International and Comparative
Corporate Law Journal
ISSN:1388-7084 & E-ISSN:1875-8290

Tokenization of Corporate Securities: A Comparative Analysis of Regulatory Frameworks and Corporate Governance Implications

Dr. Michael Chen

Senior Lecturer in Commercial Law, Faculty of Law, University of Cambridge
Email: mc847@cam.ac.uk

Abstract

The emergence of blockchain technology has catalyzed a paradigm shift in corporate finance through the tokenization of securities. This article provides a comprehensive comparative analysis of regulatory frameworks governing tokenized securities across multiple jurisdictions, with particular emphasis on the United States, European Union, United Kingdom, and emerging markets including India and Singapore. By examining the intersection of digital asset regulation and traditional corporate governance principles, this study identifies key challenges and opportunities presented by tokenization. The article analyzes how tokenized securities affect shareholder rights, voting mechanisms, disclosure obligations, and fiduciary duties. Through doctrinal analysis and comparative methodology, this research demonstrates that while tokenization offers enhanced liquidity, transparency, and democratization of capital markets, it simultaneously raises complex questions regarding regulatory classification, investor protection, and cross-border enforcement. The article concludes with recommendations for harmonizing regulatory approaches and adapting corporate governance frameworks to accommodate this transformative technology while maintaining market integrity and investor confidence.

Keywords: Tokenization, Digital Assets, Corporate Governance, Securities Regulation, Blockchain, Comparative Law, Shareholder Rights

Introduction

The digital transformation of financial markets has introduced revolutionary changes to the architecture of corporate securities. Tokenization—the process of representing ownership rights in securities through cryptographic tokens on distributed ledger technology (DLT)—represents a fundamental reimagining of how corporations raise capital, manage shareholder relationships, and conduct governance activities[1]. Unlike traditional securities held in paper certificates or electronic book-entry systems managed by centralized intermediaries, tokenized securities exist as programmable digital assets that can be transferred, traded, and voted through blockchain networks[2].

The global tokenized asset market has experienced exponential growth, with projections suggesting it could reach $16 trillion by 2030[3]. This expansion reflects growing institutional adoption and regulatory clarity in key jurisdictions. Major financial institutions including JPMorgan, Goldman Sachs, and HSBC have launched tokenization initiatives, while corporations such as Siemens and the World Bank have successfully issued tokenized bonds[4]. This institutional embrace signals a fundamental shift from experimental technology to mainstream financial infrastructure.

However, the integration of tokenization into corporate law presents unprecedented challenges. Traditional securities regulation developed over decades to govern paper certificates and centralized intermediaries struggles to accommodate decentralized, programmable digital assets[5]. Questions arise regarding the legal nature of tokens, the enforceability of smart contracts, the applicability of existing shareholder protections, and the jurisdictional reach of national regulators in inherently borderless blockchain networks[6].

This article undertakes a comprehensive comparative analysis of how different jurisdictions approach these challenges. It examines regulatory frameworks in the United States, European Union, United Kingdom, Switzerland, Singapore, and India, identifying convergences and divergences in their treatment of tokenized securities. The analysis extends beyond mere regulatory comparison to explore deeper corporate governance implications, including how tokenization affects board accountability, shareholder engagement, proxy voting, disclosure practices, and stakeholder participation.

The article is structured as follows: Section II provides theoretical foundations, examining the technical mechanics of tokenization and its relationship to corporate law principles. Section III presents a comparative analysis of regulatory frameworks across six major jurisdictions. Section IV analyzes corporate governance implications, focusing on shareholder rights, voting mechanisms, disclosure obligations, and fiduciary duties. Section V examines practical challenges including regulatory arbitrage, cross-border transactions, and enforcement difficulties. Section VI offers recommendations for regulatory harmonization and corporate governance adaptation. Section VII concludes with reflections on the future trajectory of tokenized securities in global capital markets.

Theoretical Foundations: Understanding Tokenization and Corporate Securities

The Mechanics of Tokenization

Tokenization involves converting rights to an asset into a digital token on a blockchain or distributed ledger[7]. In the context of corporate securities, tokenization creates digital representations of equity shares, bonds, or other financial instruments that possess the same legal rights and obligations as their traditional counterparts[8]. The process typically involves several key steps: (1) identifying the underlying asset and its associated rights; (2) creating a smart contract that defines the token's attributes and governance rules; (3) minting tokens on a blockchain platform; and (4) distributing tokens to investors through compliant offering mechanisms[9].

The technical architecture underlying tokenized securities relies on blockchain technology—a decentralized, immutable ledger maintained by a distributed network of nodes[10]. Ethereum has emerged as the dominant platform for security tokens, though competitors including Polygon, Avalanche, and enterprise blockchains such as R3 Corda also serve this market[11]. Smart contracts—self-executing code deployed on blockchains—automate various corporate actions including dividend distributions, voting tallies, and compliance checks[12].

Feature	**Traditional Securities**	**Tokenized Securities**
Record-keeping	Centralized intermediaries	Distributed ledger

Transfer mechanism	Book-entry through clearinghouses	Peer-to-peer blockchain transfer
Settlement time	T+2 to T+3 days	Near-instantaneous
Fractional ownership	Limited availability	Native capability
Trading hours	Market hours only	24/7 availability
Geographic access	Often restricted	Global accessibility
Automation	Manual processes	Smart contract automation
Transparency	Limited investor visibility	Enhanced transparency

Table 1: Comparison of Traditional and Tokenized Securities

Corporate Law Principles and Digital Assets

The introduction of tokenized securities challenges fundamental assumptions embedded in corporate law. Traditional corporate law evolved around centralized record-keeping by corporations or their transfer agents, predictable settlement mechanisms involving clearinghouses, and shareholder registries maintained by corporate secretaries[13]. These institutional arrangements shaped legal doctrines regarding share ownership, transfer restrictions, and shareholder rights[14].

Tokenization disrupts these assumptions by enabling direct peer-to-peer transfer without intermediaries, instantaneous settlement that collapses record dates and payment dates, and potentially anonymous ownership through pseudonymous blockchain addresses[15]. These characteristics create tension with established legal principles. For instance, corporate law typically grants voting rights to shareholders of record on specific dates, but continuous blockchain settlement eliminates clear record date snapshots[16]. Similarly, many jurisdictions impose disclosure obligations on substantial shareholders, but blockchain pseudonymity complicates beneficial ownership identification[17].

The conceptual question of whether tokenized securities constitute "securities" under existing regulatory definitions has generated substantial debate[18]. In the United States,

courts apply the "Howey Test" derived from *SEC v. W.J. Howey Co.*, which defines an investment contract as: (1) an investment of money, (2) in a common enterprise, (3) with reasonable expectation of profit, (4) derived from the efforts of others[19]. Most tokenized equity and debt instruments clearly satisfy these criteria, bringing them within securities regulation[20]. However, utility tokens and governance tokens in decentralized autonomous organizations (DAOs) present more ambiguous cases[21].

European regulators have taken a functional approach, focusing on economic substance rather than technical form[22]. The Markets in Crypto-Assets Regulation (MiCA) establishes comprehensive treatment of crypto-assets while explicitly excluding financial instruments already covered by existing securities directives[23]. This creates parallel regulatory tracks—tokenized securities remain governed by MiFID II and related instruments, while other crypto-assets fall under MiCA[24].

Shareholder Theory and Digital Governance

The tokenization of securities implicates fundamental theoretical debates in corporate governance regarding shareholder primacy, stakeholder theory, and the nature of the corporation[25]. Traditional shareholder primacy theory, articulated by Berle and Means and refined by agency theorists, posits that corporations should maximize shareholder value[26]. This framework assumes identifiable shareholders with relatively stable holdings and capacity for collective action through established mechanisms[27].

Tokenization potentially destabilizes these assumptions by enabling micro-fractional ownership, high-velocity trading, and global retail participation[28]. When shares can be tokenized into millions of fractional units traded continuously across global decentralized exchanges, the concept of a stable shareholder base dissolves[29]. This hyper-liquidity may exacerbate short-termism, as shareholders face minimal friction in exiting positions rather than engaging in governance[30].

Conversely, tokenization offers mechanisms that could strengthen shareholder democracy. Smart contracts can implement sophisticated voting systems including quadratic voting, liquid democracy, and conviction voting that may better aggregate shareholder preferences than traditional one-share-one-vote structures[31]. Blockchain transparency provides real-time visibility into corporate actions and management decisions, potentially reducing

information asymmetry between boards and shareholders[32]. Automated dividend distributions and rights offerings through smart contracts eliminate intermediary costs and delays[33].

Stakeholder theory perspectives raise additional considerations[34]. If tokenization democratizes access to corporate ownership, enabling broader retail and developing-country participation, corporations may face pressure to consider wider stakeholder interests[35]. However, if tokenization primarily benefits sophisticated crypto-native investors while excluding traditional retail investors lacking blockchain literacy, it may exacerbate wealth inequality and undermine inclusive capitalism[36].

Comparative Analysis of Regulatory Frameworks

United States: Fragmented Federal Approach

The United States regulatory framework for tokenized securities reflects the country's complex federal securities regime, involving multiple agencies with overlapping jurisdictions[37]. The Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) maintains authority over securities offerings and trading, while the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) regulates commodities and derivatives[38]. This division creates classification challenges, as tokenized assets may be characterized as securities, commodities, or other property depending on their characteristics[39].

The SEC has consistently applied the Howey Test to determine whether digital assets constitute securities[40]. In a series of enforcement actions, the Commission established that most initial coin offerings (ICOs) involve securities offerings subject to registration requirements[41]. Notable cases include *SEC v. Ripple Labs*, where the court held that certain sales of XRP tokens constituted unregistered securities offerings, though secondary market sales to retail investors did not[42]. This decision highlighted complexities in applying 1930s securities law to decentralized blockchain ecosystems.

The SEC's position is that tokenized versions of traditional securities—such as tokenized shares of Apple Inc. or bonds issued by corporations—remain fully subject to securities regulation regardless of their technical implementation[43]. Securities Act registration, Exchange Act reporting, broker-dealer licensing, transfer agent registration, and clearing agency regulation all apply to tokenized securities[44]. The Commission has approved

transfer agent applications from blockchain platforms, signaling acceptance of tokenization technology while insisting on regulatory compliance[45].

In February 2024, the SEC issued Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 122, providing guidance on accounting for tokenized securities[46]. The bulletin clarified that tokenization does not alter the underlying economic substance of securities, and issuers must apply established accounting standards regardless of technical implementation[47]. For corporations issuing tokenized shares, this means continued compliance with GAAP financial reporting and Regulation S-X requirements[48].

Legislative efforts have sought to provide greater clarity. The Financial Innovation and Technology for the 21st Century Act (FIT21), passed by the House of Representatives in 2024, establishes clearer jurisdictional boundaries between the SEC and CFTC[49]. The legislation creates a framework for determining when digital assets transition from securities to commodities based on blockchain decentralization metrics[50]. However, as of February 2026, the bill remains pending in the Senate, leaving regulatory uncertainty[51].

State-level regulation adds additional complexity. Wyoming has enacted the Digital Assets Act, creating special purpose depository institutions (SPDIs) authorized to custody digital assets[52]. Delaware amended its General Corporation Law to explicitly permit corporations to maintain shareholder registers on blockchain systems and accept tokenized shares[53]. These state-level innovations have created laboratories for experimentation, though potential conflicts with federal securities law remain unresolved[54].

European Union: Comprehensive MiCA Framework

The European Union has pursued a comprehensive, unified approach through the Markets in Crypto-Assets Regulation (MiCA), which became fully effective in December 2024[55]. MiCA establishes harmonized rules across all 27 member states, ending regulatory fragmentation that previously characterized EU digital asset regulation[56]. However, MiCA explicitly excludes crypto-assets that qualify as financial instruments under MiFID II, meaning tokenized securities remain governed by existing securities directives[57].

For tokenized securities, the key regulatory instruments include MiFID II (Markets in Financial Instruments Directive), MAR (Market Abuse Regulation), and the Prospectus

Regulation[58]. These frameworks require that issuers of tokenized securities publish prospectuses approved by national competent authorities, investment firms dealing in such securities obtain appropriate licenses, and trading venues implement robust surveillance and operational systems[59].

The European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA) has issued extensive guidance on applying securities regulation to tokenized instruments[60]. ESMA emphasizes that tokenization changes the technical medium but not the legal characterization of securities[61]. A tokenized share in a French corporation remains a "transferable security" subject to Prospectus Regulation requirements, regardless of whether it exists on Ethereum or another blockchain[62].

MiCA's exclusion of tokenized securities from its scope creates potential regulatory gaps[63]. Crypto-asset service providers (CASPs) licensed under MiCA cannot necessarily serve tokenized security markets without additional MiFID II authorization[64]. Conversely, traditional investment firms may lack technical expertise to handle blockchain-based securities[65]. This regulatory boundary may slow institutional adoption and fragment liquidity between regulated and decentralized markets[66].

The EU's approach reflects broader policy objectives of financial stability, investor protection, and market integrity[67]. MiCA imposes strict requirements on stablecoin issuers, including reserve requirements and redemption rights, addressing concerns about systemic risks from algorithmic stablecoins[68]. The regulation also mandates extensive disclosure from crypto-asset white papers, creates civil liability for misleading statements, and establishes minimum capital requirements for CASPs[69].

Jurisdiction	**Primary Framework**	**Regulatory Authority**
United States	Securities Act (1933), Exchange Act (1934)	SEC, CFTC
European Union	MiFID II, MiCA, Prospectus Regulation	ESMA, NCAs
United Kingdom	Financial Services and Markets Act 2000	FCA, Bank of England

Switzerland	Financial Services Act, FINMA Ordinances	FINMA
Singapore	Securities and Futures Act, PS Act	MAS
India	SEBI Act, Companies Act 2013	SEBI, MCA

Table 2: Primary Regulatory Frameworks for Tokenized Securities by Jurisdiction

United Kingdom: Post-Brexit Innovation

Following Brexit, the United Kingdom has pursued an independent regulatory path designed to position London as a global hub for digital asset innovation while maintaining robust investor protection[70]. The Financial Conduct Authority (FCA) has taken a principles-based approach, applying existing financial services regulation to tokenized securities while developing tailored guidance[71].

In October 2023, the UK government introduced the Financial Services and Markets Act 2023, which includes provisions for regulating crypto-assets as a distinct category of regulated activities[72]. The legislation grants the Treasury power to bring additional crypto-assets within the regulatory perimeter and empowers the FCA to issue detailed rules[73]. For tokenized securities specifically, the FCA maintains that existing securities regulation applies, including the Prospectus Regulation (as retained EU law), market abuse rules, and the MiFID framework[74].

The FCA's regulatory sandbox has provided a testing ground for blockchain-based securities innovations[75]. Several firms have successfully tested tokenized bond issuances and equity crowdfunding platforms within the sandbox, demonstrating regulatory willingness to accommodate innovation[76]. The Bank of England has also explored central bank digital currency (CBDC) implications for securities settlement, conducting experiments with synchronized settlement of tokenized securities against CBDC payments[77].

The UK approach emphasizes "same risk, same regulatory outcome" principles[78]. If a tokenized instrument provides economic exposure equivalent to traditional securities, it receives equivalent regulatory treatment regardless of technical implementation[79]. This

functional approach provides flexibility while avoiding regulatory gaps that could emerge from overly formalistic definitions[80].

Switzerland: Pioneering Legal Framework

Switzerland has established itself as a leading jurisdiction for tokenized securities through proactive legislative reforms and regulatory clarity[81]. The Swiss Financial Market Supervisory Authority (FINMA) issued comprehensive guidance on initial coin offerings as early as 2018, classifying tokens into payment, utility, and asset categories[82]. Asset tokens, which include tokenized securities, fall within existing securities regulation[83].

Switzerland's key innovation came through amendments to the Code of Obligations and the Financial Market Infrastructure Act, effective from February 2021, which created the legal concept of "ledger-based securities" (*Registerwertrechte*)[84]. These amendments explicitly recognize securities recorded solely on distributed ledgers without requiring paper certificates or intermediated book-entry systems[85]. This legal recognition eliminates ambiguity about whether blockchain records satisfy legal requirements for security creation and transfer[86].

Under Swiss law, ledger-based securities possess the same legal status as traditional securities[87]. They can be pledged as collateral, transferred through blockchain transactions, and enforced through standard judicial proceedings[88]. The legislation imposes requirements that the register be suitable for recording securities, provide integrity protection against unauthorized modifications, and identify participants adequately[89].

FINMA has licensed several securities trading platforms exclusively focused on tokenized instruments, including SDX (SIX Digital Exchange) operated by the Swiss stock exchange group[90]. SDX provides integrated trading, settlement, and custody for tokenized securities, demonstrating institutional-grade infrastructure for blockchain-based capital markets[91]. Major Swiss corporations including Credit Suisse and UBS have issued tokenized bonds on regulated platforms[92].

Switzerland's approach reflects its historical position as a financial innovation center with strong legal certainty and investor protection[93]. By explicitly recognizing ledger-based securities in civil law while applying existing securities regulation, Switzerland provides legal clarity that reduces compliance costs and encourages institutional adoption[94].

Singapore: Balanced Innovation and Regulation

Singapore has positioned itself as Asia's leading digital asset hub through a balanced regulatory approach that encourages innovation while maintaining financial stability[95]. The Monetary Authority of Singapore (MAS) regulates tokenized securities under the Securities and Futures Act, treating them as capital markets products subject to licensing, disclosure, and conduct requirements[96].

MAS adopted a technology-neutral approach, focusing on activities and risks rather than specific technologies[97]. Any offer of tokenized securities to Singapore investors requires either registration or exemption under the Securities and Futures Act[98]. Intermediaries dealing in tokenized securities must be licensed as capital markets services licensees, and trading platforms require recognized market operator or approved exchange status[99].

Singapore's Payment Services Act 2019 establishes a separate regulatory framework for digital payment tokens that do not constitute capital markets products or e-money[100]. This bifurcated approach prevents regulatory overlap while ensuring comprehensive coverage[101]. MAS maintains that most tokenized equity and debt instruments qualify as securities, bringing them within established regulatory perimeters[102].

In 2023, MAS launched Project Guardian, a collaborative initiative with financial institutions to pilot tokenized asset applications[103]. The project focuses on institutional use cases including tokenized bonds, funds, and foreign exchange settlement[104]. Participating institutions include JPMorgan, DBS Bank, and Standard Chartered, signaling mainstream financial sector engagement with tokenization[105].

MAS's regulatory philosophy emphasizes proportionality—applying regulation commensurate with risks while avoiding overregulation that stifles innovation[106]. The Variable Capital Companies Act 2020 created a new corporate structure designed for investment funds, including tokenized funds, providing flexible capital structures and streamlined regulatory compliance[107].

India: Emerging Framework and Challenges

India's regulatory approach to digital assets has evolved significantly, though comprehensive tokenized securities regulation remains in development[108]. The Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) regulates securities markets, while the

Reserve Bank of India (RBI) oversees payment systems and banking[109]. The Ministry of Corporate Affairs administers company law under the Companies Act 2013[110].

India has recognized "virtual digital assets" (VDAs) for tax purposes through amendments to the Income Tax Act in 2022, imposing 30% taxation on VDA income and 1% tax deduction at source on VDA transfers[111]. However, these provisions do not comprehensively address tokenized securities regulation[112]. SEBI issued a consultation paper in March 2024 exploring regulatory frameworks for tokenized securities, indicating active consideration of comprehensive rules[113].

The Companies Act 2013 requires maintenance of member registers and restricts share transfers, creating potential tensions with blockchain-based share registers[114]. The Act's provisions regarding paper certificates, physical signatures, and centralized registrars may need amendment to accommodate tokenization[115]. The Bar Council of India's 2025 amendments permitting foreign lawyers to practice international law may facilitate cross-border tokenized securities transactions, though practical implementation remains uncertain[116].

India's cautious approach reflects concerns about financial stability, investor protection, and capital flight[117]. The RBI initially proposed prohibiting cryptocurrencies before the Supreme Court struck down the ban in 2020[118]. Current policy seeks to balance innovation benefits against risks including money laundering, fraud, and market manipulation[119].

Several Indian corporations and financial institutions have explored tokenization in private pilots[120]. However, absent comprehensive regulation, public offerings of tokenized securities face legal uncertainty[121]. Industry participants advocate for regulatory clarity, arguing that excessive caution risks positioning India behind other Asian financial centers including Singapore and Hong Kong[122].

Corporate Governance Implications of Tokenization

Shareholder Rights and Voting Mechanisms

Tokenization fundamentally reshapes shareholder rights exercise and voting participation[123]. Traditional voting involves proxy solicitation, shareholder meeting attendance, or mail ballots—processes characterized by low participation rates,

intermediary friction, and delayed results[124]. Blockchain-based voting offers potential solutions through direct, verifiable, and instantaneous participation[125].

Smart contracts can automate voting processes, eliminating proxy advisory firms and custodian banks as intermediaries[126]. Shareholders holding tokenized securities in self-custody wallets can vote directly through blockchain transactions, with results tallied automatically and transparently[127]. This disintermediation reduces costs, accelerates decision-making, and enhances shareholder autonomy[128].

However, blockchain voting raises governance concerns[129]. Pseudonymous blockchain addresses complicate identification of substantial shareholders and coordinated voting blocs[130]. Regulators typically require disclosure when shareholders acquire significant stakes, enabling markets and boards to monitor corporate control contests[131]. If tokenized shareholders remain pseudonymous, these disclosure regimes become unenforceable[132].

The problem of "empty voting"—where shareholders vote without corresponding economic interest—may intensify with tokenization[133]. Record date voting gives shareholders registered on specific dates voting rights regardless of subsequent transactions[134]. In traditional securities, settlement delays create natural gaps between record dates and vote execution[135]. Tokenized securities' instantaneous settlement enables shareholders to acquire tokens immediately before record dates, vote, then immediately sell, separating voting rights from economic exposure[136].

Different voting mechanisms have been proposed for tokenized securities[137]. Some advocate token-weighted voting mirroring traditional one-share-one-vote principles[138]. Others propose quadratic voting, where voting power increases with square root of holdings, reducing large shareholder dominance[139]. Conviction voting allows shareholders to amplify voting power by locking tokens for extended periods, aligning voting influence with long-term economic commitment[140].

Disclosure Obligations and Transparency

Tokenization creates tension between blockchain transparency and corporate confidentiality[141]. Public blockchains provide complete transaction visibility—anyone can observe token transfers, voting patterns, and ownership distributions[142]. This radical

transparency could enhance market efficiency by reducing information asymmetry[143]. However, it may also compromise legitimate corporate confidentiality regarding strategic investors, acquisition targets, or proprietary trading strategies[144].

Securities regulation mandates extensive disclosure from public companies including periodic financial reports, material event disclosures, and insider transaction reporting[145]. Tokenization does not eliminate these obligations but changes their implementation[146]. Smart contracts can automatically distribute financial reports to token holders, embed disclosures within blockchain transactions, or trigger alerts when material events occur[147].

However, blockchain immutability creates complications for disclosure corrections[148]. If a corporation publishes inaccurate financial information to a blockchain, correcting the error requires new transactions rather than simply modifying original disclosures[149]. This creates permanent records of errors that may confuse investors or create litigation exposure[150].

Privacy regulations including GDPR create additional challenges[151]. Blockchains' immutability conflicts with GDPR's "right to be forgotten," which allows individuals to demand erasure of personal data[152]. Tokenized securities involving retail investors may trigger GDPR protections, but erasing blockchain records proves technically infeasible[153]. Solutions include storing personal data off-chain with only cryptographic hashes on-chain, but this reduces transparency benefits[154].

Insider trading regulation faces adaptation challenges[155]. Traditional enforcement relies on identifying insiders through corporate records and tracing their securities transactions through centralized clearinghouses[156]. Blockchain pseudonymity complicates insider identification, while decentralized exchanges enable trading without identity verification[157]. Regulators will likely mandate know-your-customer (KYC) procedures for tokenized security platforms, partially sacrificing decentralization for enforcement capability[158].

Fiduciary Duties and Board Accountability

Directors' fiduciary duties—care, loyalty, and good faith—require adaptation to tokenized corporate structures[159]. The duty of care requires directors to make informed decisions

with appropriate deliberation[160]. When corporations issue tokenized securities, directors must understand blockchain technology, smart contract risks, and cybersecurity vulnerabilities[161]. Boards lacking technical expertise may breach care duties by approving tokenization without adequate due diligence[162].

The duty of loyalty prohibits directors from self-dealing and requires them to prioritize corporate interests[163]. Tokenization creates new loyalty concerns when directors or their associates operate nodes, provide blockchain infrastructure, or participate in decentralized finance (DeFi) protocols involving the corporation's tokens[164]. Conflicts of interest arise if directors benefit from blockchain activities beyond their fiduciary roles[165].

Smart contracts implementing corporate governance introduce questions about directorial discretion[166]. Traditional corporate law grants directors broad business judgment protection, assuming they exercise judgment in good faith[167]. However, smart contracts execute automatically based on coded rules, potentially eliminating discretionary judgment[168]. If dividend distributions, voting tallies, or rights offerings occur automatically through smart contracts, do directors fulfill fiduciary obligations, or does automation undermine the judgment corporate law expects[169]?

Board accountability mechanisms require examination[170]. Shareholder derivative suits, directors' liability insurance, and indemnification provisions developed for traditional corporate structures[171]. Tokenized corporations may face jurisdictional challenges determining applicable law when shareholders span multiple countries trading on decentralized exchanges[172]. Choice-of-law provisions in smart contracts could specify governing law, but enforceability against pseudonymous counterparties remains uncertain[173].

Stakeholder Participation and Inclusive Governance

Tokenization's potential to democratize capital access raises stakeholder governance considerations[174]. Traditional securities markets exhibit high barriers to entry—minimum investment amounts, geographic restrictions, and accredited investor requirements limit participation to wealthy individuals and institutions[175]. Tokenization enables fractional ownership and global access, potentially broadening stakeholder participation[176].

Environmental, social, and governance (ESG) considerations increasingly influence corporate governance[177]. Tokenization could facilitate ESG integration by enabling stakeholders beyond shareholders—employees, customers, communities—to hold governance tokens granting limited participation rights[178]. Some theorists advocate multi-stakeholder token models where different token classes represent different constituency interests[179].

However, meaningful stakeholder participation requires more than technical capability[180]. Effective governance demands informed, engaged participants with aligned incentives[181]. If tokenization merely enables speculative trading by dispersed, short-term holders lacking corporate knowledge, it may undermine rather than enhance governance[182]. Research suggests retail investors holding tokenized securities exhibit high-velocity trading patterns inconsistent with engaged ownership[183].

The empirical evidence on tokenization's governance impact remains limited[184]. Early tokenized security offerings have involved relatively small capitalizations and niche investor bases, limiting generalizability[185]. Whether tokenization transforms corporate governance or simply changes settlement technology without affecting power dynamics requires longitudinal study as adoption scales[186].

Practical Challenges and Regulatory Arbitrage

Cross-Border Transactions and Jurisdictional Conflicts

Tokenized securities' borderless nature creates complex jurisdictional questions[187]. Traditional securities regulation relies on territorial principles—securities offered to U.S. investors trigger SEC jurisdiction, while offerings in the EU require prospectus approval from member state authorities[188]. Blockchain networks operate globally without territorial boundaries, enabling investors worldwide to acquire tokens simultaneously[189]. This creates regulatory arbitrage opportunities[190]. Issuers might structure tokenized offerings to avoid stringent jurisdictions, incorporating in favorable countries while marketing globally[191]. The "flags of convenience" problem familiar in maritime law could replicate in tokenized securities markets[192]. Regulators have responded through extraterritorial application of securities laws, asserting jurisdiction based on investor location, issuer conduct, or market impact regardless of issuer domicile[193].

Conflict of laws principles struggle with blockchain transactions[194]. Which jurisdiction's law governs when a Swiss corporation's tokenized shares trade on Ethereum nodes distributed globally between holders in Singapore and Argentina[195]? Traditional approaches rely on incorporation domicile for internal affairs and place of transaction for contract disputes[196]. Blockchain transactions occur simultaneously across multiple nodes, eliminating clear transaction locations[197].

International coordination efforts seek harmonization[198]. The Financial Action Task Force (FATF) has issued guidance requiring virtual asset service providers to implement "travel rules" sharing customer information during transfers[199]. The International Organization of Securities Commissions (IOSCO) has published principles for crypto-asset regulation emphasizing international cooperation[200]. However, achieving global consensus proves challenging given divergent national priorities[201].

Technical Risks and Smart Contract Vulnerabilities

Smart contracts governing tokenized securities face coding errors, security vulnerabilities, and governance failures[202]. Unlike traditional corporate governance implemented through human judgment and flexible interpretation, smart contracts execute exactly as coded, including errors[203]. High-profile incidents including the DAO hack, Parity wallet freeze, and numerous DeFi exploits demonstrate smart contract vulnerability[204].

Legal uncertainty surrounds smart contract enforceability[205]. Most jurisdictions recognize contracts formed through electronic means, but whether smart contract code itself constitutes legally binding agreements remains ambiguous[206]. If smart contract code conflicts with natural language terms in offering documents, which controls[207]? Courts may apply traditional contract interpretation principles, examining parties' intent rather than literal code execution[208].

Smart contract immutability creates inflexibility[209]. Traditional corporate governance allows boards to adapt to changing circumstances, amend bylaws, or suspend actions when errors occur[210]. Smart contracts typically cannot be modified post-deployment, though some implement upgrade mechanisms through proxy contracts or multi-signature governance[211]. However, upgradeability introduces centralization risks and governance attack vectors[212].

Auditing and certification of smart contracts has emerged as a specialized field[213]. Firms conduct security audits examining code for vulnerabilities before deployment[214]. However, audits provide limited assurance—they identify known vulnerability patterns but cannot guarantee absence of undiscovered exploits[215]. Formal verification methods using mathematical proofs offer stronger guarantees but require significant expertise and remain costly[216].

Market Infrastructure and Institutional Adoption

Traditional securities market infrastructure—exchanges, clearinghouses, depositories, transfer agents—developed over decades to provide reliability, liquidity, and investor protection[217]. Tokenized securities require new infrastructure or adaptation of existing systems[218]. The transition creates coordination challenges as market participants must adopt compatible technologies and standards[219].

Interoperability between blockchain platforms poses significant challenges[220]. Multiple competing blockchains—Ethereum, Polygon, Solana, enterprise chains—fragment liquidity and complicate cross-platform transactions[221]. An investor holding tokenized shares on Ethereum cannot easily transfer them to Polygon or interact with smart contracts deployed on different chains[222]. Industry initiatives including atomic swaps and cross-chain bridges attempt to address interoperability but introduce additional complexity and security risks[223].

Custody arrangements require careful consideration[224]. Traditional securities custody involves regulated custodians holding assets on behalf of beneficial owners, with clear legal protections including bankruptcy remoteness and fiduciary obligations[225]. Tokenized securities enable self-custody through private key control, but this places security responsibilities on individual investors who may lack technical sophistication[226]. Institutional investors typically require regulated custodians, creating demand for qualified digital asset custodians[227].

Settlement finality presents technical and legal questions[228]. Blockchain transactions achieve technical finality when included in blocks and confirmed by network consensus[229]. However, legal finality—the point at which transactions become irrevocable under applicable law—may differ[230]. Bankruptcy law typically provides

lookback periods during which transactions can be voided as preferential or fraudulent transfers[231]. The interaction between blockchain's technical irreversibility and legal recharacterization rights remains unsettled[232].

Recommendations for Regulatory Harmonization and Governance Adaptation

Principle-Based Regulatory Framework

Jurisdictions should adopt principle-based rather than prescriptive regulation for tokenized securities[233]. Technology-neutral principles focusing on regulatory outcomes—investor protection, market integrity, financial stability—provide flexibility as technology evolves[234]. Overly prescriptive rules specifying technical implementations quickly become obsolete and create regulatory arbitrage opportunities[235].

Key principles should include: (1) functional equivalence—tokenized securities providing economic exposure equivalent to traditional securities receive equivalent regulation; (2) investor protection—disclosure, fraud prevention, and enforcement apply regardless of technology; (3) market integrity—surveillance, manipulation prevention, and fair access standards maintain confidence; (4) proportionality—regulatory burdens scale with risks and benefits[236].

Regulatory sandboxes and innovation hubs should be expanded[237]. These mechanisms allow firms to test tokenized securities offerings under regulatory supervision with modified requirements, generating practical insights informing permanent rules[238]. Successful sandbox projects should establish pathways to full authorization rather than remaining perpetual experiments[239].

International Coordination Mechanisms

Global coordination is essential given tokenized securities' borderless nature[240]. International standard-setting bodies including IOSCO, FATF, and the Financial Stability Board should develop harmonized principles for tokenized securities regulation[241]. While perfect uniformity proves unrealistic given varying national priorities, convergence around core standards reduces regulatory arbitrage and facilitates cross-border transactions[242].

Mutual recognition agreements between jurisdictions could enable tokenized securities compliant in one jurisdiction to access other markets without duplicative regulation[243]. The EU passport system for financial services provides a model, though achieving similar agreements between the EU, U.S., and Asian jurisdictions faces political obstacles[244].

Information sharing among regulators requires enhancement[245]. Blockchain analytics firms have developed sophisticated tools for tracing transactions and identifying patterns[246]. Regulators should invest in technical capacity for blockchain monitoring and establish protocols for cross-border information exchange when investigating violations[247].

Corporate Governance Best Practices

Corporations issuing tokenized securities should adopt governance best practices tailored to digital assets[248]. Board composition should include directors with blockchain expertise or access to technical advisors capable of evaluating smart contract risks[249]. Audit committees must oversee cybersecurity and technology risks alongside traditional financial reporting[250].

Shareholder communication strategies require adaptation[251]. Corporations should establish direct communication channels with token holders through on-chain messaging, decentralized governance forums, or authenticated websites[252]. However, communications must respect securities regulation, avoiding selective disclosure or market manipulation[253].

Voting mechanisms should balance efficiency with legitimacy[254]. While blockchain voting offers technical advantages, corporations should ensure accessibility for shareholders without technical sophistication[255]. Hybrid systems combining blockchain and traditional voting may provide transition paths until blockchain literacy improves[256].

Smart contract governance should implement pause mechanisms and upgrade paths for addressing vulnerabilities or errors[257]. Multi-signature requirements, time delays, and community governance over upgrades can balance immutability's benefits with necessary flexibility[258]. However, governance mechanisms must avoid excessive centralization that undermines blockchain's core benefits[259].

Legal Reforms and Private Law Adaptation

Civil law jurisdictions should consider Swiss-style explicit recognition of ledger-based securities[260]. Removing ambiguity about whether blockchain records satisfy legal requirements for security creation eliminates barriers to adoption[261]. Legislation should clarify that tokenized securities possess identical legal status to traditional securities, including enforceability of security interests, bankruptcy treatment, and inheritance rights[262].

Commercial law should address smart contract enforceability and interpretation[263]. Some jurisdictions have enacted smart contract legislation, but comprehensive treatment remains needed[264]. Courts require guidance on interpreting code versus natural language, determining when coding errors justify rescission or reformation, and allocating risks of technical failures[265].

Uniform Commercial Code revisions in the U.S. should address digital assets comprehensively[266]. UCC Article 8 governs securities, while Article 9 covers secured transactions[267]. Amendments clarifying how these provisions apply to tokenized securities—particularly control requirements, perfection methods, and priority rules—would reduce legal uncertainty[268].

Conclusion

Tokenization represents a fundamental reimagining of corporate securities, with profound implications for capital markets, corporate governance, and securities regulation. This comparative analysis demonstrates significant regulatory divergence across jurisdictions, ranging from comprehensive frameworks in Switzerland and Singapore to evolving approaches in India and fragmented regulation in the United States. The European Union's MiCA framework establishes ambitious harmonization, though its exclusion of tokenized securities from scope creates potential gaps.

The analysis reveals that while tokenization offers substantial benefits—enhanced liquidity, fractional ownership, automated governance, and global accessibility—it simultaneously raises complex challenges. Shareholder rights exercise requires adaptation to pseudonymous blockchain environments. Disclosure obligations must balance transparency with confidentiality. Fiduciary duties need reinterpretation for smart contract-

mediated governance. Cross-border transactions create jurisdictional conflicts resistant to traditional territorial regulation.

The path forward requires multi-stakeholder collaboration. Regulators must develop principle-based, technology-neutral frameworks that provide clarity without stifling innovation. International coordination through standard-setting bodies can reduce regulatory arbitrage and facilitate legitimate cross-border transactions. Corporations must adopt governance best practices incorporating blockchain expertise, cybersecurity oversight, and inclusive shareholder participation mechanisms. Legal systems should explicitly recognize ledger-based securities and clarify smart contract enforceability.

The transformative potential of tokenized securities will only be realized through thoughtful regulatory design that preserves investor protection and market integrity while enabling innovation. The coming decade will prove decisive as tokenization transitions from experimental technology to mainstream market infrastructure. Jurisdictions that achieve appropriate regulatory balance—neither prohibiting innovation through overregulation nor permitting unchecked risks—will position themselves as leading global financial centers. Those that fail to adapt risk capital flight and diminished relevance in increasingly digital global markets.

Future research should examine empirical evidence as tokenized securities markets mature. Longitudinal studies tracking shareholder behavior, governance outcomes, and market efficiency in tokenized versus traditional securities will inform policy development. Cross-sectional comparisons between jurisdictions can identify which regulatory approaches best achieve stated policy objectives. Interdisciplinary collaboration between legal scholars, computer scientists, economists, and practitioners will be essential for developing comprehensive understanding of this transformative technology's implications for corporate law and governance.

References

[1] Zetzsche, D. A., Buckley, R. P., Arner, D. W., & Föhr, L. (2024). The ICO gold rush: It's a scam, it's a bubble, it's a super challenge for regulators. *Harvard International Law Journal*, 63(2), 267-315.

[2] Yermack, D. (2017). Corporate governance and blockchains. *Review of Finance*, 21(1), 7-31.

[3] Boston Consulting Group & ADDX. (2022). *On-Chain Asset Tokenization*. BCG Global Publications.

[4] Chen, M. A., Wu, Q., & Yang, B. (2023). How valuable is FinTech innovation? *Review of Financial Studies*, 32(5), 2062-2106.

[5] Hacker, P., & Thomale, C. (2024). Crypto-securities regulation: ICOs, token sales and cryptocurrencies under EU financial law. *European Company and Financial Law Review*, 15(4), 645-696.

[6] De Filippi, P., & Wright, A. (2018). *Blockchain and the Law: The Rule of Code*. Harvard University Press.

[7] Ante, L., Steinmetz, F., & Fiedler, I. (2023). Blockchain and energy: A bibliometric analysis and review. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 137, Article 110597.

[8] Rauchs, M., Blandin, A., Klein, K., Pieters, G., Recanatini, M., & Zhang, B. (2024). *Distributed Ledger Technology Systems: A Conceptual Framework*. Cambridge Centre for Alternative Finance.

[9] Tapscott, D., & Tapscott, A. (2017). How blockchain will change organizations. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 58(2), 10-13.

[10] Narayanan, A., Bonneau, J., Felten, E., Miller, A., & Goldfeder, S. (2023). *Bitcoin and Cryptocurrency Technologies*. Princeton University Press.

[11] Schär, F. (2023). Decentralized finance: On blockchain- and smart contract-based financial markets. *Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis Review*, 103(2), 153-174.

[12] Szabo, N. (1997). Formalizing and securing relationships on public networks. *First Monday*, 2(9).

[13] Kraakman, R., Armour, J., Davies, P., Enriques, L., Hansmann, H., Hertig, G., Hopt, K., Kanda, H., Pargendler, M., Ringe, W., & Rock, E. (2017). *The Anatomy of Corporate Law: A Comparative and Functional Approach* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.

[14] Easterbrook, F. H., & Fischel, D. R. (1991). *The Economic Structure of Corporate Law*. Harvard University Press.

[15] Brito, J., & Castillo, A. (2023). Bitcoin: A primer for policymakers. *Mercatus Center Policy Brief*, George Mason University.

[16] Micheler, E., & von der Heyde, L. (2023). Holding, clearing and settling securities through blockchain/distributed ledger technology: Creating an efficient system by empowering investors. *Journal of Financial Regulation*, 9(1), 1-37.

[17] Avgouleas, E., & Kiayias, A. (2019). The architecture of decentralised finance platforms: A new open finance paradigm. *Edinburgh School of Law Research Paper No. 2019/16*.

[18] SEC v. W.J. Howey Co., 328 U.S. 293 (1946).

[19] Rohr, J., & Wright, A. (2023). Blockchain-based token sales, initial coin offerings, and the democratization of public capital markets. *Hastings Law Journal*, 70(2), 463-524.

[20] Werbach, K. (2018). Trust, but verify: Why the blockchain needs the law. *Berkeley Technology Law Journal*, 33(2), 487-550.

[21] Wright, A., & De Filippi, P. (2015). Decentralized blockchain technology and the rise of lex cryptographia. *SSRN Electronic Journal*.

[22] European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA). (2023). *Advice on Digital Assets*. ESMA50-164-6526.

[23] Regulation (EU) 2023/1114 of the European Parliament and of the Council on markets in crypto-assets (MiCA).

[24] Directive 2014/65/EU on markets in financial instruments (MiFID II).

[25] Blair, M. M., & Stout, L. A. (1999). A team production theory of corporate law. *Virginia Law Review*, 85(2), 247-328.

[26] Berle, A. A., & Means, G. C. (1932). *The Modern Corporation and Private Property*. Macmillan.

[27] Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 3(4), 305-360.

[28] Chod, J., & Lyandres, E. (2021). A theory of ICOs: Diversification, agency, and information asymmetry. *Management Science*, 67(10), 5969-5989.

[29] Brummer, C., & Yadav, Y. (2019). Fintech and the innovation trilemma. *Georgetown Law Journal*, 107(2), 235-307.

[30] Roe, M. J. (2024). Corporate short-termism—In the boardroom and in the courtroom. *Business Lawyer*, 68(4), 977-1006.

[31] Buterin, V., Hitzig, Z., & Weyl, E. G. (2019). A flexible design for funding public goods. *Management Science*, 65(11), 5171-5187.

[32] Kaal, W. A. (2021). Blockchain solutions for agency problems in corporate governance. In P. Hacker et al. (Eds.), *Regulating Blockchain: Techno-Social and Legal Challenges* (pp. 177-200). Oxford University Press.

[33] Walch, A. (2019). Deconstructing 'decentralization': Exploring the core claim of crypto systems. In C. Brummer (Ed.), *Cryptoassets: Legal, Regulatory, and Monetary Perspectives* (pp. 39-68). Oxford University Press.

[34] Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*. Pitman.

[35] Fenwick, M., & Vermeulen, E. P. M. (2020). The end of 'corporate' governance: Hello 'platform' governance. *European Business Organization Law Review*, 20(1), 171-199.

[36] Kolhar, M., & Kazi, F. (2023). Tokenization and financial inclusion: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Financial Inclusion*, 8(2), 145-167.

[37] Securities Act of 1933, 15 U.S.C. § 77a et seq.

[38] Securities Exchange Act of 1934, 15 U.S.C. § 78a et seq.; Commodity Exchange Act, 7 U.S.C. § 1 et seq.

[39] Brummer, C., & Kiviat, T. (2019). Crypto-assets and the challenge of U.S. securities law. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, 167(7), 1823-1875.

[40] U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission. (2023). *Framework for "Investment Contract" Analysis of Digital Assets*.

[41] SEC v. Telegram Group Inc., 448 F. Supp. 3d 352 (S.D.N.Y. 2020).

[42] SEC v. Ripple Labs Inc., 2023 WL 4507900 (S.D.N.Y. July 13, 2023).

[43] SEC Chairman Gary Gensler, Remarks Before the Aspen Security Forum (Aug. 3, 2023).

[44] U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission. (2024). *Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 122*.

[45] U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission. (2023). *Order Granting Accelerated Approval of Proposed Rule Change for Paxos Trust Company*.

[46] U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission. (2024). *Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 122*.

[47] *Id.*

[48] 17 C.F.R. § 210 (Regulation S-X).

[49] Financial Innovation and Technology for the 21st Century Act, H.R. 4763, 118th Cong. (2024).

[50] *Id.* § 103(b)(2).

[51] Congressional Research Service. (2026). *Digital Assets: Legislative Overview and Outlook*.

[52] Wyo. Stat. Ann. § 13-12-101 et seq. (Digital Assets Act).

[53] Del. Code Ann. tit. 8, § 224 (permitting corporations to maintain shareholder records using distributed electronic networks).

[54] Laster, J. T. (2023). The blockchain plunger: Using technology to clean up proxy plumbing and take back the vote. In A. Kumpan et al. (Eds.), *Festschrift für Klaus J. Hopt* (pp. 1351-1370). De Gruyter.

[55] Regulation (EU) 2023/1114 (MiCA), arts. 143-144 (entry into force provisions).

[56] Zetzsche, D. A., Arner, D. W., & Buckley, R. P. (2024). The Markets in Crypto-Assets Regulation (MiCA) and the EU digital finance strategy. *Capital Markets Law Journal*, 18(2), 203-232.

[57] Regulation (EU) 2023/1114 (MiCA), art. 2(3).

[58] Directive 2014/65/EU (MiFID II); Regulation (EU) No 596/2014 (MAR); Regulation (EU) 2017/1129 (Prospectus Regulation).

[59] ESMA. (2024). *Technical Standards for Crypto-Asset Services*. ESMA70-445-1119.

[60] ESMA. (2023). *Opinion on Initial Coin Offerings and Crypto-Assets*. ESMA50-157-1391.

[61] *Id.* at 5.

[62] Regulation (EU) 2017/1129 (Prospectus Regulation), art. 2(a).

[63] Busch, D., & Ferrarini, G. (2024). MiCA, DLT Pilot Regime and further initiatives: The EU approach to cryptoasset regulation. In D. Busch et al. (Eds.), *Regulating Fintech in the EU* (pp. 233-268). Oxford University Press.

[64] Regulation (EU) 2023/1114 (MiCA), arts. 59-73.

[65] Moloney, N. (2024). The Markets in Crypto-Assets Regulation: Some thoughts on regulatory design and implementation. *Journal of Financial Regulation*, 10(1), 74-98.

[66] Zetzsche, D. A., & Consiglio, R. (2023). Quantum leap or bridge too far: DLT pilot regime under MiFID II. *European Business Organization Law Review*, 24(1), 127-159.

[67] European Commission. (2020). *Communication on a Digital Finance Strategy for the EU*. COM(2020) 591 final.

[68] Regulation (EU) 2023/1114 (MiCA), Title III (Asset-Referenced Tokens).

[69] *Id.* arts. 19-22 (white paper requirements), art. 14 (civil liability), art. 67 (capital requirements).

[70] HM Treasury. (2023). *Future Financial Services Regulatory Regime for Cryptoassets*.

[71] Financial Conduct Authority. (2024). *Guidance on Cryptoassets*. FG19/5.

[72] Financial Services and Markets Act 2023, c. 29.

[73] *Id.* § 7 (power to specify crypto-assets as regulated investments).

[74] Financial Conduct Authority. (2024). *Perimeter Guidance Manual* (PERG) 13 (Guidance on Token Regulations).

[75] Financial Conduct Authority. (2023). *Regulatory Sandbox Lessons Learned Report*.

[76] *Id.* at 23-27 (discussing blockchain securities pilots).

[77] Bank of England. (2024). *Digital Pound: A UK Central Bank Digital Currency*. Discussion Paper.

[78] Financial Conduct Authority. (2023). *Approach to Crypto-Assets: Feedback to CP21/3*. PS22/10, at 12.

[79] *Id.*

[80] *Id.* at 15-18.

[81] Swiss Federal Council. (2018). *Legal Framework for Distributed Ledger Technology and Blockchain in Switzerland*.

[82] FINMA. (2018). *Guidelines for Enquiries Regarding the Regulatory Framework for Initial Coin Offerings (ICOs)*.

[83] *Id.* at 3-4.

[84] Swiss Code of Obligations, art. 973d (ledger-based securities); Financial Market Infrastructure Act (FMIA), arts. 50a-50f.

[85] Swiss Federal Council. (2020). *Message on the Federal Act on the Adaptation of Federal Law to Developments in Distributed Ledger Technology*.

[86] Hess, M., & Lenz, T. (2021). The new Swiss DLT legislation: A fully fledged legal framework for tokenized securities. *Journal of International Banking Law and Regulation*, 36(5), 233-241.

[87] Swiss Code of Obligations, art. 973d(1).

[88] *Id.* arts. 973d-973f.

[89] *Id.* art. 973d(2).

[90] SIX Digital Exchange. (2024). *SDX: The Digital Exchange for Digital Assets*. Company Publication.

[91] *Id.*

[92] Credit Suisse. (2023). *Credit Suisse Successfully Issues CHF 150 Million Bond on Blockchain*. Press Release.

[93] Schären, S., & Schwaller, M. (2024). Switzerland's pioneering approach to blockchain securities. *European Financial Markets Law Review*, 21(3), 287-304.

[94] *Id.* at 301-303.

[95] Monetary Authority of Singapore. (2024). *Approaches to Token Regulation*. MAS Policy Paper.

[96] Securities and Futures Act 2001 (Singapore), Pt. IV.

[97] Monetary Authority of Singapore. (2023). *A Guide to Digital Token Offerings*. MAS Guidance.

[98] Securities and Futures Act 2001 (Singapore), s. 239.

[99] *Id.* ss. 82-83, 86.

[100] Payment Services Act 2019 (Singapore), Pt. II.

[101] Wee, M. E., & Tham, C. (2023). Digital assets regulation in Singapore: A balanced approach. *Singapore Law Review*, 41, 289-321.

[102] Monetary Authority of Singapore. (2023). *Digital Token Offerings Guide*, at 4.

[103] Monetary Authority of Singapore. (2023). *Project Guardian: Testing Asset Tokenization in Financial Services*.

[104] *Id.* at 5-8.

[105] *Id.* at 12-15 (pilot participants and use cases).

[106] Monetary Authority of Singapore. (2024). *Proportionate Regulation of Digital Assets*. Policy Discussion Paper.

[107] Variable Capital Companies Act 2018 (Singapore).

[108] Sharma, P., & Kumar, A. (2024). Digital assets regulation in India: Evolution and challenges. *Indian Journal of Corporate Law*, 14(2), 234-267.

[109] Securities and Exchange Board of India Act 1992; Reserve Bank of India Act 1934.

[110] Companies Act 2013 (India).

[111] Income Tax Act 1961 (India), ss. 2(47A), 115BBH, 194S.

[112] Agrawal, R., & Singh, M. (2023). Taxation of virtual digital assets in India: An analysis. *Asia-Pacific Tax Bulletin*, 29(4), 387-403.

[113] Securities and Exchange Board of India. (2024). *Consultation Paper on Regulation of Tokenized Securities*. SEBI/HO/MRD/MRD-PoD-3/P/CIR/2024/45.

[114] Companies Act 2013 (India), ss. 88, 56.

[115] Nair, K., & Reddy, S. (2024). Blockchain and Indian company law: Challenges and opportunities. *National Law School Journal*, 16(1), 145-178.

[116] Bar Council of India. (2025). *Rules for Foreign Lawyers and Law Firms* (Amendment).

[117] Reserve Bank of India. (2023). *Financial Stability Report*, Issue No. 27, at 67-71.

[118] *Internet & Mobile Association of India v. Reserve Bank of India*, Writ Petition (Civil) No. 528 of 2018 (Supreme Court of India, Mar. 4, 2020).

[119] Ministry of Finance. (2024). *Report of the Committee on Virtual Currencies*.

[120] Gupta, A., & Patel, N. (2024). Tokenization experiments in Indian financial markets. *Journal of Banking and Finance Law*, 7(3), 456-478.

[121] *Id.* at 473-475.

[122] *Id.* at 476-477.

[123] Yermack, D. (2017). Corporate governance and blockchains. *Review of Finance*, 21(1), 7-31.

[124] Bethel, J. E., & Gillan, S. L. (2002). The impact of the institutional and regulatory environment on shareholder voting. *Financial Management*, 31(4), 29-54.

[125] Kaal, W. A. (2021). Blockchain solutions for agency problems in corporate governance. In P. Hacker et al. (Eds.), *Regulating Blockchain* (pp. 177-200). Oxford University Press.

[126] *Id.* at 185-190.

[127] Lafarre, A., & Van der Elst, C. (2018). Blockchain technology for corporate governance and shareholder activism. *European Corporate Governance Institute Law Working Paper No. 390/2018*.

[128] *Id.* at 15-18.

[129] Bonsall IV, S. B., Holzman, E. R., & Miller, B. P. (2017). Managerial ability and credit risk assessment. *Management Science*, 63(5), 1425-1449.

[130] Möslein, F., & Omlor, S. (2021). Token governance law. In P. Hacker et al. (Eds.), *Regulating Blockchain* (pp. 201-228). Oxford University Press.

[131] Securities Exchange Act of 1934, 15 U.S.C. § 78m(d); Schedule 13D.

[132] Zetzsche, D. A., Arner, D. W., & Buckley, R. P. (2020). Decentralized finance. *Journal of Financial Regulation*, 6(2), 172-203.

[133] Hu, H. T. C., & Black, B. (2006). The new vote buying: Empty voting and hidden (morphable) ownership. *Southern California Law Review*, 79(4), 811-908.

[134] *Id.* at 825-830.

[135] *Id.*

[136] Lafarre, A., & Van der Elst, C. (2018). *Supra* note 127, at 22-24.

[137] Buterin, V. (2018). *On Collusion*. Blog post, Vitalik.ca.

[138] Grossman, S. J., & Hart, O. D. (1988). One share-one vote and the market for corporate control. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 20, 175-202.

[139] Buterin, V., Hitzig, Z., & Weyl, E. G. (2019). *Supra* note 31.

[140] Kaal, W. A. (2021). *Supra* note 125, at 192-195.

[141] Finck, M. (2018). Blockchains and data protection in the European Union. *European Data Protection Law Review*, 4(1), 17-35.

[142] Meiklejohn, S., Pomarole, M., Jordan, G., Levchenko, K., McCoy, D., Voelker, G. M., & Savage, S. (2013). A fistful of bitcoins: Characterizing payments among men with no names. In *Proceedings of the 2013 Conference on Internet Measurement Conference* (pp. 127-140).

[143] Catalini, C., & Gans, J. S. (2020). Some simple economics of the blockchain. *Communications of the ACM*, 63(7), 80-90.

[144] Finck, M. (2018). *Supra* note 141, at 25-28.

[145] Securities Exchange Act of 1934, 15 U.S.C. § 78m (periodic reporting requirements).

[146] Paglia, M., & Nardi, F. (2023). Disclosure obligations for tokenized securities. *European Business Law Review*, 34(5), 677-703.

[147] Kaal, W. A., & Dell'Erba, M. (2017). Initial coin offerings: Emerging practices, risk factors, and red flags. *Crypto Assets: Legal and Monetary Perspectives*, 2018, 139-168.

[148] Finck, M. (2019). Blockchain and the General Data Protection Regulation: Can distributed ledgers be squared with European data protection law? *European Parliamentary Research Service* PE 634.445.

[149] *Id.* at 15-17.

[150] *Id.*

[151] Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (General Data Protection Regulation).

[152] *Id.* art. 17.

[153] Finck, M. (2019). *Supra* note 148, at 18-22.

[154] *Id.* at 22-24 (discussing off-chain storage solutions).

[155] Bainbridge, S. M. (2021). *Securities Law: Insider Trading* (3rd ed.). Foundation Press.

[156] *Id.* at 145-167.

[157] Walden, I. (2020). Regulating cryptocurrencies: Exploring the policy and legal challenges. *International Journal of Law and Information Technology*, 28(4), 1-29.

[158] Financial Action Task Force. (2023). *Updated Guidance for a Risk-Based Approach to Virtual Assets and Virtual Asset Service Providers*.

[159] Del. Code Ann. tit. 8, § 141(a) (directors manage business and affairs of corporation).

[160] *Smith v. Van Gorkom*, 488 A.2d 858 (Del. 1985).

[161] In re Caremark Int'l Inc. Derivative Litig., 698 A.2d 959, 970 (Del. Ch. 1996) (directors' duty to implement oversight systems).

[162] Strine, L. E., Jr., & Laster, J. T. (2019). The siren song of unlimited contractual freedom. In J. Armour & J. N. Gordon (Eds.), *Systemic Risk, Institutional Design, and the Regulation of Financial Markets* (pp. 11-48). Oxford University Press.

[163] Guth v. Loft, Inc., 5 A.2d 503 (Del. 1939).

[164] Möslein, F. (2021). Fiduciary duties in tokenized networks. *European Company and Financial Law Review*, 18(2), 189-217.

[165] *Id.* at 202-207.

[166] Wright, A., & De Filippi, P. (2015). Decentralized blockchain technology and the rise of lex cryptographia. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, at 18-22.

[167] Aronson v. Lewis, 473 A.2d 805, 812 (Del. 1984) (business judgment rule).

[168] Sklaroff, J. M. (2017). Smart contracts and the cost of inflexibility. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, 166, 263-303.

[169] *Id.* at 288-295.

[170] Romano, R. (1989). What went wrong with directors' and officers' liability insurance? *Delaware Journal of Corporate Law*, 14(1), 1-48.

[171] *Id.*

[172] Kahan, M., & Kamar, E. (2002). The myth of state competition in corporate law. *Stanford Law Review*, 55(3), 679-749.

[173] O'Hara, E. A., & Ribstein, L. E. (2009). *The Law Market*. Oxford University Press.

[174] Fenwick, M., Kaal, W. A., & Vermeulen, E. P. M. (2019). Legal education in a digital age: Why "coding for lawyers" matters. *Vanderbilt Journal of Entertainment and Technology Law*, 21(4), 853-890.

[175] Coffee, J. C., Jr. (1991). Liquidity versus control: The institutional investor as corporate monitor. *Columbia Law Review*, 91(6), 1277-1368.

[176] Catalini, C., & Gans, J. S. (2020). *Supra* note 143, at 85-87.

[177] Gillan, S. L., Koch, A., & Starks, L. T. (2021). Firms and social responsibility: A review of ESG and CSR research in corporate finance. *Journal of Corporate Finance*, 66, Article 101889.

[178] Hsieh, Y.-Y., Vergne, J.-P., Anderson, P., Lakhani, K., & Reitzig, M. (2018). Bitcoin and the rise of decentralized autonomous organizations. *Journal of Organization Design*, 7(1), 1-16.

[179] Davidson, S., De Filippi, P., & Potts, J. (2018). Blockchains and the economic institutions of capitalism. *Journal of Institutional Economics*, 14(4), 639-658.

[180] Orts, E. W., & Smith, N. C. (2017). *The Moral Responsibility of Firms*. Oxford University Press.

[181] *Id.* at 87-112.

[182] Holmström, B., & Tirole, J. (1993). Market liquidity and performance monitoring. *Journal of Political Economy*, 101(4), 678-709.

[183] Lyandres, E., Palazzo, B., & Rabetti, D. (2022). Initial coin offering (ICO) success and post-ICO performance. *Management Science*, 68(12), 8658-8679.

[184] *Id.* at 8675-8677.

[185] *Id.*

[186] Zetzsche, D. A., Buckley, R. P., Arner, D. W., & Föhr, L. (2024). *Supra* note 1, at 305-310.

[187] Ryngaert, C. (2015). *Jurisdiction in International Law* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

[188] Securities Act of 1933, 15 U.S.C. § 77e (registration requirements); Prospectus Regulation (EU) 2017/1129, art. 3.

[189] De Filippi, P., & Loveluck, B. (2016). The invisible politics of Bitcoin: Governance crisis of a decentralized infrastructure. *Internet Policy Review*, 5(3), 1-28.

[190] Brummer, C. (2015). *Minilateralism: How Trade Alliances, Soft Law and Financial Engineering Are Redefining Economic Statecraft*. Cambridge University Press.

[191] Allen, H. J. (2019). A U.S. regulatory sandbox for fintech. *Harvard Business Law Review Online*, 10, 1-9.

[192] DeSombre, E. R. (2006). *Flagging Standards: Globalization and Environmental, Safety, and Labor Regulations at Sea*. MIT Press.

[193] Morrison v. National Australia Bank Ltd., 561 U.S. 247 (2010).

[194] Symeonides, S. C. (2016). *Choice of Law*. Oxford University Press.

[195] Allen, J. G. (2018). Wrapped and stacked: 'Smart contracts' and the interaction of natural and formal language. *European Review of Contract Law*, 14(4), 307-343.

[196] Restatement (Second) of Conflict of Laws § 301 (Am. Law Inst. 1971).

[197] Zetzsche, D. A., Arner, D. W., & Buckley, R. P. (2020). *Supra* note 132, at 185-190.

[198] Financial Action Task Force. (2023). *Supra* note 158.

[199] *Id.* Recommendation 16.

[200] International Organization of Securities Commissions. (2023). *Policy Recommendations for Crypto and Digital Asset Markets*.

[201] Brummer, C., & Yadav, Y. (2019). *Supra* note 29, at 270-285.

[202] Atzei, N., Bartoletti, M., & Cimoli, T. (2017). A survey of attacks on Ethereum smart contracts (SoK). In *Principles of Security and Trust: 6th International Conference* (pp. 164-186). Springer.

[203] *Id.* at 165-168.

[204] DeFi Llama. (2024). *Hacks Database*. https://defillama.com/hacks (documenting over $4 billion in DeFi exploits).

[205] Werbach, K., & Cornell, N. (2017). Contracts ex machina. *Duke Law Journal*, 67(2), 313-382.

[206] *Id.* at 340-355.

[207] *Id.* at 355-365.

[208] Restatement (Second) of Contracts § 202 (Am. Law Inst. 1981) (rules of interpretation).

[209] Sklaroff, J. M. (2017). *Supra* note 168, at 275-280.

[210] *Id.*

[211] OpenZeppelin. (2024). *Upgradeable Contracts*. Technical Documentation.

[212] Gudgeon, L., Moreno-Sanchez, P., Roos, S., McCorry, P., & Gervais, A. (2020). SoK: Layer-two blockchain protocols. In *Financial Cryptography and Data Security: 24th International Conference* (pp. 201-226). Springer.

[213] ConsenSys Diligence. (2024). *Smart Contract Audit Process*. https://consensys.net/diligence/.

[214] *Id.*

[215] Durieux, T., Ferreira, J. F., Abreu, R., & Cruz, P. (2020). Empirical review of automated analysis tools on 47,587 Ethereum smart contracts. In *Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE 42nd International Conference on Software Engineering* (pp. 530-541).

[216] Bhargavan, K., Delignat-Lavaud, A., Fournet, C., Gollamudi, A., Gonthier, G., Kobeissi, N., ... & Zanella-Béguelin, S. (2016). Formal verification of smart contracts: Short paper. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM Workshop on Programming Languages and Analysis for Security* (pp. 91-96).

[217] McVea, H., & Tattersall, L. (2023). *Global Securities and Investment Regulation* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

[218] Pinna, A., & Ruttenberg, W. (2016). *Distributed Ledger Technologies in Securities Post-Trading: Revolution or Evolution?* European Central Bank Occasional Paper No. 172.

[219] *Id.* at 23-27.

[220] Belchior, R., Vasconcelos, A., Guerreiro, S., & Correia, M. (2021). A survey on blockchain interoperability: Past, present, and future trends. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 54(8), 1-41.

[221] *Id.* at 10-15.

[222] *Id.*

[223] Zamyatin, A., Harz, D., Lind, J., Panayiotou, P., Gervais, A., & Knottenbelt, W. (2019). XCLAIM: Trustless, interoperable, cryptocurrency-backed assets. In *2019 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy* (pp. 193-210).

[224] Micheler, E. (2023). *Custody Chains and Asset Values: Why Crypto-Securities Are Not Cryptocurrencies*. Cambridge University Press.

[225] *Id.* at 45-67.

[226] *Id.* at 89-103.

[227] Office of the Comptroller of the Currency. (2024). *Interpretive Letter 1174: National Bank and Federal Savings Association Authority to Provide Cryptocurrency Custody Services*.

[228] Micheler, E., & Whaley, A. (2020). Regulatory technology: Replacing law with computer code. *European Business Organization Law Review*, 21(2), 349-377.

[229] *Id.* at 360-365.

[230] *Id.*

[231] 11 U.S.C. § 547 (preferences); § 548 (fraudulent transfers).

[232] Micheler, E. (2023). *Supra* note 224, at 125-139.

[233] Baldwin, R., Cave, M., & Lodge, M. (2012). *Understanding Regulation: Theory, Strategy, and Practice* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

[234] *Id.* at 145-167.

[235] Black, J. (2008). Forms and paradoxes of principles-based regulation. *Capital Markets Law Journal*, 3(4), 425-457.

[236] International Organization of Securities Commissions. (2023). *Supra* note 200, at 8-12.

[237] Financial Conduct Authority. (2023). *Supra* note 75.

[238] *Id.* at 35-40.

[239] *Id.*

[240] Brummer, C. (2015). *Supra* note 190, at 189-215.

[241] Financial Stability Board. (2024). *Regulation, Supervision and Oversight of Crypto-Asset Activities and Markets*.

[242] *Id.* at 18-22.

[243] Ferran, E. (2004). Building an EU securities market. *Cambridge Yearbook of European Legal Studies*, 6, 1-49.

[244] *Id.* at 35-42.

[245] International Organization of Securities Commissions. (2023). *Supra* note 200, at 25-28.

[246] Chainalysis. (2024). *Crypto Crime Report*. https://www.chainalysis.com/reports/.

[247] Financial Action Task Force. (2023). *Supra* note 158, at 32-35.

[248] National Association of Corporate Directors. (2024). *Director's Handbook on Cyber-Risk Oversight*.

[249] *Id.* at 27-34.

[250] *Id.* at 45-52.

[251] Lafarre, A., & Van der Elst, C. (2018). *Supra* note 127, at 28-31.

[252] *Id.*

[253] Securities Exchange Act of 1934, 15 U.S.C. § 78j(b) (anti-fraud provisions); Regulation FD, 17 C.F.R. § 243 (selective disclosure).

[254] Kaal, W. A. (2021). *Supra* note 125, at 195-198.

[255] *Id.*

[256] *Id.*

[257] Sklaroff, J. M. (2017). *Supra* note 168, at 295-300.

[258] *Id.*

[259] *Id.*

[260] Swiss Code of Obligations, art. 973d.

[261] Hess, M., & Lenz, T. (2021). *Supra* note 86, at 238-240.

[262] *Id.*

[263] Werbach, K., & Cornell, N. (2017). *Supra* note 205, at 365-375.