

# Auctions with Tokens\*

*Andrea Canidio*<sup>†</sup>

First version: September 30, 2021. This version: February 1, 2023. Please check here for the latest version.

## Abstract

I study mechanism design with blockchain-based tokens, that is, tokens that can be used within a mechanism but can also be saved and traded outside of the mechanism. I do so by considering a repeated, private-value auction, in which the auctioneer accepts payments in a blockchain-based token he creates and initially owns. I show that the present-discounted value of the expected revenues is the same as in a standard auction with dollars, but these revenues accrue earlier and are less variable. I then introduce non-contractible effort and the possibility of misappropriating revenues. I compare the auction with tokens to an auction with dollars in which the auctioneer can also issue financial securities. An auction with tokens is preferred when there are sufficiently severe contracting frictions, while the opposite is true when contracting frictions are low.

**JEL classification:** D44, E42, L86

**Keywords:** Mechanism design, Auctions, Blockchain, Cryptocurrencies, Tokens, Private Money

## 1 Introduction

Blockchain protocols resemble the mechanisms studied in mechanism design. Like in these mechanisms, each blockchain protocol needs to generate incentive-compatible

---

\*I'm grateful to John Asker, Rainer Böhme, Sylvain Chassang, Lin William Cong, Andreas Park and conference participants at the Crypto Asset Lab conference 2021, CSH Workshop on Decentralized Finance 2022, ASSA 2023, seminars at CREST, CY University (Thema) for their insightful comments and suggestions.

<sup>†</sup>IMT school of advanced studies, Lucca, Italy; andrea.canidio@imtlucca.it

behavior, so to achieve a given aggregate outcome. Furthermore, each blockchain protocol is associated with a specific blockchain-based token, which is necessary to use the protocol, usually as its internal currency.<sup>1</sup> The use of tokens within blockchain protocols is, therefore, similar to the use of “virtual money” in several mechanisms. For example, several business schools allocate students to MBA classes by distributing “points” to students, who then use them to bid for classes.<sup>2</sup> Similarly, the organization Feeding America distributes food to various local food banks via auctions in which a virtual currency is used.<sup>3</sup> Unlike these virtual currencies, however, the tokens associated with blockchain protocols exist also outside of their respective protocol: they can be held without being used and can be exchanged on financial markets. They are, therefore, a new financial instrument, which opens several issues not usually considered in mechanisms design: will some of these tokens be held and not used in the mechanism? And how will this affect the mechanism itself? And the revenues earned by the designer?

Studying blockchain protocols as mechanisms, therefore, required a theory of mechanism design that incorporates blockchain-based tokens. This paper makes the first step in this direction by considering a specific mechanism: an auction. Auctions are the most widely studied and better-understood mechanism and therefore constitute an ideal starting point in this research agenda. They are also effective at allocating a given good to the bidder who values it the most, something that, as we will see, remains true with the introduction of tokens. The role of tokens within the mechanism is, therefore, limited, which allows me to focus on the most novel aspect of the model: the fact that these tokens can be held and can be traded outside of the mechanism.

I consider a finite sequence of private-value auctions in which multiple objects

---

<sup>1</sup> The fact that the token is the internal currency is very explicit in protocols creating decentralized marketplaces, for example, for buying and selling computer storage space (see Filecoin, Storj, Sia) or CPU cycles (see the Golem network). It is also the case in decentralized computing platforms such as Ethereum, in which users pay miners/validators for executing smart contracts. It also extends to cryptocurrencies such as Bitcoin, in which users pay miners to process transactions in Bitcoins.

<sup>2</sup> See Hylland and Zeckhauser (1979), Budish (2011), Budish et al. (2017), He et al. (2018).

<sup>3</sup> See Prendergast (2017) and Prendergast (forthcoming). Note that, in the existing literature studying the use of virtual currencies within mechanisms, the objective of the auctioneer is not to maximize revenues.

are sold (one per period).<sup>4</sup> In every period, risk-neutral bidders draw their valuation for the object sold from an i.i.d. distribution. Then they submit bids. Given the profile of bids, the auction format determines the winning bidder and the payment of each player. The good is then consumed within the period. Each auction is, therefore, a simple static auction, repeated multiple times (that is, there is no connection between auctions in different periods). As a part of the auction design, the auctioneer can decide to accept payments in dollars or in a blockchain-based token that he creates and initially owns. If he chooses the latter option, the auctioneer also commits to a monetary policy: a set of rules determining how the stock of tokens evolves. The auctioneer earns revenues by selling newly created tokens to bidders and re-selling tokens he received as payment. Tokens can be held without being used for bidding and can be traded on a financial market where their value is determined as an equilibrium outcome.<sup>5</sup>

I show that in the auction with tokens when the realized valuations in a given period are low (relative to the future expected valuations), bidders might purchase tokens for speculation, not bidding. The reason is that when valuations are low, the demand for tokens *for bidding* is low, creating an arbitrage opportunity for bidders: they may purchase tokens, not use them for bidding in that period, and sell them (or use them) in future periods. The speculative demand for tokens increases the price for tokens in a given period and, as a consequence, drives the auctioneer's expected revenues for that period above those of the auction with dollars. At the same time, today's speculators will compete with the auctioneer on tomorrow's market for tokens, pushing the auctioneer's future expected revenues below those of the auction with dollars. Also, the speculative demand in a given period depends on the *expected* future valuations. Hence, speculation transforms future uncertain revenues into present certain revenues

---

<sup>4</sup> The companion short paper Canidio (forthcoming) considers the case of an infinitely repeated auction. The main issue there is the emergence of financial bubbles on tokens.

<sup>5</sup> Note that creating new tokens and trading them on a financial market is quite easy to do. There are several simple tutorials explaining how to create blockchain-based tokens (I invite the reader to search "how to create an ERC-20 Token", where ERC-20 is the simplest type of token on the Ethereum blockchain). Also, after the creation of a new token, anyone can then use a protocol such as Uniswap to create a *decentralized financial market* for exchanging the new token against, for example, a stablecoin (i.e., a blockchain-based token with constant value relative to the dollar).

I show that there is a form of revenue equivalence: the present-discounted value of the expected revenues is the same in all auction formats (with or without tokens). However, in each specific period, the revenues in the auction with tokens may be different from those in the auction with dollars. More precisely, revenues accrue earlier and are less variable in the auction with tokens than in the auction with dollars. How exactly depends on the specific monetary policy announced by the auctioneer. A particularly relevant case is a policy in which all tokens used to pay the auctioneer are then destroyed. In this case, all revenues are earned in the first period, when the auctioneer sells the initial stock of tokens. Furthermore, the present-discounted value of the expected revenues from period-2 onward is earned with probability 1.<sup>6</sup>

Hence, by designing an appropriate auction with tokens, the auctioneer can fully front-load his revenues and eliminate (almost) all risk. Quite immediately, it is possible to achieve the same outcome by holding an auction with dollars in which the auctioneer also sells equity (i.e., transferring to investors his future cash flow). The first result is, therefore, an equivalence result: absent costs of issuing tokens or equity, the optimal auction with tokens is equivalent to issuing equity.

I then extend the model by introducing two frictions (i) costly non-contractible effort and (ii) revenue misappropriation, i.e., the possibility that the auctioneer can hide revenues by “running away with the till” (at a cost). Intuitively, when issuing tokens, the auctioneer commits to deliver the object in the future. This commitment may be imperfect whenever the auctioneer can shirk, exert low effort, and provide an object of lower value to the token holders. Alternatively, the auctioneer can hold an auction with dollars while simultaneously pledging future cash flows to investors via a traditional financial instrument. The critical observation is that everything that limits the auctioneer’s ability to commit the object also limits his ability to commit the revenues generated by the sale of the object. But the possibility of revenue misappropriation only affects traditional financial instruments because it reduces the auctioneer’s ability to commit revenues.

---

<sup>6</sup> The reason is that, in the model, the first sale of tokens happens after the period-1 valuations are drawn, which therefore is the only risk faced by the auctioneer. There is a straightforward extension of the model in which the auctioneer can also sell tokens before period-1 valuations are drawn, in which case the auctioneer can eliminate all risks.

Hence, whether to issue tokens or a traditional financial instrument hinges on a trade-off. On the one hand, the possibility of misappropriating revenues is a concern only when issuing a traditional financial instrument. On the other hand, depending on the contracting environment, a traditional financial instrument may specify contingent payments that tokens cannot replicate. I show that if the cost of hiding revenue is sufficiently low, tokens are the preferred financial instrument because the possibility of revenue misappropriation is absent. If instead, running away is sufficiently costly, a traditional financial instrument is the preferred means of financing. Note that the cost of revenue misappropriation proxies contract incompleteness because it determines the set of incentive-compatible financial instruments. Hence, the result is that if the contracting space is limited, issuing tokens is preferred, while when the contracting space is sufficiently large, then a traditional financial instrument is preferred.

This paper makes several contributions. First, it shows that destroying (or burning) tokens may be the optimal monetary policy. Burning has been widely discussed within the Ethereum community in relation to the implementation of EIP-1559, a new way to calculate transaction fees according to which a fraction of the fees paid by users are burned rather than transferred to miners/validators.<sup>7</sup> This paper also contributed to the discussion on whether tokens are securities. The tokens in the model provide access to a service and are, therefore, “utility tokens.” The logic behind their pricing and valuation is different from that of equity (see, in particular, Prat et al., 2019). Because of that, some argue that utility tokens are not securities. However, the benchmark model (i.e., the one without frictions) shows that *in equilibrium*, the value of these tokens is identical to that of equity. Finally, this paper also provides a rationale for using tokens over equity. When the contracting space is sufficiently restricted, then tokens are preferred to equity because revenue misappropriation is not an issue with tokens, but it is with equity.

---

<sup>7</sup> See the original proposal here <https://eips.ethereum.org/EIPS/eip-1559>. For an economic analysis of EIP-1559, see Roughgarden (2020). The original motivation for burning is to prevent miners/validators from manipulating how fees are calculated. There is, however, a heated debate on whether tokens should be burned rather than automatically forwarded to a dedicated fund.

## Literature review

The literature studying the use of tokens within mechanisms includes papers in which the mechanism encompasses the entire economy. The goal of these papers is to establish whether certain centralized mechanisms can be implemented in a decentralized way using tokens (see, for example, Ostroy and Starr, 1974, Kocherlakota, 1998). Similarly, some of the early papers in monetary theory considered general-equilibrium models in which there is at least an equilibrium with money (see Samuelson, 1958, and Townsend, 1980). Because the equilibrium with money is Pareto superior to that without money, again, we can think of money as allowing the decentralized implementation of some (usually constrained) optimal allocation. Also related are models in which money has value (also in finite time) because of exogenous reasons. For example, in Starr (1974), a government creates money and establishes that taxes need to be paid using money. Likewise, in the cash-in-advance model of Clower (1967), fiat money needs to be acquired one period in advance. Note that in these models, the optimal monetary policy is typically time inconsistent, and hence the issue of commitment to a monetary policy arises (see, in particular, Lucas Jr and Stokey, 1983).

The advent of blockchain and blockchain-based tokens provided a new impulse to the above literature (for an overview, see Townsend, 2020). The reason is that blockchain-based smart contracts can be used to generate commitment, for example, to perform payments based on contingencies. Several authors have therefore studied how blockchain-based smart contracts can be used to implement various types of mechanisms (see, Holden and Malani, 2019, Gans, 2019, Lee et al., 2021, Brzustowski et al., 2021, Townsend and Zhang, forthcoming).<sup>8</sup> With this respect, note that, in the model presented here, the auction itself could be a traditional, centralized auction or a decentralized one (via a smart contract). Hence, this paper does not contribute to the study of how auctions (or other mechanisms) can be implemented using blockchain. However, the issue of implementation is relevant for the equilibrium of the game (of which the auction is a part). The reason is that,

---

<sup>8</sup> There is also a small but growing literature using insights from mechanism to propose improvements to blockchain protocols. See, for example, Gans and Holden (2022a), Gans and Holden (2022b), Capponi and Jia (2021), Canidio and Danos (2022).

in equilibrium, the auction with tokens is equivalent to an auction with dollars in which the auctioneer also issues equity.

Several papers study theoretically firms' incentives to issue blockchain-based tokens, which can represent a pre-sale of a given unit of future output, the only currency that the firm will accept in the future, or a claim on future revenues or profits. Some of these papers showed that, in the presence of network externalities, selling tokens helps avoid coordination failures (Sockin and Xiong, 2018, Cong et al., 2021, Bakos and Halaburda, 2018, and Li and Mann, 2018). Other papers focused on the sale of tokens as an innovative way to raise capital and finance the development of a product or a platform (Catalini and Gans, 2018, Malinova and Park, 2018, Canidio, 2018, Bakos and Halaburda, 2019, Goldstein et al., 2019, Cong et al., 2020, Canidio, 2020, Gryglewicz et al., 2021, Garratt and van Oordt, 2021, Chod and Lyandres, 2021). In the model considered here, the auctioneer has no financing need, and there are no network externalities. Hence, tokens are sold purely to earn a profit. Nonetheless, there is a connection with the above literature because by issuing tokens, the auctioneer can manipulate the time profile and riskiness of his revenues. Both these elements are important in determining the incentives to invest and create new ventures.

I will frequently refer to two important results in auction theory. The first is the revenue equivalence theorem, which states:<sup>9</sup>

*Assume each of a given number of risk-neutral potential buyers of an object has a privately-known signal independently drawn from a common, strictly-increasing, atomless distribution. Then any auction mechanism in which (i) the object always goes to the buyer with the highest signal, and (ii) any bidder with the lowest-feasible signal expects zero surplus, yields the same expected revenue (and results in each bidder making the same expected payment as a function of her signal).*

For our purposes, the above statement implies that all common auction formats (i.e., first-price, second-price, all-pay, ...) generate the same expected payment from

---

<sup>9</sup> Vickrey (1961) developed some special case of the revenue equivalence theorem. The statement presented here is taken from Klemperer (1999), and summarizes results in Myerson (1981) and Riley and Samuelson (1981). For a more general formulation, see Milgrom and Segal (2002).

bidders and hence the same expected revenues for the auctioneer. The second result is the design of optimal auctions (see, again, Myerson, 1981, Bulow and Roberts, 1989, Bulow and Klemperer, 1996 and Klemperer, 1999). In particular, in the model I will assume that the distribution of valuations is such that all common auction formats with a reservation price of zero maximize the auctioneer's expected revenues.

## 2 The model

I consider a single-object private-value auction repeated  $T \geq 1$  times. There are  $n \geq 2$  ex-ante identical bidders and an auctioneer. Bidders are risk-neutral and cash abundant in the sense that their cash constraint is never binding. The auctioneer's per-period utility function is  $U()$ , assumed concave. There is a common discount factor  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ . Bidders and the auctioneer can hold a risk-free asset yielding a per-period gross return of  $R \geq 1$ . For ease of derivations, I assume that  $R = \frac{1}{\beta}$ .<sup>10</sup> The auctioneer's initial assets are  $w_1 \geq 0$ . For the moment, I assume that the auctioneer can only save by investing in the risk-free asset, and hence  $w_t \geq 0$  for all  $t \leq T$ , where  $w_t$  are the asset owned by the auctioneer at the beginning of a given period  $t$ . Section 3.3 discusses what happens when the auctioneer can also issue equity.

In period 0, the auctioneer decides whether to accept payments in fiat currency (for simplicity, dollars) or in tokens. When the auction format requires the use of tokens, the auctioneer creates an initial stock of tokens  $M_1$  and announces a monetary policy, that is, how the stock of tokens will evolve (see below). Then, in every period  $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ , the auctioneer sells a single object according to the auction format specified initially.

At the beginning of each period  $t \geq 1$ , each bidder draws a valuation  $v_{i,t} > 0$  from a continuous and atomless distribution with c.d.f  $F(v)$ , p.d.f.  $f(v)$  and support  $[\underline{v}, \bar{v}]$ . Each  $v_{i,t}$  is bidder  $i$ 's private information, but the distribution  $F(v)$  is common knowledge. The auction is in private value so that each bidder's valuation is independent of the other bidders' valuations. To avoid uninteresting complications,

---

<sup>10</sup> Hence,  $R$  is the steady-state rate of return of the Ramsey-Cass-Koopmans growth model (with no population growth or exogenous productivity growth). This assumption is not essential for the results but simplifies the derivations.



I assume that  $vf(v) \geq 1 - F(v)$  for all  $v \in [\underline{v}, \bar{v}]$ .<sup>11</sup> Each object sold has zero value to the auctioneer.

If the auctioneer uses dollars, the sequence of events in each period is standard: after drawing the valuations, each bidder sends a message  $m_{i,t} \in \mathbb{R}_+$  to the auctioneer, interpreted as his bid. As a function of the messages received and the auction format initially announced, the auctioneer determines who is the winner and payments  $b_{i,t} \leq m_{i,t}$  for each bidder. Each bidder then pays  $b_{i,t}$  dollars to the auctioneer, and the winner receives and consumes the object. The period- $t$  payoff of the winning bidder is  $v_{i,t} - b_{i,t}$ ; the period- $t$  payoffs of all other bidders is  $-b_{i,t}$ . The auctioneer's period- $t$  revenues are  $\sum_i^n b_{i,t}$ . At this point, the auctioneer invests  $\frac{w_t+1}{R}$  in the risk-free asset (which become  $w_{t+1}$  in the following period), and consumes  $w_t + \sum_i^n b_{i,t} - \frac{w_t+1}{R}$ .

If the auctioneer instead uses tokens, then the timeline of each period  $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$  is the following:

- Again, at the start of a period, each bidder draws a valuation  $v_{i,t}$  from the distribution  $F(v)$ , and then sends a message  $m_{i,t} \in \mathbb{R}_+$  to the auctioneer, interpreted as his bid *in dollars*. Note that, at this point, both the auctioneer and bidders may own tokens that they accumulated from previous periods. Call  $A_t \geq 0$  the tokens owned by the auctioneer at the beginning of the period, and  $a_{i,t} \geq 0$  the tokens owned by bidder  $i$ . By assumption,  $A_1 = M_1$  and  $a_{i,1} = 0$  for all  $i \leq n$ .
- As a function of the messages received and the auction format initially announced, the auctioneer determines who is the winner and payments  $b_{i,t} \leq m_{i,t}$  for each bidder (implicitly a function of all messages received). This payment is expressed in dollars, *but needs to be settled using tokens*.<sup>12</sup>
- A frictionless, anonymous financial market for tokens opens, in which both the auctioneer and bidders participate. All market participants are price tak-

---

<sup>11</sup> As we will see, under this assumption, the revenue-maximizing reservation price in the auction with dollars is zero, and calculating the revenues from the optimal auction with dollars is straightforward.

<sup>12</sup> The fact that bids and payments are expressed in dollars is for convenience, as it allows me to use the same notation as in the auction with dollars. The results are identical whenever bids are expressed in tokens.

ers. Call  $p_t$  the equilibrium price for tokens; call  $q_{i,t}$  the equilibrium demand for tokens of bidder  $i$ ; call  $Q_t$  the equilibrium demand for tokens of the auctioneer. Both  $q_{i,t}$  and  $Q_t$  could be positive or negative: if negative, the bidder/auctioneer is a net seller of tokens in equilibrium; if positive, he is a net buyer. Furthermore, feasibility implies  $A_t + \sum_i a_{i,t} = Q_t + \sum_i q_{i,t}$ . Also, because tokens will be used to pay the auctioneer (see the next point), it must be that  $q_{i,t} \geq \frac{b_{i,t}}{p_t} - a_{i,t}$ .

- Then, each bidder sends  $\frac{b_{i,t}}{p_t}$  tokens to the auctioneer. The winner receives the object and consumes it. At this point, each bidder owns  $a_{i,t} + q_{i,t} - \frac{b_{i,t}}{p_t}$  tokens, and the auctioneer owns  $A_t + Q_t + \sum_i \frac{b_{i,t}}{p_t}$  tokens.
- The winning bidder enjoys a per-period payoff equal to the value of the object minus the expenditure in tokens  $v_i - p_t \cdot q_{i,t}$ . Similarly, the losing bidders enjoy per-period payoffs equal to  $-p_t q_{i,t}$ , and the auctioneer's revenues are  $-p_t Q_t$ . Again, the auctioneer chooses  $w_{t+1}$  and then consumes  $w_t - p_t Q_t + \frac{w_{t+1}}{R}$ .
- The stock of tokens changes according to the monetary policy announced by the auctioneer. Here I restrict my attention to two time-varying monetary-policy parameters: a uniform increase (or decrease) of all tokens by the same factor  $\tau_t \geq -1$ , and an increase (or decrease) of only the tokens used for bidding by a time-varying factor  $\sigma_t \geq -1$ . As a result, at the beginning of the subsequent period, each bidder  $i$  owns  $a_{i,t+1} = (1 + \tau_t)(a_{i,t} + q_{i,t} - \frac{b_{i,t}}{p_t})$ , while the auctioneer owns  $A_{t+1} = (1 + \tau_t)(A_t + Q_t + (1 + \sigma_t) \sum_i \frac{b_{i,t}}{p_t})$ . Hence, the total stock of tokens at the beginning of period  $t + 1$  is  $M_{t+1} \equiv A_{t+1} + \sum_i a_{i,t+1}$ .

The monetary policy considered here may sound far-fetched, but it is very simple to implement with blockchain-based tokens. In particular, the fact that the tokens used for bidding may grow at a different rate than the other tokens is inspired by staking. In staking, those who “lock” some tokens (or, more in general, do not use them) are rewarded with additional tokens. Here the staking reward is positive if  $\sigma_t < 0$ , in which case those who do not use the tokens receive an additional reward relative to those who use them.

The above auction with tokens is as close as possible to a traditional auction with dollars: bids and payments are expressed in dollars but need to be settled

using tokens. However, other assumptions are possible. For example, bidders may be required to bid by submitting tokens, which could then be partially returned to the bidders after the winner is determined.<sup>13</sup> Also, here I consider only two possible monetary policies, but many more are possible. The bottom line is that the above is the least complex auction with tokens and not the most general auction with tokens.

### 3 Equilibrium

I first consider the auction with dollars and then the auction with tokens.

#### 3.1 Auction with dollars

When the auction uses dollars, all the standard results from auction theory apply.<sup>14</sup> Quite immediately, in every period, the revenue equivalence theorem holds: all standard auction formats generate the same expected revenues. Also, given our assumption on the distribution of valuations, revenues are maximized when the reservation price is zero. By considering a second-price auction, in every period, expected revenues are

$$k \equiv E[v_{Max-1,t}].$$

where  $v_{Max,t} \equiv \max_i \{v_{i,t}\}$  is the realized highest valuation in period  $t$ , and  $v_{Max-1,t} \equiv \max_{i \neq Max} \{v_{i,t}\}$  is the realized second-highest valuation in period  $t$ . Also, each bidder's expected payoff from the auction is

$$g \equiv E[\max\{v_i - v_t^{Max-1}, 0\}]$$

---

<sup>13</sup> In this case, bidders need to purchase tokens before bidding, which means that the equilibrium price of tokens may reveal some information relative to the realized distribution of valuations. Hence, the equilibrium on the market for tokens should be a rational expectation equilibrium, which opens several additional complications, including the existence of the equilibrium.

<sup>14</sup> See, for example, Klemperer (1999), in particular Section 4 (for the revenue equivalence theorem) and Appendix B (how to calculate the optimal reservation price).

Hence, from period-1 viewpoint, the present-discounted value of the expected revenues of the auction with dollars are:

$$\Pi_{USD} = k \sum_{t=1}^T \beta^{t-1} = \frac{1 - \beta^T}{1 - \beta} k$$

and the present discounted value of participating in the auction as a bidder is

$$u_{USD} = g \sum_{t=1}^T \beta^{t-1} = g \frac{1 - \beta^T}{1 - \beta}$$

For a given auction format, the auctioneer's utility is

$$U_{USD} = \max_{w_2 \geq 0, \dots, w_T \geq 0, w_{T+1} = 0} \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^T \beta^{t-1} EU \left( \sum_i^n b_{i,t} + w_t - \frac{w_{t+1}}{R} \right), \right\},$$

where  $EU_t()$  is the auctioneer's expected utility in period  $t$ . Note that, if the auctioneer is risk averse (i.e. his utility function is strictly concave), not all common auction formats maximize expected utility. The reason is that the variance of the revenues also matters. Nonetheless, for our purposes, it is enough to establish an upper bound to the auctioneer's utility, as the next lemma does (its proof is omitted).

**Lemma 1.** *Consider a given auction format, a given level of initial assets  $w_1$ , and realized period-1 revenues  $\sum_i^n b_{i,1}$ . Define  $w_2^*, \dots, w_T^*$  as the unconstrained optimal sequence of assets in the absence of risk, that is*

$$\{w_2^*, \dots, w_T^*\} \equiv \operatorname{argmax}_{w_2, \dots, w_{T+1} = 0} \left\{ U \left( \sum_i^n b_{i,1} + w_1 - \frac{w_2}{R} \right) + \sum_{t=2}^T \beta^{t-1} U \left( k + w_t - \frac{w_{t+1}}{R} \right) \right\}.$$

*It must be that*

$$U_{USD} \leq E \left[ U \left( \sum_i^n b_{i,1} + w_1 - \frac{w_2^*}{R} \right) + \sum_{t=2}^T \beta^{t-1} U \left( k + w_t^* - \frac{w_{t+1}^*}{R} \right) \right]$$

*where the expectation is taken over period-1 revenues  $\sum_i^n b_{i,1}$ . The above inequality is strict if  $U()$  is strictly concave.*

The above lemma says that, for every possible auction format, the auctioneer's utility must be lower than the utility when all risks after period 1 are eliminated and credit constraints are removed, allowing him to borrow at the risk-free rate. The inequality must be strict if his utility is strictly concave. Quite intuitively, if the auctioneer is risk averse, he would rather receive the largest possible expected revenues  $k$  with probability 1 in each period rather than be exposed to the variability of these revenues. Furthermore, the fact that utility is strictly concave also implies that the auctioneer benefits from smoothing consumption across periods. Because achieving optimal consumption smoothing may require borrowing, the auctioneer benefits when borrowing constraints are removed (independently of whether risk is also removed).

### 3.2 Auction with tokens

I start by deriving the price of tokens in a given period  $t$  as a function of the following-period expected price of tokens  $p_{t+1}^e$  and the realization of bids.

**Lemma 2.** *Consider a given  $p_{t+1}^e$  and a given realization of period- $t$  valuations (and hence given profile of bids  $m_{i,t}, \dots, m_{n,t}$  and payments  $b_{i,t}, \dots, b_{n,t}$ ). The demand for tokens in period  $t$  is*

$$\frac{\sum_i b_{i,t}}{p_t} + S_t$$

where  $S_t \geq 0$  is the speculative demand for tokens, that is, the demand for tokens not used for paying the auctioneer in period  $t$ , and is defined as

$$S_t = \max \left\{ M_t - \frac{\sum_i^n b_{i,t}}{\beta(1 + \tau_t)p_{t+1}^e}, 0 \right\}.$$

The equilibrium period- $t$  price is:

$$p_t = \max \left\{ \frac{\sum_i b_{i,t}}{M_t}, \beta(1 + \tau_t)p_{t+1}^e \right\}. \quad (1)$$

The most important observation is that some tokens may be purchased not for bidding but for speculative purposes. This happens in equilibrium when the realized distribution of valuations is such that total payments to the auctioneer are low. In

this case, if the demand for tokens was determined exclusively by the tokens used for bidding, we would have  $p_t < \beta(1 + \tau_t)p_{t+1}^e$  which cannot be an equilibrium because the return on investing in tokens would be strictly greater than that of investing in the risk-free asset (remember that the risk-free asset generates a present-discounted return equal to  $\beta R = 1$  and that tokens held for speculation grow by a factor  $1 + \tau_t$  between periods). The possibility of purchasing tokens for speculation implies that the period- $t$  price of tokens has a lower bound at  $\beta(1 + \tau_t)p_{t+1}^e$ .

The above lemma can be used to derive the bidders' incentives to bid for a given sequence of token prices. If  $p_t \geq \beta(1 + \tau)p_{t+1}^e$  then bidders do not want to hold any token between the two periods, hence  $a_{i,t+1} = 0$ . If instead  $p_t = \beta(1 + \tau)p_{t+1}^e$ , then holding tokens for speculation generates zero utility. Bidders are therefore indifferent between holding any amount of tokens between period  $t$  and period  $t + 1$ , including zero tokens. It follows that, in both cases, bidder  $i$ 's utility as a function of  $p_t$ ,  $p_{t+1}^e$  and the profile of bids is:

$$\begin{cases} v_{i,t} + p_t a_{i,t} - b_{i,t} + \beta u_{t+1}(0) & \text{if } i \text{ is the winner} \\ p_t a_{i,t} - b_{i,t} + \beta u_{t+1}(0) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where  $u_{t+1}(a_{i,t+1})$  is the expected continuation utility from period  $t + 1$  onward, as a function of the tokens owned at the start of period  $t + 1$ . It immediately follows that, for a given auction format, the bidders' incentives to bid are the same with or without tokens. Because of this, the revenue equivalence theorem holds also here: any standard auction format with a reservation price of zero maximizes the expected payment to the auctioneer, which is  $E[\sum_i b_{i,t}] = k$ . As a consequence, the bidders' expected payoff from participating in the auction is, again,  $g$ .

Importantly, (2) also implies that the bidders' payoffs depend both on the expected payoff from participating in the auction  $g$ , and on the expected value of the tokens held at the beginning of the period  $p_t^e \cdot a_{i,t}$ .<sup>15</sup> I can therefore take the expectation of (2), use the fact that the expected payoff from participating in the auction

---

<sup>15</sup> It is useful to think of each bidder selling all their tokens and earning  $p_t a_{i,t}$ , while simultaneously purchasing tokens to bid  $b_{i,t}$ . The expected cost of the bid is part of the expected payoff from the auction.

is  $g$ , and write bidder  $i$ 's expected continuation utility as:

$$u_t(a_{i,t}) = p_t^e a_{i,t} + g \sum_{t=1}^T \beta^{t-1} = p_t^e a_{i,t} + g \frac{1 - \beta^T}{1 - \beta}$$

Note that because  $a_{i,1} = 0$ , then a bidder's expected continuation utility from period 1 viewpoint is the same as in the auction with dollars. But because  $a_{i,t}$  could be positive for  $t \geq 2$ , then the time profile of the bidder's utility may differ in the auction with tokens from the auction with dollars.

Having determined the bidders' expected utility, I can now derive the auctioneer's expected revenues, as the next proposition does.

**Proposition 1** (Expected revenues). *Consider a given sequence of equilibrium expected prices (i.e., prices such that equation 1 holds). At the beginning of each period  $t \leq T$ , the present-discounted value of the auctioneer's future expected revenues is*

$$\Pi_{Tokens,t}(A_t) = \frac{1 - \beta^T}{1 - \beta} k - p_t^e (M_t - A_t).$$

The key observation is that the speculative demand for tokens in period  $t$  increases the price of tokens and the auctioneer's revenues in that period. At the same time, speculators compete against the auctioneer on the market for tokens in period  $t + 1$ . The proposition shows that, in expected terms, the two effects cancel out. As a consequence, the present discounted value of the auctioneer's expected revenues at the beginning of the game is  $\Pi_{Tokens,1}(M_1) = \frac{1 - \beta^T}{1 - \beta} k$ , as in the auction with dollars. In any subsequent period, the auctioneers' continuation revenues may be lower than those in the auction with dollars by an amount equal to the value of the tokens not held by the auctioneer in that period. Finally, note that the above proposition highlights the effect of the speculative demand for tokens on the time profile of the auctioneer's revenues. The speculative demand for tokens, however, has an additional effect on the variability of these revenues. The reason is that the speculative demand for tokens depends on the future expected price and therefore transforms uncertain future revenues into certain present revenues.

Crucially, the incentive to purchase tokens for speculation—and, as a consequence, the time profile and variability of revenues—depends on the monetary pol-

icy specified by the auctioneer. If  $\sigma_t$  is sufficiently large for all  $t \leq T$ , then in every period, the auctioneer creates and keeps for himself a large number of tokens. As a consequence of the resulting inflation, the speculative demand for tokens is, therefore, zero, and, like in the auction with tokens, the auctioneer earns  $\sum_i b_{i,t}$  dollars in every period. As  $\sigma_t$  decreases, the incentive to purchase tokens for speculation increases, causing revenues to accrue earlier and to be less uncertain. The case  $\sigma_t = -1$  is therefore particularly relevant: bidders purchase all tokens in period 1, and progressively use them to pay the auctioneer, who then destroys these tokens. The next proposition derives the auctioneer's revenues for this case.

**Proposition 2** (Revenues when  $\sigma_t = -1$  for all  $t \leq T$ ). *If  $\sigma_t = -1$  for all  $t \leq T$ , then the auctioneer earns revenues exclusively in period 1, which are*

$$p_1 M_1 = \sum_i b_{i,t} + \beta \frac{1 - \beta^{T-1}}{1 - \beta} k \quad (3)$$

Quite intuitively, when the auctioneer destroys all tokens received as payment, then he earns revenues only in period 1. The revenues pertaining to period 1 are subject to risk, and the present-discounted value of the expected revenues pertaining to all following periods is earned with probability 1.<sup>16</sup> Note also that because all revenues are earned in period 1 and all risk past period 1 is eliminated, the auctioneer can achieve optimal consumption smoothing by simply saving. Hence, for every possible realization of  $\sum_i b_{i,t}$ , the auctioneer achieves utility:

$$U \left( \sum_i^n b_{i,1} + R w_1 - w_2^* \right) + \sum_{t=2}^T \beta^{T-1} U(k + R w_t^* - w_{t+1}^*)$$

where  $w_2^*, \dots, w_T^*$  are defined in Lemma 1. Lemma 1 then immediately implies the following corollary:

**Corollary 1.** *The auction with tokens with  $\sigma_t = -1$  for all  $t \leq T$  is the preferred auction with tokens, strictly so if  $U(\cdot)$  is strictly concave. It is also preferred to the*

---

<sup>16</sup> There is a straightforward extension of the model in which the auctioneer is allowed to sell tokens already in period 0. In that case, also the variability of period-1 revenues is eliminated because the auctioneer earns the total present-discounted value of the expected revenues in period 0 with probability 1.



*auction with dollars, strictly so if  $U()$  is strictly concave.*

### 3.3 Discussion: traditional financial instruments.

A natural question is whether the optimal auction with tokens can be replicated by holding an auction with dollars while simultaneously issuing a traditional financial instrument.

The answer is, quite clearly, yes. To see this, suppose that the auctioneer holds an auction with dollars and also issues equity in period 1: investors pay the auctioneer for the right to receive all future cash flows. To ease comparison with the auction with tokens, assume that equity is sold to investors at the end of period 1, just before consumption occurs. Furthermore, suppose the auctioneer sells 1 unit of equity.

In equilibrium, investors must be indifferent between purchasing equity or not, which implies that the price at which the auctioneer can sell equity is

$$P_1 = \beta \frac{1}{1 - \beta} k.$$

The auctioneer's period-1 revenues (from the sale of the object and equity) are

$$\sum_i b_{i,1} + \beta \frac{1}{1 - \beta} k.$$

Because the auctioneer does not earn revenues in any subsequent period, the equilibrium is, therefore, identical to the optimal auction with tokens.

## 4 Extension: pledging an object vs. pledging cash

When issuing tokens, the auctioneer pledges to deliver the object to investors in the future. When issuing equity, instead, the auctioneer pledges to deliver the revenues earned via the sale of the object to investors in the future. In the model discussed above, the absence of any friction makes the two identical under an appropriate monetary policy. However, in a more realistic environment, pledging revenues may be easier or more difficult than pledging an object. In particular, note that any friction affecting the ability of the auctioneer to pledge the object (e.g., non-contractible

effort) will necessary also affect the ability to pledge revenues that are generated from the sale of the object. But there may be frictions that affect the ability to pledge revenues but not the object—for example, when cash is easier to hide than the object—therefore making revenues harder to pledge. At the same time, traditional financial instruments can be very flexible and specify contingent payments in a way that cannot be replicated with tokens.

To explore the interaction of these two effects, here I modify the above model by introducing both effort and the possibility of misappropriating revenues. The auction runs for  $T = 2$  periods, and the risk-free asset has a return of 1 so that  $R = 1$ . The auctioneer is also risk-neutral and cash-abundant. Differently from the above model, here the auctioneer is less patient than the investors: whereas investors do not discount the future, the auctioneer's discount factor is  $\beta < 1$ .<sup>17</sup>

The timing of the first period is identical to the model presented earlier. Unlike the model presented earlier, at the beginning of the second period, the auctioneer exerts effort  $e \geq 0$  to improve the quality of the object sold. Effort is observable (but non-contractible) and shifts uniformly the distribution of valuations, so that when bidder  $i$  draws  $v_{i,2}$  from the distribution  $F(x)$ , his utility from consuming the object is  $v_{i,2} + e$ .<sup>18</sup> Effort has a quadratic cost equal to  $\frac{e^2}{2}$ . Furthermore, after period-2 revenues are realized but before payments to investors are made, the auctioneer can misappropriate revenues. More precisely, by paying a cost  $c$ , he can consume revenues that should otherwise be forwarded to investors. A familiar micro-foundation for this is the possibility for the auctioneer to “run away with the till” at a cost  $c$ , which therefore measures the extent to which revenues can be pledged to investors.

**First best** In the first best, effort is such that its marginal cost equals its marginal benefit, and hence  $e^{**} = 1$ . At the same time, because the auctioneer is more impatient than investors, in period 1 investors will pay the auctioneer an amount

---

<sup>17</sup> Clearly, the results derived earlier are robust to this change in assumptions: if fully front loading revenues by setting  $\sigma_t = -1$  for all  $t$  is optimal when the auctioneer is as patient as investors, it is also optimal when the auctioneer is more impatient than investors.

<sup>18</sup> Note that, because  $e$  is observable, the auction is still in private value despite the valuations having a “common” component.

equal to the expected future revenues and will earn back these revenues in period 2. As a consequence, the auctioneer earns all his revenues in period 1.

**Auction with dollars with outside investors.** Suppose now that the auction uses dollars and that the auctioneer sells a contingent security to risk-neutral investors, who also do not discount the future. Assume that effort is not contractible, but revenues are. The security specifies a payment to the auctioneer in period 1  $y_1$ , and a contingent period-2 payment from the auctioneer to investors  $y_2(\sum_i b_{2,i} + e)$  subject to the investors' rationality constraint:

$$E[y_2(\sum_i b_{2,i} + e)] = y_1.$$

Note that the possibility of “running away with the till” implies that, in period 2, the auctioneer should always earn at least  $\sum b_{i,2} + 1 - c$ , or else he would prefer to run away. The incentive compatibility constraint is, therefore:

$$\sum_i b_{2,i} + e - y_2(\sum_i b_{2,i} + e) \geq \sum_i b_{i,2} + e - c \quad \forall \sum_i b_{2,i}, e$$

or

$$y_2(\sum_i b_{2,i} + e) \leq c \quad \forall \sum_i b_{2,i}, e.$$

The first important observation is that if  $c = 0$  (i.e., misappropriation of revenues is costless), then the incentive compatibility constraint immediately implies  $y_2(\sum_i b_{2,i} + e) = 0$ : no outside investment is possible. The choice of effort solves:

$$\max_{e \geq 0} \left\{ k + e - \frac{e^2}{2} \right\},$$

with solution  $e^* = 1$ , which is efficient. However, the time profile of revenues is not efficient because the auctioneer earns his revenues (and consumes) in each period.

If instead  $c$  is sufficiently large, then the first best can be achieved. To see this, note that if the auctioneer sets the optimal level of effort  $e^{**} = 1$ , then revenues should always be larger than  $\underline{v} + 1$ . The contract between the auctioneer and the investor can therefore impose the punishment  $c$  whenever revenues are below  $\underline{v} + 1$ .

If this punishment is sufficiently large, an efficient level of effort is achieved. The revenues generated are transferred to the investor, so that  $E[y_2(\sum_i b_{2,i} + e)] = y_1 = k + 1$ , therefore, implementing the first best.

**Auction with tokens** Without loss of generality, I normalize the initial stock of tokens so that  $M_1 = 1$ . In the second period of the auction with tokens, the speculative demand is zero for any level of effort. Hence, optimal period-2 effort solves:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{e_2 \geq 0} & \left\{ A_2 \frac{k + e_2}{M_2} - \frac{e_2^2}{2} \right\} \\ \text{s.t. } & M_2 = A_2 + S_1(1 + \tau). \end{aligned}$$

Define

$$\alpha \equiv \frac{A_2}{M_2}$$

as the fraction of the total stock of tokens held by the auctioneer at the beginning of period 2. The equilibrium effort is

$$e_2^*(\alpha) = \alpha.$$

Hence, the period-2 expected price is

$$p_2^e = \frac{k + \alpha}{M_2},$$

and the expected value of the tokens held by investors at the beginning of period 2 is

$$S_1(1 + \tau)p_2^e = (1 - \alpha)(k + \alpha). \quad (4)$$

For future reference, note that  $\alpha$  may have an ambiguous effect on the expected value of tokens held by investors, because higher  $\alpha$  implies higher effort and higher expected revenue, but also that a lower fraction of these revenues is earned by investors. More precisely, 4 is strictly increasing in  $\alpha$  for  $\alpha < \frac{1-k}{2}$  and strictly decreasing otherwise. In particular, it is always strictly decreasing for  $\alpha > 1/2$ .

The parameter  $\alpha$  depends on the period-1 speculative demand  $S_1$ , which itself depends on period-1 realized valuations and the monetary policy, as the next lemma

shows.

**Lemma 3.** *For given  $\sum_i b_{i,1}$  we have:*

$$\alpha = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{\sqrt{k^2 + 4 \sum_i b_{i,1} (1 + \sigma)} - k}{2} \right\}$$

Hence,  $\alpha$  depends on  $\sigma$  but not  $\tau$ . Furthermore, for given  $\sum_i b_{i,1}$ ,  $\alpha$  is zero at  $\sigma = -1$ , it is strictly increasing in  $\sigma$ , and it reaches 1 whenever  $\sum_i b_{i,1} < \frac{k+1}{1+\sigma}$ . Hence, for any given  $\sum_i b_{i,1}$ ,  $\alpha$  can take any value between 0 and 1 as a function of  $\sigma$  (which is chosen by the auctioneer). More important, for  $\sigma$  such that  $\bar{v} < \frac{k+1}{1+\sigma}$  the period-1 speculative demand for tokens is always zero and  $\alpha = 1$  for all realizations of  $\sum_i b_{i,1}$ . In this case, the equilibrium is identical to that of the auction with dollars when  $c = 0$  (i.e., without outside investors).

Given this, I can write the auctioneer payoff from period-1 viewpoint. I use the fact that, in equilibrium, the expected value of the tokens held by investors at the beginning of period 2 (c.f., equation 4) must equal the extra revenues earned by the auctioneer in period 1. I can therefore write the auctioneer's period-1 expected utility as

$$k + E[(1 - \alpha)(k + \alpha)] + \beta \left( E[\alpha(k + e(\alpha))] - \frac{E[e(\alpha)^2]}{2} \right)$$

where the expectations are taken with respect to the realization of period-1 valuations. Taking first order conditions with respect to  $\sigma$  yields:<sup>19</sup>

$$E \left[ (1 - k - 2\alpha + \beta(k + \alpha)) \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial \sigma} \right]$$

The important observation is that, as long as  $\beta < 1$  the above expression is negative at  $\sigma$  such that  $\bar{v} = \frac{k+1}{1+\sigma}$ , that is,  $\sigma$  such that  $\alpha = 1$  with probability 1. The optimal  $\sigma$  therefore implies an intermediate expected  $\alpha$ , balancing the tension between inducing effort and front-loading revenues. Because the auction with tokens with  $\bar{v} = \frac{k+1}{1+\sigma}$  is equivalent to the auction with dollars with  $c = 0$ , this observations also

---

<sup>19</sup> By the envelope theorem, the effect of  $\sigma$  on the optimal period-2 effort can be ignored.

implies that the optimal auction with tokens is strictly preferred to the auction with dollars with  $c = 0$ .

The following proposition summarizes these observations.

**Proposition 3.** *If  $c$  is sufficiently low (i.e., revenue misappropriation is easy), then the auctioneer is better off holding an auction with tokens. If  $c$  is sufficiently large (i.e., revenue misappropriation is very costly), then the auctioneer is better off holding an auction with dollars and issuing a traditional financial instrument.*

The key takeaway is that the possibility of misappropriating revenues affects the auction with dollars but not the auction with tokens. Despite this, if the contracting space is sufficiently large, then the auction with dollars with an appropriately designed contingent security is preferred to the auction with tokens. If instead the contracting space is restricted, then the auction with tokens is preferred.

## 5 Conclusions.

By issuing tokens and accepting them as payment, an auctioneer earns revenues earlier and is exposed to less risk relative to a standard, repeated auction in which bidders pay in dollars. In particular, if the auctioneer commits to destroying all tokens received as payment, he earns all his revenues in period 1 and eliminates all risk from period 2 onward. The same outcome can be achieved in a traditional auction with dollars in which the auctioneer issues equity.

The reason for this equivalence is that the auctioneer has full commitment, both to deliver the object to token holders and to deliver the revenues generated by the sale of the object to equity holders. I move away from this assumption by introducing effort and the possibility of misappropriating revenues. I show that, in this case, the equilibrium in the auction with tokens may differ from that in the auction with dollars in which the auctioneer can issue a financial security. On the one hand, the possibility of misappropriating revenues is a friction that does not matter when issuing tokens. On the other hand, a financial security can specify contingent payments in a way that cannot be replicated with tokens. I show that if the contracting frictions are severe, then the auction with tokens is preferred, while the opposite is true if the contracting frictions are mild or absent.

I considered issuing tokens and issuing a contingent security as alternative ways to raise funds. But they need not be. For example, an auctioneer may issue tokens, sell some on the open market (to be used for bidding), while simultaneously signing an investment contract with an investor for the delivery of additional tokens in the future. This investment contract may also specify penalties in case, for example, the value of the tokens (which depends on the value of the object) falls below a certain threshold. This punishment, however, needs to be incentive compatible if the auctioneer can run away to escape it. Exploring this intriguing possibility is left for future work.

I assumed that the market for tokens is frictionless. Hence, holding tokens is inconvenient only because exchanging them for consumption may require waiting one period. However, this exchange generates no cost. A more realistic view is that the market for tokens has frictions, and these frictions further reduce the benefit of using tokens. In an even more realistic model, these frictions would depend on the volume of transactions, which itself is a function of the value of the object being exchanged. This extension is also left for future work.

## A Mathematical derivations

*Proof of Lemma 2.* Consider period  $t$ . Take the total payments to the auctioneer  $\sum_i b_{i,t}$  and the expected future price  $p_{t+1}^e$  as given. Note that a bidder can spend 1 dollar to purchase  $\frac{1}{p_t}$  tokens in period  $t$ , these tokens then multiply by  $1 + \tau_t$  and can be sold in period  $t+1$ , for a present-discounted return of  $\frac{\beta(1+\tau_t)p_{t+1}^e}{p_t}$ . Alternatively, he can invest the same amount of money in the risk-free asset for a present-discounted return of  $\beta R = 1$  in the following period. It follows that there can be an equilibrium in the market for tokens if and only if  $p_t \geq \beta(1 + \tau_t)p_{t+1}^e$ .

If  $p_t > \beta(1 + \tau_t)p_{t+1}^e$ , no tokens are purchased and then brought to the next period. The demand for tokens is given by the tokens used for bidding  $\frac{\sum_i b_{i,t}}{p_t}$ . The supply of tokens is  $M_t$ , and hence the equilibrium price is

$$p_t = \frac{\sum_i b_{i,t}}{M_t}$$

This is indeed an equilibrium if  $\frac{\sum_i b_{i,t}}{M_t} > \beta(1 + \tau_t)p_{t+1}^e$ , that is, if the realized bids are sufficiently high relative to the future expected price.

If instead  $\frac{\sum_i b_{i,t}}{M_t} \leq \beta(1 + \tau_t)p_{t+1}^e$ , then tokens may be purchased but not used for bidding. I call this demand the speculative demand for tokens  $S_t$ . The total demand for tokens is now  $S_t + \frac{\sum_i b_{i,t}}{p_t}$ , and the equilibrium price is

$$p_t = \frac{\sum_i b_{i,t}}{M_t - S_t} = \beta(1 + \tau_t)p_{t+1}^e$$

which pins down the speculative demand for tokens:

$$S_t = \max \left\{ M_t - \frac{\sum_i^n b_{i,t}}{\beta(1 + \tau_t)p_{t+1}^e}, 0 \right\}$$

□

*Proof of Proposition 1.* To start, note the following two facts:

1. in each period the auctioneer will liquidate all his tokens. If the price in a given period is such that  $p_t > \beta(1 + \tau_t)p_{t+1}^e$ , then the auctioneer is better off selling tokens in period  $t$  at a higher price than in period  $t + 1$  at a lower price. If instead  $p_t = \beta(1 + \tau_t)p_{t+1}^e$  and the auctioneer is risk averse, then again he prefers to earn revenues in period  $t$  than to wait one period and earn the same expected revenues (but this time being exposed to risk). If  $p_t = \beta(1 + \tau_t)p_{t+1}^e$  and the auctioneer is risk neutral then his expected revenues are the same whether he holds tokens between periods (i.e., he acts as a speculator) or not. Without loss of generality, we can assume that he sells all his tokens in period  $t$  also in this case;
2. an implication of the above fact is that, for given  $p_{t+1}^e$ ,  $A_{t+1}$  is independent of  $A_t$ . That is because  $A_{t+1}$  depends on the monetary policy parameters  $\sigma_t, \tau_t$  and on the tokens received for payment in period  $t$ , which depend exclusively on  $p_{t+1}^e$  and the realization of valuation in period  $t$ .

I can therefore write the auctioneer's expected continuation revenues in period  $t$  as:

$$\Pi_t(A_t) = p_t^e A_t + \beta E[p_{t+1} A_{t+1}] + \beta^2 \Pi_{t+2}(A_{t+2})$$



where the expectations are taken at the beginning of period  $t$ , before the valuations are realized (note: I use  $\Pi_t()$  to indicate unconditional expected revenues. I will write the expectation explicitly if, instead, the expectation is conditional).

Consider now a given  $p_{t+1}^e$ . The realization of valuations in period  $t$  may be such that  $S_t = 0$  and hence  $p_t = \frac{\sum_i b_{i,t}}{M_t}$ . In this case,  $A_{t+1} = M_{t+1}$ , so that, conditional on  $S_t = 0$ :

$$\begin{aligned} E[\Pi_t(A_t)|S_t = 0] &= E[p_t|S_t = 0]A_t + \beta E[p_{t+1}A_{t+1}|S_t = 0] + \beta^2 E[\Pi_{t+2}(A_{t+2})|S_t = 0] \\ &= E\left[\frac{\sum_i b_{i,t}}{M_t}|S_t = 0\right](M_t - M_t + A_t) + \beta p_{t+1}^e E[M_{t+1}|S_t = 0] + \beta^2 E[\Pi_{t+2}(A_{t+2})|S_t = 0] \\ &= E\left[\sum_i b_{i,t}|S_t = 0\right] - E[p_t|S_t = 0](M_t - A_t) + \beta p_{t+1}^e E[M_{t+1}|S_t = 0] + \beta^2 E[\Pi_{t+2}(A_{t+2})|S_t = 0] \end{aligned}$$

If instead  $S_t > 0$ , then  $p_t = \beta(1 + \tau)p_{t+1}^e$  and  $A_{t+1} = M_{t+1} - S_t(1 + \tau) \geq 0$ . In this case, conditional on  $S_t > 0$ :

$$\begin{aligned} E[\Pi_t(A_t)|S_t > 0] &= E[p_t|S_t > 0]A_t + \beta E[p_{t+1}A_{t+1}|S_t > 0] + \beta^2 E[\Pi_{t+2}(A_{t+2})|S_t > 0] \\ &= E[p_t|S_t > 0]A_t + \beta p_{t+1}^e (E[M_{t+1}|S_t > 0] - E[S_t|S_t > 0](1 + \tau)) + \beta^2 E[\Pi_{t+2}(A_{t+2})|S_t > 0] \\ &= E[p_t|S_t > 0]A_t + \beta p_{t+1}^e E[M_{t+1}|S_t > 0] - \beta p_{t+1}^e (1 + \tau) \left( M_t - \frac{E[\sum_i b_{i,t}|S_t > 0]}{\beta p_{t+1}^e (1 + \tau)} \right) + \beta^2 E[\Pi_{t+2}(A_{t+2})|S_t > 0] \\ &= E\left[\sum_i b_{i,t}|S_t > 0\right] - E[p_t|S_t > 0](M_t - A_t) + \beta p_{t+1}^e E[M_{t+1}|S_t > 0] + \beta^2 E[\Pi_{t+2}(A_{t+2})|S_t > 0] \end{aligned}$$

where I used the definition of  $S_t$  as well as the fact that  $E[p_t|S_t > 0] = \beta p_{t+1}^e (1 + \tau)$ .

The above derivations then imply that, for a given sequence of expected equilibrium prices, the unconditional expected revenues are

$$\Pi_t(A_t) = k - p_t^e(M_t - A_t) + \beta p_{t+1}^e E[M_{t+1}] + \beta^2 \Pi_{t+2}(A_{t+2}) = k - p_t^e(M_t - A_t) + \beta \Pi_{t+1}(M_{t+1}) \quad (5)$$

where the last equality exploits the fact that, for given equilibrium expected prices,  $A_{t+2}$  is independent of  $A_{t+1}$ . The statement then follows by iterating the above equation.

□

*Proof of Proposition 2.* The statement follows from Proposition 1, and by noting that all revenues accrue in period 1, after the period-1 valuations are drawn. It is nonetheless instructive to present a direct proof of the statement.

Because all tokens earned by the auctioneer are burned, in equilibrium, the speculative demand for tokens is strictly positive in every period  $t \leq T$  and for every possible realization of valuations. Because of this, in every period  $t$  and every realization of period  $t < T$  valuations, equilibrium prices must be such that bidders are indifferent between holding tokens between any two periods, that is  $p_t = \beta \cdot (1 + \tau_t) \cdot p_{t+1}^e$ .

This observation has two implications. First, I can write the sequence of equilibrium prices as  $p_1, p_2^e = p_1/(\beta(1 + \tau_1)), \dots, p_t^e = p_1/(\beta^{t-1} \prod_{s=1}^{t-1} (1 + \tau_s))$  for  $t \leq T$ .

Second, in every period  $t \geq 2$  the supply of tokens is  $S_{t-1}(1 + \tau_{t-1})$ . By equating this supply with the demand for tokens, I can write

$$p_t = \frac{\sum b_{i,t}}{S_{t-1}(1 + \tau_{t-1}) - S_t}$$

so that

$$S_{t-1} = \frac{\sum b_{i,t}}{p_t(1 + \tau_{t-1})} + \frac{S_t}{(1 + \tau_{t-1})} \quad (6)$$

Note that the speculative demand in period  $T$  is zero. Hence, for given  $\sum b_{i,T}$  I can write

$$\begin{aligned} E[S_{T-1}] &= \frac{k}{p_T(1 + \tau_{T-1})} \\ E[S_{T-2}] &= \frac{k}{p_{T-1}(1 + \tau_{T-2})} + \frac{k}{p_T(1 + \tau_{T-2})(1 + \tau_{T-1})} \\ &\dots \\ S_1 &= k \sum_{s=2}^T \frac{1}{p_s \prod_{j=1}^{s-1} (1 + \tau_j)} \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that  $p_s^e = p_1/(\beta^{s-1} \prod_{j=1}^{s-1} (1 + \tau_j))$ , the above expression becomes:

$$S_1 = \frac{k}{p_1} \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \beta^s.$$

Finally, use the fact that the initial supply of tokens is  $M_1$ , so that the period-1 market clearing price is

$$p_1 = \frac{\sum b_{i,1}}{M_1 - S_1},$$

to get the expression:

$$p_1 M_1 = \sum b_{i,1} + k \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \beta^s \quad (7)$$

□

*Proof of Lemma 3.* By using the definition of  $\alpha$ , I can write

$$\alpha = \frac{(1 - S_1)(1 + \sigma)(1 + \tau)}{(1 - S_1)(1 + \sigma)(1 + \tau) + S_1(1 + \tau)} \quad (8)$$

Next, I use the above expression to write

$$p_2^e = \frac{k + \alpha}{(1 - S_1)(1 + \sigma)(1 + \tau) + S_1(1 + \tau)} = \frac{(k + \alpha)\alpha}{(1 - S_1)(1 + \sigma)(1 + \tau)} \quad (9)$$

I use the definition of  $S_1$  and the above expression to obtain:

$$S_1 = \max \left\{ 0, 1 - \frac{\sum_i b_{i,1}}{p_2^e(1 + \tau)} \right\} = \max \left\{ 0, 1 - \frac{\sum_i b_{i,1}}{(k + \alpha)\alpha} (1 - S_1)(1 + \sigma) \right\}$$

$$1 - S_1 = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{\sum_i b_{i,1}}{(k + \alpha)\alpha} (1 - S_1)(1 + \sigma) \right\}$$

Suppose  $\alpha < 1$  so that  $0 < S_1 \leq 1$ . Then  $\alpha$  must be such that

$$\alpha = \sqrt{\left(\frac{k}{2}\right)^2 + \left(\sum_i b_{i,1}\right)(1 + \sigma) - \frac{k}{2}}$$

this can be the solution as long as  $\alpha < 1$ , or  $k + 1 > \sum_i b_{i,1}(1 + \sigma)$ . If instead  $\alpha = 1$ , then  $S_1 = 0$  and it must be that

$$k + 1 < \sum_i b_{i,1}(1 + \sigma)$$

Putting everything together, we have that

$$\alpha = \min \left\{ 1, \sqrt{\left(\frac{k}{2}\right)^2 + \sum_i b_{i,1}(1 + \sigma)} - \frac{k}{2} \right\}.$$

□

## References

- Bakos, Y. and H. Halaburda (2018). The role of cryptographic tokens and icos in fostering platform adoption. *working paper*.
- Bakos, Y. and H. Halaburda (2019). Funding new ventures with digital tokens: due diligence and token tradability. *NYU Stern School of Business*.
- Brzustowski, T., A. Georgiadis, and B. Szentes (2021). Smart contracts and the coase conjecture. Technical report, Working Paper.
- Budish, E. (2011). The combinatorial assignment problem: Approximate competitive equilibrium from equal incomes. *Journal of Political Economy* 119(6), 1061–1103.
- Budish, E., G. P. Cachon, J. B. Kessler, and A. Othman (2017). Course match: A large-scale implementation of approximate competitive equilibrium from equal incomes for combinatorial allocation. *Operations Research* 65(2), 314–336.
- Bulow, J. and P. Klemperer (1996). Auctions versus negotiations. *The American Economic Review* 86(1), 180–194.
- Bulow, J. and J. Roberts (1989). The simple economics of optimal auctions. *Journal of political economy* 97(5), 1060–1090.
- Canidio, A. (2018). Financial incentives for the development of blockchain-based platforms.
- Canidio, A. (2020). Cryptotokens and cryptocurrencies: the extensive margin. Technical report, working paper.

- Canidio, A. (forthcoming). Financial bubbles in infinitely repeated auctions with tokens. *AEA Papers and Proceedings* 113.
- Canidio, A. and V. Danos (2022). Commitment against front running attacks. *working paper*.
- Capponi, A. and R. Jia (2021). The adoption of blockchain-based decentralized exchanges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.08842*.
- Catalini, C. and J. S. Gans (2018, March). Initial Coin Offerings and the Value of Crypto Tokens. NBER Working Papers 24418, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.
- Chod, J. and E. Lyandres (2021). A theory of icos: Diversification, agency, and information asymmetry. *Management Science* 0(0), null.
- Clower, R. (1967). A reconsideration of the microfoundations of monetary theory. *Economic Inquiry* 6(1), 1–8.
- Cong, L. W., Y. Li, and N. Wang (2020). Token-based platform finance. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Cong, L. W., Y. Li, and N. Wang (2021). Tokenomics: Dynamic adoption and valuation. *The Review of Financial Studies* 34(3), 1105–1155.
- Gans, J. S. (2019). The fine print in smart contracts. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Gans, J. S. and R. T. Holden (2022a). Mechanism design approaches to blockchain consensus. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Gans, J. S. and R. T. Holden (2022b). A solomonic solution to ownership disputes: An application to blockchain front-running. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Garratt, R. J. and M. R. van Oordt (2021). Entrepreneurial incentives and the role of initial coin offerings. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 104171.

- Goldstein, I., D. Gupta, and R. Sverchkov (2019). Initial coin offerings as a commitment to competition. *Available at SSRN 3484627*.
- Gryglewicz, S., S. Mayer, and E. Morellec (2021). Optimal financing with tokens. *Journal of Financial Economics*.
- He, Y., A. Miralles, M. Pycia, and J. Yan (2018). A pseudo-market approach to allocation with priorities. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics* 10(3), 272–314.
- Holden, R. T. and A. Malani (2019). Can blockchain solve the hold-up problem in contracts? Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Hylland, A. and R. Zeckhauser (1979). The efficient allocation of individuals to positions. *Journal of Political economy* 87(2), 293–314.
- Klemperer, P. (1999). Auction theory: A guide to the literature. *Journal of economic surveys* 13(3), 227–286.
- Kocherlakota, N. R. (1998). Money is memory. *journal of economic theory* 81(2), 232–251.
- Lee, M., A. Martin, and R. M. Townsend (2021). Optimal design of tokenized markets. *Available at SSRN 3820973*.
- Li, J. and W. Mann (2018). Digital tokens and platform building. *Working paper*.
- Lucas Jr, R. E. and N. L. Stokey (1983). Optimal fiscal and monetary policy in an economy without capital. *Journal of monetary Economics* 12(1), 55–93.
- Malinova, K. and A. Park (2018). Tokenomics: when tokens beat equity. *Available at SSRN 3286825*.
- Milgrom, P. and I. Segal (2002). Envelope theorems for arbitrary choice sets. *Econometrica* 70(2), 583–601.
- Myerson, R. B. (1981). Optimal auction design. *Mathematics of operations research* 6(1), 58–73.

- Ostroy, J. M. and R. M. Starr (1974). Money and the decentralization of exchange. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, 1093–1113.
- Prat, J., V. Danos, and S. Marcassa (2019). Fundamental pricing of utility tokens. *working paper*.
- Prendergast, C. (2017). How food banks use markets to feed the poor. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 31(4), 145–62.
- Prendergast, C. (forthcoming). The allocation of food to food banks. *Journal of Political Economy*.
- Riley, J. G. and W. F. Samuelson (1981). Optimal auctions. *The American Economic Review* 71(3), 381–392.
- Roughgarden, T. (2020). Transaction fee mechanism design for the ethereum blockchain: An economic analysis of eip-1559. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.00854*.
- Samuelson, P. A. (1958). An exact consumption-loan model of interest with or without the social contrivance of money. *Journal of political economy* 66(6), 467–482.
- Sockin, M. and W. Xiong (2018). A model of cryptocurrencies. *Working paper*.
- Starr, R. M. (1974). The price of money in a pure exchange monetary economy with taxation. *Econometrica* 42(1), 45–54.
- Townsend, R. and N. X. Zhang (forthcoming). Technologies that replace a “central planner”. *AEA Papers and Proceedings* 113.
- Townsend, R. M. (1980). Models of money with spatially separated agents. *Models of monetary economies*, 265–303.
- Townsend, R. M. (2020). *Distributed Ledgers: Design and Regulation of Financial Infrastructure and Payment Systems*. MIT Press.
- Vickrey, W. (1961). Counterspeculation, auctions, and competitive sealed tenders. *The Journal of finance* 16(1), 8–37.