

THE VIRTUAL
CURRENCY
REGULATION
REVIEW

THIRD EDITION

Editors

Michael S Sackheim and Nathan A Howell

THE LAWREVIEWS

THE VIRTUAL
CURRENCY
REGULATION
REVIEW

THIRD EDITION

Reproduced with permission from Law Business Research Ltd
This article was first published in August 2020
For further information please contact Nick.Barette@thelawreviews.co.uk

Editors

Michael S Sackheim and Nathan A Howell

PUBLISHER

Tom Barnes

SENIOR BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Nick Barette

BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Joel Woods

SENIOR ACCOUNT MANAGERS

Pere Aspinall, Jack Bagnall

ACCOUNT MANAGERS

Olivia Budd, Katie Hodgetts, Reece Whelan

PRODUCT MARKETING EXECUTIVE

Rebecca Mogridge

RESEARCH LEAD

Kieran Hansen

EDITORIAL COORDINATOR

Georgia Goldberg

PRODUCTION AND OPERATIONS DIRECTOR

Adam Myers

PRODUCTION EDITOR

Tessa Brummitt

SUBEDITORS

Sarah Andreoli, Caroline Fewkes

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Nick Brailey

Published in the United Kingdom

by Law Business Research Ltd, London

Meridian House, 34–35 Farringdon Street, London, EC4A 4HL, UK

© 2020 Law Business Research Ltd

www.TheLawReviews.co.uk

No photocopying: copyright licences do not apply.

The information provided in this publication is general and may not apply in a specific situation, nor does it necessarily represent the views of authors' firms or their clients. Legal advice should always be sought before taking any legal action based on the information provided. The publishers accept no responsibility for any acts or omissions contained herein. Although the information provided was accurate as at August 2020, be advised that this is a developing area.

Enquiries concerning reproduction should be sent to Law Business Research, at the address above.

Enquiries concerning editorial content should be directed
to the Publisher – tom.barnes@lbresearch.com

ISBN 978-1-83862-513-9

Printed in Great Britain by
Encompass Print Solutions, Derbyshire
Tel: 0844 2480 112

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The publisher acknowledges and thanks the following for their assistance throughout the preparation of this book:

AMERELLER

ANDERSON MORI & TOMOTSUNE

ARTHUR COX

BECH-BRUUN

BRANDL & TALOS RECHTSANWÄLTE GMBH

CLIFFORD CHANCE LLP

DENTONS

GERNANDT & DANIELSSON ADVOKATBYRÅ

GTG ADVOCATES

HARNEYS

HENGELER MUELLER PARTNERSCHAFT VON RECHTSANWÄLTEN MBB

KIM & CHANG

KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS & FRANKEL LLP

MARVAL, O'FARRELL & MAIRAL

MVR LEGAL BV

NISHITH DESAI ASSOCIATES

PINHEIRO NETO ADVOGADOS

RUSSELL MCVEAGH

SCHELLENBERG WITTMER LTD

SCHILTZ & SCHILTZ SA

SCHJØDT

SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP

STIKEMAN ELLIOTT LLP

TFH RUSSIA LLC

URÍA MENÉNDEZ

WEBB HENDERSON

CONTENTS

PREFACE.....	vii
<i>Michael S Sackheim and Nathan A Howell</i>	
Chapter 1	ARGENTINA..... 1
<i>Juan M Diebl Moreno</i>	
Chapter 2	AUSTRALIA..... 7
<i>Ara Margossian, Ritam Mitra and Irene Halforty</i>	
Chapter 3	AUSTRIA..... 22
<i>Nicholas Aquilina, Raphael Toman and Florian Braunauer</i>	
Chapter 4	AZERBAIJAN 37
<i>Ulvia Zeynalova-Bockin</i>	
Chapter 5	BELGIUM 42
<i>Michiel Van Roey and Louis Bidaine</i>	
Chapter 6	BRAZIL..... 64
<i>Fernando Mirandez Del Nero Gomes, Tiago Moreira Vieira Rocha, Alessandra Carolina Rossi Martins and Bruno Lorette Corrêa</i>	
Chapter 7	CANADA..... 78
<i>Alix d'Anglejan-Chatillon, Ramandeep K Grewal, Éric Lévesque and Christian Vieira</i>	
Chapter 8	CAYMAN ISLANDS 95
<i>Daniella Skotnicki and Marc Piano</i>	
Chapter 9	DENMARK..... 110
<i>David Moalem and Kristoffer Probst Larsen</i>	

Contents

Chapter 10	FRANCE.....	120
	<i>Hubert de Vauplane and Victor Charpiat</i>	
Chapter 11	GERMANY.....	135
	<i>Matthias Berberich, Tobias Wohlfarth and Gerrit Tönningsen</i>	
Chapter 12	INDIA.....	156
	<i>Vaibhav Parikh and Jaideep Reddy</i>	
Chapter 13	IRELAND.....	170
	<i>Maura McLaughlin, Pearse Ryan, Caroline Devlin and Declan McBride</i>	
Chapter 14	JAPAN.....	175
	<i>Ken Kawai, Takeshi Nagase and Huan Lee Tan</i>	
Chapter 15	LUXEMBOURG.....	185
	<i>Jean-Louis Schiltz and Nadia Manzari</i>	
Chapter 16	MALTA.....	197
	<i>Ian Gauci, Cherise Abela Grech, Terence Cassar and Bernice Saliba</i>	
Chapter 17	NEW ZEALAND.....	207
	<i>Deemle Budhia and Tom Hunt</i>	
Chapter 18	NORWAY.....	219
	<i>Klaus Henrik Wiese-Hansen and Vegard André Fiskerstrand</i>	
Chapter 19	RUSSIA.....	230
	<i>Tatiana Sangadzhieva and Maxim Pervunin</i>	
Chapter 20	SINGAPORE.....	239
	<i>Han Ming Ho and Josephine Law</i>	
Chapter 21	SOUTH KOREA.....	251
	<i>Jung Min Lee, Joon Young Kim and Samuel Yim</i>	
Chapter 22	SPAIN.....	262
	<i>Pilar Lluesma Rodrigo and Alberto Gil Soriano</i>	

Contents

Chapter 23	SWEDEN.....	272
	<i>Niclas Rockborn</i>	
Chapter 24	SWITZERLAND.....	282
	<i>Olivier Favre, Tarek Houdrouge and Fabio Elsener</i>	
Chapter 25	UNITED ARAB EMIRATES.....	299
	<i>Silke Noa Elrifai and Christopher Gunson</i>	
Chapter 26	UNITED KINGDOM.....	322
	<i>Laura Douglas</i>	
Chapter 27	UNITED STATES.....	345
	<i>Sidley Austin LLP</i>	
Appendix 1	ABOUT THE AUTHORS.....	409
Appendix 2	CONTRIBUTORS' CONTACT DETAILS.....	433

PREFACE

We are pleased to introduce the third edition of *The Virtual Currency Regulation Review* (the *Review*). The increased acceptance and use of virtual currencies by businesses and the exponential growth of investment opportunities for speculators marked late 2019 and early 2020. In 2019, it was reported that several of the largest global banks were developing a digital cash equivalent of central bank-backed currencies that would be operated via blockchain technology, and that Facebook was developing its own virtual currency pegged to the US dollar – Libra – to be used to make payments by people without bank accounts and for currency conversions. In 2019, the US House of Representatives’ Committee on Financial Services held a hearing on the potential impact of Libra in which one witness testified that Libra posed a fundamental threat to the ability of sovereign nations to maintain distinct monetary policies and respond to currency crises.

The *Review* is a country-by-country analysis of developing regulatory initiatives aimed at fostering innovation, while at the same time protecting the public and mitigating systemic risk concerning trading and transacting in virtual currencies. In February 2020, the International Organizations of Securities Commissions (IOSCO) published a final report titled ‘Issues, Risks and Regulatory Considerations Relating to Crypto-Asset Trading Platforms’. The final report describes issues and risks identified to date that are associated with the trading of cryptoassets on cryptoasset trading platforms (CTPs). In relation to the issues and risks identified, the report describes key considerations and provides related toolkits that are useful for each consideration. The key considerations relate to: (1) access to CTPs; (2) safeguarding participant assets; (3) conflicts of interest; (4) operations of CTPs; (5) market integrity; (6) price discovery; and (7) technology. IOSCO advised that these seven key considerations (and the related toolkits described in the report) represent specific areas that IOSCO believes jurisdictions could consider in the context of the regulation of CTPs.

Fortunes have been made and lost in the trading of virtual currencies since Satoshi Nakamoto published a white paper in 2008 describing what he referred to as a system for peer-to-peer payments, using a public decentralised ledger known as a blockchain and cryptography as a source of trust to verify transactions. That paper, released in the dark days of a growing global financial market crisis, laid the foundations for Bitcoin, which would become operational in early 2009. Satoshi has never been identified, but his white paper represented a watershed moment in the evolution of virtual currency. Bitcoin was an obscure asset in 2009, but it is far from obscure today, and there are now many other virtual currencies and related assets. In 2013, a new type of blockchain that came to be known as Ethereum was proposed. Ethereum’s native virtual currency, Ether, went live in 2015 and opened up a new phase in the evolution of virtual currency. Ethereum provided a broader platform, or protocol, for the development of all sorts of other virtual currencies and related assets.

In 2020, the global outbreak of the novel coronavirus (or covid-19) impacted virtually every person on the planet and had severe and sudden effects on every major economy. At the time of writing, the pandemic is ongoing and, while some locations are pushing past their respective ‘peaks’ of infection, cities that are central to the global financial markets, such as New York City, remain under strict lockdown orders, with many workers in the financial services sector working remotely. It is unclear when these cities will return to a version of ‘normal’. In the midst of all this chaos, there is a natural experiment under way in the cryptocurrency markets. We are perhaps learning what happens when our governments are strained and their competence is questioned. Since mid-March 2020, when the pandemic hit the United States in earnest (it had already been raging in China, Italy, Iran, etc.), the price of Bitcoin has gone up in essentially a straight line – from approximately US\$5,000 to almost US\$10,000 as at mid-May. Now, to be fair, this follows a significant price decline preceding March, but it is at least interesting to observe that the most widely held cryptocurrency is weathering a significant economic storm with apparent ease.

When we first launched the *Review* three years ago, we were optimistic but sceptical about whether virtual currencies would be widely and consistently in commercial use. However, the virtual currency revolution has come a long way and has endured a sufficient number of events that could or should have been fatal for the asset class. Our confidence in the long-term viability of virtual currency has only increased over the previous year. Virtual currencies and the blockchain and other distributed ledger technology on which they are based are groundbreaking, and are being deployed right now in many markets and for many purposes. As lawyers, we must now endeavour to understand what that means for our clients.

Virtual currencies are borderless: they exist on global and interconnected computer systems. They are generally decentralised, meaning that the records relating to a virtual currency and transactions therein may be maintained in a number of separate jurisdictions simultaneously. The borderless nature of this technology was the core inspiration for the *Review*. As practitioners, we cannot afford to focus solely on our own jurisdictional silos. For example, a US banking lawyer advising clients on matters related to virtual currency must not only have a working understanding of US securities and derivatives regulation; he or she must also have a broad view of the regulatory treatment of virtual currency in other major commercial jurisdictions.

Global regulators have taken a range of approaches to responding to virtual currencies. Some regulators have attempted to stamp out the use of virtual currencies out of a fear that virtual currencies such as Bitcoin allow capital to flow freely and without the usual checks that are designed to prevent money laundering and the illicit use of funds. Others have attempted to write specific laws and regulations tailored to virtual currencies. Still others – the United States included – have attempted to apply legacy regulatory structures to virtual currencies. Those regulatory structures attempt what is essentially ‘regulation by analogy’. In some countries, a virtual currency, which is not a fiat currency, may be regulated in the same manner as money; in other countries, virtual currency may be regulated similarly to securities or commodities. We make one general observation at the outset: there is no consistency across jurisdictions in their approach to regulating virtual currencies. Perhaps the efforts of IOSCO will help to change that going forward, but there is currently no widely accepted global regulatory standard. That is what makes a publication such as the *Review* both so interesting and so challenging.

The lack of global standards has led to a great deal of regulatory arbitrage, as virtual currency innovators shop for jurisdictions with optimally calibrated regulatory structures that provide an acceptable amount of legal certainty and virtual currency scofflaws shop for jurisdictions with regulatory structures that provide no meaningful regulation. While some market participants are interested in finding the jurisdiction with the lightest touch (or no touch), most legitimate actors are not attempting to flee from regulation entirely. They appreciate that regulation is necessary to allow virtual currencies to achieve their potential, but they do need regulatory systems with an appropriate balance and a high degree of clarity. The technology underlying virtual currencies is complex enough without adding layers of regulatory complexity into the mix.

It is perhaps ironic that the principal source of strength of virtual currencies – decentralisation – is the same characteristic that the regulators themselves seem to be displaying. There is no central authority over virtual currencies, either within or across jurisdictions, and each regulator takes an approach that seems appropriate to that regulator based on its own narrow view of the markets and legacy regulations. Again, we are hopeful that IOSCO's efforts will help to encourage the emergence of optimal regulatory structures over time. Ultimately, the borderless nature of these markets allows market participants to 'vote with their feet', and they will gravitate towards jurisdictions that achieve the right regulatory balance of encouraging innovation and protecting the public and the financial system. It is much easier to do this in a primarily electronic and computerised business than it would be in a brick-and-mortar business. Computer servers are relatively easy to relocate; factories and workers are less so.

The third edition of the *Review* provides a practical analysis of recent legal and regulatory changes and developments, and of their effects, and looks forward to expected trends in the area of virtual currencies on a country-by-country basis. It is not intended to be an exhaustive guide to the regulation of virtual currencies globally or in any of the included jurisdictions. Instead, for each jurisdiction, the authors have endeavoured to provide a sufficient overview for the reader to understand the current legal and regulatory environment at a high level.

Virtual currency is the broad term that is used in the *Review* to refer to Bitcoin, Ether, Tethers and other stablecoins, cryptocurrencies, altcoins, ERC20 tokens, digital, virtual and crypto assets, and other digital and virtual tokens and coins, including coins issued in initial coin offerings. We recognise that in many instances the term 'virtual currency' will not be appropriate, and other related terms are used throughout as needed. In the law, the words we use matter a great deal, so, where necessary, the authors of each chapter provide clarity around the terminology used in their jurisdiction and the legal meaning given to that terminology.

Based on feedback on the first and second editions of the *Review* from members of the legal community throughout the world, we are confident that attorneys will find the updated third edition to be an excellent resource in their own practices. We are still in the early days of the virtual currency revolution, but it does not appear to be a passing fad. The many lawyers involved in this treatise have endeavoured to provide as much useful information as practicable concerning the global regulation of virtual currencies.

The editors would like to extend special thanks to Ivet Bell (New York) and Dan Applebaum (Chicago), both Sidley Austin LLP associates, for their invaluable assistance in organising and editing the third edition of the *Review*, and particularly the United States chapter. The assembly of this third edition is made all the more remarkable by the fact that

many of the authors and contributors are working from home, with dogs barking in the background and children at their feet. Special thanks go out to all those dogs and children for being as tolerant as possible as we try to conduct the work of busy lawyers and also produce this *Review*.

Michael S Sackheim and Nathan A Howell

Sidley Austin LLP

New York and Chicago

August 2020

SPAIN

*Pilar Lluesma Rodrigo and Alberto Gil Soriano*¹

I INTRODUCTION TO THE LEGAL AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

In Spain, there is no legislation specific to virtual currencies, except for a preliminary draft law launched in February 2020 implementing the Fifth Anti-Money Laundering Directive (see Section IV) and a piece of draft legislation, approved by the government in February 2020, which indirectly relates to virtual currencies, which will be debated in the Spanish parliament in the coming months. The draft legislation includes measures for the digital transformation of the financial system, including the legal framework for a regulatory sandbox.²

In 2018 the Spanish securities regulator (CNMV) and the Bank of Spain issued joint advice on the risks associated with purchasing virtual currencies or investing in products tied to them,³ and the CNMV has issued two other documents setting out its opinion and position on several matters related to virtual currencies. However, only the CNMV has issued a statement to clarify that it has not authorised any prospectus, nor has it exercised any authorisation for, or power to verify, any transaction in connection with cryptocurrencies.⁴

The Spanish tax authorities have also issued several binding rulings on the tax aspects of activities involving virtual currencies.

II SECURITIES AND INVESTMENT LAWS

i Classification and commercialisation of virtual currencies

The CNMV has unofficially stated that virtual currencies per se should not be considered as securities. However, following reports from the European Securities and Markets Authority and the European Banking Authority (EBA) (both published in January 2019), cryptoassets can be classified into four categories: (1) currency tokens (cryptocurrencies with no rights or investment purposes); (2) security tokens, which usually provide property rights, interest rights or dividends attached to a business; (3) utility tokens, which facilitate access to a product or a service, but do not serve as a payment method for other products or services; and (4) hybrids, which can fall under more than one of the first three categories.

1 Pilar Lluesma Rodrigo is counsel and Alberto Gil Soriano is a managing associate at Uría Menéndez. The authors would like to thank Alberto Gómez Fraga and Arianna Vazquez Fernández for their collaboration on this chapter.

2 http://www.congreso.es/public_oficiales/L14/CONG/BOCG/A/BOCG-14-A-3-1.PDF

3 https://www.bde.es/f/webbde/GAP/Secciones/SalaPrensa/NotasInformativas/18/presbe2018_07en.pdf

4 <https://www.cnmv.es/portal/verDoc.axd?t={76316281-6a21-42a5-b742-085dca1d9c7f}>

Without prejudice to the above, the CNMV has acknowledged that the offering and commercialisation of virtual currencies can have investment law implications as follows.⁵

Direct marketing

Where virtual currencies are acquired through platforms operating on the internet (exchanges) and through cryptocurrency automatic teller machines (ATMs), the CNMV considers that investors do not actually directly own the virtual currencies, and instead only have rights in relation to an unsupervised exchange or intermediary. As a consequence, purchasers are exposed to the risk of an intermediary becoming insolvent or not complying with basic rules on proper record-keeping, diligent custody and recording of assets, and the correct management of conflicts of interest.

Contracts for differences

Entities offering these products should be authorised by the CNMV to provide investment services and meet all reporting obligations and other applicable rules of conduct.

Futures, options and other derivatives

If these types of products have been authorised by a regulated supervisor, their active marketing under a public offering by market professionals to retail investors might require a prospectus approved by the CNMV or another EU authority under the passporting arrangements.

Specific investment funds and other collective investment vehicles that invest in virtual currencies

These types of vehicles and investment funds should be approved or registered by the CNMV. The CNMV⁶ has acknowledged that, in accordance with Article 2.1 of Law 22/2014, a closed-ended collective investment scheme can invest directly in virtual currencies, but it has to be registered with the CNMV. In this regard, the CNMV has pointed out that the divestment policies of its participants or partners must meet the following requirements: divestment must take place simultaneously with respect to all investors and participants; and investors and participants must be remunerated according to the articles of association or regulations for each class of shares or participations.

This type of fund cannot be marketed to retail investors.

Acquiring structured bonds where the underlying asset is a virtual currency

The marketing under a public offering regime of exchange-traded products and exchange-traded notes requires the approval of the supervisors of an explanatory prospectus that has also been subject to the relevant EU passporting procedure.

5 See CNMV considerations on cryptocurrencies and ICOs addressed to market professionals, 8 February 2018.

6 See Questions and Answers for FinTech companies on activities and services that may be within the CNMV's remit, last updated 12 March 2019.

ii Initial coin offerings

The CNMV⁷ understands that transactions structured as initial coin offerings (ICOs) in many cases should be treated as issues or public offerings of transferable securities given the broad definition of transferable security under Spanish law.⁸

The CNMV sets out the following factors as being relevant in assessing whether transferable securities are being offered through an ICO:

- a tokens that assign rights or expectations of a share in the potential increase in value or profitability of businesses or projects or, in general, that they constitute or assign rights equivalent or similar to those of shares, bonds or other financial instruments governed by Spanish securities law; or
- b tokens that entitle access to services or to receive goods or products, that they are offered referring explicitly or implicitly to the expectation that the purchaser or investor will obtain a profit as a result of their increase in value or some form of remuneration associated with the instrument, or reference is made to its liquidity or tradability on equivalent or allegedly similar markets to regulated securities markets.

However, with regard to point (b) above, if it cannot be reasonably established that there is a correlation between the expectations of a profit or an increase of value and the evolution of the underlying business or project, then the token should not be considered a financial instrument.⁹

If ICOs qualify as financial instruments, then the regulation contained in, relating to or arising from the Markets in Financial Instruments Directive II, the Prospectus Directive and the Alternative Investment Fund Managers Directive should apply to them.

Even if an ICO does not qualify as a public offer (because it is either aimed at fewer than 150 investors, or involves a minimum investment of €100,000 or a total amount of less than €5 million), if the placement is made using whatsoever form of advertising (including websites in Spanish offering the tokens), an entity authorised to provide investment services should intervene in relation to its marketing.¹⁰ The CNMV understands that this requirement is fulfilled if the entity authorised to provide investment services intervenes:

- a on the occasion of each individual subscription or acquisition of the securities or financial instruments as a placement agent, broker or adviser, subject to the rules applicable in each case; or
- b by validating and supervising the offer in general and, in particular, the information provided to investors, and the placement or marketing procedure used (without an authorised entity having to intervene on the occasion of each subscription or acquisition). With regard to the validation of information, the authorised entity must ensure that the information is clear, impartial and not misleading, and that it refers to the characteristics and risks of the securities issued, as well as the company's legal, economic and financial situation, in a sufficiently detailed manner to allow the investor

7 See CNMV considerations on cryptocurrencies and ICOs addressed to market professionals, 8 February 2018.

8 Article 2.1. of the Spanish Securities Law: 'Any patrimonial right, regardless of its name, which, because of its legal configuration and system of transfer, can be traded in a generalised and impersonal way on a financial market.'

9 See CNMV Criteria in relation to ICO, 20 September 2018.

10 Article 35.3 of the Spanish Securities Law.

to make a well-informed investment decision. Likewise, the information for investors shall include a warning on the novel nature of the registry technology and on the fact that the custody of the tokens is not carried out by an authorised entity.

To date, the CNMV has not authorised any ICOs, although it has analysed several potential ICO structures. The action of the CNMV in connection with those projects on the issue of tokens, which could be equivalent to transferable securities, has been limited to confirm that in the event of complying with the requirements set out in the Spanish legislation not be considered as a public offer, the transaction would not require the approval of a prospectus; nor would it be subject to verification or prior intervention by the CNMV, although the participation of an investment firm is necessary.

III BANKING AND MONEY TRANSMISSION

The Bank of Spain, the Spanish authority responsible for banking and money transfer matters, has not issued any statement or otherwise set out its position on virtual currencies other than in the joint warning issued with the CNMV mentioned in Section I.

According to the joint warning, and although they acknowledge that virtual currencies are occasionally presented as an alternative to legal tender, the Spanish authorities note that the former differ greatly from the latter in that their acceptance as a means of payment of a debt or other obligations is not mandatory, their circulation is very limited and their value fluctuates widely, meaning that they cannot be considered as a sound store of value or a stable unit of account.

In this regard, the advice of the EBA on cryptoassets of 9 January 2019 provides that a competent authority will consider a token to be electronic money if it: is electronically stored; has monetary value; represents a claim on the issuer; is issued on receipt of funds; is issued for the purpose of making payment transactions; and is accepted by persons other than the issuer.¹¹

At present, no virtual currency, including Bitcoin, is recognised by Spanish law as a digital currency, electronic money or as a payment method. The main concern is consumer protection as an important part of the activities related to cryptocurrencies cannot be included within the scope of European regulations for financial services (EDM2 and PSD2) and, in the instances when some activities do fall within their scope, not all risks attached are adequately addressed and mitigated.

11 <https://eba.europa.eu/documents/10180/2545547/EBA+Report+on+crypto+assets.pdf>.

IV ANTI-MONEY LAUNDERING

In addition to the warnings issued by the Bank of Spain and the CNMV on money laundering risks regarding virtual currencies themselves and the activities related to them, on 12 June 2020 the Spanish government launched a preliminary draft law¹² amending the current anti-money laundering (AML) legal framework and transposing some EU AML provisions, including the Fifth Anti-Money Laundering Directive.¹³

Thus, the new Article 1 of the current Law 10/2010 of 28 April on the prevention of money laundering and terrorist financing will include the following definitions:

- a* virtual currency: a digital representation of value that is not issued or guaranteed by a central bank or a public authority, is not necessarily attached to a legally established currency and does not possess a legal status of currency or money, but is accepted by natural or legal persons as a means of exchange and that can be transferred, stored and traded electronically;
- b* exchange between virtual currencies and fiat currencies: the purchase and sale of virtual currencies through the delivery or acceptance of euros or any foreign legal tender or electronic money accepted as medium of exchange in the country where it has been issued; and
- c* custodian wallet provider: a legal or natural person that provides services to safeguard private cryptographic keys on behalf of its customers, to hold, store and transfer virtual currencies.

Likewise, the new Article 2(u), in turn, will consider providers engaged in exchange services between virtual currencies and between virtual currencies and fiat currencies and custodian wallet providers as obliged entities, including non-resident entities providing services through branches or agents, or providing services without a permanent establishment that provide similar services to those referred to above. The entities must be registered with the Executive Service of the Commission for the Prevention of Money Laundering and Monetary Offences (SEPBLAC), the Spanish competent authority on anti-money laundering.

The preamble of the preliminary draft explains that although the Financial Action Task Force extends the application of the AML rules to the issue and trading of virtual assets considered as negotiable securities (security tokens), it is understood that no further amendments to the law are required for this purpose because, to the extent that a virtual currency will be considered as a negotiable security by the CNMV, it will be already included within the scope of Law 10/2010.

V REGULATION OF EXCHANGES

The regulation to which an exchange is subject under Spanish law depends on whether or not the assets are traded as financial instruments and on the type of activity performed within the exchange.

12 Draft Law --/2020, amending Law 10/2010 of 28 April on the prevention of money laundering and terrorist financing and transposing EU Directives in the field of the prevention of money laundering and terrorist financing, https://www.mineco.gob.es/stfls/mineco/ministerio/participacion_publica/audiencia/ficheros/ECO_TES_20200612_AP_V_Directiv_Blanqueo.pdf.

13 Directive (EU) 2018/843 of 30 May 2018.

Although there is no specific regulation on trading platforms for virtual currencies or other cryptoassets, the CNMV¹⁴ has indicated that to the extent that the assets traded in an exchange are not considered as financial instruments, at a very minimum they should be subject to rules related to custody, registration, management of conflicts of interest between clients and transparency on fees (in addition to anti-money laundering regulations). Therefore, the CNMV recommends that these platforms voluntarily apply the principles of securities market regulations relating to the aforementioned matters to ensure the proper functioning of their activities. If they qualify as financial instruments, Spanish securities market legislation applies, which means the corresponding authorisations must be obtained, including, where appropriate, an authorisation as a trading venue (such as a regulated market, a multilateral trading system or an organised trading facility), or as an investment firm or credit institution that operates as a systematic internaliser. On this matter, in response to the consultation document on an EU framework for markets in cryptoassets, the independent committee of the CNMV noted that the main risks of exchanges are the following: (1) absence of transparency in the information requirements and regulatory status of the companies involved; (2) operational resilience and good risk governance (in case of loss of cryptoassets, for instance); (3) absence of solutions to mitigate conflicts of interest; and (4) absence of adequate advertising standards.

However, the Bank of Spain has not given any guidance as to whether activities performed by an exchange would qualify as payment services or currency exchange services for regulatory purposes where virtual currencies are used solely for payment purposes (not as securities or similar).

To the extent that regulated markets, multilateral trading facilities (MTFs) and organised trading facilities (OTFs) located in Spain require that the instruments traded on or through them be represented in book entries, tokens cannot be traded in Spanish regulated markets, MTFs or OTFs because they cannot be represented in book entries.

VI REGULATION OF MINERS

With the exception of the tax issues explained in Section IX, there is no regulation of miners in Spain, and the Bank of Spain and the CNMV have not expressed their views on this matter.

However, to the extent that miners would not be considered as issuers of financial instruments or electronic money, or as placing financial instruments, no licence or authorisation would be required under Spanish law to mine.

VII REGULATION OF ISSUERS AND SPONSORS

To the extent that virtual currencies could be classed as financial instruments or as electronic money, their issuers must obtain the corresponding authorisations from the CNMV and the Bank of Spain. In terms of virtual currencies as financial instruments, see Section II.ii regarding ICOs. Neither the Bank of Spain nor the current legislation considers a virtual currency as electronic money; therefore, its issuance falls outside the scope of the Spanish legislation on electronic money institutions, although the assessment has to be made on a case-by-case basis.

The concept of sponsor does not exist under Spanish law.

¹⁴ See Questions and Answers for FinTech companies on activities and services that may be within CNMV's remit, last updated 12 March 2019.

VIII CRIMINAL AND CIVIL FRAUD AND ENFORCEMENT

In recent years, fraud through improper acts of disposition relating to cryptocurrencies such as Bitcoin has been increasing. As with any other type of asset, there are certain criminal liabilities associated with virtual currencies, given that the conduct of a third party (such as a wealth manager) may cause a loss to the investor's equity.

First, it is worth noting that equity as a whole is the legal interest protected from the crime of fraud and that cryptocurrencies are a part of this equity because they are considered valuable assets. As a consequence, improper acts of disposition of cryptocurrency assets are protected under criminal law. Article 248 of the Criminal Code sets out the ways in which the crime of fraud can be considered to have been committed. If the behaviour is considered to be fraud, it will be punishable.

Article 248.1 specifies that fraud is committed when the perpetrator, for financial gain and by means of deception, induces the victim to act in error, resulting in him or her carrying out an act of disposition to his or her own detriment or to the detriment of a third party. There needs to be a link between the perpetrator's deception and the victim's act of disposition (see Supreme Court judgment 531/2015 of 23 September).

Article 248.2.a) provides for another type of fraud (computer fraud) in cases in which perpetrators use manipulation through a computer or similar device to carry out an unauthorised transfer of an asset to the detriment of the victim or a third party (Supreme Court judgment 860/2008 of 17 December). This provision sets out the same scheme as described above except that it requires no deception – which is interpreted narrowly – as it is replaced by manipulation through a computer. Where traditional fraud requires some form of deception, computer fraud requires manipulation through a computer or similar device. This means that this crime can be committed in different ways, given the breadth of the expression 'manipulation through a computer or similar device'. Thus, for example, the offence would be committed when an individual alters an email address or bank account number, or implants files that unlock a user's passwords.

Judgment 326/2019 of 20 June of the Criminal Chamber of the Supreme Court ruled on Spain's first case of fraud regarding cryptocurrencies under Article 248.1 of the Criminal Code. In this case, the Supreme Court upheld the sentence of imprisonment given to an investment manager as the perpetrator of the fraud. According to the judgment, the defendant signed several high-frequency trading agreements with the aggrieved parties under which he committed to (1) manage Bitcoins that were delivered to him as a deposit, (2) reinvest the potential dividends and (3) finally, at maturity, deliver the profits obtained in exchange for a commission. However, it was proven that at the time of signing those agreements the defendant did not intend to fulfil his contractual obligations (in fact, he did not carry out any investment transactions at all), and his only intention was to seize the received Bitcoins and simulate the execution of the agreements.

As regards the civil liabilities arising from the criminal offence, the Supreme Court denied the aggrieved parties' request to be compensated with cryptocurrencies rather than with their equivalent value in euros (their motion for this was driven by the fact that Bitcoins had undergone a significant increase in value since the time the high-frequency trading agreements were signed). According to the Supreme Court, Bitcoins are intangible assets that cannot be reinstated, nor are they considered 'electronic money' in the legal sense set out by Spanish Law 21/2011 of 26 July. Thus, although the aggrieved parties delivered cryptocurrencies (and subsequently lost them because of the fraud), the perpetrator was

ordered to pay back the equivalent value in euros of the cryptocurrencies at the time when they were delivered (plus additional compensation for the profitability that those Bitcoins would have offered up until the agreements expired).

The criminal proceedings through which these offences are prosecuted in Spain do not contain any special provision for when the disposition of assets relates to a type of cryptocurrency instead of a traditional currency. Therefore, the procedure for summary proceedings will apply if the penalty does not exceed nine years in prison.

These proceedings are divided into three phases. The first is the pre-trial phase, in which the judge will try to obtain evidence to determine whether the investigated behaviour may be considered criminal and, if so, discover the identity of the perpetrator. The second is the intermediate phase, in which the prosecution and defence will draft their respective briefs. The third phase is the oral trial, in which the admitted evidence is examined.

The main procedural difficulties Spanish authorities face when it comes to prosecuting these crimes are the lack of jurisdiction and competence. The anonymity with which perpetrators act, the places from which they do so (in most cases outside Spain) and the fact that the funds usually go to other countries prevent action being taken against them through judicial avenues in Spain. Having said that, when determining the authority of Spanish courts with regard to cybercrimes committed over the internet, the Spanish Supreme Court has embraced the 'theory of ubiquity', under which the offence should be regarded as having been committed on Spanish territory if any substantial element of the criminal activity (unlawful action, damage, profit of the perpetrators, etc.) took place in Spain.¹⁵

IX TAX

Virtual currencies perform an economic function (store of value or medium of exchange), which means that their possession and use may have tax implications. In addition, they pose a higher-than-average risk of being used as a means to commit tax fraud given that it is very difficult to determine the true identity of their owners (to the point that they are almost anonymous), and that the transactions are peer-to-peer and may have a cross-border element, and therefore the ability of tax authorities to monitor them is reduced. All this has put them under the spotlight of the Spanish tax authorities, albeit the tax regime and reporting obligations regarding virtual currencies are still at an early stage.

i Income tax and value added tax (dynamic approach)

The tax treatment of virtual currencies and their trading differs within the country, depending on the tax. From an accounting standpoint, the Spanish Accounting Board considers virtual currencies to be an intangible asset or a commercial stock, depending on their use.

To date, the Spanish tax authorities have considered that any operation (except mining) with virtual currencies constitutes a barter transaction for income tax purposes (personal income tax, corporate income tax and non-resident income tax), which means that users of virtual currencies make a capital gain or loss with any delivery of virtual currencies; and tax compliance becomes complicated and burdensome for both the taxpayer and the tax authority.

¹⁵ See agreement of the non-jurisdictional plenary session of the Criminal Chamber of the Supreme Court dated 3 February 2005.

The Spanish tax authorities set out in binding tax ruling V0808-18 of 22 March that the use of virtual currencies outside of the performance of an economic activity may result in capital gains or losses at the moment in which the transaction takes place (Article 14.1.c) of Law 35/2006 of 28 November on personal income tax (the PIT Law)), with a tax rate of up to 23 per cent for individuals. According to binding tax ruling V1604-18 of 11 June, fees charged by the exchange increase and the decrease the acquisition and sale price, respectively, if they are directly related to the transaction. The first-in, first-out principle applies. The income obtained from mining is considered business income, and the applicable tax rate could be as much as 48 per cent for individuals, depending on the autonomous region where they reside. The corporate income tax rate is 25 per cent, while the non-resident income tax rate is 24 per cent (19 per cent for residents of the European Union and European Economic Area). The Spanish tax authorities also state in binding tax ruling V1149-18 of 8 May that the exit tax regulated in Article 95 *bis* of the PIT Law does not apply to virtual currencies.

As regards value added tax (VAT), the Spanish tax authorities' position, as set out in binding tax rulings V1274-30 of 6 May and V1748-18 of 18 June, is aligned with that of the European Court of Justice, which considered in *Hedqvist*¹⁶ that virtual currencies constitute a currency in the sense of Article 135(1)(e) of the VAT Directive and are a direct means of payment; therefore, services related to those currencies (including mining) are covered by the VAT exemption granted by that Article. Consequently, input VAT will not be deductible.

ii Net wealth tax and reporting obligations (static approach)

Virtual currencies, as an asset, fall under the scope of Law 19/1991 of 6 June on net wealth tax (the NWT Law) and therefore must be declared by filing Form 714 with the Spanish tax authorities by 30 June each year. According to Article 24 of the NWT Law, taxpayers must report their virtual currencies' market value in euros on 31 December. There is no official market value, so taxpayers will have to rely on the most widely used websites (such as www.coindesk.com). The Spanish tax authorities endorsed this conclusion in binding rulings V0590-18 of 1 March and V2289-18 of 3 August, among others. The net wealth tax rate can be up to 2.75 per cent, depending on the autonomous region of residence (there are some regions with a zero per cent rate).

In addition to the net wealth tax, there are three independent obligations to declare all assets held abroad worth more than €50,000 (bank accounts, securities and real estate). Taxpayers must submit Form 720 (informative report of assets and rights held abroad) by 31 March each year. To date, virtual currencies have not been considered to be securities or held in a bank account for tax purposes; therefore, it seems they need not be included in a Form 720 declaration. However, this approach will probably change in the near future. In this regard, on 19 October 2018 the government made public a draft bill on measures to prevent and fight tax evasion (the Draft Bill), including a new obligation to report the amount of virtual currencies held in Spain or abroad (through Form 720), identifying the owner and the beneficial owner; and report all transactions involving virtual currencies (acquisitions, sales, barter transactions or transfers). The legislative proposal was published for public consultation on 23 October 2018 but was withdrawn because of the call for a general election (see below).¹⁷

16 Judgment of 22 October 2015, *Hedqvist*, Case C-264/14.

17 <http://www.hacienda.gob.es/Documentacion/Publico/NormativaDoctrina/Proyectos/Tributarios/ANTEPROYECTO%20LEY%20ATAD.pdf>.

The Annual Tax and Customs Control Plan for 2018, published in the Spanish Official Gazette of 23 January 2018, pointed out that, in the context of the prevention and suppression of smuggling, drug trafficking and money laundering, the tax authorities 'will detect and prevent the use by organised crime of the deep web to trade in any illicit goods, as well as the use of cryptocurrencies such as Bitcoin or similar as a means of payment'. In addition, the National Anti-fraud Office attempted to identify all entities that operate with virtual currencies, and sent them requests to provide specific information. Thus, the pre-filled tax forms that the Spanish authorities make available to the taxpayers each year include that the taxpayer has carried out transactions with virtual currencies. The Annual Tax and Customs Control Plan for 2020 published in the Spanish Official Gazette of 28 January 2020 reiterates that the Spanish tax authorities will continue gathering information and designing control initiatives to ensure that transactions with cryptoassets are duly reported and that the funds have a licit origin.

The Spanish tax authorities are also assessing the possibility of imposing new reporting obligations, regulating 'human ATMs' (persons carrying out physical transfers of virtual currencies using apps such as Meetup¹⁸) and establishing a sanctioning regime for non-compliance with these reporting obligations. In fact, the Draft Bill requires: (1) wallet providers to provide information on virtual currencies balances (segregated by virtual currency), owners, authorised persons or beneficiaries of these balances; and (2) exchanges to provide information on the transactions carried out, identifying the parties involved, address, tax identification number, class and number of virtual currencies, and price and date of the transaction. These reporting obligations also apply to issuers of ICOs with tax residence in Spain.

However, the dissolution of the Spanish parliament and the calling of a general election in spring 2019 implied the automatic withdrawal of the Draft Bill. It is likely that the new government will relaunch this initiative but, to date, there is no information in this regard.

X LOOKING AHEAD

While no specific legislation has been adopted in Spain on virtual currencies, the need for comprehensive regulation (of, inter alia, tax, consumer protection and regulatory aspects) regarding this matter has been already discussed in both Spanish legislative chambers by all political parties.

On the other hand, the Spanish supervisory bodies (the CNMV, the Bank of Spain and SEPBLAC) understand that, given the transnational nature of virtual currencies and the activities related to them (issuance, deposit, marketing, etc.), their regulation should be addressed at an international level or, at the very least, at an EU level, so that as many regulators and supervisory bodies as possible adopt and share common positions, otherwise uncoordinated regulatory approaches may prove ineffective and create incentives for regulatory arbitrage. The first step is Directive 2018/843 of 30 May 2018, amending Directive (EU) 2015/849 on the prevention of the use of the financial system for the purposes of money laundering or terrorist financing, which directly regulates virtual currencies for the first time at an EU level and is in the process of being implemented in Spain.

Despite the potential risks that virtual currencies pose as a consequence of their lack of regulation, both the Spanish legislator and supervisory bodies are aware of their importance and of the technological developments behind them, and they are therefore pressing for the speedy adoption of regulations and common positions on this matter.

18 www.meetup.com.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

PILAR LLUESMA RODRIGO

Uría Menéndez

Pilar Lluesma Rodrigo is counsel in Uría Menéndez's Madrid office. She began her career at Uría Menéndez in 1995 and rejoined the firm in 2018, having worked in the legal department of INVERCO from 2016 to 2017.

She has 20 years of experience advising a wide range of financial entities, including credit entities, investment services firms, collective investment schemes management companies, and private equity management companies, in regulatory and financial matters.

In particular, within the regulatory field, she advises on matters such as authorisations, cross-border provision of services, marketing of products, rules of conduct and transparency, disciplinary proceedings, reporting to supervisory authorities, anti-money laundering, derivatives and service client agreements.

ALBERTO GIL SORIANO

Uría Menéndez

Alberto Gil Soriano joined Uría Menéndez in 2012 and is a managing associate in the tax department.

He has more than eight years of experience advising resident and non-resident entities in general tax law and anti-money laundering and terrorist financing matters. He has also expertise in tax planning for high net worth individuals, in tax litigation and in local taxes. In addition, he has broad experience in tax regularisations.

URÍA MENÉNDEZ

Calle del Príncipe de Vergara, 187

Plaza de Rodrigo Uría

28002 Madrid

Spain

Tel: +34 915 860 400

pilar.lluesma@uria.com

alberto.gil@uria.com

www.uria.com

an LBR business

ISBN 978-1-83862-513-9