Hi Juror,

Thank you for your notice. I will answer all open questions below by adding my remarks to the points made by the challenger and questions asked for the submitter:

1. Challenger: Point 3.1 states that novel technology may be demonstrating using a working beta product (3.1.1). From what we have heard in this trial so far Submitter is already operating with the Token in questions. Doesn't his mean that 3.1 is met?

Answer: Yes this is true. The Spendcoin is presently being spent on the Spend Visa Card and Spend App, being staked to upgrade to higher tier cards, and being rewarded to users in Proof of Purchase.

2. Challenger: You state yourself that Spendcoin has utility "at this current moment" (p. 1, new agruments). Point 3.2 states that there has to be "demand for a token driven by an existing or future utility". Why should the court deny the badge on the grounds of 3.2 when it, as both parties agree, have a current utility?

Answer: Yes, there is present day utility for this now and in the future.

3. Challenger: When interpreting "dividend or similar payments" — doesn't that have to mean a form of recurring payments or at least payments that are made using a predictable method? Can an abuse of the system that leads to regular income be a dividend?

Answer: The definition of a dividend is as follow:

What is a Dividend?

A dividend is the distribution of reward from a portion of company's earnings and is paid to a class of its shareholders. Dividends are decided and managed by the company's board of directors, though they must be approved by the shareholders through their voting rights. Dividends can be issued as cash payments, as shares of stock, or other property, though cash dividends are the most common. Along with companies, various mutual funds and exchange traded funds (ETF) also pay dividends.

The rewards users receive are individual based and dynamic and do not relate to how much spendcoins they have or how much the company earns. It's an individual basis similar to American Express points. (As in regards to the reward system)

4. Submitter: What exactly does a "full legal opinion" (p. 3, response to new arguments) mean? I am fine with any reference you do not have to explain it yourself.

Answer: A full legal opinion is where a reputable law firm analyzes your token framework and underlying elements to determine wether the tokens and business model are legal in the statutory terms and is not a security by definition of the 1934 Securities Act. Bittrex Exchange required this for us to be listed in the USA and USD markets.

Reference : https://minexcoin.com/doc/LegalOpinion.pdf

5. Submitter: In what way. is the Blockchain required for your payment system? You argue that the tokens have to stake in order to get better cards. Why is this staking necessary for your business model to work?

Answer: Currently we utilize our private version of Spendchain as a full proof fraud ledger for our Spend App and Spend Card to track and give users proper credits from deposits. As a banking application this is highly important to prevent fraud. To your second point, yes that is one current day utility. Staking is required as that is an essential part of the business model. High tier memberships require either higher

spending or a cost. Example American Express Black Card. However for us, we remove both elements by require you to just stake your tokens for the higher tiers. However, that is just present day utility. In the future when Spendchain is launched Spendcoins are required for every step of the system from governance, voting, staking, and running validator, merchant, and settlement nodes.

6. Submitter: Point 1.1.5 tells jurors to reject an application when "[t]he project currently need a 'coordinator node' controlled by the issuer to work [and t]here is no plan of replacing" it. Do you currently have a plan on how to implement decentralised KYC? Do you agree that the need for KYC is currently an element of Spendcoin causing centralisation?

Answer: As mentioned in our white paper for Spendchain, Settlement nodes voted in or staking Spendcoins are responsible for this. This will never be a centralized feature, but more a part of the protocol like a feature that is ran on the CLI. If validators vote to remove this it goes against the basic principals of the system but they are entitled to vote for a change as the network will be fully decentralized and controlled by them. So to answer your question, yes there is a plan to make kyc decentralized as mentioned in the white paper. KYC is centralized currently on the Spend App provided by Spend.com as it's the frontend application of the system current ERC20 system. As soon as mainnet is launched that all changed, therefore meeting the plan of the future requirement for 1.1.5. Bare in mind KYC is only required for settlement nodes to perform fiat transactions and they have their own

method to do so each and are not required to use a centralized service. All other features of the blockchain are decentralized.