
CHAMBERS GLOBAL PRACTICE GUIDES

Fintech 2023

Definitive global law guides offering
comparative analysis from top-ranked lawyers

Japan: Law & Practice

Ken Kawai, Kei Sasaki, Shunsuke Aoki and Takeshi Nagase
Anderson Mori & Tomotsune

Law and Practice

Contributed by:

Ken Kawai, Kei Sasaki, Shunsuke Aoki and Takeshi Nagase
Anderson Mori & Tomotsune see p.22



Contents

1. Fintech Market	p.4	4. Online Lenders	p.9
1.1 Evolution of the Fintech Market	p.4	4.1 Differences in the Business or Regulation of Loans Provided to Different Entities	p.9
2. Fintech Business Models and Regulation in General	p.5	4.2 Underwriting Processes	p.9
2.1 Predominant Business Models	p.5	4.3 Sources of Funds for Loans	p.9
2.2 Regulatory Regime	p.5	4.4 Syndication of Loans	p.9
2.3 Compensation Models	p.6	5. Payment Processors	p.9
2.4 Variations Between the Regulation of Fintech and Legacy Players	p.6	5.1 Payment Processors' Use of Payment Rails	p.9
2.5 Regulatory Sandbox	p.6	5.2 Regulation of Cross-Border Payments and Remittances	p.10
2.6 Jurisdiction of Regulators	p.7	6. Fund Administrators	p.10
2.7 Outsourcing of Regulated Functions	p.7	6.1 Regulation of Fund Administrators	p.10
2.8 Gatekeeper Liability	p.7	6.2 Contractual Terms	p.10
2.9 Significant Enforcement Actions	p.7	7. Marketplaces, Exchanges and Trading Platforms	p.10
2.10 Implications of Additional, Non-financial Services Regulations	p.8	7.1 Permissible Trading Platforms	p.10
2.11 Review of Industry Participants by Parties Other than Regulators	p.8	7.2 Regulation of Different Asset Classes	p.11
2.12 Conjunction of Unregulated and Regulated Products and Services	p.8	7.3 Impact of the Emergence of Cryptocurrency Exchanges	p.11
2.13 Impact of AML Rules	p.8	7.4 Listing Standards	p.12
3. Robo-advisers	p.8	7.5 Order-Handling Rules	p.12
3.1 Requirement for Different Business Models	p.8	7.6 Rise of Peer-to-Peer Trading Platforms	p.13
3.2 Legacy Players' Implementation of Solutions Introduced by Robo-advisers	p.8	7.7 Issues Relating to Best Execution of Customer Trades	p.13
3.3 Issues Relating to Best Execution of Customer Trades	p.9	7.8 Rules of Payment for Order Flow	p.13
		7.9 Market Integrity Principles	p.13

8. High-Frequency and Algorithmic Trading	p.13	12. Blockchain	p.16
8.1 Creation and Usage Regulations	p.13	12.1 Use of Blockchain in the Financial Services Industry	p.16
8.2 Requirement to Register as Market Makers When Functioning in a Principal Capacity	p.14	12.2 Local Regulators' Approach to Blockchain	p.16
8.3 Regulatory Distinction Between Funds and Dealers	p.14	12.3 Classification of Blockchain Assets	p.17
8.4 Regulation of Programmers and Programming	p.14	12.4 Regulation of "Issuers" of Blockchain Assets	p.17
9. Financial Research Platforms	p.14	12.5 Regulation of Blockchain Asset Trading Platforms	p.19
9.1 Registration	p.14	12.6 Regulation of Funds	p.19
9.2 Regulation of Unverified Information	p.14	12.7 Virtual Currencies	p.20
9.3 Conversation Curation	p.15	12.8 Impact of Regulation on "DeFi" Platforms	p.20
10. Insurtech	p.15	12.9 Non-fungible Tokens (NFTs)	p.21
10.1 Underwriting Processes	p.15	13. Open Banking	p.21
10.2 Treatment of Different Types of Insurance	p.16	13.1 Regulation of Open Banking	p.21
11. Regtech	p.16	13.2 Concerns Raised by Open Banking	p.21
11.1 Regulation of Regtech Providers	p.16		
11.2 Contractual Terms to Assure Performance and Accuracy	p.16		

Contributed by: Ken Kawai, Kei Sasaki, Shunsuke Aoki and Takeshi Nagase,
Anderson Mori & Tomotsune

1. Fintech Market

1.1 Evolution of the Fintech Market

Evolution of the Japanese Fintech Market

During the past few years, there have been notable developments in the non-fungible token (NFT) sector and the digital securities' sector – as well as in respect of “buy now pay later” (BNPL) services.

NFT-related businesses have been popular since late 2020, especially in the online gaming sector. In addition, content holders, digital artists and advertising agencies have rushed to these new markets.

Digital security businesses have gained traction in 2021. Their main focus is on digital corporate notes and the tokenised equity interests of real estate funds – for instance, on 19 April 2021, SBI Securities Co Ltd made its first offering of digital corporate bonds in Japan. Another example is the first public offering in Japan of asset-backed security tokens by a subsidiary of Kenedix, one of the leading real estate companies in Japan. The asset-backed security tokens are based on a beneficiary certificate issuance trust scheme that uses a blockchain platform. The platform in the offering was provided by Mitsubishi UFJ Trust and Banking Corporation and the offering was underwritten by Nomura Securities Co Ltd and SBI Securities Co Ltd.

Among mobile payment services, BNPL services have been growing rapidly in tandem with the development of this business abroad. It is notable that PayPal acquired one of the largest BNPL services providers in Japan, Paidy Inc, in autumn 2021 so as to expand its BNPL services to Japan.

Trends for 2023

On 4 March 2022, the Bill for Partial Amendment to the Act on Payment Services Act, etc. for the Purpose of Establishing a Stable and Efficient Funds Settlement System (the “Amendment Act”) was submitted to the Diet. It was subsequently approved on 3 June 2022. The Amendment Act aims to establish a stable and efficient funds settlement system that is responsive to the digitalisation of finance and other fields against a backdrop of:

- the rise in issuance and circulation of stablecoins overseas;
- the growing need for improvement in transaction monitoring by banks, etc; and
- the increasing prevalence of prepayment instruments that enable payment by electronic means.

In connection with the rise in issuance and circulation of stablecoins overseas, the Amendment Act also introduces the concept of “electronic payment instruments” (EPIs), which corresponds to the concept of stablecoins (Article 2, paragraph 5 of the Amended Payment Services Act (PSA)).

The Amendment Act will come into effect within a year of the date of its promulgation. Under the Amended Act:

- stablecoins that are redeemable for fiat currencies (fiat-backed stablecoins) will be regulated as EPIs, while non-fiat-backed stablecoins such as DAI will continue to be regarded as crypto-assets;
- only banks, fund transfer services providers, trust banks and trust companies that are licensed or registered in Japan may issue EPIs directly to residents of Japan;

Contributed by: Ken Kawai, Kei Sasaki, Shunsuke Aoki and Takeshi Nagase,
Anderson Mori & Tomotsune

- an entity is required to obtain a licence as an electronic payment instruments transaction service provider (EPI-TSP) if, as a business, it:
 - (a) sells or buys EPIs;
 - (b) acts as an intermediary, a broker or an agency of sales and purchases of EPIs; or
 - (c) provides custody services of EPIs, as a business;
- an EPI-TSP is subject to AML/CFT regulations, including the travel rule;
- an EPI-TSP that continuously sends or receive EPIs to or from overseas virtual asset service providers (VASPs) must check whether such VASPs are conducting appropriate due diligence of users for AML/CFT purposes; and
- an EPI-TSP must segregate users' EPIs from its proprietary assets.

2. Fintech Business Models and Regulation in General

2.1 Predominant Business Models

In Japan, almost every area of finance has been benefiting from robust fintech innovation. Online or mobile payment services, cryptocurrency-based businesses and other blockchain-based tokens, robo-advisers and financial account aggregation services that utilise OpenAPI (Application Programming Interface) are among the predominant sectors.

One indication that the fintech business is maturing is the shift in major players from fintech start-ups to well-established companies (such as traditional major financial institutions and telecommunications companies).

2.2 Regulatory Regime

Apart from the regulations applicable to crypto-asset exchange services (CAES) and EPI ser-

vices, there is no specific regulatory framework for fintech businesses. If the services provided by the fintech companies are subject to existing financial regulations, such as obtaining applicable authorisation (licences or registrations), then they are required to comply with them. What follows is a high-level outline of the regulations that apply to popular fintech services.

Online/Mobile Payment

Although there are many payment methods and instruments in Japan, there is no comprehensive payment law.

A prepaid payment instrument (PPI) is an instrument that records a certain value charged in advance of its use and is then debited as payment of consideration for goods and/or services. PPIs are regulated under the PSA.

Instalment payments made in consideration for goods or services that are divided over two months or more are regulated under the Instalment Sales Act. The Act substantially covers all credit card payments and BNPL services.

Remittance or money transfer is regulated pursuant to the Banking Act and the PSA. The PSA classifies fund transfer services (FTS) into the following three categories:

- (a) FTS involving remittances exceeding JPY1 million per transaction;
- (b) FTS that correspond to the current classification of FTS in the PSA; and
- (c) FTS involving remittances of small amounts (ie, several tens of thousands of yen).

Services Related to Crypto-Assets

CAES providers (CAESPs) are regulated under the PSA. Most of the so-called payment tokens

Contributed by: Ken Kawai, Kei Sasaki, Shunsuke Aoki and Takeshi Nagase,
Anderson Mori & Tomotsune

and utility tokens would fall within the definition of a crypto-asset. Those who provide CAES (or custody services thereof) must register with the Financial Services Authority (FSA).

Crypto-asset derivatives are regulated as a financial derivative under the Financial Instruments and Exchange Act (FIEA). A company engaging in providing crypto-asset derivatives has to register as a Type 1 Financial Instruments Business Operator (Type 1 FIBO).

Digital Securities

In May 2020, amendments to the FIEA came into effect, including a new regulatory framework for transferring securities by using electronic data processing systems. An issuer of tokenised securities is, unless exempt, required to file a securities registration statement and issue a prospectus upon making a public offering or secondary distribution. Any person who engages in the sale, purchase or handling of the public offering of tokenised securities must be registered as a Type 1 FIBO.

Robo-advisers

Under the FIEA, a robo-adviser providing users with automated access to investment products must be registered as:

- an investment manager (if providing discretionary investment management services); or
- an investment adviser (if providing non-discretionary investment advisory services).

Open Banking/Electronic Payment Intermediate Service Providers

Entities that act as intermediaries between banks and customers – for example, by using IT to communicate payment instructions to banks based on entrustment from customers or by using IT to provide customers with information

regarding their financial accounts deposited in banks – are categorised as EPI service providers under the Banking Act and are required to register with the FSA.

Financial Services Intermediary Businesses

In June 2020, the Act on Sales, etc. of Financial Instruments (ASFI) was amended to enable the establishment of financial services intermediary businesses that are capable of intermediating the cross-sectoral banking, securities and insurance financial services under a single licence. The ASFI was renamed the Act on Provision of Financial Services and came into effect on 1 November 2021.

2.3 Compensation Models

There are no regulations specifically targeting fintech companies in connection with compensation models. The compensation restrictions under traditional finance regulations are applicable to fintech services as well.

2.4 Variations Between the Regulation of Fintech and Legacy Players

There are no specific regulatory incentives applicable to fintech companies. Fintech companies are on equal footing with legacy players.

2.5 Regulatory Sandbox

The Japanese regulatory sandbox was introduced in June 2018. The regulatory sandbox can be used by both the Japanese people and overseas companies. It enables companies to apply and receive approval for innovative and new projects not yet covered by current regulations without having to amend such existing regulations. Approved projects may not be carried out as a business but rather as a proof of concept or demonstration under certain conditions, including limitations on the number of participants and length of operations. There are no restrictions

Contributed by: Ken Kawai, Kei Sasaki, Shunsuke Aoki and Takeshi Nagase,
Anderson Mori & Tomotsune

with regard to which business sectors can benefit from the sandbox.

2.6 Jurisdiction of Regulators

The main regulatory body for fintech businesses is the FSA, including the local finance bureaus to which it has delegated certain aspects of its authority. The Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (METI) has jurisdiction over credit cards and instalment payments. The Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism has jurisdiction over some types of real estate fund businesses. The National Police Agency, the FSA and the Ministry of Finance have co-jurisdiction over AML/CFT. The Personal Information Protection Committee is the prime regulator of personal information; however, the FSA shares regulatory power over the protection of personal information in the financial sector.

2.7 Outsourcing of Regulated Functions

Under Japanese law, when a business operator engaging in a regulated business outsources part of its business, it is obliged to properly supervise the outsourcee in accordance with the applicable laws and regulations. By way of an example, when outsourcing part of its CAES to a third party (including outsourcing in two or more stages), a CAESP regulated under the PSA is required to supervise such third party and take other such necessary measures to ensure the proper and reliable execution of the outsourced functions.

2.8 Gatekeeper Liability

Under Japanese law, providers of fintech-related services are responsible as gatekeepers within the scope of the applicable regulations – for example, as a gatekeeper providing a platform for the exchange of fiat currency and crypto-assets, CAESPs are subject to various obligations concerning user protection and AML/CFT.

Specifically, from the viewpoint of user protection, CAES providers are obligated to provide certain information to users.

In addition, from an AML/CFT perspective, CAESPs are required – as specified business operators under the Act on Prevention of Transfer of Criminal Proceeds (APTCP) – to take steps to ascertain certain information when commencing transactions with users.

2.9 Significant Enforcement Actions

The upsurge of the Japanese crypto-asset market was stalled in January 2018 when one of the largest CAES providers in Japan announced losses of approximately USD530 million due to a cyber-attack on its network. This hacking incident prompted inspections of CAESPs by the FSA, which found internal weaknesses in most of the inspected entities – particularly in the areas of AML/CFT and cybersecurity. As a result, business improvement orders or business suspension orders were issued to these entities.

In addition, it was reported in November 2022 that FTX Trading Limited (FTX Trading) – the parent company of FTX Japan KK, which is a CAESP and a Type 1 FIBO – has been experiencing financial problems. In light of the capital and business relationship between FTX Trading and FTX Japan KK, the FSA issued a business suspension order and a business improvement order to FTX Japan KK, citing the need to:

- immediately halt new transactions by users; and
- take all possible measures in order to prevent the flow of FTX Japan KK's assets to affiliated companies outside Japan and subsequent harm to users' interests.

Contributed by: Ken Kawai, Kei Sasaki, Shunsuke Aoki and Takeshi Nagase,
Anderson Mori & Tomotsune

2.10 Implications of Additional, Non-financial Services Regulations

The Act on the Protection of Personal Information (the APPI) is a principle-based regime for the processing and protection of personal data in Japan. The APPI generally follows the eight basic principles of the OECD Guidelines on the Protection of Privacy and Transborder Flow of Personal Data. The Act is applicable to all private businesses, including fintech business operators. Based on the requirements of the APPI, every governmental ministry in Japan issued administrative guidelines applicable to the specific industry sectors under its supervision. Fintech businesses are required to comply with the “Guidelines on Personal Information Protection” that concern the financial services industry.

2.11 Review of Industry Participants by Parties Other than Regulators

In Japan, accounting/audit firms are the only entities that review the activities of industry participants. For some industries, however, self-regulatory organisations also conduct reviews separately from regulators or accounting/audit firms under the applicable laws or regulations. By way of an example, the Japan Virtual and Crypto-assets Exchange Association (the JVCEA) is a self-regulatory organisation authorised under the PSA to review its CAESP members.

2.12 Conjunction of Unregulated and Regulated Products and Services

An NFT is not defined under Japanese regulation; however, it is generally understood to refer to an irreplaceable token minted on a blockchain. Since NFTs are digital items minted on a blockchain, the question is whether NFTs also constitute crypto-assets under the PSA.

NFTs are increasingly being used in various fields because, although they are digital data

generated on a blockchain, they are characterised as irreplaceable owing to the unique values assigned to them.

NFTs are unlikely to constitute crypto-assets if:

- the specifications or functions of NFTs are limited in the same manner as trading cards and in-game items; and
- NFTs do not serve economic functions (such as being a means of payment) in the way that crypto-assets do.

2.13 Impact of AML Rules

In Japan, AML rules are regulated by the APTCP. The APTCP requires “specified business operators” to conduct KYC and the like. The term “specified business operators” refers to business operators like fintech companies (among others) that are subject to financial regulations.

The APTCP is not directly applicable to unregulated fintech companies that do not fall within the definition of “specified business operators”. Accordingly, the AML policies (if any) of such unregulated fintech companies would only be those they have established on their own initiative.

3. Robo-advisers

3.1 Requirement for Different Business Models

Japanese financial laws do not require different business models for different asset classes, per se.

3.2 Legacy Players’ Implementation of Solutions Introduced by Robo-advisers

Legacy players are proactively utilising robo-advisers. Having said that, unlike in the USA,

Contributed by: Ken Kawai, Kei Sasaki, Shunsuke Aoki and Takeshi Nagase,
Anderson Mori & Tomotsune

the Japanese robo-adviser market is relatively small and a couple of independent robo-advisory companies are deemed market leaders.

3.3 Issues Relating to Best Execution of Customer Trades

Currently, there are no specific rules and no guidance applicable to robo-advisers in connection with best execution of customer trades.

4. Online Lenders

4.1 Differences in the Business or Regulation of Loans Provided to Different Entities

There is no significant business or regulatory difference in online lending based on whether the borrower is an individual or a corporation.

With the exception of commercial banks and certain banks incorporated for specific purposes, engaging in the loan business requires registration under the Money Lending Business Act (the “MLB Act”) and is subject to the MLB Act regulations. Under the MLB Act, a loan provider must prepare a written contract and certain explanatory documents and receipts. Further, the interest rate of a loan is subject to:

- the Interest Rate Restriction Act; and
- the Act Regulating the Receipt of Contributions, the Receipt of Deposits, and Interest Rates.

Loan interest rate per annum must not exceed 20% for loans with a principal amount of less than JPY100,000, 18% for loans with principal amount of between JPY100,000 and JPY999,999, or 15% for loans with a principal amount of JPY1 million or more. These regula-

tions apply to loans to corporate borrowers as well as individual borrowers.

4.2 Underwriting Processes

In Japan, loan providers do not engage in underwriting for non-professional investors. If a non-bank loan provider sells its loan receivables, its assignee would also be subject to the MLB Act regulations. This regulatory restriction makes it difficult to implement the underwriting of loan receivables for non-professional investors.

Selling loan receivables to professional, institutional investors who can comply with the MLB Act may be a practical option. However, underwriting transactions – ie, the transfer of loan receivables immediately after a loan transaction – are not usually entered into. Instead, a loan provider is more likely to sell the loan receivables for financial purposes after it has had sufficient time to observe performance of the loan receivables.

4.3 Sources of Funds for Loans

Most of the funds raised for loans are lender-raised capital. Securitisation of online lending receivables has not been typical and it is also uncommon to raise funds for specific lending transactions from general investors.

4.4 Syndication of Loans

Online lending services in the form of syndicated loans are not available in Japan.

5. Payment Processors

5.1 Payment Processors’ Use of Payment Rails

There is no legal requirement stating that payment processors must use existing payment rails. With that said, most payment processors

Contributed by: Ken Kawai, Kei Sasaki, Shunsuke Aoki and Takeshi Nagase,
Anderson Mori & Tomotsune

in Japan use bank or credit card networks to provide payment processing services – except for transactions between accounts opened with the same payment processor.

5.2 Regulation of Cross-Border Payments and Remittances

Foreign remittances are subject to the APTCP. Financial institutions and certain other payment providers that receive requests for foreign remittances are required to verify the remitter's identity and confirm the purpose of the remittance in accordance with the APTCP.

The Foreign Exchange and Foreign Trade Act (Act No 228 of 1949) (the "Foreign Exchange Act") applies to remittances to and from abroad. Specifically, a payer who remits JPY30 million or more to a payee overseas – or a payee that receives such amount from overseas – is required to submit a transaction report under the Foreign Exchange Act. Further, payments for capital transactions and certain other transactions (mainly related to those for financial control of corporations domiciled in Japan) are subject to separate regulations under the Foreign Exchange Act.

6. Fund Administrators

6.1 Regulation of Fund Administrators

Fund administrators (that is, those who do not have custody of assets) are not generally regulated or subject to qualification requirements. However, certain laws specifically require a fund to engage a fund administrator and/or regulate fund administrators. A fund that is incorporated as an investment corporation is, for example, required to hire a fund administrator and such fund administrator would owe the duties of loyalty and of a prudent manager's due care under

the Act on Investment Trusts and Investment Corporations. Furthermore, a fund custodian is legally and contractually obligated to segregate the fund's assets from its proprietary assets or the assets of other funds.

On a related note, in Japan, crypto-asset funds are substantially prohibited and only funds in the form of certain partnership structures are permitted to invest in crypto-assets.

6.2 Contractual Terms

In general, administrative contracts are not regulated. However, as funds and fund operators are subject to certain regulations regarding their operations, fund administrators are generally required under contracts with funds or fund investors to comply with the relevant laws and regulations. The obligations of fund administrators typically include periodic reporting, the reporting of incidents, and an acceptance of inspections.

As regards custody duties, see **6.1 Regulation of Fund Administrators**.

7. Marketplaces, Exchanges and Trading Platforms

7.1 Permissible Trading Platforms

In Japan, marketplaces are governed by laws and regulations, depending on the type of financial instrument in question – for example, securities such as stocks are regulated by financial instruments exchanges under the FIEA. Commodities such as gold or crude oil, on the other hand, are regulated by commodity exchanges under the Commodity Futures Act. Crypto-assets are regulated by CAESPs as marketplaces under the rules of the PSA. See **7.2 Regulation of Different Asset Classes**.

Contributed by: Ken Kawai, Kei Sasaki, Shunsuke Aoki and Takeshi Nagase,
Anderson Mori & Tomotsune

7.2 Regulation of Different Asset Classes

As mentioned in 7.1 **Permissible Trading Platforms**, financial instruments are regulated under different laws and regulations, depending on their type. Securities such as stocks are regulated by the FIEA and are classified as Paragraph I Securities (defined in 12.4 **Regulation of “Issuers” of Blockchain Assets**) or Paragraph II Securities (also defined in this section) based on their degree of tradability, and are subject to strict registration requirements, disclosure regulations, and conduct rules.

Commodities such as gold or crude oil are regulated under the Commodity Futures Act and are subject to regulations similar to those for securities under the FIEA. However, the competent authority in respect of commodities is not the FSA but the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries or the METI. The disclosure requirements applicable to commodities are not as strict as those applicable to securities.

Crypto-assets are regulated under the PSA and CAESPs that provide a venue for the trading of crypto-assets are subject to regulation. As is the case with securities under the FIEA, CAESPs are subject to strict registration requirements and conduct rules. The PSA does not impose strict disclosure regulations (as it does on securities) because the purpose of the PSA is limited to ensuring fairness of settlement instruments.

7.3 Impact of the Emergence of Cryptocurrency Exchanges

Japan has emerged as one of the largest global crypto-asset markets and was the first country to establish a regulatory framework for crypto-assets. Besides enabling the registration of CAESPs wishing to provide CAES to residents in Japan, such framework seeks to protect cus-

tomers of CAESPs and prevent crypto-related money laundering and terrorism financing.

Under the PSA, CAESPs are required to:

- take such measures necessary to ensure the safe management of information available to them;
- provide sufficient information to customers;
- take such measures necessary for the protection of customers and for the proper provision of services;
- segregate the property of customers from their own property and subject such segregation to regular audits by a certified public accountant or audit firm; and
- establish internal management systems to enable the provision of fair and appropriate responses to customer complaints, as well as implement measures for the resolution of disputes through financial ADR proceedings.

It should be noted that a CAESP is required under the PSA to both manage the money of users separately from its own money and to entrust users' money to a trust company or any other similar entity in accordance with the provisions of the relevant Cabinet Office Ordinance. In other words, a CAESP is required to not only manage the money of users in bank accounts separately from its own, but also to entrust such money to a trust company or trust bank acting as trustee.

In addition, the FIEA prohibits, with penalties, unfair acts in crypto-asset trading (without limitation as to the victims of such acts) for purposes of protecting users and preventing unjust gains. However, insider trading regulations have not been included within the scope of the FIEA because of the difficulties in identifying issuers

Contributed by: Ken Kawai, Kei Sasaki, Shunsuke Aoki and Takeshi Nagase,
Anderson Mori & Tomotsune

and undisclosed material facts pertaining to crypto-assets.

7.4 Listing Standards

The criteria for the listing of crypto-assets by CAESPs is set out not in the PSA, but in the “Rules on Handling of New Crypto-Assets” formulated by the JVCEA.

Specifically, CAESPs must carefully determine whether it is appropriate for them to handle crypto-assets if the relevant crypto-assets have any of the following characteristics (per the JVCEA Pre-Assessment):

- the crypto-asset is being used or will likely be used in a way that violates laws, regulations, or principles of public order and morals;
- the crypto-asset is used or will likely be used for criminal purposes;
- the crypto-asset is used or will likely be used for money laundering or terrorist financing;
- the crypto-asset presents significant impediments or concerns to the updating or maintenance of transfer or retention records;
- the crypto-asset issuer is unable or unwilling to be properly audited by a chartered accountant or an audit firm; or
- the crypto-asset cannot be managed or disbursed in a systematic or otherwise secure manner (or it will be difficult to do so).

In addition, as of 26 December 2022, the JVCEA self-regulatory rules were amended to introduce a system to relax the handling of new crypto-assets by member CAESPs. Specifically, two systems were introduced:

- a “Green List System” to exempt certain member CAESPs (Green List Eligible Members) from the JVCEA Pre-Assessment for certain prescribed crypto-assets; and

- a Crypto-Asset Self-Check System to exempt certain member CAESPs from the JVCEA Pre-Assessment except in specific cases.

Under the Green List System, crypto-assets are designated by the JVCEA on the home page of its website as “crypto-assets widely handled in Japan” and crypto-assets for which JVCEA Pre-Assessment is not required when handled by a Green List Eligible Member if they meet all of the following four criteria:

- crypto-assets that have been handled by three or more member CAESPs;
- crypto-assets that have been handled by one member CAESP for at least six months;
- crypto-assets for which the JVCEA has not set any ancillary conditions for handling; and
- crypto-assets that are not deemed inappropriate by the JVCEA under the Green List System for any other reason.

7.5 Order-Handling Rules

Regarding transactions of crypto-assets, the JVCEA’s self-regulatory “Rules Concerning Development of Order Management Systems for Crypto-Asset Exchange Services” regulates the system for order management in CAESPs by stipulating the processes necessary to carry out proper business operations regarding acceptance of orders and processing of contracts from users when CAESPs carry out transactions related to the exchange of crypto-assets with users. Specifically, CAESPs are required to formulate internal rules for the development of order management systems in order to control unfair transactions and to execute transactions on the best terms.

Contributed by: Ken Kawai, Kei Sasaki, Shunsuke Aoki and Takeshi Nagase,
Anderson Mori & Tomotsune

7.6 Rise of Peer-to-Peer Trading Platforms

Recently, decentralised exchanges (DEXs) – ie, exchanges of crypto-assets accessible to the general public – have emerged as a form of decentralised finance. Their trading volume has rapidly increased in the past few years.

Under Japanese law, there are no specific regulations for DEX. However, if the services provided by DEXs fall within regulated activities under the existing law, such DEXs may be subject to the relevant regulations. More specifically, DEXs may be subject to the regulations on CAES as an intermediary for the sale or exchange of crypto-assets under the PSA.

However, DEXs are characterised as decentralised exchanges with no specific centralised administrator. Therefore, if DEXs are so decentralised that no specific operator is conceivable and the person required to register as a CAESP is not conceivable, it would be difficult to apply the PSA to such an operator in a practical manner.

7.7 Issues Relating to Best Execution of Customer Trades

When offering multiple transaction methods to users, the Cabinet Office Ordinance on Crypto-Asset Exchange Service Providers and the JVCEA's self-regulatory "Rules Concerning Development of Order Management Systems for Crypto-Asset Exchange Services" require CAESPs to specify and publish those methods, the best conditions under which the methods should be used, and the reasons for why any method should be selected for each type of crypto-assets handled by the CAESP.

7.8 Rules of Payment for Order Flow

There are no specific regulations on payment for order flow in Japan.

7.9 Market Integrity Principles

The purpose of the FIEA is to ensure fairness in the issuance of securities and in transactions of financial instruments, etc, in order to facilitate the circulation of securities, ensure fair price formation of financial instruments and – via full operation of the functions of capital markets – contribute to the sound development of the national economy and the protection of investors. Accordingly, the FIEA prohibits any person from engaging in unfair transactions in respect of the purchase and sale of securities, other transactions, or derivative transactions.

As regards crypto-assets, there have been cases in which undisclosed information (ie, the commencement of handling of a new crypto-asset) was leaked outside a CAESP and those who obtained such information allegedly profited from it. The FIEA also prohibits any person from engaging in unfair trading in the spot trading of crypto-assets or crypto-related derivative transactions.

8. High-Frequency and Algorithmic Trading

8.1 Creation and Usage Regulations

Given the increased volume of high-frequency trading (HFT) and its influence on the market, Japan implemented regulations relating to this type of trading in 2018. Although commonly referred to in English as HFT, this type of trading is known in Japan as "high-speed trading (HST)" (*kousoku torihiki*) pursuant to the FIEA. In line with this terminology, the frequency of trading is not a requirement for HST pursuant to the FIEA.

Contributed by: Ken Kawai, Kei Sasaki, Shunsuke Aoki and Takeshi Nagase,
Anderson Mori & Tomotsune

The FIEA specifies certain categories of trading as HST, including:

- the sale or purchase (or entrustment thereof) of securities or market transactions of derivatives;
- the management of funds or other assets constituting the sale or purchase; and
- the execution of over-the-counter derivative transactions that cause a counterparty to conduct the sale or purchase.

These categories constitute HST when the trading decision is made automatically through an electronic information processing system and the information necessary for the trade based on that decision is communicated through IT to the financial instruments exchange or proprietary trading system (PTS) via a method used to shorten the time typically required for that communication.

A trader engaging in HST is required to register as a high-speed trader and establish an operational control system, manage risks, and provide certain information relating to that trading to the FSA. However, simply developing or creating trading algorithms or other electronic trading tools is not regulated under the FIEA.

8.2 Requirement to Register as Market Makers When Functioning in a Principal Capacity

There is no such requirement under the FIEA.

8.3 Regulatory Distinction Between Funds and Dealers

HST regulations under the FIEA are principally applicable to traders (including funds) – although certain reporting requirements are also applicable to dealers (ie, financial instruments business operators registered under the FIEA) when the

dealers are engaging in proprietary trading. A financial instruments business operator may not accept HST orders from:

- a trader who is not registered pursuant to the FIEA; or
- a registered trader for which the financial instruments business operator is unable to confirm the appropriate trading system management has been implemented.

8.4 Regulation of Programmers and Programming

There is no such regulation under the FIEA (see 8.1 Creation and Usage Regulations).

9. Financial Research Platforms

9.1 Registration

In Japan, there are no specific laws or regulations applicable to the provision of financial research platforms. However, the operation of investment management businesses and investment advisory businesses are regulated under the FIEA (as described in 9.3 Conversation Curation). In addition, if a financial research platform has any function that helps to match users' transactions of any financial instruments, the platform operator may be required to register as a financial instruments business operator under the FIEA.

9.2 Regulation of Unverified Information

The FIEA prohibits the spreading of rumours or other information relating to securities or derivative transactions without verification that the statement has a reasonable basis. More specifically, the FIEA prohibits dissemination of rumours for purposes of:

- selling or purchasing, engaging in any transaction in respect of securities or crypto-

Contributed by: Ken Kawai, Kei Sasaki, Shunsuke Aoki and Takeshi Nagase,
Anderson Mori & Tomotsune

- assets, or engaging in any derivative transactions relating to financial instruments or indexes (including crypto-asset derivative transactions); or
- causing any fluctuation in the quotations of any securities or financial instruments or indexes of derivative transactions (including crypto-asset derivative transaction).

For purposes of the FIEA, rumours are interpreted by the disseminator as information lacking a reasonable basis. Therefore, rumours include more than simple statements of false information.

Additionally, certain market manipulations using representations that are intended to induce transactions of securities and derivatives are generally prohibited under the FIEA.

9.3 Conversation Curation

Responsibility as Platform Operator

If the operation of a financial research platform constitutes an investment advisory business under the FIEA, the operator is subject to a registration requirement. A registered operator would generally be instructed by the FSA to prevent the spread or exchange on the platform of statements made with the intent of market manipulation or the provision of inside information. Although no general rules or guidelines are provided with regard to prevention measures, the definition of market manipulation activities under the FIEA includes:

- engaging in fake sales and purchases;
- collusive sales and purchases;
- actual sales and purchases; or
- false representation for purposes of misleading other persons into believing that the sale and purchase of securities, crypto-assets or derivative transactions are thriving – or

otherwise misleading other persons about the state of those transactions.

Definition of Investment Advisory Business

An entity constitutes an investment advisory business under the FIEA if:

- the business operator promises to provide the customer with advice on either the value of securities or an investment decision based on an analysis of the value of financial instruments and, as part of the Investment Advisory Agreement, the customer agrees to pay a fee as compensation for that advice; and
- the business operator provides advice pursuant to the Investment Advisory Agreement.

Advice as to the value of securities is generally understood to mean an express or implicit presentation of expected future profits (eg, capital gains and income gains) that would accrue from investment in securities. By way of an example, if a financial research platform provided a recommendation for an investment in certain securities – including portfolio information relating to certain prominent investors – to customers for a fee, that platform may constitute an investment advisory business and its operator may be required to register pursuant to the FIEA.

10. Insurtech

10.1 Underwriting Processes

In Japan, when a company (including fintech companies) engages in insurance solicitation (ie, acts as an agent or intermediary for the conclusion of insurance contracts), it must be registered as an insurance agent or insurance broker under the Insurance Business Act.

Contributed by: Ken Kawai, Kei Sasaki, Shunsuke Aoki and Takeshi Nagase,
Anderson Mori & Tomotsune

10.2 Treatment of Different Types of Insurance

In Japan, no distinction is made between different types of insurance in terms of their treatment by the regulators.

11. Regtech

11.1 Regulation of Regtech Providers

There is no regulation in Japan that relates specifically to providers of regtech. Accordingly, such providers are regulated under the existing legal framework, depending on their activities.

Regtech is not yet prevalent in Japan; however, the FSA officially announced in its Assessments and Strategic Priorities for 2018 that it would enhance regtech and suptech (supervisory technology) in Japan. One legislative change in this area was the 2018 amendment of the subordinate regulations of the APTCP in order to provide for various methods by which e-KYCs may be conducted in Japan.

11.2 Contractual Terms to Assure Performance and Accuracy

There have not been many cases in which financial institutions have used regtech services.

In addition, there are no laws and regulations or industry practices that require financial institutions to stipulate a clause in their contracts with service providers that assures the accuracy of services provided when using a regtech service.

12. Blockchain

12.1 Use of Blockchain in the Financial Services Industry

In connection with the use of blockchain technology, the most significant developments in the traditional financial service industry have been those relating to digital securities, NFTs and stablecoins.

The new regulatory framework has clarified the manner of application of regulations on digital securities (as described in **12.4 Regulation of “Issuers” of Blockchain Assets**). As a result, a considerable number of financial institutions have entered into this new market. For more details recent developments in this area, see **1.1 Evolution of the Fintech Market**.

Regulatory discussions and developments on NFTs and NFT platforms in Japan have accelerated in tandem with global trends in the field of NFTs. For the legal implications of such developments in Japan, see **2.12 Conjunction of Unregulated and Regulated Products and Services** and **12.9 Non-fungible Tokens (NFTs)**.

In addition, the FSA has introduced new regulations on stablecoins ahead of regulators in other jurisdictions (as described in **1.1 Evolution of the Fintech Market**), thereby clarifying the rules applicable to issuers and intermediaries. Stablecoins to be issued in compliance with the new regulations are expected to be used for settlement transactions in respect of digital securities or other types of assets (including NFTs) on blockchain.

12.2 Local Regulators’ Approach to Blockchain

Generally speaking, financial regulators in Japan are receptive to fintech innovation — including

Contributed by: Ken Kawai, Kei Sasaki, Shunsuke Aoki and Takeshi Nagase,
Anderson Mori & Tomotsune

those using blockchain and technology-driven new entrants in the regulated financial services markets — and are actively participating in discussions taking place in this industry.

However, various consumer protection issues have arisen in connection with the Japanese fintech industry. These have resulted in a decision made by regulators to strengthen the regulations governing emerging fintech businesses in order to address new risks to consumers arising from the new services. Notably, the regulatory framework for crypto-assets was amended to enhance customer protection by introducing stricter regulations. This was in response to a major incident in January 2018 in which one of the largest crypto-asset exchanges in Japan announced it had lost approximately USD530 million worth of crypto-assets after a hacking attack on its network. The new regulatory framework entered into force on 1 May 2020.

12.3 Classification of Blockchain Assets

In Japan, regulations applicable to certain blockchain assets (ie, tokens issued on blockchain) may vary, depending on the nature of those assets (as per the following classifications).

Crypto-Assets

The authors believe that a large proportion of tokens issued on blockchain constitute crypto-assets as defined in the PSA. See **12.7 Virtual Currencies** for regulations applicable to issuers of crypto-assets.

Prepaid Payment Instruments

Tokens issued on blockchain that are similar to prepaid cards, in that the tokens may be used as consideration for goods or services provided by token issuers, may be regarded as PPIs as defined under the PSA. See **12.4 Regulation of**

“Issuers” of Blockchain Assets for regulations applicable to issuers of PPIs.

Non-fungible Tokens

NFTs are irreplaceable tokens minted on a blockchain. The applicability of the PSA to an NFT depends on whether such NFT constitutes a crypto-asset. However, NFT platforms that enable the conduct of NFT-related transactions are not subject to financial regulation. See **2.12 Conjunction of Unregulated and Regulated Products and Services** and **12.9 Non-fungible Tokens (NFTs)**.

Digital Securities

Tokens issued on blockchain that represent any securities as defined in the FIEA would be regulated under FIEA as described in **12.1 Use of Blockchain in the Financial Services Industry** and **12.4 Regulation of “Issuers” of Blockchain Assets**.

Stablecoins

Stablecoins that are redeemable for fiat currencies (fiat-backed stablecoins) will be regulated as EPIs, as noted in **1.1 Evolution of the Fintech Market**.

12.4 Regulation of “Issuers” of Blockchain Assets

Regulation on Issuers of Crypto-Assets

See **12.7 Virtual Currencies**.

Regulation on Issuers of Prepaid Payment Instruments

An issuer of PPIs is required to comply with applicable rules under the PSA. If a PPI may only be used for payments to the issuer for its goods or services, that issuer will not be required to register under the PSA; however, it must still comply with certain notice requirements. By contrast, an issuer of PPIs that may be used not

Contributed by: Ken Kawai, Kei Sasaki, Shunsuke Aoki and Takeshi Nagase,
Anderson Mori & Tomotsune

only for payments to the issuer for its goods or services, but also for payments to other parties designated by the issuer, will be required to register as an “issuer of PPIs” under the PSA.

Regulation on Issuers of NFTs

See **12.9 Non-fungible Tokens (NFTs)**.

Regulation on Issuers of Digital Securities

As mentioned in **7.2 Regulation of Different Asset Classes**, the FIEA has conventionally classified securities into:

- traditional securities such as shares and bonds (Paragraph 1 Securities); and
- contractual rights such as trust beneficiary interests and collective investment scheme interests (Paragraph 2 Securities).

Whereas Paragraph 1 Securities are subject to relatively stricter requirements in terms of disclosures and licensing/registration because they are highly liquid, Paragraph 2 Securities are subject to relatively looser requirements because they are less liquid. However, if securities are issued using an electronic data processing system such as blockchain, it is expected that such securities may have higher liquidity than securities issued using conventional methods – regardless of whether they are Paragraph 1 or Paragraph 2 Securities. For this reason, the FIEA introduced a new regulatory framework for securities that are transferable through electronic data processing systems. Under the FIEA, such securities are classified into the following three categories:

- Paragraph 1 Securities such as shares and bonds, which are transferable by using electronic data processing systems (Tokenised Paragraph 1 Securities);
- contractual rights such as trust beneficiary interests and collective investment scheme

interests, which are conventionally categorised as Paragraph 2 Securities and are transferable by using electronic data processing systems (electronically recorded transferable rights (ERTRs)); and

- contractual rights such as trust beneficiary interests and interests in collective investment schemes, which are conventionally categorised as Paragraph 2 Securities and are transferable by using electronic data processing systems but have their negotiability restricted to a certain extent (Non-ERTR Tokenised Paragraph 2 Securities).

An issuer of Tokenised Paragraph 1 Securities or ERTRs is, in principle, required to file a securities registration statement (as is the case for traditional Paragraph 1 Securities) before making a public offering or secondary distribution, unless the offering or distribution falls under any category of private placements. Any person who engages in the business of the sale, purchase or handling of the offering of Tokenised Paragraph 1 Securities or ERTRs is required to undergo registration as a Type 1 FIBO. In light of the higher degree of freedom in designing Tokenised Paragraph 1 Securities or ERTRs and the higher liquidity of these securities, a Type 1 FIBO that handles these digital securities will be required to control risks associated with digital networks such as blockchain used for digital securities.

Regulation on Issuers of Stablecoins

Under the amended PSA, only banks, fund transfer services providers, trust banks and trust companies that are licensed or registered in Japan may issue EPIs directly to Japan residents. See **1.1 Evolution of the Fintech Market** for more details on the regulations applicable to intermediaries of EPIs.

Contributed by: Ken Kawai, Kei Sasaki, Shunsuke Aoki and Takeshi Nagase,
Anderson Mori & Tomotsune

12.5 Regulation of Blockchain Asset Trading Platforms

Trading Platforms for Crypto-Assets

An operator of a trading platform for purchases, sales or exchanges of crypto-assets is regulated under the PSA. More specifically, a person who engages in intermediary, brokerage or agency activities for the trading or exchange of crypto-assets as a business is regarded as a CAESP and is required to register under the PSA. A typical example of a CAESP is a regulated crypto-asset exchange, such as bitFlyer or Coincheck. See 12.8 Impact of Regulation on “DeFi” Platforms regarding peer-to-peer trading platforms for crypto-assets.

Trading Platforms for NFTs

See 12.9 Non-fungible Tokens (NFTs).

Trading Platforms for Digital Securities

Currently, there is no secondary trading market using an electronic matching system for digital securities in Japan. Accordingly, establishment of a PTS (ie, an equivalent of an alternative trading system in the USA) for digital securities is highly anticipated. In this connection, it is expected that the requirements and procedures tailored for digital securities in order for a Type 1 FIBO to obtain authorisation required to operate a PTS will be clarified in the first half of 2023.

Also, the regulator’s attitude towards the secondary market for digital securities is stringent, so the introduction of a pure peer-to-peer trading platform for digital securities in Japan will require careful analysis as to its legality – as well as significant discussion with the FSA, particularly from the consumer protection viewpoint.

12.6 Regulation of Funds Crypto-Asset Investment Funds

Funds that invest in crypto-assets are subject to the same rules and regulations as other investment funds that take the form of a partnership. Therefore, in order to solicit investments, the operator of the fund must register as Type 2 FIBO unless:

- there are no more than 49 non-professional investors with one or more professional investors and notification in connection therewith has been made to the FSA; or
- the fund delegates its solicitation and marketing activities to a registered Type 2 FIBO.

The operator of a fund that mainly invests in crypto-assets is not required to register as an investment management business operator because that registration obligation is only triggered when an operator mainly invests in securities and derivatives.

In addition, investment in crypto-assets by the operator of a fund is not likely to trigger the requirement to register as a CAESP under the PSA because the trading of crypto-assets for the fund’s own investment purposes is not considered to be the trading of crypto-assets “as a business”, which is one of the requirements for the registration obligation.

In Japan, the practical forms for the vehicle for crypto-assets investment funds would be:

- a Tokumei Kumiai, a partnership formed pursuant to the Commercial Code; or
- an offshore fund, including a Cayman limited partnership, because of its flexibility in structuring the scheme while mitigating any regulatory risks.

Contributed by: Ken Kawai, Kei Sasaki, Shunsuke Aoki and Takeshi Nagase,
Anderson Mori & Tomotsune

An investment trust fund under the Investment Trust and Investment Corporation Act may not be used as a vehicle for the purpose of investment in crypto-assets because, currently, crypto-assets are excluded from the specified asset classes in which an investment trust fund is allowed to invest under the Act.

Funds Investing in Digital Securities

In general, the operator of an investment fund that mainly invests in securities and derivatives must register as an investment management business operator. Digital securities constitute securities under the FIEA, so investing in digital securities may trigger the registration obligation as described earlier.

Also, if a fund expects to invest mainly in securities (including digital securities) and if the number of investors acquiring fund interests is expected to be 500 or more, a disclosure obligation will be triggered under the FIEA when raising capital.

The registration obligation with respect to self-solicitation as described previously will also be applicable to a fund investing in digital securities.

12.7 Virtual Currencies

The PSA defines “crypto-asset” and requires a person who provides CAES to be registered with the FSA. The term “crypto-asset” is defined in the PSA as:

- proprietary value that may be used to pay an unspecified person the price of any goods purchased or borrowed or any services provided and may be sold to or purchased from an unspecified person – limited to that recorded on electronic devices or other objects by electronic means and excluding Japanese and other foreign currencies

and currency denominated assets (the same applies in the following item) – and that may be transferred using an electronic data processing system; or

- proprietary value that may be exchanged reciprocally for proprietary value specified in the preceding item with an unspecified person and that may be transferred using an electronic data processing system.

“Currency denominated assets” means any assets that are denominated in Japanese or other foreign currency. Such assets do not fall within the definition of crypto-assets – for example, prepaid e-money cards are usually considered currency denominated assets. If a coin issued by a bank is guaranteed to have a certain value vis-à-vis fiat currency, such a coin is unlikely to be deemed a crypto-asset but would instead be considered a currency denominated asset.

12.8 Impact of Regulation on “DeFi” Platforms

“DeFi” is an abbreviation of decentralised finance. DeFi refers to a decentralised financial system consisting of blockchain applications (generally referred to as decentralised applications, or “Dapps”). It is a general term for financial systems and projects that are accessible and transparent to the general public. The terms and degree of decentralisation would vary from project to project.

There are no regulations relating specifically to DeFi in Japan. However, where DeFi activities fall within regulated activities under any existing law, such activities may be subject to the relevant regulations. By way of an example, within the scope of DeFi, DEXs may be subject to regulations relating to CAES as an intermediary for the sale or exchange of crypto-assets under the

Contributed by: Ken Kawai, Kei Sasaki, Shunsuke Aoki and Takeshi Nagase,
Anderson Mori & Tomotsune

PSA. See 7.6 Rise of Peer-to-Peer Trading Platforms for further details.

12.9 Non-fungible Tokens (NFTs)

NFTs that do not serve economic functions, such as being a means of payment, are unlikely to constitute crypto-assets. Accordingly, the issuance and sale of NFTs – and the operation of NFT platforms that enable the conduct of NFT-related transactions – are in effect not subject to financial regulation. However, depending on the business model involved – for example, where crypto-assets are deposited for purposes of the operation of an NFT platform – NFT platforms and NFT-related transactions may be subject to certain financial regulations, such as those relating to CAES.

13. Open Banking

13.1 Regulation of Open Banking

The Japanese government is trying to accelerate the shift to open banking. Specifically, banks were legally obligated to make efforts to complete the development of an OpenAPI system by 31 May 2018. However, banks are not legally obligated to release APIs, and fees and other terms must be agreed upon separately between a fintech company and a bank.

13.2 Concerns Raised by Open Banking

In many cases, banks impose security requirements on the users of OpenAPI, and conduct pre-screening and regular monitoring on such users. Banks also carry out security audits through third parties when necessary.

Contributed by: Ken Kawai, Kei Sasaki, Shunsuke Aoki and Takeshi Nagase,
Anderson Mori & Tomotsune

Anderson Mori & Tomotsune is one of the largest and most international Japanese law firms. The firm is best known for its long history of advising overseas companies doing business in Japan and in cross-border transactions. The main office in Tokyo is supported by two additional offices in Japan and seven offices overseas. The firm has one of the leading fintech practices in Japan. With extensive experience across all areas of fintech, Anderson Mori & Tomotsune's skilled lawyers provide innovative, up-to-date legal advice to clients in this fast-

growing and cutting-edge industry. Thanks to the firm's long history of success and proven understanding of new technology, its advice is regularly sought in fintech-related matters such as applications for licences and regulatory approvals for business start-ups, analysis of financial regulatory issues, consultations and negotiations with official regulatory authorities and self-regulatory organisations, and the development and marketing of innovative financial instruments, products and transactions.

Authors



Ken Kawai is a partner at Anderson Mori & Tomotsune and has extensive experience of advising financial institutions, fintech start-ups, investors and corporate clients on complex

finance and financial regulatory matters. Ken focuses primarily on the fintech industry and regularly advises fintech companies, financial institutions, governmental organisations and industry organisations on legal issues surrounding fintech.



Kei Sasaki is a partner at Anderson Mori & Tomotsune who provides comprehensive advice in a wide range of areas, focusing on financial transactions, financial

regulations, and taxation. He has particular expertise in structured finance (real estate and other asset finance), project finance (including private finance initiative and energy projects), syndicated loan transactions and international fund transactions. Kei also has extensive experience with fintech projects – especially in the payment area (prepaid payment instrument and remittance) – and acts as a tax specialist for financial transactions.

JAPAN LAW AND PRACTICE

Contributed by: Ken Kawai, Kei Sasaki, Shunsuke Aoki and Takeshi Nagase,
Anderson Mori & Tomotsune



Shunsuke Aoki is a partner at Anderson Mori & Tomotsune, where he advises primarily on financial regulatory matters – albeit with a particular focus on fintech regulations and

corporate finance transactions, including equity and debt offerings in both domestic and international capital markets. He also regularly assists overseas clients in the cryptocurrency and crypto-derivatives industries on their entry into or exit from the Japanese market.

Capitalising on his two-year stint with one of Japan’s leading securities houses, Shunsuke also acts for domestic financial institutions in their structuring of various financial instruments using innovative technologies such as blockchain. He has considerable additional experience in matters relating to security tokens.



Takeshi Nagase is a partner at Anderson Mori & Tomotsune.

Between 2013 and 2014,

Takeshi served on secondment in the disclosure department at the Financial Services Agency of

Japan. Additionally, he handled a broad range of finance and corporate transactions on a secondment stint with the legal department of a major Japanese securities firm from 2015–17. As a result of the unique perspective he has gained from these professional experiences, Takeshi has extended his focus to crypto-asset laws, including regulatory requirements applicable to the registration of crypto-asset exchange service providers, initial coin offerings, and NFT businesses.

Anderson Mori & Tomotsune

Otemachi Park Building
1-1-1 Otemachi
Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo 100-8136
Japan

Tel: +81 3 6775 1000
Web: www.amt-law.com

**ANDERSON
MŌRI &
TOMOTSUNE**

CHAMBERS GLOBAL PRACTICE GUIDES

Chambers Global Practice Guides bring you up-to-date, expert legal commentary on the main practice areas from around the globe. Focusing on the practical legal issues affecting businesses, the guides enable readers to compare legislation and procedure and read trend forecasts from legal experts from across key jurisdictions.

To find out more information about how we select contributors, email Katie.Burrington@chambers.com