen of liquid coin performance to date
 - Like early stage venture capital, token investing is a high-risk activity which must pass through several filters, from failing to raise capital, to operating failure and missing product/market fit; but tokens can also fail to list on an exchange, or fall victim to scams and hacking
 - Once liquid, price performance is exponentially volatile, though that has been narrowing since 2018
- In thinking about token value, many investors and influencers make claims that are fundamentally divorced from reality
 - No good fundamental valuation framework exists today for crypto assets, though work is being done along several dimensions, and we plan to explore the topic in a future analysis
 - The need for a valuation framework is driven by (1) institutional investors used to DCF and comps entering a market that is more appropriate for early stage venture, and (2) the immaturity of decentralized project models, which have no stable equilibrium around long-term instrument pricing and market outcomes
- Unlike traditional equities, which may see 5-10 years between the first Seed stage financing and Initial Public Offerings, ICOs may come to a liquid market in less than 12 months
 - This implies that capital markets traders, venture investors, price insensitive retail investors, and market manipulators are all participating in the same asset class at the same time
 - ICO founders are under pressure from their community, also often fractured between believers and speculators, to list the token on an exchange even prior to any meaningful technological progress
 - End of the day, many participants are speculating on abstract ideas and rough comps of revenue pools of existing companies, rather than any detailed understanding of what it takes to grow a business




An emerging set of philosophical approaches to crypto valuation creates feedback loops

Discussion

- Tokens and coins take form anywhere between currency, commodity, security and mutualized asset, making the task of finding a common valuation framework close to impossible
- Smart people are retro-fitting frameworks and math from adjacent industries on digital assets, but we think any resemblance to market outcomes are merely reflexive, i.e., self-causing
- Real economic activity, as a percentage of transactions across the major blockchains, is still overshadowed by persistent speculation and market manipulation by increasingly sophisticated counterparties
- Until we see the transition from corporations to networks, and from profits to mutualized resources, market participants are trading on stories and sentiment
- Tokenized physical assets and Security Tokens, however, can be valued using existing valuation frameworks




A guide to not making ridiculous claims, by understanding what a particular growth multiple implies in terms of size

Growth Multiple	Description
	1x Rough size of today's crypto markets is \$300 billion
	5x Total US currency in circulation is \$1.6 trillion
	20x Total tech marketcaps on the Nasdaq in the DotCom bubble reached \$3.2 trillion, out of \$6.7 trillion total
	25x All gold ever mined at today's prices is valued at \$7.6 trillion
	33x Global foreign exchange reserves stand at \$10 trillion
	270x All equities of all public companies are worth \$80 trillion
	1,700x All asset classes including alternatives and real estate come to \$500 trillion, equal to the net present value of global GDP
	17,000x The statistical value of all human life on the planet, based on per country estimates, is \$5 quadrillion

The optimist's case: a Crypto financial singularity by 2033


- An optimist could tell the story that the rise of crypto assets is akin to the economic version of Moore's law
- If crypto asset growth continues on an exponential curve, by 2021 we should see a trillion in value, and by 2025 the asset class will surpass the values of Gold and FX reserves
- By 2030, all economic activity will flow through crypto infrastructure, and by 2033 will subsume all human activity
- For reference, Ray Kurzweil places non-biological computation surpassing all human intelligence by the 2030s, with the singularity in 2045

Bitcoin Marketcap on Log Axis (\$B)






Realistically, token investing is early stage tech investing -- a high-risk activity which must pass through several filters






Exposure to crypto assets has annual 20% fraud rate on entry, 0.5% hacking/phishing rate at exchanges and wallets

Size of Fraud at Entry (WSJ, 05/2018)



Hacking and Phishing (\$MM, % of Crypto*)




- 20% of all ICOs are likely to be scams at whitepaper stage
- The rate seems to be decreasing in 2018

- 15% of crypto currency has been hacked or phished, representing a cumulative \$2 billion in value at time of hack, potentially much more at mark to market




While ICO failure rates are around 50%, that is in line with the 60-80% general fundraising and early stage failure rates



- When looking at failure of an ICO to raise a target, the correct comparison is the failure rate on Kickstarter, which is approximately 60-70%
- Looking at venture: for Seed stage startups, 55-70% are no longer operating by Series A either due to exit or failure to raise; for later stage, 70-80% do not make it to Series C due to either exit or failure


Statistically, ICO selection creates losses – 34% chance to lose more than half, 60% to underperform Bitcoin & Ether

ICO Returns Distribution (Up to 03/18)



- ICO returns have very long tails in both directions, and have a 50% chance to be either negative or positive
- 34% of losing more than half of investment
- 22% of more than doubling investment

Relative Performance (Up to 03/18)




- ICO selection is subject to the same dynamics as active management and security selection: 60% of all ICOs underperformed Bitcoin and Ether instruments
- In such situations:
 - Venture investors build a wide portfolio of instruments so that the one winner pays for all the losers
 - Indexing broadly may also work by creating exposure, rather than focusing on selection




ICO selection appears to be getting more difficult as the return profile normalizes

ICO Returns by End Month of Token Raise (up to 02/18)





After an ICO offering, tokens may be listed on an exchange, and experience the price performance of liquid coins






2018 has led to some volatility dampening in the crypto markets – though it is a long way off from regular equities

Price Performance of Top 200 Coins,
01/2018 to 05/2018, Log%



Price Performance of 200 SP 500 Components, 01/2017 to 05/2018



- Returns are still on a log scale, but the standard deviation is narrower in 2018 than in the prior year – with the highest return being 1000x less

- Since 2017, the S&P 500 components have had a much tighter performance distribution, with most losing no more than 50%, and very few doubling



Crypto assets are tightly correlated with each other, with some separation starting to show in for EOS, TRX and VEN

Discussion

- In this analysis, we look at price data for the top 15 coins by end of 05/18 market capitalization
- In 2017, nearly the entire sector appears to move together
- Data is missing for several top 2018 coins given their late launch date, so the correlations may not be indicative, and prior top performers (e.g., Dogecoin) have dropped off our list
- In 2018, we do see some pulling apart of EOS, TRX and VEN from the rest of the pack, but it would be hard to say that there is a meaningful diversification among these assets

Correlation Matrix of Top 15 Coins, 2017 and 2018 YTD

2017	BTC	ETH	XRP	BCH	EOS	LTC	ADA	XLM	IOTA	TRX	NEO	XMR	DASH	XEM	VEN	MV 05/18
BTC	1.00															126.7
ETH	0.89	1.00														57.0
XRP	0.71	0.80	1.00													23.7
BCH	0.85	0.92	0.76	1.00												16.9
EOS	0.85	0.91	0.80	0.92	1.00											10.6
LTC	0.93	0.89	0.81	0.86	0.94	1.00										6.6
ADA	0.77	0.92	0.91	0.83	0.91	0.87	1.00									5.7
XLM	0.86	0.80	0.90	0.88	0.94	0.91	0.97	1.00								5.4
IOTA	0.92	0.88	0.67	0.82	0.90	0.90	0.77	0.90	1.00							4.8
TRX	0.69	0.88	0.87	0.82	0.88	0.86	0.95	0.90	0.71	1.00						3.9
NEO	0.84	0.87	0.66	0.80	0.71	0.79	0.96	0.69	0.74	0.93	1.00					3.4
XMR	0.96	0.91	0.79	0.93	0.89	0.95	0.88	0.89	0.93	0.84	0.86	1.00				2.5
DASH	0.95	0.92	0.79	0.96	0.91	0.94	0.88	0.88	0.90	0.84	0.87	0.99	1.00			2.5
XEM	0.81	0.89	0.90	0.84	0.90	0.91	0.95	0.91	0.85	0.94	0.80	0.90	0.89	1.00		2.2
VEN	0.71	0.88	0.95	0.81	0.87	0.83	0.96	0.94	0.76	0.93	0.94	0.86	0.84	0.95	1.00	1.8

2018 YTD	BTC	ETH	XRP	BCH	EOS	LTC	ADA	XLM	IOTA	TRX	NEO	XMR	DASH	XEM	VEN	MV 05/18
BTC	1.00															126.7
ETH	0.81	1.00														57.0
XRP	0.95	0.76	1.00													23.7
BCH	0.92	0.84	0.91	1.00												16.9
EOS	0.19	0.36	0.17	0.44	1.00											10.6
LTC	0.92	0.78	0.82	0.80	0.03	1.00										6.6
ADA	0.91	0.82	0.97	0.92	0.29	0.75	1.00									5.7
XLM	0.86	0.87	0.90	0.90	0.46	0.73	0.95	1.00								5.4
IOTA	0.91	0.80	0.94	0.97	0.43	0.76	0.95	0.92	1.00							4.8
TRX	0.71	0.50	0.76	0.77	0.50	0.48	0.76	0.72	0.79	1.00						3.9
NEO	0.66	0.90	0.58	0.60	0.17	0.73	0.65	0.71	0.58	0.19	1.00					3.4
XMR	0.93	0.85	0.84	0.83	0.16	0.91	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.51	0.80	1.00				2.5
DASH	0.95	0.87	0.96	0.91	0.15	0.88	0.95	0.90	0.91	0.63	0.75	0.92	1.00			2.5
XEM	0.90	0.81	0.96	0.89	0.19	0.74	0.98	0.90	0.91	0.72	0.63	0.82	0.94	1.00		2.2
VEN	0.51	0.81	0.42	0.56	0.49	0.54	0.52	0.64	0.50	0.28	0.79	0.61	0.57	0.49	1.00	1.8



Crypto assets are still correlated with traditional assets, and also move together with ETH & BTC on-chain metrics

Discussion

- When looking at correlations between the top coins and traditional asset classes, over the last 1.5 years, crypto has not been an uncorrelated asset; at best, it was uncorrelated from Fixed Income and Real Estate
- In 2018 YTD, the relationship to traditional assets has started to slip as the asset class began to lose value
- When looking at the on-chain metrics of BTC and ETH as a driver, they correlate positively with nearly all major cryptocurrencies, but for EOS, which has had a unique fundraising

Correlation Matrix of Top 15 Coins, 2017 and 2018 YTD

	2017-2018 YTD														
Asset Classes	BTC	ETH	XRP	BCH	EOS	LTC	ADA	XLM	IOTA	TRX	NEO	XMR	DASH	XEM	VEN
SP 500 (IVV)	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.6	0.8	0.9	0.7	0.8	0.7	0.6	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.7	0.8
Value (VTY)	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.9	0.7	0.8	0.7	0.6	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.7	0.8
Small Cap (VB)	0.8	0.9	0.7	0.6	0.8	0.8	0.5	0.8	0.6	0.6	0.8	0.9	0.8	0.7	0.8
Fixed Income (AGG)	0.4	0.3	0.2	-0.1	-0.7	0.2	-0.1	-0.1	-0.1	-0.4	-0.1	0.2	0.4	0.4	-0.1
Commodities (DBC)	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.4	0.8	0.6	0.3	0.7	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.7	0.5	0.4	0.8
Gold (GLD)	0.6	0.7	0.6	0.0	0.4	0.6	0.4	0.7	0.2	0.5	0.7	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.7
Real Estate (VNQ)	-0.2	-0.4	-0.3	-0.1	-0.6	-0.3	-0.2	-0.5	-0.1	-0.4	-0.5	-0.3	-0.1	-0.1	-0.6
Onchain Metrics	BTC	ETH	XRP	BCH	EOS	LTC	ADA	XLM	IOTA	TRX	NEO	XMR	DASH	XEM	VEN
BTC Transaction Volume (\$mm)	0.9	0.7	0.6	0.7	0.3	0.8	0.4	0.6	0.8	0.1	0.5	0.8	0.9	0.8	0.4
BTC Fees (in BTC)	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.6	-0.1	0.2	0.4	0.0	0.5	0.1	-0.1	0.2	0.4	0.5	-0.2
BTC Active Addresses	0.6	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.0	0.5	0.3	0.3	0.6	-0.1	0.2	0.5	0.7	0.6	0.1
ETH Transaction Volume (\$mm)	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.1	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.5	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.8	0.3
ETH Fees (in ETH)	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.4	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9	0.5
ETH Active Addresses	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.8
Asset Classes	BTC	ETH	XRP	BCH	EOS	LTC	ADA	XLM	IOTA	TRX	NEO	XMR	DASH	XEM	VEN
SP 500	0.4	0.6	0.4	0.4	0.2	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.6	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.7
Value	0.5	0.7	0.5	0.5	0.1	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.2	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.7
Small Cap	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.4	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.3
Fixed Income	0.6	0.5	0.7	0.5	-0.2	0.4	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.8	0.2
Commodities	-0.3	-0.2	-0.3	-0.1	0.6	-0.5	-0.2	-0.1	0.0	0.2	-0.5	-0.4	-0.4	-0.3	0.0
Gold	0.1	0.1	0.1	-0.1	-0.3	0.1	0.1	0.1	-0.1	-0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2
Real Estate	0.5	0.4	0.6	0.6	0.4	0.2	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.7	0.1	0.3	0.5	0.6	0.3
Onchain Metrics	BTC	ETH	XRP	BCH	EOS	LTC	ADA	XLM	IOTA	TRX	NEO	XMR	DASH	XEM	VEN
BTC Transaction Volume (\$mm)	0.8	0.8	0.9	0.8	0.0	0.7	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.6	0.6	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.4
BTC Fees (in BTC)	0.8	0.7	0.9	0.8	0.0	0.6	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.5	0.7	0.9	0.9	0.3
BTC Active Addresses	0.8	0.8	0.9	0.8	0.0	0.7	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.5	0.7	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.4
ETH Transaction Volume (\$mm)	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.1	0.6	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.9	0.9	0.4
ETH Fees (in ETH)	0.8	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.1	0.6	0.8	0.7	0.8	0.7	0.5	0.7	0.8	0.9	0.4
ETH Active Addresses	0.7	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.2	0.5	0.8	0.7	0.8	0.7	0.4	0.6	0.8	0.8	0.4



Takeaways and areas for further research

- **The speculation in the space has led to attempts by financiers and investors to engineer financial outcomes and research drivers of the asset class, but the answer is simpler**
 - Since our Token Mania report, the sector has experienced tremendous financial specialization and complexity, from investor strategies to tokenomics design using behavioral finance to generate demand
 - The sector needs not financial engineering, but economic activity – this can only come from building software that users want, and driving adoption of that software such that it creates a consumer surplus
- **The exponential return profile of crypto assets looks less like an option, and more like a lottery ticket, with generational and social dynamics explaining the need for such an asset**
 - Debt, inequality and mistrust in institutions are growing; Millennials are unlikely to see traditional retirement given government balance sheets, carry record levels of student debt, and will inherit massive healthcare liabilities from older generations who are living longer lives
 - Buying the lottery ticket of crypto to get rich quick is akin to management in a failing company taking on unsustainable amounts of debt to take a gamble; further, younger generations have an informational advantage in understanding the upside of a software-based solution to economic pressures
- **It may be too early to create systematic valuation frameworks for token assets**
 - Crypto assets have created financial outcomes for asset owners, but the story of real world deployment is still in progress across retail and enterprise
 - We need better data and examples to define what economic success looks like before we can model how benefits accrue to asset owners, aside from sentiment and expectations
 - Forward looking claims about diversification and high Sharpe ratios that rely on 2017-2018 historic returns are not indicative of future performance in our view

Emerging Crypto Fund Ecosystem





Introduction

- **The number of crypto funds is at record 312, with over 250 funds started in 2017 and 2018**
 - Formation is highly correlated with Bitcoin capital appreciation and the ICO boom, both of which highlighted opportunity in the space for different types of investors
 - Not including traditional instruments like the Bitcoin Investment Trust or BTC futures, the Crypto funds control about \$7.5-10 billion of assets; traditional vehicles would add another \$2-4 billion of exposure
 - Assets under management are held by just a few funds, with the top 10 funds controlling over 40%
- **Increasing differentiation between crypto funds shows emerging maturity of investor strategies, which is encouraging to see**
 - Strategies of funds we track include (1) liquid venture investing in tokens, (2) cryptocurrency traders and former hedge fund managers, (3) artificially intelligent or automated bot funds, (4) traditional funds of funds, (5) token baskets, usually raising money through their own tokens to invest in other crypto assets, (6) passive crypto-indexes, (7) ecosystem funds from software platforms and (8) credit funds
 - Liquid venture is the most popular strategy, followed by capital markets trading
 - We highlight some of the more unique offerings in the marketplace herein
- **While many new funds have come onto the market, there should be legitimate concern around how viable many of these entities are in the long term**
 - Based on a model of estimated fund economics, we expect funds with less than \$25 million in AUM to struggle in flat or down years
 - Key drivers that would make survival more viable are custody, trading costs, and market performance
 - Services that diligence the operational quality of Crypto funds add meaningful value at this stage



The number of crypto funds is at record 312, highly correlated with Bitcoin appreciation and ICO activity




- In *Token Mania*, we highlighted the original crypto funds: e.g., Pantera, Polychain, Blockchain Capital
- Since then, over 200 new funds have entered the space, such as Galaxy Digital and a16z crypto

- The number of crypto funds is highly correlated with both ICO fundraising and the marketcap of Bitcoin
- Pre-sale discounts and 10,000% returns on crypto beta exposure catalyzed record fund formation




Crypto funds hold \$7.5 to 10 Billion of Assets Under Management, which is highly concentrated with the top 10

AUM Distribution (% of Total AUM)



AUM Distribution per Fund



- Fund AUM appears highly concentrated based on available data, with the top 50 funds holding 80% of assets and the top 10 funds holding 43%
- 70% of all funds are lurkers, where information on their assets is unavailable. We assume these funds to be the winnings of early adopters in 2017, with a median size of \$5 million and accounting for 14% of total AUM.
- Adding traditional products to these funds, such as the Bitcoin Investment Trust, Coinshares ETNs, Bitcoin Futures, and others, would likely add another \$2-4 billion to industry exposure




Increasing differentiation between crypto funds shows emerging maturity of investor strategies

	Description of Strategy	Value Drivers
Liquid Venture	Apply early stage technology pattern matching skills to recognize crypto projects that could be the next generation of web infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Market size & Team Token design Long term holding period
Trading	Treat Crypto as any other asset class, like commodities or equities, and trade long or short positions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Liquidity, technical trading Short-medium term holding period
AI / Quant	Use statistical models or machine learning to generate alpha through arbitrage or factor analysis, with quant methods generalized from other markets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Large data sets Test large numbers of alpha hypotheses
Token Basket	Manager selection or aggregation projects that provide a single token representing several managers or investments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality of underlying managers Counterparty risk
Index	Several emerging packages of small, mid and large cap crypto currencies for asset allocation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Passive beta exposure to the asset class Selection criteria
Fund of Funds	Traditional fund of funds packaging of crypto funds that use hedge fund structures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality of underlying managers Two layers of fees
Credit	Investment advisors that invest in crypto lending assets from networks like SALT, like funds investing in Lending Club loans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Underwriting risk modeling and loan selection
Ecosystem	Investment into projects that build on top of the investor's technology or use an internal product or service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Growth of ecosystem Use of protocol/exchange




Venture and trading funds are most numerous and hold the most assets under management

Crypto Funds by Inception & Strategy*



Estimated AUM by Strategy





AUTONOMOUS



Funds are segmented by active vs. passive styles and bundled vs. standalone products; examples follow ...

Bundle

Fund of Funds



AI / Quant



Trading



Token Basket



Ecosystem



Index



Product

Liquid Venture



More Active
Trading Strategy

Less Active
HODL Strategy




Emerging Fund: ICONOMI Token Basket


ICONOMI

Overview

- Unlike several Index funds, that are accessible to only accredited investors (e.g., Crescent Crypto, Bitwise), ICONOMI is building an investment platform for a larger market segment
- The core offering is a variety of token baskets or “Digital Asset Arrays” (DAAs) that users can buy on the platform, each featuring a high, medium, and low risk profile with high liquidity and no threat of lock-outs
- ICONOMI’s flagship DAA – Blockchain Index, is passively managed consisting of 29 blockchain-based crypto assets, such as bitcoin (15%) and ethereum (15%) representing 78% of the total market cap
- Competitors offering similar platforms consist of Prism and Melonport



Ways to get exposure to ICONOMI's DAAs





Emerging Fund: The Bitwise Hold 10 Private Index Fund

Bitwise

Overview

- Bitwise tracks a basket of the 10 most highly valued coins based on their market capitalisation, called Hold 10 Private Index Fund
- It raised \$4 million from the likes of Blockchain Capital, Khosla Ventures, General Catalyst, and The Collaborative Fund
- The 10 coins in the HOLD 10 index are chosen to comprise of 85% of the total crypto market capitalisation; the allocation consists predominantly of Bitcoin at 61.6%, Ethereum second at 18.9%, and Ripple third at 7.1%
- The funds are held in an institutional-grade 100% cold storage vault, accessed primarily during monthly rebalancing
- Since the 1st of January 2017, the fund is up 934%, whilst Bitcoin is up 583%

Inception Date
2017

Initial Raise
\$4 Million

2017 Return
2,200%

Hold 10 Index Performance





Emerging Fund: Protocol Ventures' Fund-of-Funds



Overview

- Protocol Ventures' fund-of-funds invests in the top 10 crypto funds using a combination of historic and expected performance, quality of fund managers and complimentary fund strategies to deliver diversification and outsized returns to inform allocation
- Two of the known funds in Protocol's portfolio are MetaStable Capital – one of the larger crypto funds, and Neural Capital – whose bet on Ethereum in 2017 earned them significant returns
- With initial funding of \$1 Million coming from founder Rick Marini, the fund hopes to raise more to solidify its future, noting that the fund-of-funds space has already seen the fall of Apex Token fund who failed to raise the \$13 Million capital needed to progress

Founded	Goal AUM	# Target Funds
2017	\$100 Million	10

Protocol Ventures' Fund-of-funds offering

Solution from Protocol Ventures

1. Protocol has strong relationships with the best crypto fund managers
2. These top investors have deep industry expertise and exercise excellent judgment based on years of trading crypto
3. Protocol will build a diverse portfolio based on complimentary strategies with a mix of large funds and emerging managers, with holdings in numerous cryptocurrencies and ICOs via one investment
4. Many of the top funds now have a \$1M minimum so a pooled fund allows for diversification across 10 funds, not a single strategy
5. Protocol has access and better pricing. Two of the top funds are closing soon. Protocol enjoys reduced fee pricing in 2 other funds
6. "Connective Tissue" - Access to data, knowledge and deal flow



© 2017 PROTOCOL VENTURES
CONFIDENTIAL & PROPRIETARY

Emerging Fund: Numerai Quant / AI



NUMERAI

Overview

- Numerai is a decentralised hedge fund that works by building its own financial model that incorporates the machine learning models submitted by data scientists from various backgrounds and expertise.
- The Numerai team democratises participation by making an encrypted dataset readily accessible via their platform.
- Data scientists download the dataset in order to build and submit their own machine learning model, targeting regions or sectors of the stock market in search of the best accuracy in predictability.
- Numerai synthesise all submitted models into their meta model, rewarding those with the most accurate predictive models in Numeraire- Numerai's token.
- The diversity of models submitted leads to diversification in the meta model, reducing risk.

Founded

2015

Raised

**\$7.5
Million**



California, USA

Numerai's results page per tournament

Tournament 51 Results

This tournament has resolved.

PARTICIPANTS	CONTROLLING CAPITAL	USD PAID OUT	NMR PAID OUT		
475	266	\$3603.05	14412.09		
#	DATA SCIENTIST	LIVE LOGLOSS	VAL LOGLOSS	ROUND USD	ROUND NMR
1	GIRAS	0.690556	0.692082	\$1000.00	4000.00
2	THEAFH	0.691091	0.692447	\$435.28	1741.10
3	STUDYAI	0.691223	0.660740	\$267.58	1070.32
4	JOSEPH_SCHUMPETER	0.691505	0.692316	\$189.46	757.86
5	INVAI	0.691647	0.661223	\$144.96	579.82
6	KARL_MARK	0.691776	0.692233	\$116.47	465.88
7	ANYTT	0.691778	0.680470	\$96.80	387.21
8	HENRYWANG7	0.691880	0.692742	\$82.47	329.88
9	UUAZED2	0.691991	0.692207	\$71.60	286.40
10	INTELAYER	0.691995	0.692595	\$63.10	252.38



Emerging Fund: #Hashed Venture Capital

#HASHED

Overview


- #Hashed – a successful Korean blockchain-focused fund, incubator and community builder, whose primary mission is to accelerate the global enablement of blockchain through community building and impact investing in Korea
- Evidence this mission is #HashedLounge: a community building meetup initiative, and Hashed Post: a blockchain/crypto journal
- The venture fund's successes have come from the acceleration of what is now South Korea's largest digital wallet provider – Coin manager, as well as, two others – Icon and Mediblock who rank among the cryptocurrency's top100 with a combined market capitalisation of over \$3B
- The fund's current value reportedly increased from \$600K to \$250 million, with no outside investors

Founded
2017

Fund Assets
\$250
Million

Portfolio
Companies
49

The #Hashed Portfolio





Emerging Fund: SALT Crypto-to-Cash Lending



Overview


- Cash-to-crypto lending platforms such as SALT (Secured Automated Lending Technology) offer a means to obtain blockchain-backed loans using cryptocurrency holdings as collateral
- Loans are provided via SALT Blockchain Asset Management, who manage the Crypto Credit Opportunity Fund. The crypto-lending fund provides investors exposure to digital currency without directly owning them via secured debt.
- Proprietary software ensures the fund maintains over-collateralisation even during large single-day losses
- We see the Investment Advisor entity which manages the fund potentially as an analog to NSR Invest (lending investor) and Lending Club (lending platform)

Founded
2017

Loans to date
\$40 Million

Bonds to be issued in Q4 2018
\$200 Million

SALT's lending application process



- SALT works by offering 3 – 36 month loans of up to 60 percent of the value of the cryptocurrency collateral (depending on the loan-to-value ratio) with interest rates around 16 percent. The platform makes use of automated margin calls when the loan-to-value ratio reaches a specific threshold (dependent on the loan amount).



Emerging Fund: Binance Ecosystem Fund



Overview

- Binance, one of the world's largest crypto exchanges based on daily trading volumes, is launching a \$1 Billion ecosystem fund to back blockchain and crypto startups, such as public blockchains, decentralised exchanges, custody/payments/wallets, stable digital currency, and security token platforms
- The fund serves as an initiative to collaborate with 20 vetted partners to enact lasting change and progress for the whole ecosystem. Investment will take place in 10 phases of \$100 Million each.
- Binance's internal currency, BNB will serve as the sole means of investment for the ecosystem fund, driving the usage of the coin. Partners of the fund get priority in recommending projects to Binance Labs; if the fund is successful, it will also increase trading on Binance

Announced

June 1st
2018

No. of partners

20

Investment per
phase

\$100
Million

Binance Labs' Mandate

Binance Labs

Binance Labs is a blockchain technology incubator. We focus on pre-ICO projects and teams.

We are:

- A startup helping other startups;
- Entrepreneurs helping other entrepreneurs;
- Crypto believers helping other crypto believers.

We provide:

- | | |
|-----------|------------------|
| Funds | Launchpad |
| Advice | Listing |
| Resources | Ideas & Concepts |

Apply



While many funds have started after 2017, funds below \$25 million are likely to struggle with fixed costs in a flat market

Estimated Fund Economics

	Small Fund		Mid Size Fund		Large Fund	
	Good Market	Bad Market	Good Market	Bad Market	Good Market	Bad Market
Revenue						
Assets	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$100,000,000	\$100,000,000
Management Fee %	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%
Management Fee \$	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000
Carry %	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
Expected Performance	200%	0%	200%	0%	200%	0%
Carry \$	\$400,000	\$0	\$4,000,000	\$0	\$40,000,000	\$0
Total Revenue	\$420,000	\$20,000	\$4,200,000	\$200,000	\$42,000,000	\$2,000,000
Costs						
Trading (assuming 50% turnover)						
Trading / advisory as %	1%	1%	0.7%	0.7%	0.5%	0.5%
Trading / advisory \$	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$250,000	\$250,000
Fund Costs						
Custody min	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000
Custody %	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Custody \$	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
Administration	\$40,000	\$40,000	\$40,000	\$40,000	\$40,000	\$40,000
Legal	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000
Personnel						
Employees	1	1	3	3	8	8
Salaries & Benefits	\$120,000	\$120,000	\$360,000	\$360,000	\$960,000	\$960,000
Office & Misc	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$80,000	\$80,000
Nice to Have						
Data & Research	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$125,000	\$125,000
Conferences & Mktg	\$0	\$0	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$50,000	\$50,000
Total Costs	\$320,000	\$320,000	\$650,000	\$650,000	\$2,530,000	\$2,530,000
Profit to Partners	\$100,000	(\$300,000)	\$3,550,000	(\$450,000)	\$39,470,000	(\$530,000)

- Capital appreciation allowed small funds to turn into medium size funds in 2017
- But running these organisations carries significant costs, especially as infrastructure costs are high and immature
- 2018 has already seen a number of crypto funds shut down, including Alpha Protocol, CryptoF2, and Crowd Crypto Fund

The Asset Class Opportunity



Institutional capital markets progress still early


- Today's crypto markets are primarily retail investors circumnavigating institutional finance
 - Unlike mature markets, where retail comprises 10-30% of the flow, most crypto assets are traded on immature infrastructure by individuals or small funds
 - Massive opportunity for capital pools, like mutual funds, ETFs, endowments and retirement portfolios to shift a portion in crypto assets
- Institutional financial product manufacturing infrastructure is only now starting to catch up
 - Fractured exchanges without best execution between them imply that liquidity is too shallow for large transactions, leading to an informal OTC market
 - Lack of custody suitable for traditional wrappers of asset management products, like ETFs and mutual funds, has slowed downstream adoption
- Retail investors invested before traditional packaging was ready in 2017
 - Generational and economic changes drive the need for a volatile risk asset across wealth levels
 - The financial industry's reticence has no impact on the investing preference of consumers





Distributors need more progress from manufacturers


- **The \$80 trillion AUM wealth management industry needs crypto assets to sit in traditional instruments to distribute it**
 - Thousands of interlocking capital assets (human, financial), powered by software like financial planning, CRM, risk assessment, and various workflows distribute financial products today
 - Once institutional liquidity and custody are solved, crypto assets can be packaged and distributed like other investments within asset allocations to family offices, endowments and retirement portfolios
- **Possible meaningful outcomes that have much greater impact than early stage venture investing**
 - A crypto Index exchange traded fund with exposure to the top liquid coins and a <20 bps expense ratio would fit into many allocations at 1-5% of holdings
 - The tokenization of all asset classes and consolidation of market infrastructure and capital, starting with Security Tokens (public) and smart contracts (enterprise blockchains)
- **The asset needs institutional adoption and distribution to get out of the current scammy sentiment-based speculation period**





Given global asset allocations, maintaining \$500 billion in crypto value does not require much change


- In the US alone, \$20 trillion of assets sit with HNW investors (\$1MM+ investable assets), of whom 29% have interest in crypto investments. These investors have historically put 10% of portfolios in Alternatives, which includes venture capital, various speculative commodities, and hedge funds
- Another \$20 trillion sit with non-HNW investors, who historically have not had access to the Alternatives asset class, representing pent-up demand



- A global allocation to Alternative investments of 10% is approximately \$5-10 trillion
- A 5% allocation within Alternatives to crypto or tokenized assets is \$500 billion
- Such a holding is not a fundamental shift in capital markets, but a speculative slice of a speculative slice within a globally diversified portfolio
- The 300 crypto funds described earlier are operationalizing this theme

\$500
billion

Moving crypto from Alternatives into the core of portfolios using efficient ETF products would drive far larger growth




- ETFs have been a growth engine of the asset management industry, adding \$3.4 trillion in 10 years, given their low cost and ease of use within a financial advice framework, distributed at scale
- Digital wealth managers, such as Betterment, Personal Capital and Wealthfront, have demonstrated how mass customization via software can be combined with efficient product for mass-affluent distribution
- A similar instrument for crypto assets, we think, would do much to normalize exposures and reduce speculation



Current public market exposure to Crypto assets is unnecessarily expensive and risky


Price Drag Between GBTC and BTC



- While Grayscale's Bitcoin Investment Trust is a good entrant into the space, it has a management fee of 200 bps, 194 bps higher than the average SPDR
- It also often trades at a premium to underlying holdings of Bitcoin; investors may experience less price appreciation and additional volatility

Public Company Pretenders

Companies Adding DotCom or Blockchain to Name



- Individual public companies have attempted to capitalize on blockchain demand, by changing their name (e.g., Long Island Ice Tea), partnering with new projects (e.g., Kodak), or legitimately investing into the space (e.g., Overstock)
- But in all cases, individual companies create unneeded idiosyncratic risk that an index reduces



Non-public market options, like Crypto funds or buying Crypto at exchanges, are also suboptimal

Issues with Crypto Funds



- Management fee of 2% and success fee of 20%, with some funds going up to 3% and 30%, for what is really crypto beta exposure
- Advisory fees to pay for capital introductions netted from performance (e.g., 5% for Coinlist)
- Must be an accredited investor (\$1mm in net worth or \$200k in income in last 2 years)

- Not available to regular retail investors
- Performance drag from fees
- Additional manager selection risk
- Not integrated with retirement assets and brokerage custodians

Issues with Crypto Exchanges



- Current retail penetration is still low, at 5 to 10%, and likely of only the largest currencies
- Exchanges take large trading spreads and can charge to move money in and out (e.g., 4% Coinbase fee for credit card purchase, 200 bps exchange rate spreads)
- Exposure to longer tail of tokens is far more difficult given quality of UI/UX, finding trading pairs on emerging exchanges, or investing in ICOs

- Still too complex for many non-techie investors
- Cyber security and human error risks
- Token selection risk
- Not integrated with retirement assets and brokerage custodians
- No risk assessment and suitability review



Developments in Custody

Theme Overview

- Under American regulation, securities managed on behalf of a client by an investment adviser must be held at a qualified custodian (e.g., broker/dealer or bank), which has control over the assets and issues account statements
- Blockchain-based assets are stored on a decentralized ledger, controlled by nobody by design, and accessed via private keys by owners of the assets; there are no portfolio accounting or tax statements available
- These issues have been most relevant for Crypto funds, which manage assets on behalf of direct investors and would like to outsource, rather than invent, functionality
- While these ideas may seem orthogonal, several players have either focused on (1) key management, access and storage, or (2) building hardware solutions and smart accounts to approximate traditional custody needs, including large players like Fidelity, Nomura and others


Select Company Examples



- \$54MM raised
- Over \$10B in transactions / month
- CEO was on founding team of Google Chrome
- Strong multi-signature, multi-currency capabilities
- 0.25% fee per outgoing transaction, plus volume discounts



- \$216MM raised
- Crypto exchange with \$20B in retail and institutional assets
- Custody product is \$100k set up, 120 bps per year, \$10MM minimum
- Reportedly \$1B+ in 2017 Revenue



- Venture funded by ConsenSys and run by Alex Baitlin (former UBS, BNY Mellon lead on innovation and blockchain)
- Product still in development, but promises architecture of smart accounts that have detailed permissions with custom hardware

"Different people can write different smart contracts yet operate them on a shared network with immutable performance guarantees"



Developments in Institutional Exchanges and Liquidity

Theme Overview	Select Company Examples
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Crypto exchanges have been successful in gaining large global user bases, but not building mature infrastructure 	<p> CUMBERLAND MINING <small>A DRW COMPANY</small></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One of the largest market makers in institutional crypto Part of Chicago-based market maker / prop trading firm DRW \$100k minimum trade size Early investor in ecosystem
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current trading happens on about 200 exchanges and another 50+ over the counter (OTC) venues. This means that markets are shallow and large block trades – which is what institutional trading requires by definition – is hard 	<p></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> London-based OTC company in business since 2015 Institutional trading, liquidity pool, synthetic crypto exposure Services via FIX & REST APIs \$1mm monthly trading minimum
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arbitrage exists between crypto and decentralized exchanges, OTC venues, publicly traded products (GBTC, Futures); there is no requirement to provide “best execution” or lowest price across venues 	<p></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Raised ICO financing in presale Building FIX API, unified exchange interface, dark pools Team with experience in traditional HFT infrastructure
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Various projects tackle how to connect these disjointed markets, for example using established FIX APIs to pipe into existing liquidity pools, high-frequency trading firms and market makers 	<p></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$110MM raised from venture Led by top Wall Street talent Chosen by Australian Stock Exchange (\$1T+ traded equities) to replace trading stack Own DAML, smart contract language used by institutions



Developments in Decentralized Exchanges

Theme Overview

- To understand this theme, consider the analogy of Napster and BitTorrent. While Napster facilitated P2P sharing of music, it used centralized servers and was shut down. BitTorrent, on the other hand, was fully decentralized to millions of users sharing small pieces of content, so there was nobody to shut down. Decentralized trading aims to remove shut-down risk from individual companies and build liquidity into software permanently.
- Efforts like Shapeshift are akin to Stripe, layering trading into APIs that apps can integrate, but rely on a proprietary order book, which has led to wide spreads
- Actual decentralized trading would require no intermediary between users, but challenges in liquidity remain; projects like Republic Protocol (\$30MM ICOs) are working on decentralized dark pools
- Further, second level protocol projects are working on “atomic swaps”, which allow for users to swap across chains

Select Company Examples




- Raised \$24MM ICO, trades at \$500MM marketcap
- Off-chain order relay with on-chain settlements via Ethereum network for ERC20 tokens
- 16 projects are building on top of 0x including MelonPort, Aragon, Augur, ChronoBank and Lendroid



- Raised \$36MM ICO in 2 days
- Uses a P2P trading model which matches users through an indexer protocol, providing a discovery mechanism for users to chose their counterparty
- Oracle included for market data



- Overlay network for Bitcoin, allowing for instant, high-volume transactions using native protocol
- Relevant in-progress functionality is called an “atomic swap”, like an OTC trade between counterparties on different chains





Developments in Institutional Products

Theme Overview

- Several traditional instruments already deliver exposure to the crypto asset class; they range from eToro's CFDs, various trusts (e.g., Grayscale's Bitcoin Investment Trust*), the Bitcoin futures products, several asset management products, and brokerage SMAs
- Other notable examples include Revolut, a neobank that allows for crypto currency exchange within its app, and Robinhood, which is working on free crypto trading
- The proliferation of such products help along several dimensions: (1) train new entrants to trade crypto exposure, (2) allow regulators to engage with crypto within familiar constraints, (3) increase price quality through ability to take both long and short positions, (4) start the conversation about asset allocation and risk management
- What these products do not do yet is meaningfully integrate into the wealth management distribution pipeline

Select Product Examples



Futures and Derivatives

- LedgerX pioneered crypto derivatives, soon followed by large institutional futures offerings from CBOE & CME, regulated by CFTC
- These instruments allow for directional market bets at large sizes, including going short



Exchange Traded Products

- Coinshares created ETNs tradable on Nasdaq Stockholm, tracking Bitcoin and Ether, 250 bps fee
- VanEck, a \$40B asset manager, filed with the SEC for a Bitcoin ETF offering; the Winklevoss twins also have pursued this

Name	Bitcoin Tracker One
Issuer	XBT Provider AB (publ)
ISIN	SE0007126024
Type	Certificate
1st Trading Day	2015-05-18
Tracked Asset	Bitcoin (BTC/USD)
Leverage	1:1
Minimum Investment	1 Share
Annual fee	2.5%

Brokerage & Proprietary Funds

- HQ in Malta, has lobbied for positive crypto regulation
- Access to 35,000 stocks, 20,000 derivatives, 15 cryptocurrencies, proprietary funds
- First BTC fund set up in 2012 with €200m





Developments in Security Tokens

Theme Overview

- In 2017, tokens projects did not want to be categorized as securities in order to side-step regulation and maximize fundraising; this has led to a backlash and poor behavior by opportunistic actors
- One response by the financial industry is to use the concept of tokens recorded on distributed ledgers, but tokenize traditional securities in the capital structure
- Investors already know how to value Security Tokens, and regulators already know how to regulate them, which has kicked off a race to build platforms to support such instruments
- Further, tokenization of ownership of illiquid assets – expensive paintings, commercial real estate, commodities – democratizes ownership at much lower net-worth levels, and may catalyze a boom in the assets being tokenized
- Such financial invention may also come with systemic risk and over-engineering

Select Company Examples




- \$59MM ICO raised, trades at \$100MM marketcap
- Aims to replicate the success that Ethereum has had with utility tokens for security tokens by creating a standard and an offering platform




- \$10MM raise in venture
- Acquired a broker/dealer and an Alternative Trading System that will power tokenized security launches, and secondary trading
- Seeks to replace the IPO process with regulated token offerings



- Subsidiary of online retailer, Overstock, which has made several fintech related moves
- \$168MM raised in token sale
- Involved in launching a regulated security token exchange and an Alternative Trading System





"create a turn-key solution for the initial issuance and secondary trading of ICOs as unregistered private securities"




A parting word on the role of banks in a trustless system

- Banks have traditionally been the trusted intermediary of the financial system, receiving access to cheap money from governments, and therefore a return on that capital, for providing financial products to customers
- To secure the financial system from systemic risk, banks have to maintain capital on their balance sheet at a level which is tightly regulated
- Cryptocurrencies do not need to be kept in a bank, nor do they need the backing of one, so the role of creating trust in the financial system falls away
- However, blockchains need to be maintained through consensus mechanisms, like Proof of Work or Proof of Stake, which is the process by which trust and stability in a crypto financial system are manufactured
- We see an opportunity for banks to take up the mantle of maintaining crypto financial systems by dedicating capital – similar to maintaining capital reserves dedicated to stability -- towards validating transactions in the emerging economy



ICO Process and Token Engineering

The ICO process is like the entire venture to IPO lifecycle, compressed into a 12 month process, without a product or market traction, and with hostile financial service providers





What started out as a cypherpunk's ideal bootstrapping method has become a pay-to-play minefield

Crypto Law Firm Cost

Phase 1

**\$70-100K
with \$25K down**

- Assistance on White Paper
- Implementation plan
- Disclaimer, offering restriction language for marketing materials/website
- Regulatory analysis and structuring paper

Phase 2

**\$300-600K
or 1% raise**

- Advice on process
- Full legal documentation
- Prospectus if needed
- No tax advice or US investors

ICO Platform Cost

**“Basic” ICO Launch
BTC 40 + 3% raise
~ \$200K-\$1 Million**

- Technology
- Legal
- Business Consulting
- Marketing Consulting

**Marketing Execution
BTC 40 + 1.5% raise
~ \$200-\$500K**

- Monthly PR campaign
- Growth hacking package
- Bounties allocation not included

**Positive ICO Rating
\$1,500 for
4 “expert” reviews**

Liquidity

**Crypto Exchange Launch
\$1-3 Million**

- More popular tokens will be listed based on community demand
- Many tokens can be traded on decentralized exchanges, but liquidity is poor
- Post-ICO proceeds are needed in cash to pay the exorbitant fees of advisory firms
- Even established currencies like XRP wanted to pay for liquidity at Coinbase and Gemini

Compared to Traditional Exchanges (Nasdaq/NYSE)


**\$150-500K
ongoing up to \$500k**



Token offering allocations may look like venture cap tables, but are closer conceptually to a use of funds schedule

- While there are similarities between a venture-based company capital table and an ICO, these are only analogies:
 - Utility tokens are not equities and are not dilutive to other equity holdings, seen by some as “free money”
 - The ICO reflects the use of funds on marketing, via partnership, advisor and bounty budgets, which is notable
 - ICO advisors are often recruited as credibility anchors for a short term fund-raising event rather than long term strategy
- Most tokens claim to have a non-deflationary monetary policy, i.e., no more tokens will be issued after the generation event, which makes the comparison to a “final” pre-IPO cap table relevant
- Reserves and centralization of control over large token holdings is important given issues of liquidity and market manipulation

ICO Allocations vs. Cap Table in Venture Capital



A challenge to selecting the right jurisdiction is finding a functional, regulated bank that accepts crypto proceeds

Banking for Crypto Proceeds

 fidor BANK Über Fidor Bank ▾ Privatkunden ▾ Geschäftskunden ▾ FinanceBay As-A-Service ▾ Karriere

A corporate account, that also understands Cryptocurrency

Enabling Cryptocurrency Business

Silvergate Continues to Bank Innovative Cryptocurrency Companies

June 05, 2017

There are a growing number of solid companies that deal in cryptocurrencies and they need banking services

 BANK FRICK Professional clients Private clients UK Branch About Bank Frick

[Home](#) > [About Bank Frick](#) > News

Bank Frick allows direct investments in leading cryptocurrencies


28. Feb. 2018

Bank Frick is the first financial institution in Liechtenstein to offer the trading of five leading cryptocurrencies and secure safekeeping via offline storage. Trading takes place within the fully regulated framework of the Bank's processes. The offering is aimed at professional market participants and financial intermediaries.

- Correct legal structure and a friendly jurisdiction is imperative for projects
- Taxation complexities may require the setup of a foundation in a friendly jurisdiction – something that happened in the Crypto Valley in Zug, Switzerland in 2017, but is now more difficult to do
- Since ICOs raise money from the crowd across the globe in both public and private sales, banking the proceeds is a challenge if the project did not do appropriate KYC/ AML
- Traditional banks, like Citi and Bank of America, have been understandably reticent to engage in this business line, even cutting credit to retail customers buying Bitcoin
- Some players like Fidor, Bank Frick, and Silvergate have emerged to satisfy demand for corporate banking services in jurisdictions like Lichtenstein, Luxembourg, Gibraltar and Malta




What does the token resemble during this journey?



No wonder it's difficult to regulate!


Designing economics of a token requires modeling participant behavior inside the new network ...



- In designing the economics of a token, understand how many end points the token is meant to hit, and how it travels between them: (1) does it circulate between participants within an economy, (2) is it exchanged between two or more parties in pre-defined roles, (3) or is it only paid into a service and then destroyed
- Another framing for this question is where the token can be used, and for how many use-cases: (1) some utility tokens can only be used in one place for one service, (2) protocol tokens can be used to power many use cases within a single or several protocol layers, (3) cryptocurrency are meant to support economic activity within digital and physical economies, (4) and some currencies like the dollar are universally used across all economies



... as well as the full external context of a project






Example of token segments by internal and external factors

Technical Layer	Purpose	Underlying Value	Utility	Legal Status*
Blockchain-Native Tokens <p>Description: A token that is implemented on the protocol-level of a blockchain</p> <p>Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Critical to operate the blockchain Integral component of the blockchain's consensus mechanism Part of the blockchain's incentive mechanism for block validators/other nodes <p>Examples: BTC (Bitcoin), ETH (Ether), STEEM (Steem, Steem)</p>	Cryptocurrencies <p>Description: A token that is intended to be a "pure" cryptocurrency</p> <p>Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intended as a global medium of exchange Functions as a store of value <p>Examples: BTC (Bitcoin), ZEC (Zcash), KIN (Kin, Kik)</p>	Asset-backed Tokens <p>Description: A token that functions as a claim on an underlying asset</p> <p>Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows trading via IOUs without actually having to move the underlying asset The issuer is responsible to hold the underlying asset Introduces counterparty risk <p>Examples: USDT (Tether USD, Tether), GOLD (GOLD, GoldMint), Ripple IOUs (Ripple)</p>	Usage Tokens <p>Description: A token that provides access to a digital service, similar to a paid API key</p> <p>Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grants holders access to exclusive functionality of the service <p>Examples: BTC (Bitcoin), STX (Stacks, Blockstack)</p>	Utility Tokens <p>Description: A token offering owners clearly defined utility within a network or (decentralized) application</p> <p>Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Closely tied to the functionality of the issuing network or application Internal network/app currency but not necessarily attempting to be a currency Grants owners the right to actively contribute to the system vs. passive investor role Avoids security-like features <p>Examples: GNO (Gnosis), STEEM (Steem)</p>
Non-native Protocol Tokens <p>Description: A token that is implemented in a cryptoeconomic protocol on top of a blockchain</p> <p>Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integral component of the protocol's consensus mechanism Part of the protocol's incentive mechanism for nodes Tracked on an underlying blockchain to which it is not integral (e.g. ERC20 Tokens on Ethereum) <p>Examples: REP (Decentralized Oracle Protocol, Augur)</p>	Network Tokens <p>Description: A token that is primarily intended to be used within a specific system (e.g. network, application)</p> <p>Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tokens have functionality within the issuers system Not intended as a general cryptocurrency <p>Examples: GNO (Gnosis), STX (Stacks, Blockstack)</p>	Network Value Tokens <p>Description: A token that is tied to the value and development of a network</p> <p>Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tied to the value generated and exchanged on the network (e.g. transaction fee volume) Closely intertwined with key interactions of network participants <p>Examples: ETH (Ether, Ethereum) STEEM (Steem)</p>	Work Tokens <p>Description: A token that provides the right to contribute to a system</p> <p>Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Owning Tokens is the precondition for contributing to the system Contributions are either incentivized with a rewards system or holders get utility from the system/decentralized organization <p>Examples: REP (Reputation, Augur), MKR (Maker, Maker DAO)</p>	Security Tokens <p>Description: A token that behaves like a security</p> <p>Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Showcases security-like features, e.g. voting on decisions regarding the issuing entity, dividends, or profit shares Holders are regarded as owners Little or insufficient utility <p>Examples: SPICE (SPICE VC), Bitwala (tba)</p>
(d)App Tokens <p>Description: A token that is implemented on the application-level on top of a blockchain (and potentially protocol)</p> <p>Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integrated within the application Part of the app's incentive mechanism for nodes and/or users Tracked on an underlying blockchain to which it is not integral (e.g. ERC20 Tokens on Ethereum) <p>Examples: WIZ (Wisdom, Gnosis), SAFE (Safecoin, SAFE Network)</p>	Investment Tokens <p>Description: A token that is primarily intended as a way to passively invest in the issuing entity or underlying asset</p> <p>Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promises owners a share of asset value or in (future) success of the issuing entity (e.g. dividends, profit-shares) No or little significant functionality <p>Examples: Neufund Equity Tokens (Neufund), DGX (Digix Gold, DigixDAO)</p>	Share-like Tokens <p>Description: A token with share-like properties</p> <p>Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The issuer promises token owners a share in the success of the issuing entity (e.g. dividends, profit-shares) May or may not come with voting-rights Mostly on no/weak legal basis <p>Examples: DGD (DigixDAO), LKK (Lykke) Likely to be classified as a security token</p>	Hybrid Tokens <p>Description: A token featuring traits of both usage and work tokens</p> <p>Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grants access to system functionalities Allows owners to contribute to the system <p>Examples: ETH (Ether, Ethereum, after Casper), DASH (Dash)</p>	Cryptocurrencies <p>Description: A token that is a pure cryptocurrency</p> <p>Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acts as a store of value and medium of exchange Not emitted by a central authority against which owners have claims <p>In Germany (according to BaFin):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> currently not regarded as lawful, functional currency not regulated by e-money laws <p>Examples: BTC (Bitcoin), ZEC (Zcash), LTC (Litecoin)</p>


*details dependent on respective jurisdiction

Various Taxonomies have emerged to categorize projects, with emerging common themes





Our taxonomy combines these frameworks into the broadest view of architecture in the space





The first category most resembles currencies, which we call monetary instruments

Unified Token Taxonomy




Crypto Asset

- Monetary instruments are the payment unit of crypto economic activity, with (1) coins like BTC attempting to be used everywhere for all use-cases, and (2) protocol tokens like ETH attempting to be used generally within its protocol
- We further break out coins by their monetary policy: (1) floating currencies like BTC or LTC experience volatility relative to other crypto assets and fiat; (2) fixed currencies like USDT or Basis/Basecoin attempt to minimize volatility through pegging, market operations, or inflation and may require reserves of fiat and crypto; (3) asset-backed coins, like tokenized diamonds currency CEDEX or the Royal Mint's gold-backed RMG
- Note that asset-backed coins look quite similar to tokenized assets. We do, however, see a distinction between a currency with physical reserves backing the value, and a physical asset that has been split into shares and sold as an investment
- While no meaningful Central Bank / fiat coins have yet been launched, both intellectual exercises as well as various internal pilots have been performed across the world; a Bank of England study from 2016 suggested that GDP would rise by 3% if 30% of GDP was digitized in this manner

The second category parses the Utility tokens that have come from ICOs and smart contracts


Unified Token Taxonomy



- We retain the word “utility” in the title, while some industry participants would prefer to frame them as consumption tokens that power smart contract platforms. “Utility” correctly points out generalized functionality, i.e., something being useful, and is not limited to consumer or enterprise use cases but generally how software is powered when interactions provide surplus and are valuable
- The first split is between (1) tokens used in applications on public, decentralized networks, like Filecoin and (2) tokens or units of account used in applications on private, enterprise networks, like the UBS Utility Settlement Coin project, which we believe in the long run will be interoperable
- Within decentralized applications, we leverage the thinking of the Brooklyn project, which splits out token features as definitional. Rights enabled by tokens include (1) ownership of internal and external objects (e.g., Identity, Cryptokitties), (2) economic participation (e.g., Binance coupons), and (3) the ability to perform activities, like doing work for rewards or purchasing a license to use a software. The subcategories here are likely to multiply as projects innovate new models.
- Economic rights and ownership of digital objects have attributes of financial instruments, but require more detailed analysis as to particular features in order to qualify as such



The third category bundles together existing and emerging financial instruments, delivered via blockchains




- The category of financial instrument primarily refers to the coming wave of security tokens, which are akin to equity or real estate crowdfunding sitting on more modern, decentralized infrastructure. These assets have an established and clear role relative to capital tables of corporate entities.
- We expect a convergence of enterprise and public blockchains as consortia digitize existing capital markets, insurance and asset management, and thereafter become interested in crypto liquidity
- Economic participation in decentralized applications (e.g., DAO, profit sharing, referrals) will inadvertently qualify as a financial instrument even if not explicit in the capital structure
- We include digital assets, such as tokenized commodities (e.g., a tokenized share of a painting) and digital collectibles (e.g., Cryptokitties), as a financial instrument when they function as a store of value and are legally structured as to become a regulated commodity

For public token projects, investor relations and attempts at monetary policy join early stage technology development

Token Mechanisms as Price Management

- After a decentralized project achieves all the previously described milestones, including token engineering and exchange listing, investor relations and token price management become a key part of the process
- Arguably, this is not a great use of time for an early stage technology development team and can be highly distracting, but is necessary given that token liquidity literally powers many of the proposed applications
- As an example, see the disconnect between code commits for the Brave Browser (useful) and the price of the token impacted by the general crypto capital markets (irrelevant)
- Economic mechanisms such as Burning, Staking, or creating digital collectibles are meant to improve the performance of a crypto asset by improving its function as a store of value, but may inadvertently handicap the use of the token as a medium of exchange


Price of BAT token vs Commits to Code Repositories





Burning mechanic meant to reduce supply, increase price

Token lifecycle map with burning mechanism




Overview

- Token “burning” is the act of sending a token to an eater address – a digital wallet for which there is no private key
- The reasons for burning include
 - Destroying unsold tokens (e.g., Neblio ICO)
 - Reduction of token supply to cause price appreciation
 - Proof-Of-Burn (PoB) consensus algorithm which requires miners to burn coins to earn mining rights
- The action can be akin to traditional share buy backs, since a company is spending its Treasury Tokens on giving economics back to shareholders, but the connection with price appreciation is far more tenuous
- Binance, for example, uses 20% of their profits each quarter to buy back its native coin BNB from the market in order to “burn” them



Staking mechanic intends to encourage holding and committing coins, thereby reducing supply, increasing price

Example of Staking Mechanism



Overview

- Staking is the act of buying and holding (or committing) crypto assets for a fixed period of time, potentially earning an economic return, similar to a fixed deposit
- Proof-of-Stake (PoS) is a protocol consensus mechanism which requires participants to stake their assets in order to validate blocks on the network (e.g., Dash, NEO, Lisk, PIVX). Rewards are paid out to holders or “validators” of the coin based on the length of time and quantity of the coin held, as opposed to computational resource energy consumption used in Bitcoin’s Proof-of-Work. Other permutations, like Delegated Proof of Stake, use such assets to elect validator parties.
- Each validator locks up their coin for the period of their respective stake, meaning this becomes an illiquid position which reduces available trading supply and potentially increases price



Collectibles designed to be scarce and drive purchases, which increase value of monetary instrument and asset

- Each crypto collectible is a scarce blockchain-recorded digital object, most of which are being created within the gaming category
- Crypto Kitties is the most famous such game, having raised \$12 million from investors, at one point taking up 70% of Ethereum transaction capacity, and selling the most expensive cat for over \$100,000 in 12/2017
- Other permutations of digital collectibles have sprouted across several smart contracts platforms, though they have low adoption given a niche user base
- Yet they provide an example of potential value capture similar to art

Current Top Digital Games (07/18)						Most Expensive Digital Cats		
#	Name	Balance	Users 24h	Volume 7d	Tx 7d	Kitty	Date	Amount
1	ETH.TOWN: Moon Factory is Li...	♦ 637.56	25 +25.00%	♦ 111.19	6,604		Dec. 7, 2017, 3:28 a.m.	253.3369 ETH
2	ETHERBOTS	♦ 490.72	1 -66.67%	♦ 0.50	512		7:41 p.m.	247.0000 ETH
3	CryptoKitties	♦ 337.26	108 -0.92%	♦ 157.43	15,485			
4	Etheremon	♦ 177.51	19 +35.71%	♦ 7.72	5,078			
5	CSC - Crypto Space Commander	♦ 173.21	4 -20.00%	♦ 4.94	1,139		Dec. 2, 2017, 8:32 p.m.	246.9258 ETH
6	ETHERCRAFT	♦ 167.15	1 —	♦ 0.15	348		Dec. 8, 2017, 9:31 a.m.	237.5460 ETH
7	Ether Tulips	♦ 93.80	0 —	♦ 0.00	4		Dec. 8, 2017, 9:34 a.m.	225.0000 ETH
8	Ether Goo - Idle Game	♦ 89.71	31 +3.33%	♦ 1.69	5,065		Dec. 5, 2017, 4:45 p.m.	222.0000 ETH
9	MegaCryptoPolis	♦ 67.08	38 -2.56%	♦ 219.45	2,550			
10	Cryptocup	♦ 56.49	3 -25.00%	♦ 2.15	175			

Regulatory, Legal and Tax Considerations

The following section reflects input from global law firm Latham & Watkins.

Latham & Watkins' FinTech lawyers help clients around the globe navigate the critical and ever-changing business, legal and regulatory issues associated with the technological disruption of financial services. Latham mobilizes a cross-disciplinary and global team with deep experience in regulation and technology to serve the full spectrum of the FinTech ecosystem on any aspect of a FinTech matter; whether it be the regulatory implications of establishing a new crypto-asset, adopting a new technology or system, or the considerations of investing in, or acquiring, a FinTech company. To find out more, or for more information, please contact Stuart Davis (stuart.davis@lw.com) or Sam Maxson (sam.maxson@lw.com).

Disclaimer

The material contained in this document has been prepared for information purposes only. It should not be construed as legal or tax advice. You are advised to seek your own legal and tax advice accordingly.

While we have taken steps to ensure that the information in this document is reliable and up-to-date as at the date of publication, we make no representation that it is accurate or complete. Nor do we assume any responsibility to update the contents of this document following publication.


This document is not a solicitation for legal work under the laws of any jurisdiction in which Latham lawyers are not authorized to practice.

Latham & Watkins operates worldwide as a limited liability partnership organized under the laws of the State of Delaware (USA) with affiliated limited liability partnerships conducting the practice in France, Italy, Singapore, and the United Kingdom and as affiliated partnerships conducting the practice in Hong Kong and Japan. Latham & Watkins operates in South Korea as a Foreign Legal Consultant Office. Latham & Watkins works in cooperation with the Law Office of Salman M. Al-Sudairi in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Under New York's Code of Professional Responsibility, portions of this communication contain attorney advertising. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome. Results depend upon a variety of factors unique to each representation. Please direct all inquiries regarding our conduct under New York's Disciplinary Rules to Latham & Watkins LLP, 885 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10022-4834, Phone: +1.212.906.1200. © Copyright 2018 Latham & Watkins. All Rights Reserved.

Introduction


- **Regulators generally use a technology-neutral approach, focusing on human business activities and not developments in hardware / software**
 - Most jurisdictions around the globe take a technology-neutral approach to financial regulation, although there are some exceptions
 - This means they typically do not regulate specific technologies, but rather the activities which are carried out using those technologies
 - Distributed ledger technology (DLT) and blockchain are no different and where they are employed to conduct financial services activities it is likely that some or all of those activities may be regulated under the laws of one or more jurisdictions
- **A distinction between first generation cryptocurrencies and second generation coins and tokens can be instructive, but not dispositive**
 - In a number of jurisdictions, a general distinction can be drawn between:
 - First generation cryptocurrencies (e.g. BTC / ETH), which are more likely to be unregulated (or, if they would have been regulated on issuance, are no longer regulated) and
 - Second generation coins / tokens (e.g. those built on the ERC-20 protocol) that provide holders with some rights (e.g. the right to receive a good or service, or some form of debt / equity participation right in the issuer), which may be regulated depending on their characteristics
 - However, this general distinction is no substitute for analyzing whether a particular cryptocurrency or crypto-asset is subject to regulation under the laws of the relevant jurisdiction as the regulatory treatment of cryptocurrencies and crypto-assets is fragmented across jurisdictions
 - We use the term crypto-asset broadly to cover both first generation crypto currencies and second generation coins / tokens, unless stated otherwise
 - Note that airdrops may also fall within the scope of regulation and should still be considered in line with the regulatory regime of the relevant jurisdictions

Key Issues – Securities Law




- Across jurisdictions there are typically four approaches to applying securities laws to crypto-assets
 1. Active prohibition (e.g. China, South Korea)
 2. Not prohibited, but securities laws interpreted broadly to cover the majority of crypto-assets (e.g. US)
 3. Not prohibited, but securities laws interpreted neutrally (e.g. UK, France, Hong Kong, Singapore)
 4. Specific licensing regimes / regulatory guidelines relating to crypto-assets (e.g. Japan, Switzerland, Malta, Gibraltar).
- If a crypto-asset is classified as a security some of the typical regulatory consequences which may flow are:
 - A public offer of the crypto-asset would have to be run in compliance with requirements governing the offering and distribution of securities (such as the requirement to produce an approved prospectus / offering memorandum) unless an exemption applies. Typically, assessing whether an exemption applies requires analysis of the exemptions available in the jurisdiction of the issuer as well as the jurisdictions containing the target market for the offer.
 - There are also likely to be restrictions on secondary market trading of the crypto-asset (e.g. lock-up periods) as well as requirements that the crypto-asset is only tradable on a regulated trading platform.
 - In addition, intermediary services provided in relation to the crypto-asset (e.g. broker-dealer, custody activities) are also likely to be regulated.

Key Issues – Money Transmission and Derivatives




- The value of some crypto-assets (sometimes called “stablecoins”, e.g. Tether, Basis) is pegged to the value of a fiat currency, using a variety of different mechanisms (e.g. fiat collateralization, seigniorage algorithms)
- As a general rule of thumb, centrally-issued fiat currency pegged coins will be treated as a form of electronic money / pre-paid or stored value instrument which may require the issuer to be licensed / registered. Intermediaries providing payment / transmission services in relation to such instruments may also need to be licensed / registered. Typically, this is not the case with non-pegged cryptocurrencies.
- Note that in some jurisdictions it may also still be necessary to assess whether centrally-issued fiat currency pegged coins might be classified as securities
- Other kinds of stablecoin/asset-backed coins are pegged to the value of underlying assets or indices which are not currencies (e.g. gold or diamonds)
- These kinds of stablecoins may be classified as derivatives in certain jurisdictions. Stablecoins which employ seigniorage algorithms (or similar mechanisms) may also be classified as derivatives in certain jurisdictions, depending on their precise structure
- Some of the typical regulatory consequences which may flow from classification as a derivative are:
 - Issuer may be required to be licensed / registered
 - There may be restrictions on the sale of the instrument to certain types of counterparty (e.g. retail)
 - Other regimes may apply (e.g. EMIR in the EU / Dodd-Frank in the US).

Key Issues – Fund Regulation



- Discretionary management of a portfolio of crypto-assets typically requires the manager to be licenced in the jurisdiction in which it is based
- Substantive legal documentation is typically required to govern the formation and membership of the fund
- There may also be restrictions on the types of investor the fund may be marketed to (e.g. retail), as well as restrictions on the ability to market the fund into certain jurisdictions (e.g. the AIFMD marketing regime in the EU)
- Some jurisdictions may require the appointment of a licenced depository as well as pre-subscription disclosures and post-subscription investor information requirements (e.g. statements and net asset value (NAV) calculations)
- Note the potential difficulties in calculating the NAV in relation to a fund holding ICO tokens (e.g. how do you calculate the value of a token in an early stage company, particularly if it is not traded on an exchange?)

Key Issues – Consumer protection & legal considerations



- Even if a crypto-asset is otherwise “unregulated” in a given jurisdiction, any offer or sale of the crypto-asset is still likely to be subject to consumer protection requirements applicable in the jurisdiction of the purchaser (note that these may also apply to regulated offerings, too)
- Typical consumer protection requirements include:
 - Requirements to provide full disclosures to consumers and ensure that communications are clear, fair and not misleading
 - Potential restrictions on the method of sale of the tokens (e.g. requirements for disclaimers, cooling-off periods, ongoing post-transactional requirements)
- In any event, issuers should always have regard to general legal considerations (e.g. fundamental legal principles around fraud and misrepresentation) and ensure that they are fully compliant with AML / KYC and applicable sanctions regimes, both in relation to the sale of crypto-assets as well as the ongoing operation of the platform they are establishing
- Marketing materials and whitepapers should be carefully reviewed against these principles



From a strategy perspective, global regulatory approaches follow three directions according to role in global economy

Crypto Delaware



- Develop the most permissive and attractive regulatory environment for innovation and spur economic activity from startups
- Some jurisdictions offering a tailored approach to consumer protection
- **Examples: Gibraltar, Malta, Switzerland**

Sovereign Technology Sword



- See technology and economic competition as a national mandate, which can be controlled and directed with sovereign power and national investment
- Generally, decentralized anonymous networks are antithetical to this type of actor
- **Examples: China, Russia**


Consumer Protection Shield



- Put existing regulation and law first, preferring to leverage existing frameworks that have worked to generate economic prosperity
- Generally, less interested in innovation outside regulated bounds in favor of maintaining a sound economic system
- **Examples: United States, United Kingdom**



Global Crypto Temperature at a Glance



State of Regulation: United States of America

Outlook

MIXED

Key Regulators

- **Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC)**
- **Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC)**
- **Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC)**
- **50 state regulators**

- US financial regulation operates at both a federal and state level
- At the federal level, it must be determined whether the crypto-asset is a security regulated by the SEC or a commodity regulated by the CFTC
- At the state level, the regulatory approach to crypto-assets has been inconsistent. Certain states (e.g. New York) require a specific licence for cryptocurrency related activities, whereas others do not.
- If the crypto-asset is not a security it will be regulated as a commodity. Generally, spot market transactions in commodities are not regulated, aside from anti-fraud enforcement authority. However, a derivative based on the crypto-asset (such as a forward contract) will be regulated as a swap under CFTC regulations.
- Other banking, payments and investment advisor regulation may apply to the companies making or selling crypto-assets. From the AML perspective, cryptocurrency exchanges and administrators of centralized cryptocurrency are regulated by FinCEN as Money Service Businesses, while mere users of cryptocurrency are not.

Status of Crypto Assets

- Crypto-assets must be assessed on a case-by-case basis to determine whether they are subject to financial regulation. First, to determine whether the asset is a security, the *Howey* test for investment contracts is applied. If the crypto-asset is a security then the US securities laws apply at both a federal and state level in relation to any purchase or sale of the assets involving US persons, within the US or from outside the US. It is worth noting that US securities law has significant potential extra-territorial reach, such that merely marketing of ICOs via websites which are accessible by US persons may be enough to trigger application of US securities laws.
- For the securities analysis, the main inquiry is whether a person is investing money in a common enterprise and expects profits from third party efforts.
- BTC and ETH have been expressly designated as commodities by the CFTC and the SEC has indicated that it does not view either to be a security

Recent Developments

- In June 2018, Director of the SEC's Division of Corporation Finance William Hinman signalled a way forward for consumer tokens by suggesting that digital assets are likely not securities "where there is no longer any central enterprise being invested in or where the digital asset is sold only to be used to purchase a good or service available through the network on which it was created."

State of Regulation: United Kingdom

Outlook

NEUTRAL

Key Regulators

- Prudential Regulation Authority (PRA)
- Financial Conduct Authority (FCA)

Status of Crypto Assets

- Crypto-assets must be assessed on a case-by-case basis to determine whether they are subject to financial regulation
- Cryptocurrencies (e.g. BTC / ETH) are not currently regulated, provided they are not part of other regulated products or services
- Cryptocurrencies are unlikely to be characterized as currency or money for financial regulatory purposes

- The PRA and FCA have continued to take a broadly neutral approach to crypto-assets, placing the onus on market participants to assess for themselves whether or not crypto-assets fall within the scope of existing UK financial regulation
- For crypto-assets which constitute regulated investments in the UK, market participants involved with the offer, promotion, issue, trading, settlement and custody of those investments will need to consider UK licensing, conduct of business and AML / KYC requirements. Securities offering documentation (e.g. offering memorandum) and marketing requirements are also likely to apply to offerings of such investments.
- The principal risks associated with crypto-assets in the eyes of the PRA and FCA are: (1) financial crime (money laundering and terrorist financing), (2) fraud and manipulation / consumer detriment, (3) price volatility, (4) relative illiquidity, (5) cyber crime

Recent Developments

- In September 2017, the FCA issued a consumer warning on ICOs warning consumers of the risks involved with investing in ICOs and stating that “most ICOs are not regulated by the FCA”
- During June 2018, the PRA and FCA each recently wrote to authorized firms setting out their expectations in relation to the activities of those firms in relation to crypto-assets
- During 2019, EU anti-money laundering legislation will be extended to crypto-exchanges and crypto-wallet providers even where these are not otherwise regulated
- The FCA continues to learn more about crypto-assets through its regulatory sandbox and has recently consulted on the launch of a new global sandbox which would potentially allow firms to run pilots across a number of jurisdictions in a customized regulatory environment, overseen by the FCA and overseas regulators. Over 40% of companies accepted to cohort 4 of the FCA regulatory sandbox are using DLT and a small number of firms will be testing propositions relating to crypto-assets.
- An FCA discussion paper on cryptocurrencies is expected in H2 2018, following participation by the FCA in a crypto-asset taskforce being undertaken in combination with the Bank of England and HM Treasury.

State of Regulation: France

Outlook	Key Regulators	Status of Crypto Assets
NEUTRAL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial markets authority (Autorité des marchés financiers (AMF)) • Prudential control and regulation authority (Autorité de contrôle prudentiel et de régulation (ACPR)) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The regulatory status of crypto-assets must be assessed on a case-by-case basis in order to determine whether they are subject to financial regulation • Cryptocurrencies (e.g. BTC / ETH) are not currently regulated, provided they are not part of other regulated products or services (e.g. cryptocurrency CFDs / payment services / regulated intermediaries activities in connection with the marketing of assets putting forward the possibility of a direct or indirect financial return or a similar economic effect). • Cryptocurrencies are unlikely to be characterized as currency or money for financial regulatory purposes; French consumer law rules are likely to apply to the marketing and sale of crypto-assets.
		<p style="text-align: center;">Recent Developments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In January 2018, the Economy Minister Bruno Le Maire created a working group headed by former central bank official Jean-Pierre Landau with the purpose of establishing a crypto-assets regulatory framework. • In February 2018, the AMF published an analysis concluding that derivative contracts relating to crypto-assets may be characterized as regulated financial contracts. On this basis, the AMF and the ACPR have jointly decided to publish a blacklist of websites which propose, in France, derivative products relating to crypto-assets without being authorized to do so. • The AMF launched a public consultation from October 2017 until December 2017 on crypto-assets. In February 2018, following the consultation, the AMF indicated that it had decided to work on creation of a specific legal framework for ICOs. This framework should encompass all types of ICOs and provide for sufficient guarantees for investors, with a focus on money laundering risk and investor protection on the secondary market. The AMF contemplates the involvement of independent experts in connection with ICOs. • In June 2018, the Chairman of the AMF confirmed that the AMF is in favour of a specific legal framework for crypto-assets consisting of the implementation of an AMF "label" granted on a voluntary basis and of a regulatory framework for crypto-assets trading platforms having common features with the status of electronic money and payment services institutions and financial securities trading platforms.

State of Regulation: Germany

Outlook	Key Regulators	Status of Crypto Assets
NEUTRAL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Federal Financial Supervisory Authority (BaFin) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Crypto-assets must be assessed on a case-by-case basis in order to determine whether they are subject to German financial regulatory rules. Specific crypto-assets can be presented to BaFin in order to obtain an assessment of their regulatory status. BaFin has stated that certain cryptocurrencies (e.g. BTC / ETH) constitute “units of account” which are regulated financial instruments under German law. BaFin has also stated that cryptocurrencies may be subject to e-money regulations if (contrary to the case of, e.g. BTC) there is a specific issuer and the cryptocurrency represents a claim on this issuer.
		<p style="text-align: center;">Recent Developments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In November 2017, BaFin issued a consumer warning on ICOs warning consumers of the risks involved with investing in ICOs and stating that “undertakings and persons that arrange the acquisition of tokens, sell or purchase tokens on a commercial basis, or operate secondary market platforms on which tokens are traded are generally required to obtain authorisation from BaFin in advance”. In 2017, BaFin reportedly initiated 13 investigations regarding unauthorized financial services in connection with token offerings. In four of those cases winding-down of the activities was ordered. In February 2018, BaFin released an advisory letter on the classification of tokens as regulated financial instruments, stressing that the general regulatory rules apply. The advisory letter only contains very high-level guidance, leaving uncertainties of how securities tokens, utility tokens and currency tokens are to be classified under the general rules. During 2019 or early 2020 EU anti-money laundering legislation extending to crypto-exchanges and crypto-wallet providers even where these are not otherwise regulated is expected to be implemented in Germany.

State of Regulation: Switzerland

Outlook

POSITIVE

Key Regulators

- Swiss Financial Market Supervisory Authority (FINMA)

- Switzerland has generally been seen as an accommodating jurisdiction for crypto-asset activity
- Although no specific law or regulation relating specifically to crypto-assets has been proposed, FINMA has issued regulatory guidelines which clarify its approach when applying existing Swiss financial regulation to crypto-assets
- Broadly, FINMA will focus on the economic function and purpose of the crypto-asset in determining how it should be treated for financial regulatory purposes. The key factors for FINMA are the underlying purpose of the crypto-asset and whether they are already tradeable or transferable.
- FINMA categorises crypto-assets into three types, but hybrid forms are possible:
 1. “Payment tokens are synonymous with cryptocurrencies and have no further functions or links to other development projects. Tokens may in some cases only develop the necessary functionality and become accepted as a means of payment over a period of time.”
 2. “Utility tokens are tokens which are intended to provide digital access to an application or service.”
 3. “Asset tokens represent assets such as participations in real physical underlyings, companies, or earnings streams, or an entitlement to dividends or interest payments. In terms of their economic function, the tokens are analogous to equities, bonds or derivatives.”

Status of Crypto Assets

- Crypto-assets must be assessed on a case-by-case basis to determine whether they are subject to financial regulation
- According to the FINMA guidance ICOs will be regulated by FINMA as follows:
 1. “Payment ICOs: For ICOs where the token is intended to function as a means of payment and can already be transferred, FINMA will require compliance with anti-money laundering regulations. FINMA will not, however, treat such tokens as securities.”
 2. “Utility ICOs: These tokens do not qualify as securities only if their sole purpose is to confer digital access rights to an application or service and if the utility token can already be used in this way at the point of issue. If a utility token functions solely or partially as an investment in economic terms, FINMA will treat such tokens as securities (i.e. in the same way as asset tokens).”
 3. “Asset ICOs: FINMA regards asset tokens as securities, which means that there are securities law requirements for trading in such tokens, as well as civil law requirements under the Swiss Code of Obligations (e.g. prospectus requirements).”

State of Regulation: Russia

Outlook	Key Regulators	Status of Crypto Assets	Recent Developments
MIXED	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Bank of Russia (BoR)• Russian Finance Ministry (RFM)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Crypto-assets, including tokens and cryptocurrencies (e.g. BTC / ETH), are not currently defined under Russian legislation and therefore are not regulated• Taking into account the wording of the existing draft laws and explanatory notes thereto, crypto-assets are not treated as financial instruments	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There has been a mixed regulatory approach to crypto-assets in Russia• Historically, the BoR has been hostile to cryptocurrencies stating that exchanging cryptocurrencies for goods, services or fiat currency may constitute a “questionable transaction” for the purposes of Russian anti-money laundering legislation. A ban was also imposed on 40 websites offering information about cryptocurrencies and crypto-exchanges in May 2017, but later overturned in early 2018• However, draft legislation has been proposed on “digital rights”, “digital financial assets” and “investment platforms” which would provide an explicit legal and regulatory framework for crypto-assets in Russia	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Draft legislation is currently being considered by the Russian parliament which would provide an explicit legal and regulatory framework for crypto-assets, in particular:<ul style="list-style-type: none">- recognition and definition of a transferrable “digital right”- recognition and definition of a “token”- definition of “investment platforms” (informational systems used for fundraising)- registration of investment platforms with the BoR and requirements to such investment platforms (including a minimum capital requirement of Rub 5m)- governance requirements for investment platforms- registration requirements for operators of investment platforms- requirements on the entities raising funds via investment platforms- requirements relating to the conduct of token offerings- licensing requirements for operators of crypto-fiat exchanges- reserved powers for the BoR and RFM to issue further regulations specifying a list of transactions which may be carried out with tokens, the permitted terms of such transactions, the maximum amount of investments made by a non-qualified investor within the same issuance of tokens and the maximum amount of investment made by a non-qualified investor through different investment platforms during one year, etc.	

State of Regulation: China

Outlook	Key Regulators
NEGATIVE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People's Bank of China (PBC) and other regulators

Status of Crypto Assets

- Trading of crypto-assets and ICOs in China is effectively illegal

Recent Developments

- In September 2017, PBOC, CSRC, the China Insurance Regulatory Commission, and other regulators issued a joint statement announcing a ban on all ICOs.
- In February 2018, it was reported that China may ban access to foreign websites related to ICOs and also access to foreign platforms related to cryptocurrency trading.

Hong Kong

Outlook	Key Regulators
NEUTRAL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Securities and Futures Commission (SFC) • Hong Kong Monetary Authority (HKMA)

Status of Crypto Assets

- Crypto-assets must be assessed on a case-by-case basis in order to determine whether they are subject to financial regulation (e.g. whether they are "securities").
- Cryptocurrencies (e.g. BTC / ETH) are not currently regulated, provided they are not part of other regulated products or services

- On 19 March 2018, the SFC took action against Black Cell Technology Limited ("Black Cell") in respect of its ICO to the Hong Kong public. This is the first regulatory action taken by the SFC against a cryptocurrency issuer. Black Cell, which is a public company incorporated in Hong Kong, promoted digital tokens called KROPS through a website which is accessible by the Hong Kong public, pitching that the ICO proceeds would be used to fund the development of a mobile application wherein one can have access to every food source in the world, and that holders of the tokens would be eligible to redeem equity shares of Black Cell. The SFC considered such arrangement may constitute a "collective investment scheme", and therefore a "security", under the SFO and instructed Black Cell to refund purchase monies to purchasers.
- It appears that the SFC is uncomfortable that utility tokens are being used for investment but are not regulated like other investment products. The SFC has expressed the view in a private regulatory forum that these tokens should also be subject to SFC regulation, although the legal basis for this view is unclear.

State of Regulation: Singapore

Outlook	Key Regulators	Status of Crypto Assets
NEUTRAL	Monetary Authority of Singapore (MAS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Crypto-assets must be assessed on a case-by-case basis in order to determine whether they are subject to financial regulation (e.g. whether they are “securities” or “collective investment schemes”).Cryptocurrencies (e.g. BTC / ETH) are not currently regulated, provided they are not part of other regulated products or services
<p>Recent Developments</p> 		<ul style="list-style-type: none">On 22 May 2018, the MAS consulted on expanding the tiers of recognized market operators so that digital assets can be traded with certain recognized market operatorsOn 24 May 2018, the MAS censured 8 cryptocurrency exchanges and one ICO issuer none of whom have been named. The ICO issuer was required to refund all monies raised from any Singapore investor and cease making any offering in Singapore.

State of Regulation: Japan

Outlook	Key Regulators	Status of Crypto Assets
MIXED	• Financial Services Agency (FSA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Crypto-assets must be assessed on a case-by-case basis in order to determine whether they are subject to financial regulation• Providing Japanese residents with cryptocurrency-related exchange or broker-dealer services (e.g. BTC / ETH) requires a Japanese cryptocurrency exchange license• Generally crypto-assets are deemed “cryptocurrencies” by the Japan FSA and trigger Japanese cryptocurrency license obligations from their initial offering• To obtain a cryptocurrency exchange license, a person must, among other things: (1) have a well-functioning corporate governance system, (2) properly segregate client assets, (3) demonstrate adequate system security, (4) comply with AML / KYC requirements, (5) be periodically audited by external auditors• If token holders are entitled to a distribution of profits or assets that are generated from or related to the issuer’s business, such tokens may be deemed “securities” depending on the form of consideration paid by the token holders to the issuer
<p>Recent Developments</p> 		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• On 1 April 2017, cryptocurrencies were deemed to be a “legal form of payment”• The Japan Virtual Currency Exchange Industry Association, a self-regulatory body (composed of registered crypto-exchanges) with the power to create rules for cryptocurrency exchanges, was launched in April 2018

State of Regulation: South Korea

Outlook	Key Regulators	Status of Crypto Assets	Recent Developments
MIXED	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Financial Services Commission (FSC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Crypto-assets must be assessed on a case-by-case basis to determine whether they are subject to financial regulation.However, in general, ICOs are still purportedly prohibited by the FSC.	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none">On 30 January 2018, a ban was imposed on the use of anonymous accounts to conduct transactions in cryptocurrenciesOn 30 May 2018, the Supreme Court overturned the lower court's decision in September 2017 and recognized the legal status of cryptocurrency as it is traded on an exchange. Accordingly, the Bitcoins derived as crime proceeds are subject to confiscation.On 31 May 2018, FSC responded to the Supreme Court's ruling, clarifying that the cryptocurrencies are not financial assets and there is no change in the regulation.New regulations were recently issued which provide for a new regulatory framework for cryptocurrencies, imposing AML and KYC requirements on cryptocurrency exchanges.

State of Regulation: Gibraltar

Outlook	Key Regulators	Status of Crypto Assets
POSITIVE	<p>Gibraltar Financial Services Commission (GFSC)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Crypto-assets must be assessed on a case-by-case basis in order to determine whether they are subject to financial regulation. This will remain the case even once the proposed token sale regulations come into effect as these are designed to govern only tokens which are not securities under existing securities legislation Even if a crypto-asset does not fall within the scope of existing financial regulation in Gibraltar or the proposed token the regulations on DLT may still apply to the underlying technology (e.g. platform facilitating the sale of the crypto-assets / the platform which will be developed and operated by the issuer of the crypto-assets)
		<p>Recent Developments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In March 2018, the Government of Gibraltar published a white paper setting out the scope of the proposed token sale regulations. Among other things, the white paper states (1) "The public offering of tokens that constitute securities are already adequately caught by existing securities legislation and do not require further regulation.", (2) "Most often, tokens do not qualify as securities under Gibraltar or EU legislation. In many cases, they represent the advance sale of products that entitle holders to access future networks or consume future services. They are akin to mobile phone companies pre-selling airtime in networks they plan to build using the proceeds of those airtime sales. As such, these tokens represent commercial products (albeit reliant on future availability and utility) and are not caught by existing securities regulation in Gibraltar." According to the white paper, crypto-assets that "function solely as decentralised virtual currency (e.g. Bitcoin) or as central bank-issued digital currency" will be excluded from the limb of the proposed token regulations covering primary market promotion, sale and distribution of tokens, however they will be subject to the other two limbs covering secondary market activities and investment and ancillary services. The white paper states that the last of the three Regulations should be completed by the end of October 2018, suggesting that full implementation of the proposed token sale regime will not be before Q4 2018

State of Regulation: Malta

Outlook

POSITIVE

Key Regulators

- **Malta Financial Services Authority (MFSA)**

- The Government of Malta has proactively sought to introduce legislation providing an explicit legal and regulatory framework for crypto-assets and the technologies underlying them
- The Maltese Parliament is currently considering three bills related to DLT and crypto-assets: i) the Malta Digital Innovation Authority Bill; ii) the Innovative Technology Arrangements and Service Bill; and iii) the Virtual Financial Assets Bill
- In particular, the Virtual Financial Assets Bill proposes the introduction of a bespoke “financial instrument test” for crypto-assets
- To the extent that crypto-assets constitute regulated investments in Malta, market participants involved with the offer, promotion, issue, trading, settlement and custody of those investments will need to consider local licensing, conduct of business and AML / KYC requirements. Securities offering documentation (e.g. offering memorandum) and marketing requirements are also likely to apply to offerings of such investments

Status of Crypto Assets

- Crypto-assets must be assessed on a case-by-case basis in order to determine whether they are subject to financial regulation
- This will remain the case even once the proposed Virtual Financial Assets Act comes into effect, although a bespoke financial instrument test will apply to crypto-assets

Recent Developments

- On 13 April 2018, the MFSA published a consultation paper relating to the bespoke financial instrument test under the Virtual Financial Assets Act
- According to the consultation, the test is likely to be a three-stage test:
 - (1) The first stage would involve a determination whether a crypto-asset is a “virtual token” which would be exempt from regulation under the proposed Virtual Financial Assets Act. The consultation defines a virtual token in terms effectively identical to the concept of a utility token: “Virtual token means a [crypto-asset] that has no utility, value or application outside of the DLT platform on which it was issued and that cannot be exchanged for funds on such platform or with the issuer of such [crypto-asset].”
 - (2) Crypto-assets which are not virtual tokens would then be subject to a second determination as to whether they constitute financial instruments under the EU Markets in Financial Instruments Directive (MiFID) which would be regulated in accordance with the relevant existing provisions of MiFID (as implemented under Maltese law)
 - (3) Only those crypto-assets which are not virtual tokens or MiFID Financial Instruments would be subject to regulation as “Virtual Financial Assets” under the proposed Virtual Financial Assets Act (which proposes, among other things, to impose licensing requirements, ongoing obligations on issuers of Virtual Financial Assets and persons who intend to provide services in relation to Virtual Financial Assets, in each case if the issue or service in question is provided in or from Malta)
- On 4 July 2018, the MFSA published a consultation paper relating to the draft Virtual Financial Assets Regulations to be issued under the proposed Virtual Financial Assets Act

State of Regulation: UAE

Outlook

NEGATIVE

Key Regulators

- **Securities and Commodities Authority (SCA)**

- The SCA (the regulator for “onshore” UAE, i.e., excluding the free zones) has taken a negative regulatory approach to crypto-assets by warning investors against the risks of ICOs and refusing to regulate or recognize ICOs
- The onus appears to be on market participants to assess for themselves whether or not crypto-assets fall within the scope of existing UAE financial regulation
- For crypto-assets which constitute regulated financial products in the UAE, market participants involved in the offer, marketing or promotion of such crypto-assets will need to consider SCA licensing and conduct of business and AML / KYC requirements. Securities offering documentation and marketing requirements will also apply to offerings of such investments.
- The principal risks that the SCA believes investors should be aware of are: (1) lack of regulation of ICOs, (2) fraud, (3) difficulty in verifying foreign laws and regulations to which ICOs not operating in the UAE may be subject, (4) difficulty in recovering invested funds in the event of a collapse of the ICO, (5) price volatility, (6) insufficient liquidity


Status of Crypto Assets

- Crypto-assets are not currently regulated in onshore UAE
- Chairman Resolution No. 3 R.M. of 2017 (concerning the regulations as to the promotion of financial products and the introduction of financial services and activities within the UAE) (the “PIRs”) regulates the offering of “Financial Products.” Crypto-assets that constitute Financial Products (which includes securities) will be subject to the PIRs.

Recent Developments

- On 1 January 2017, the UAE Central Bank issued the Regulatory Framework for Stored Values and Electronic Payment Systems (“Electronic Payment Regulations”), which offers a new licensing framework for stored value facilities offering certain digital payment services. The Electronic Payment Regulations state that all virtual currencies (and transactions thereof) are prohibited. However, in February 2017, the Governor of the Central Bank, issued a statement that the Electronic Payment Regulations do not cover virtual currency and do not apply to BTC or other cryptocurrencies, currency exchanges or underlying technology such as blockchain.
- On 4 February 2018, the SCA issued a public warning statement on ICOs, cautioning investors against the risks associated with investment in ICOs. The SCA also confirmed that it does not regulate or recognize any ICO.

State of Regulation: Abu Dhabi Global Market



State of Regulation: Dubai International Financial Centre

Outlook

NEUTRAL

Key Regulators

- **Dubai Financial Services Authority (DFSA)**

- The DFSA (the regulator for the Dubai International Financial Centre ("DIFC") financial free zone located in Dubai) has taken a mixed regulatory approach to crypto-assets.
- Similar to the SCA, the DFSA has warned investors against the risks of ICOs and has confirmed that it does not regulate ICOs.
- While the onus appears to be on market participants to assess for themselves whether or not crypto-assets fall within the scope of existing DFSA laws and regulations, the DFSA has confirmed that it is open to discussing potential token offerings with issuers.
- For crypto-assets which constitute regulated investments in the DIFC, market participants involved in the offer, marketing or promotion of crypto-assets will need to consider DFSA licensing and conduct of business and AML / KYC requirements.
- If the proposed ICO constitutes an offering of securities then any offer in or from the DIFC will need to be made pursuant to a DFSA-approved prospectus or otherwise in reliance on an available exemption from registration.

Status of Crypto Assets

- Crypto-assets are not currently regulated in the DIFC
- However, the DFSA is likely to consider crypto-assets that have a claim on something, such as an asset or commodity, to be securities, any offering of which would be subject to the DFSA securities rules and regulations
- The DFSA's view on utility tokens is currently unclear

Recent Developments

- On 13 September 2017, the DFSA announced that ICOs should be regarded as high-risk investments and that the risks associated with ICOs may increase when offerings are made on a cross-border basis. The DFSA urged investors to exercise caution and undertake due diligence to understand the risks involved. The DFSA also clarified that it does not currently regulate ICOs or provide licensing to firms in the DIFC to undertake ICO fundraising activities.

Tax Considerations - Overview

- **The tax position in respect of ICOs is still a developing area and the approach taken varies across jurisdictions**
 - This is a general guide of the types of taxes that may arise and possible trigger events in the ICO lifecycle. The tax position for each country will differ and it is strongly recommended that specific tax advice is sought in each relevant jurisdiction on a case-by-case basis before an ICO process is undertaken.
 - In the UK, for example, the tax authority (HMRC) has to a large extent held off implementing specific laws or guidance in relation to ICOs and the focus has instead been placed on applying the relevant general tax principles from other analogous transactions. HMRC considers that the tax treatment of any transaction involving crypto-assets needs to be ‘looked at on a case-by-case basis taking into account the specific facts’, each case being ‘considered on the basis of its own individual facts and circumstances’. Other jurisdictions, such as Israel, have instead expressed an intention to implement specific laws and guidance on ICOs, the scope of which remains uncertain.
 - Whether or not an ICO process and any subsequent transactions involving a crypto-asset may result in a taxable event will depend on a number of factors including the specific facts, structure of the offering and the nature and rights attaching to the crypto-asset
- **There are a number of circumstances in the ICO process and in the lifecycle of a crypto-asset which may give rise to a taxable event arising for either the issuing company or the investor. We give a very general overview of some key trigger points and the taxes that may be at play. Possible taxes to consider include:**
 - Corporation taxes; taxes on income; taxes on capital gains; VAT or other similar sales or value added taxes; stamp taxes or other transfer or issue taxes; employee payroll and social security contributions; inheritance and death taxes.

Tax Considerations - Issue of tokens

Issuing Company



- **Corporation taxes**

On issue, the issuing company will need to consider whether the issue of the crypto-asset and receipt of the funds will result in a corporation / income tax liability. The analysis will often depend on the characterisation of the type and terms of the specific crypto-asset issued to investors and the functions and purpose of the ICO. For example, it may be the case that the relevant tax authority would view crypto-assets which grant a right of access to an online platform and specific services as being related to the trading activity of the ICO company, in which case, there is a risk that the proceeds raised may be viewed as being taxable trading income (rather than as being akin to an equity offering).

- **VAT**

The VAT treatment of issuing/transferring tokens will need to be considered on a case by case basis and the characterisation of the type and terms of the specific tokens will again be relevant. It may be the case that the issuance of the tokens will be exempt or outside the scope of VAT but this will depend on the specific facts. The VAT treatment will also depend on the nature of the supply and the location and nature of the investor.

- **Stamp taxes or other similar issue taxes**

The issue of the crypto-assets could give rise to documentary or stamp taxes for the investor or the issuing company (depending on the laws of the relevant jurisdiction).

Investor



- **Taxes on Income**

If the crypto-assets carry with them a right to participate in the profits of the ICO company, this may be viewed by the relevant tax authority as being similar to a right to receive a dividend or other distribution, potentially resulting in a tax on income arising for an investor on receipt of such profits.

- **Employee payroll taxes**

It may also be the case that some investors are issued the crypto-assets under an ICO in connection with their employment. This may result in payroll deductions and/or social security contributions being imposed depending on the relevant jurisdiction and the perceived value of the crypto-assets issued.

Tax Considerations - Transfer and other issues

Issuing Company



- Generally the transfer/disposal of the crypto-asset from an investor to a third party should be tax neutral for the issuing company.

Investor



- Taxes on capital gains or income**

A transfer/disposal by an investor of a crypto-asset may result in a tax charge for the investor on any chargeable gains (or even income in the event of those who habitually trade).

- Inheritance or death taxes**

On death of an investor who holds crypto-assets, it may be necessary to consider if any inheritance or death taxes will arise upon the passing of their estate.

- Stamp or transfer taxes**

The transfer of crypto-assets could give rise to documentary, stamp or similar transfer taxes for the transferor or the transferee

Miscellaneous Issues

- In a scenario where a company or an individual is transferred a crypto-asset as consideration for any sales in the course of a trade, the company or individual may be subject to income tax on the value of the crypto-asset and any F/X gains.
- Where an ICO company receives a different form of crypto-asset in exchange for one that it has issued under an ICO this may also lead to a charge to income or capital gains tax arising on any disposal. Stamp taxes or other similar transfer taxes may also be in point.
- In a scenario where an ICO company buys back its own crypto-assets, this may also lead to a charge to income or capital gains tax arising on any disposal. Stamp taxes or other similar transfer taxes may also be in point.

Appendix



Featured Data Sources



[BITA](#) is the first professional index and data provider in the digital asset space. Through state of the art technology, BITA has the mission to develop enterprise-grade infrastructure for the digital asset investment market.

- **Liquid coin prices**
- **Returns and marketcaps**

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP

[Latham & Watkins'](#) FinTech lawyers help clients around the globe navigate the critical and ever-changing business, legal and regulatory issues associated with the technological disruption of financial services. Latham mobilizes a cross-disciplinary and global team with deep experience in regulation and technology to serve the full spectrum of the FinTech ecosystem on any aspect of a FinTech matter.

- **Legal and Tax considerations**



[token data](#)

[Token Data](#) provides data, analytics and long form content on cryptocurrencies, tokens and ICOs

- **ICO failure stats**
- **Part of underlying ICO data**

Coin Metrics

[Coinmetrics](#) is a free and open source software project, presenting data through our convenient website portal. Individuals seeking to verify our data scraping methods or fork the code can visit our Github.

- **On-chain metrics stats**
- **Transactions, addresses**



[Dalia](#) was founded in Berlin in 2013, with a clear vision to utilise mobile technology to change the way that attitudinal data is collected, analysed and presented. Our goal is to be known as the platform and methodology of choice for global consumer understanding.

- **Consumer survey**

20|30

[20|30](#) is a venture studio building the future on blockchain. We are blockchain-agnostic and experiment-driven. Our four first experiments have all led to early sales success.

- **Token engineering**
- **Taxonomies and macroeconomics**

Key Contacts – Latham & Watkins LLP

**Andrew C. Moyle**

Partner, London

T +44.20.7710.1078
E andrew.moyle@lw.com

**David L. Concannon**

Partner, New York

T +1.212.906.1389
E david.concannon@lw.com

**Stephen P. Wink**

Partner, New York

T +1.212.906.1229
E stephen.wink@lw.com

**Simon Hawkins**

Counsel, Hong Kong

T +852.2912.2733
E simon.hawkins@lw.com

**Stuart Davis**

Associate, London

T +44.20.7710.1821
E stuart.davis@lw.com


**Sam Maxson**

Associate, London

T +44.20.7710.1823
E sam.maxson@lw.com



Autonomous NEXT is a mission-driven innovation and fintech analysis process for financial firms and investors



- We are independent, creative and original thinkers about the future of finance serving the world's largest financial services investors and operators
- We combine both a fundamental and innovation perspective
- Better decisions in financial services = better outcomes for real people



We are a global financial research firm ...



- 📍 Founded in London in 2009 as an independent research firm, specialising in European banks and insurers.
- 📍 In 2012, Autonomous opened an office in New York and launched coverage on US financials.
- 📍 Autonomous opened an office in Hong Kong in Q1 2015 and launched coverage on Chinese financials and China macro.



Autonomous is a partnership, fully owned by its people, with no external investors.



The founding partners of Autonomous were top ranked for 5 years in the European banking and insurance sectors (ex ML and Citi).



Autonomous covers 196 companies globally, with a combined market capitalisation of \$4.4 trillion.



Autonomous offers exclusivity/limited distribution to provide a more bespoke service.



Our objective is to be the leading global research firm for financials.



Our strategy is to be the trusted advisor to the world's leading asset managers.



Autonomous has 90 people globally including 40 full time analysts with unrivaled experience covering banks, insurers, diversified financials and FinTech.



Autonomous offers unique and unbiased perspectives on the future of Fintech by exploring the way in which technology will shape the global financials industry.



... that combines an entrepreneurial and fundamental view

Lex Sokolin

Global Director Fintech Strategy

Lex is a futurist and entrepreneur focused on the next generation of financial services. He directs Fintech Strategy at Autonomous Research, a global research firm for the financial sector, helping clients understand and leverage innovation.

Lex is on the Board of Directors and previously was the Chief Operating Officer at AdvisorEngine (formerly Vanare), a digital wealth management technology platform that received \$50 million in financing from WisdomTree. He was also founder and CEO of NestEgg Wealth, a roboadvisor that pioneered online wealth management in partnership with financial advisors, acquired by AdvisorEngine.

Lex is a contributor of thought leadership to the Economist, WSJ, Bloomberg, CNBC, Reuters, Investopedia, American Banker, ThinkAdvisor, and Investment News, among others. He has spoken on the future of technology and achieving extraordinary growth at conferences like Money2020, Lendit, Schwab Impact, TD National LINC, T3 Enterprise Edition, and the Financial Planning Association.

Prior to NestEgg, Lex held a variety of roles in investment management and banking at Barclays, Lehman Brothers and Deutsche Bank. He holds a JD/MBA from Columbia University and a B.A. in Economics and Law from Amherst College.

The image is a collage of several news articles and profiles featuring Lex Sokolin. At the top left is a screenshot of the 'InvestmentNews' website's '40 Under 40' section, showing a profile for 'Alexey Sokolin AGE 32' as 'Chief operating officer, Vanare'. To the right is a snippet from 'WealthManagement.com' under the heading 'The Finance Futurist'. Below these is a larger profile from 'ThinkAdvisor' titled 'Lex Sokolin: Fintech Futurist – The 2016 IA 25', which includes a photo of Lex. To the right of this is a snippet from 'WSJ MoneyBeat' with the headline 'Lex Sokolin Talks Top FinTech Predictions for 2017', featuring a graphic of a smartphone displaying a grid of icons. The bottom right corner shows a small portion of another article.



AUTONOMOUS



Examples of our thought leadership



How Artificial Intelligence creates \$1 trillion of change in the front, middle and back office of the financial services industry



#MACHINE INTELLIGENCE

A primer on Artificial Intelligence, what is driving the resurgence of the technology, and where it is going in the future

A primer on Artificial Intelligence, what is driving the resurgence of the technology, and where it is going in the future



#FINTECH & CRYPTO 2018 Predictions

Review of our 2017 themes and a look-ahead to what matters in 2018

Review of our 2017 themes and a look-ahead to what matters in 2018



The new funding mechanism using distributed ledger technology that displaces both public markets (IPOs) and private investment (Venture Capital) with a billion of USD equivalent cryptocurrency



#FUTURE VISION

A blueprint for the strategic roles and competitive options of financial services, high-tech and start-up companies in 2030

Making sense of blockchain, digital currencies, roboadvisors, wealthtech and other futurist themes within a unified, quantified framework



#FINTECH PHENOMENON

Making sense of blockchain, digital currencies, roboadvisors, wealthtech and other futurist themes within a unified, quantified framework

A blueprint for the strategic roles and competitive options of financial services, high-tech and start-up companies in 2030



We see 2025 as the point when fully autonomous cars become a commercial reality. We see motor premiums in the developed world more than halving between 2025-40.



We see clearing and settlement as the first major implementation. Blockchain can reduce industry spend by 30% or \$16bn on a five year view.




We expect digital lending to double again before 2020, reaching \$100bn in loan origination volumes from the US and Europe combined



AUTONOMOUS



Autonomous Research is a leader in equity research on financial services, translating themes into investment ideas





Connect with us now to act on the future of finance

1

Learn more and subscribe to our weekly newsletter here:

<http://next.autonomous.com>

2

Connect on Social Media on Twitter at:

@autonofintech

3

Interested in research or engagement? Contact us at:

next@autonomous.com