



Blockchain & Cryptocurrency Regulation

2020

Second Edition

Contributing Editor
Josias N. Dewey



CONTENTS

Preface	Josias N. Dewey, <i>Holland & Knight LLP</i>	
Foreword	Aaron Wright, <i>Enterprise Ethereum Alliance</i>	
Glossary	The Editor shares key concepts and definitions of blockchain	
Industry	<i>Promoting innovation through education: The blockchain industry, law enforcement and regulators work towards a common goal</i> Jason Weinstein & Alan Cohn, <i>The Blockchain Alliance</i>	1
	<i>The loan market, blockchain, and smart contracts: The potential for transformative change</i> Bridget Marsh, <i>LSTA</i> & Josias N. Dewey, <i>Holland & Knight LLP</i>	5
	<i>A year of progress – the Wall Street Blockchain Alliance and the ongoing evolution of blockchain and cryptoassets</i> Ron Quaranta, <i>Wall Street Blockchain Alliance</i>	14
General chapters	<i>Blockchain and intellectual property: A case study</i> Joshua Krumholz, Ieuan G. Mahony & Brian J. Colandreo <i>Holland & Knight LLP</i>	18
	<i>The custody of digital assets – 2020</i> Jay G. Baris, <i>Shearman & Sterling LLP</i>	35
	<i>Cryptocurrency and other digital assets for asset managers</i> Gregory S. Rowland & Trevor I. Kiviat, <i>Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP</i>	52
	<i>The yellow brick road for consumer tokens: The path to SEC and CFTC compliance. An update</i> David L. Concannon, Yvette D. Valdez & Stephen P. Wink, <i>Latham & Watkins LLP</i>	64
	<i>Custody and transfer of digital assets: Key U.S. legal considerations</i> Michael H. Krimminger, Colin Lloyd & Sandra Rocks, <i>Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton LLP</i>	88
	<i>An introduction to virtual currency money transmission regulation</i> Michelle Ann Gitlitz & Michael J. Barry, <i>Blank Rome LLP</i>	101
	<i>Cryptocurrency compliance and risks: A European KYC/AML perspective</i> Fedor Poskriakov, Maria Chiriaeva & Christophe Cavin, <i>Lenz & Staehelin</i>	119
	<i>The potential legal implications of securing proof of stake-based networks</i> Angela Angelovska-Wilson, <i>DLx Law & Evan Weiss, Proof of Stake Alliance</i>	133
	<i>Legal issues surrounding the use of smart contracts</i> Stuart Levi, Alex Lipton & Cristina Vasile, <i>Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP</i>	155
	<i>U.S. Federal Income Tax implications of issuing, investing and trading in cryptocurrency</i> Mary F. Voce & Pallav Raghuvanshi, <i>Greenberg Traurig, LLP</i>	171
	<i>Stablecoins: A global overview of regulatory requirements in Asia Pacific, Europe, the UAE and the USA</i> David Adams & Jesse Overall, <i>Clifford Chance LLP</i> Jason Rozovsky, <i>R3</i>	182
	<i>Blockchain and the GDPR: Co-existing in contradiction?</i> John Timmons & Tim Hickman, <i>White & Case LLP</i>	202

General chapters	<i>Smart contracts in the derivatives space</i> Jonathan Gilmour & Vanessa Kalijnikoff Battaglia, <i>Travers Smith LLP</i>	220
	<i>Distributed ledger technology as a tool for streamlining transactions</i> Douglas Landy, James Kong & Jonathan Edwards, <i>Milbank LLP</i>	232
Country chapters		
Argentina	Juan M. Diehl Moreno & Santiago Eraso Lomaquiz, <i>Marval, O'Farrell & Mairal</i>	245
Australia	Peter Reeves, <i>Gilbert + Tobin</i>	251
Austria	Ursula Rath & Thomas Kulnigg, <i>Schoenherr Attorneys at Law</i>	263
Bermuda	Mary V. Ward & Adam Bathgate, <i>Carey Olsen Bermuda Limited</i>	271
Brazil	Martim Machado & Julia Fontes Abramof, <i>CGM Advogados</i>	282
British Virgin Islands	Clinton Hempel & Mark Harbison, <i>Carey Olsen</i>	288
Canada	Simon Grant, Kwang Lim & Matthew Peters, <i>Bennett Jones LLP</i>	294
Cayman Islands	Alistair Russell & Dylan Wiltermuth, <i>Carey Olsen</i>	308
China	Jacob Blacklock & Shi Lei, <i>Lehman, Lee & Xu</i>	316
Cyprus	Karolina Argyridou, Prodromos Epifaniou & Akis Papakyriacou, <i>Verita Legal K. Argyridou & Associates LLC</i>	326
Estonia	Priit Lätt, <i>PwC Legal Estonia</i>	332
France	Christophe Perchet, Juliette Loget & Stéphane Daniel, <i>Davis Polk and Wardwell LLP</i>	344
Germany	Dr Stefan Henkelmann & Lennart J. Dahmen, <i>Allen & Overy LLP</i>	355
Gibraltar	Joey Garcia & Jonathan Garcia, <i>ISOLAS LLP</i>	367
Guernsey	David Crosland & Felicity Wai, <i>Carey Olsen (Guernsey) LLP</i>	376
Hong Kong	Yu Pui Hang (Henry Yu), <i>L&Y Law Office / Henry Yu & Associates</i>	387
India	Anu Tiwari & Rachana Rautray, <i>AZB & Partners</i>	401
Ireland	Maura McLaughlin, Pearse Ryan & Caroline Devlin, <i>Arthur Cox</i>	407
Japan	Taro Awataguchi & Takeshi Nagase, <i>Anderson Mōri & Tomotsune</i>	414
Jersey	Christopher Griffin, Emma German & Holly Brown, <i>Carey Olsen Jersey LLP</i>	424
Korea	Jung Min Lee, Samuel Yim & Joon Young Kim, <i>Kim & Chang</i>	433
Liechtenstein	Dr Ralph Wanger, <i>BATLINER WANGER BATLINER Attorneys at Law Ltd.</i>	440
Malta	Malcolm Falzon & Alexia Valenzia, <i>Camilleri Preziosi Advocates</i>	445
Mexico	Miguel Ángel Peralta García, Pedro Said Nader & Patrick Seaver Stockdale Carrillo, <i>Basham, Ringe y Correa, S.C.</i>	455
Montenegro	Marija Vljaković & Luka Veljović, <i>Moravčević Vojnović i Partneri</i> <i>AOD Beograd in cooperation with Schoenherr</i>	463
Netherlands	Björn Schep, Willem Röell & Christian Godlieb, <i>De Brauw Blackstone Westbroek</i>	466
Portugal	Filipe Lowndes Marques, Mariana Albuquerque & João Lima da Silva <i>Morais Leitão, Galvão Teles, Soares da Silva & Associados</i> <i>[Morais Leitão]</i>	476
Russia	Vasilisa Strizh, Dmitry Dmitriev & Anastasia Kiseleva, <i>Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP</i>	486

Serbia	Bojan Rajić & Mina Mihaljčić, <i>Moravčević Vojnović i Partneri AOD Beograd in cooperation with Schoenherr</i>	494
Singapore	Franca Ciambella & En-Lai Chong, <i>Consilium Law Corporation</i>	500
South Africa	Angela Itzikowitz & Ina Meiring, <i>ENSafrica</i>	512
Spain	Alfonso López-Ibor, Pablo Stöger & Olivia López-Ibor, <i>Ventura Garcés López-Ibor</i>	519
Switzerland	Daniel Haeberli, Stefan Oesterhelt & Alexander Wherlock, <i>Homburger AG</i>	524
Taiwan	Robin Chang & Eddie Hsiung, <i>Lee and Li, Attorneys-at-Law</i>	536
United Arab Emirates	Abdulla Yousef Al Nasser, Flora Ghali & Nooshin Rahmannedjadi, <i>Araa Group Advocates and Legal Consultants</i>	543
United Kingdom	Stuart Davis, Sam Maxson & Andrew Moyle, <i>Latham & Watkins LLP</i>	554
USA	Josias N. Dewey, <i>Holland & Knight</i>	565
Venezuela	Luisa Lepervanche, <i>Mendoza, Palacios, Acedo, Borjas, Pérez Pumar & Cía. (Menpa)</i>	575

Australia

Peter Reeves
Gilbert + Tobin

Government attitude and definition

The past few years have seen a sharp rise in the creation and use of cryptocurrencies in Australia, with companies such as Enosi and Havven raising millions through their Australia-based initial coin offerings (ICOs). The Commonwealth Government of Australia (**Government**) has shared a broader commitment to facilitate growth and innovation within the technology and cryptocurrency sector whilst also increasing its regulatory involvement. To date, the Government has taken a largely non-interventionist approach to the regulation of cryptocurrency, allowing the landscape to evolve at a faster rate than its regulatory response. Australian law does not currently equate digital currency with fiat currency and does not treat cryptocurrency as “money”.

The Governor of the Reserve Bank of Australia (**RBA**), Australia’s central bank, stated during the 2017 Australian Payment Summit that the RBA has no immediate plans to issue a digital dollar akin to money. Terming it an “eAUD”, the Governor noted that the rise of new technology associated with cryptocurrencies has the capacity to challenge the role of traditional financial institutions with regard to payments, but that there is currently no public policy case for the RBA to issue an eAUD. Despite this, the Governor indicated that the RBA remains open to considering wholesale applications for a digital Australian dollar and would be continuing to research this area with ongoing studies of the use of a central bank-issued digital dollar in relation to settlement arrangements.

While the Government has not intervened in cryptocurrencies and related activities to the extent that foreign government bodies have done in jurisdictions such as China or South Korea, there has been general clarification of the application of Australian regulatory regimes to the sector. For example, the Government passed the *Anti-Money Laundering and Counter-Terrorism Financing Amendment Act 2017 (AML/CTF Amendment Act)*, which brought cryptocurrencies and tokens within the scope of Australia’s anti-money laundering regime. This recognised the movement towards digital currencies becoming a popular method of paying for goods and services and transferring value in the Australian economy, but also posing significant money laundering and terrorism financing risks.

The Government has also been widely supportive of the new technologies in the blockchain and cryptocurrency space. In 2018, the Government committed \$700,000 for the Digital Transformation Agency to examine possible blockchain applications within government services.

Cryptocurrency regulation

While there have been recent amendments to various pieces of legislation to accommodate

the use of cryptocurrencies, these have predominantly focused on the transactional relationships, such as the issuing and exchanging process, rather than the cryptocurrencies themselves.

Australia's primary corporate, markets, consumer credit and financial services regulator, the Australian Securities and Investments Commission (**ASIC**), has reaffirmed the view that legislative obligations and regulatory requirements are technology-neutral and apply irrespective of the mode of technology that is being used to provide a regulated service. While there hasn't been any legislation created to deal with cryptocurrencies as a discrete area of law, this does not hinder them from being captured within existing regimes under Australian law.

ASIC's recently updated regulatory guidance informs businesses of ASIC's approach to the legal status of coins (or tokens). The legal status of such coins is dependent on how they are structured and the rights attached, which ultimately determines the regulations with which an entity must comply. A key example is that cryptocurrency which is characterised as a financial product under the *Corporations Act 2001* (Cth) (**Corporations Act**) will fall within the scope of Australia's existing financial services regulatory regime. This is discussed in more detail under "Sales regulation" below.

There are currently no specific regulations dealing with blockchain or other distributed ledger technology (**DLT**) in Australia. However, in March 2017, ASIC released an information sheet (*INFO 219 Evaluating distributed ledger technology*) outlining its approach to the regulatory issues that may rise through the implementation of blockchain technology and DLT solutions more generally. Businesses considering operating market infrastructure, or providing financial or consumer credit services using DLT, will still be subject to the compliance requirements that currently exist under the applicable licensing regime. There is a general obligation that entities relying on technology in connection with the provision of a regulated service must have the necessary organisational competence and adequate technological resources and risk-management plans in place. While the existing regulatory framework is sufficient to accommodate current implementations of DLT, as the technology matures, additional regulatory considerations will arise.

Various cryptocurrency networks have also implemented "smart" or self-executing contracts. These are permitted in Australia under the *Electronic Transactions Act 1999* (Cth) (**ETA**) and the equivalent Australian state and territory legislation. The ETA provides a legal framework to enable electronic commerce to operate in the same way as paper-based transactions. Under the ETA, self-executing contracts are permitted in Australia, provided they meet all the traditional elements of a legal contract.

Sales regulation

The sale of cryptocurrency through an ICO is regulated by Australia's existing financial services regulatory regime. Core considerations for issuers are outlined below.

Licensing

Of particular concern to those dealing with cryptocurrencies is whether a cryptocurrency (including those offered during an ICO) constitutes a financial product and therefore triggers financial services licensing and disclosure requirements. Entities carrying on a financial services business in Australia must hold an Australian financial services licence (**AFSL**) or be exempt. The definitions of "financial product" or "financial service" under the *Corporations Act* are broad and ASIC has indicated in its information sheet, *INFO 225 Initial*

coin offerings (**INFO 225**), that cryptocurrency with similar features to existing financial products or securities will trigger the relevant regulatory obligations.

In INFO 225, ASIC indicated that the legal status of cryptocurrency is dependent upon the structure of the ICO and the rights attaching to the coins or tokens. ASIC has also indicated that what is a right should be interpreted broadly. Depending on the circumstances, coins or tokens may constitute interests in managed investment schemes (collective investment vehicles), securities, derivatives, or fall into a category of more generally defined financial products, all of which are subject to the Australian financial services regulatory regime. In INFO 225, ASIC has provided high-level regulatory signposts for crypto-asset participants to determine whether they have legal and regulatory obligations. These signposts are relevant to crypto-asset issuers, crypto-asset intermediaries, miners and transaction processors, crypto-asset exchanges and trading platforms, crypto-asset payment and merchant service providers, wallet providers and custody service providers, and consumers. Broadly, entities offering coins or tokens that can be classified as financial products will need to comply with the regulatory requirements under the Corporations Act which generally include disclosure, registration, licensing and conduct obligations. An entity which facilitates payments by cryptocurrencies may also be required to hold an AFSL and the operator of a cryptocurrency exchange may be required to hold an Australian market licence if the coins or tokens traded on the exchange constitute financial products.

Generally, ASIC's regulatory guidance is consistent with the position of regulators in other jurisdictions. For example, the financial regulator in Hong Kong has outlined situations where cryptocurrency may be a financial product. ASIC has also recommended that companies wishing to conduct an ICO seek professional advice, including legal advice, and contact its Innovation Hub (discussed in detail below, "Promotion and testing") for informal assistance. This reflects its willingness to build greater investor confidence around cryptocurrency as an asset class. However, ASIC has emphasised consumer protection and compliance with the relevant laws and has taken action as a result to stop proposed ICOs targeting retail investors due to issues with disclosure and promotional materials (the requirements of which are discussed below) as well as offerings of financial products without an AFSL.

The Treasury has just closed consultation on ICOs and the relevant regulatory frameworks in Australia.

Marketing

ASIC's recognition that an ICO may involve an offer of financial products has clear implications for the marketing of an ICO. For example, an offer of a financial product to a retail client (with some exceptions) must be accompanied by a regulated disclosure document (e.g., a product disclosure statement or a prospectus and a financial services guide) that satisfies the content requirements of the Corporations Act and regulatory guidance published by ASIC. Such a disclosure document must set out prescribed information, including the provider's fee structure, to assist a client to decide whether to acquire the cryptocurrency from the provider. In some instances, the marketing activity itself may cause the ICO to be an offer of a regulated financial product.

Under the Corporations Act, depending on the minimum amount of funds invested per investor and whether the investor is a "sophisticated investor" or wholesale client, an offer of financial products may not require regulated disclosure.

Cross-border issues

Carrying on a financial services business in Australia will require a foreign financial services provider (**FFSP**) to hold an AFSL, unless relief is granted. Entities, including FFSPs, should note that the Corporations Act may apply to an ICO regardless of whether it was created and offered from Australia or overseas. Currently, Australia has cooperation (passporting) arrangements with regulators in foreign jurisdictions (including the United States of America and the United Kingdom), which enable FFSPs regulated in those jurisdictions to provide financial services in Australia without holding an AFSL. However, the passporting relief is currently only available in relation to the provision of services to wholesale clients (i.e. accredited investors), and the FFSP must only provide the services it is authorised to provide in its home jurisdiction. However, ASIC has announced that it will be repealing this passport relief, and instead will implement a new regime requiring FFSPs to apply for a foreign AFSL. It is expected that the new regime will apply from 30 September 2019.

Foreign companies taken to be carrying on a business in Australia, including by issuing cryptocurrency or operating a platform developed using ICO proceeds, may be required to either establish a local presence (i.e., register with ASIC and create a branch) or incorporate a subsidiary. Broadly, the greater the level of system, repetition or continuity associated with an entity's business activities in Australia, the greater the likelihood that registration will be required. Generally, a company holding an AFSL will be carrying on a business in Australia and will trigger the requirement.

Promoters should also be aware that if they wish to market their cryptocurrency to Australian residents, and the coins or tokens are considered a financial product under the Corporations Act, they will not be permitted to market the products unless the requisite licensing and disclosure requirements are met. Generally, a service provider from outside of Australia may respond to requests for information and issue products to an Australian resident if the resident makes the first (unsolicited) approach and there has been no conduct on the part of the issuer designed to induce the investor to make contact, or activities that could be misconstrued as the provider inducing the investor to make contact.

Design and distribution obligations and product intervention powers

The Government has passed the *Treasury Laws Amendment (Design and Distribution Obligations and Product Intervention Powers) Act 2019* (Cth) (**DDO PIP Act**) and released the Corporations Amendment (Design and Distribution Obligations and Product Intervention Powers) Regulations 2018, which may impact the way cryptocurrencies are structured and ICOs conducted in future. The DDO PIP Act introduces new design and distribution obligations in relation to financial products and provides ASIC with temporary product intervention powers where there is a risk of significant consumer detriment. The new arrangements aim to ensure that financial products are targeted at the correct category of potential investors. At the time of writing, ASIC has yet to release guidance on the way it might interpret its powers beyond its initial submission to consultation on the legislation, but ASIC's powers are highly likely to impact marketing and distribution practices in the cryptocurrency sector.

Consumer law

Even if an ICO is not regulated under the Corporations Act, it may still be subject to other regulation and laws, including the Australian Consumer Law set out at Schedule 2 to the *Competition and Consumer Act 2010* (Cth) (**ACL**) relating to the offer of services or products to Australian consumers. The ACL prohibits misleading or deceptive conduct in a range of circumstances including in the context of marketing and advertising. As such, care must be

taken in ICO promotional material to ensure that buyers are not misled or deceived and that the promotional material does not contain false information. In addition, promoters and sellers are prohibited from engaging in unconscionable conduct and must ensure the coins or tokens issued are fit for their intended purpose.

The protections of the ACL are generally reflected in the *Australian Securities and Investments Commission Act 2001* (Cth) (**ASIC Act**), providing substantially similar protection to investors in financial products or services.

ASIC has also received delegated powers from the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission to enable it to take action against misleading or deceptive conduct in marketing or issuing in ICOs (regardless of whether it involves a financial product). ASIC has indicated misleading or deceptive conduct in relation to ICOs may include:

- using social media to create the appearance of greater levels of public interest;
- creating the appearance of greater levels of buying and selling activity for an ICO or a crypto-asset by engaging in (or arranging for others to engage in) certain trading strategies;
- failing to disclose appropriate information about the ICO; or
- suggesting that the ICO is a regulated product or endorsed by a regulator when it is not.

ASIC has stated that it will use this power to issue further inquiries into ICO issuers and their advisers to identify potentially unlicensed and misleading conduct.

A range of consequences may apply for failing to comply with the ACL or the ASIC Act, including monetary penalties, injunctions, compensatory damages and costs orders.

Taxation

The taxation of cryptocurrency in Australia has been an area of much debate, despite recent attempts by the Australian Taxation Office (**ATO**) to clarify the operation of the tax law. For income tax purposes, the ATO views cryptocurrency as an asset that is held or traded (rather than as money or a foreign currency).

Investors and holders of cryptocurrencies

The tax implications for investors, holders and users of cryptocurrency depends upon the intended use of that cryptocurrency. The summary below applies to investors who are Australian residents for tax purposes.

Investors (including funds) in the business of trading cryptocurrencies are likely to be subject to the trading stock provisions, much like a supermarket treats its goods for sale as trading stock. The gain on the sale of cryptocurrencies will be taxable to such investors on “revenue account”, and any losses will be deductible on a similar basis.

Otherwise, the ATO has indicated that cryptocurrency will likely be a capital gains tax (**CGT**) asset. The gain on its disposal will be subject to CGT. Capital gains may be discounted under the CGT discount provisions, so long as the investor satisfies the conditions for the discount. Note that the ATO’s views on the income tax implications of transactions involving cryptocurrencies is in a state of flux due to the rapid evolution of both cryptocurrency technology and its uses.

Capital losses made on cryptocurrencies which are “personal use” assets are disregarded. This includes cryptocurrencies acquired or kept for personal use or consumption (i.e., to buy goods or services). Capital gains on personal use assets are only disregarded where the asset was acquired for less than A\$10,000.

Issuers of cryptocurrencies

In the context of an ICO, a coin issuance by an entity that is either an Australian tax resident, or acting through an Australian “permanent establishment”, will likely be taxable in Australia. The current corporate tax rate in Australia is either 27.5% or 30%. If the issued coins are characterised as equity for tax purposes, the ICO proceeds should not be taxable to the issuer, but all future returns to the token holders will be treated as dividends.

Australian Goods and Services Tax (GST)

Supplies and acquisitions of digital currency made from 1 July 2017 are not subject to GST on the basis that they will be input taxed financial supplies. Consequently, suppliers of digital currency will not be required to charge GST on these supplies, and a purchaser would not be entitled to GST refunds (i.e., input tax credits) for these corresponding acquisitions. On the basis that digital currency is a method of payment, as an alternative to money, the normal GST rules apply to the payment or receipt of digital currency for goods and services. The term “digital currency” in the GST legislation requires that it is a digital unit of value that has all the following characteristics:

- it is fungible and can be provided as payment for any type of purchase;
- it is generally available to the public free of any substantial restrictions;
- it is not denominated in any country’s currency;
- the value is not derived from or dependent on anything else; and
- it does not give an entitlement or privileges to receive something else.

Enforcement

The ATO has created a specialist task force to tackle cryptocurrency tax evasion. The ATO also collects bulk records from Australian cryptocurrency designated service providers to conduct data matching to ensure that cryptocurrency users are paying the right amount of tax. With the broader regulatory trend around the globe moving from guidance to enforcement, it is likely that the ATO will also begin enforcing tax liabilities more aggressively.

In relation to mining cryptocurrency, the ATO has also released guidance in relation to how these activities will be taxed. This is discussed in “Mining”, below.

Money transmission laws and anti-money laundering requirements

In 2017, the Government passed the AML/CTF Amendment Act, which brought cryptocurrencies and tokens within the scope of Australia’s anti-money laundering and counter-terrorism financing (AML/CTF) regulatory framework. The amendments came into force on 3 April 2018 and focus on the point of intersection between cryptocurrencies and the regulated financial sector, namely digital currency exchanges.

Broadly, digital currency exchange (DCE) providers are now required to register with the Australian Transaction Reports and Analysis Centre (AUSTRAC) in order to operate, with a penalty of up to two years’ imprisonment or a fine of up to A\$105,000, or both, for failing to register. Registered exchanges will be required to implement know-your-customer processes to adequately verify the identity of their customers, with ongoing obligations to monitor and report suspicious and large transactions. Exchange operators are also required to keep certain records relating to customer identification and transactions for up to seven years.

Bringing DCE providers within the ambit of the AML/CTF framework is intended to help legitimise the use of cryptocurrency while protecting the integrity of the financial system in which it operates.

Promotion and testing

Regulators in Australia have generally been receptive to fintech and innovation and have sought to improve their understanding of, and engagement with businesses by regularly consulting with industry on proposed regulatory changes. While there are no programmes specifically promoting research and investment in cryptocurrency, both ASIC and AUSTRAC have established Innovation Hubs designed to assist fintech businesses more broadly in understanding their obligations under Australian law. ASIC has also entered into a number of co-operation agreements with overseas regulators which aim to further understand the approach of fintech businesses in other jurisdictions (as discussed below).

ASIC Innovation Hub

The ASIC Innovation Hub is designed to foster innovation that could benefit consumers by helping Australian fintech start-ups navigate the Australian regulatory system. The Innovation Hub provides tailored information and access to informal assistance intended to streamline the AFSL process for innovative fintech start-ups, which could include cryptocurrency-related businesses.

In December 2016, ASIC made certain class orders establishing a fintech licensing exemption and released *Regulatory Guide 257*, which details ASIC's framework for fintech businesses to test certain financial services, financial products and credit activities without holding an AFSL or Australian credit licence by relying on the class orders (referred to as the regulatory sandbox). There are strict eligibility requirements for both the type of businesses that can enter the regulatory sandbox and the products and services that qualify for the licensing exemption. There are restrictions on how many persons can be provided with a financial product or service, and caps on the value of the financial products or services which can be provided. Businesses may only rely conditionally on the relief for 12 months.

The framework relating to ASIC's regulatory sandbox has been subject to review. The Government recently closed its consultation on draft legislation and regulations outlining an enhanced framework that allows businesses to test a wider range of products and services for a longer period of time. ASIC has also released a consultation paper suggesting that no changes to its existing fintech licensing exemption will be made.

Cross-border business

Beyond this, ASIC has engaged with regulators overseas to deepen its understanding of innovation in financial services, including in relation to cryptocurrencies. In particular, ASIC and the United Kingdom's Financial Conduct Authority have signed an Enhanced Cooperation Agreement, which allows the two regulators to, among other things, information-share, refer innovative businesses to each regulator's respective regulatory sandbox, and conduct joint policy work. ASIC also currently has either information-sharing or cooperation agreements with regulators in Hong Kong, Singapore, Canada, Kenya and Indonesia. These arrangements facilitate the cross-sharing of information on fintech market trends, encourage referrals of fintech companies and share insights from proofs of concepts and innovation competitions.

ASIC is also a signatory to the IOSCO Multilateral Memorandum of Understanding, which has committed over 100 regulators to mutually assist and cooperate with each other, particularly in relation to the enforcement of securities laws.

ASIC has committed to supporting financial innovation in the interests of consumers by joining the Global Financial Innovation Network (**GFIN**), which was formally launched in January 2019 by a group of financial regulators across 29 member organisations. The GFIN is dedicated to facilitating regulatory collaboration in a cross-border context and provides more efficient means for innovative businesses to interact with regulators.

In 2019, a group of fintech associations formed the Asia-Pacific FinTech Network, which is designed to facilitate greater collaboration, cooperation and innovation across the region. The network will focus on sectors including RegTech, Blockchain, Payment Systems, Artificial Intelligence and Financial Inclusion and is expected to accelerate fintech development and lower financial costs both domestically and internationally.

AUSTRAC Innovation Hub

AUSTRAC's Fintel Alliance is a private-public partnership seeking to develop "smarter regulation". This includes setting up an innovation hub targeted at improving the fintech sector's relationship with the government and regulators. The hub will provide a regulatory sandbox for fintech businesses to test financial products and services without risking regulatory action or costs.

AUSTRAC has also implemented a new dedicated webpage providing information about the AML/CTF regime and AUSTRAC's role to assist businesses wishing to create a new financial service product or to understand their AML/CTF obligations. In its annual report for 2016–17, AUSTRAC noted that the webpage had been successful, garnering over 40 direct enquiries from entities developing innovative new approaches to providing "designated services" as defined under the *Anti-money Laundering and Counter-terrorism Financing Act 2006* (Cth) (**AML/CTF Act**). As discussed above, designated services now include the provision of DCE services, and consequently DCE providers may contact AUSTRAC through the webpage to understand their regulatory obligations.

Ownership and licensing requirements

At the time of writing, there are currently no explicit restrictions on investment managers owning cryptocurrencies for investment purposes. However, investment managers may be subject to Australia's financial services regulatory regime where the cryptocurrencies held are deemed to be "financial products".

For example, investment managers providing investment advice on cryptocurrencies held that are financial products will be deemed to be providing financial product advice under the Corporations Act and will need to hold an AFSL or be exempt. ASIC has provided significant guidance in relation to complying with the relevant advice, conduct and disclosure obligations, as well as the conflicted remuneration provisions under the Corporations Act. Further, investment managers may be required to hold an AFSL with a custodial or depository authorisation or be exempt from this requirement if investment managers wish to hold cryptocurrencies that are financial products on behalf of clients.

Against the backdrop of the *Royal Commission into Misconduct in the Banking, Superannuation and Financial Services Industry* and the broader innovation agenda of the Government, Australia has seen a rapidly rising interest in robo-advice or digital advice models. The provision of robo-advice is where algorithms and technology provide automated financial product advice without a human advisor. For investment or fund businesses seeking to operate in Australia by providing digital or hybrid advice (including with respect to investing in cryptocurrencies), there are licensing requirements under the

Corporations Act. ASIC has released *Regulatory Guide 255: providing digital financial product advice to retail clients*, which details issues that digital advice providers need to consider generally, during the AFSL application stage and when providing digital financial product advice to retail clients. It is intended to complement ASIC's existing guidance including *Regulatory Guide 36: Licensing: Financial product advice and dealing*. Financial product advisers also need to consider their conduct and disclosure obligations. ASIC has released *Regulatory Guide 175 Licensing: Financial product adviser – conduct and disclosure* with respect to this.

Mining

At the time of writing, there are no prohibitions on mining Bitcoin or other cryptocurrencies in Australia.

Cryptocurrency mining taxation

The ATO has released some guidance on its approach to taxation in relation to cryptocurrency mining activities. The summary below applies to miners or business owners who are Australian residents for tax purposes.

Income derived by a taxpayer from “carrying on a business” of mining cryptocurrency must be included in the calculation of their assessable income. Whether or not a taxpayer's activities amount to carrying on a business is “a question of fact and degree”, and is ultimately determined by weighing up the taxpayer's individual facts and circumstances. Generally (but not exclusively), where the activities are undertaken for a profit-making purpose, are repetitious, involve ongoing effort, and include business documentation, the activities would amount to “carrying on a business”.

Cryptocurrency miners would also be subject to tax on any gains or profits derived from transferring cryptocurrency mined to a third party.

Where carrying on a business, outgoing and losses would be deductible to the taxpayer (subject to integrity measures and the “non-commercial loss” rules).

Whether or not GST is payable by a cryptocurrency miner on its supply of new cryptocurrency depends on a number of factors, including its specific features, whether the miner is registered for GST, and whether the supply is made in the course of the miner's enterprise.

The specific features of cryptocurrency include: it being a type of security or other derivative; it being “digital currency” as defined in the GST legislation (see “Taxation”, above); or it providing a right or entitlement to goods or services. If the cryptocurrency is “digital currency”, its supply will not be subject to any GST because it will be an input taxed financial supply (assuming the other requirements are satisfied).

A cryptocurrency miner would generally be required to register for GST if its annual GST turnover is \$75,000 or more, excluding the value of its supplies of digital currencies and other input-taxed supplies. However, a miner who does not satisfy this GST registration threshold may nevertheless elect to register for GST in order to claim from the ATO full or reduced input tax credits (i.e., GST refunds) for the GST cost of its business acquisitions (but acquisitions that relate to the sales or acquisitions of digital currencies are *prima facie* non-creditable or non-refundable).

Cybersecurity

More generally, with the rise of cloud-based Bitcoin mining enterprises in Australia, mining businesses should carefully consider cybersecurity issues in relation to mining activities.

In its Corporate Plan 2018 to 2022, ASIC signalled that cyber resilience would be a key focus area for the regulator, particularly in relation to monitoring threats of harm from emerging products, the adequate management of technological solutions and misconduct facilitated by or through cyber-based tools. CERT Australia (now part of the Australian Cyber Security Centre) has noted that there has been an increase in cryptomining malware affecting business' resources and processing capacity. ASIC has also released regulatory guidance indicating its expectations for licensees' cloud computing security arrangements. Two reports, namely 429 *Cyber resilience: Health check* and 555 *Cyber resilience of firms in Australia's financial markets*, examine and provide examples of good practices identified across the financial services industry. The reports contain questions that board members and senior management of financial organisations should ask when considering cyber resilience.

Border restrictions and declaration

There are currently no border restrictions or obligations to declare cryptocurrency holdings when entering or leaving Australia.

The AML/CTF Act mandates that both individuals and businesses must submit reports where physical currency in excess of A\$10,000 (or foreign currency equivalent) is brought into or taken out of Australia. This requirement is restricted to "physical currency", which AUSTRAC has defined as being any coin or printed note of Australia or a foreign country that is designated as legal tender, and is circulated, customarily used and accepted as a medium of exchange in the country of issue. Although recent discourse indicates that some governments have created or are attempting to issue official cryptocurrencies, the intangible nature of cryptocurrency seems to remain a bar to cryptocurrency being captured by declaration obligations under the AML/CTF Act.

It should be noted that the AML/CTF Act was amended to address some aspects of cryptocurrency transfer and exchange; however, this amendment did not see the scope of AML/CTF regulation widen the border restrictions. At the time of writing, there appears to be no indication that any such further amendment to include border restrictions is being contemplated.

Reporting requirements

The AML/CTF Act imposes obligations on entities that provide "designated services" with an Australian connection. Generally, the AML/CTF Act applies to any entity that engages in financial services or credit (consumer or business) activities in Australia including the provision of DCE services. These obligations include record-keeping and reporting requirements. AUSTRAC has released draft AML/CTF rules, which outline reportable details for matters including but not limited to threshold transaction reports (TTRs). TTRs will be required to be submitted where transactions over A\$10,000 have occurred.

Reportable information includes, among other details, the denomination or code of the digital currency and the number of digital currency units, a description of the digital currency including details of the backing asset or thing (if known), the Internet Protocol address information of the payee, the social media identifiers of the payee, and the unique identifiers relating to the digital currency wallet of the payee.

In April 2016, the Report on the Statutory Review of the Anti-Money Laundering and Counter-Terrorism Financing Act 2006 and Associated Rules and Regulations (AML/CTF

Report), which contained 84 recommendations to improve Australia's AML/CTF regime, was released. The AML/CTF Report contemplated two phases of consultation of consultation and implementation, with Phase 1 including priority projects completed in 2017, while Phase 2 progresses major, long-term reforms. These reforms should, among other things, clarify record-keeping requirements and reporting obligations for reporting entities.

Estate planning and testamentary succession

To date, there has been no explicit regulation or case law surrounding the treatment of cryptocurrency in Australian succession law. Generally, if estate plans do not cater for cryptocurrency and steps are not taken to ensure executors can access a deceased's cryptocurrency, it may not pass to the beneficiaries.

A will should be drafted to give the executor authority to deal with digital assets. As cryptocurrencies are generally held anonymously, a will should also establish the existence of the cryptocurrency as an asset to be distributed to beneficiaries. A method must also be established to ensure passwords to digital wallets and external drives storing cryptocurrency are accessible by a trusted representative. Unlike a bank account which can be frozen upon death, anyone can access a digital wallet, so care should be taken to ensure external drives and passwords are not easily accessible on the face of the will. This may include providing a memorandum of passwords and accounts to the executor to be placed in a safe custody facility which remains unopened until a will is called upon.

There may also be tax implications arising for the beneficiaries of cryptocurrencies, which are similar to the tax implications for cryptocurrency holders. See "Taxation" above, for further details.

**Peter Reeves****Tel: +61 2 9263 4000 / Email: preeves@gtlaw.com.au**

Peter Reeves is a partner in Gilbert + Tobin's Corporate Advisory group and is an expert and market-leading practitioner in financial services regulation and funds management. He leads the Financial Services and Fintech practices at G+T. Peter advises domestic and off-shore corporates, financial institutions, funds, managers and other market participants in relation to establishing, structuring and operating financial services sector businesses in Australia. He also advises across a range of issues relevant to the fintech and digital sectors, including platform structuring and establishment, payment solutions, blockchain solutions and global crypto-asset strategies. *Chambers 2019* ranks Peter in Band 1 for Fintech.

Gilbert + Tobin

Level 35, Tower Two, International Towers Sydney, 200 Barangaroo Avenue, Barangaroo, Sydney NSW 2000, Australia
Tel: +61 2 9263 4000 / URL: www.gtlaw.com.au

Other titles in the **Global Legal Insights** series include:

- Alternative Real Estate Investments
- AI, Machine Learning & Big Data
- Banking Regulation
- Bribery & Corruption
- Cartels
- Commercial Real Estate
- Corporate Tax
- Employment & Labour Law
- Energy
- Fintech
- Fund Finance
- Initial Public Offerings
- International Arbitration
- Litigation & Dispute Resolution
- Merger Control
- Mergers & Acquisitions
- Pricing & Reimbursement

Strategic partner:

