

# HARMONIZING VIRTUAL CURRENCY USE IN THE EU: THE EVOLUTION AND IMPACT OF MiCA REGULATION

**Teodor FRUNZETI**

*“Carol I” National Defence University, Bucharest, Romania*  
tfunzeti@gmail.com

**Alexandru-Cosmin DUMITRU**

*“Carol I” National Defence University, Bucharest, Romania*  
a.co.dumitru@gmail.com

## ABSTRACT

*This article analyses the regulatory framework for virtual currencies in the European Union, tracing the development from several national laws to the comprehensive Markets in Crypto-assets (MiCA) regulation. At first, EU member states had different methods for regulating virtual currencies, creating a fragmented regulatory landscape that posed difficulties for market integrity, consumer protection, and cross-border transactions. This article covers the many regulatory responses before MiCA, explores the reasons for regulatory harmonization, and delves into the legislative process that resulted in the creation and proposal of MiCA. We examine how MiCA tackles the deficiencies of past regulations and its impact on standardizing virtual currency processes throughout the EU. MiCA's importance rests in its ability to provide a cohesive legal structure that harmonizes innovation with the requirements of financial stability and consumer safeguarding. This article explores how MiCA will influence member states' laws and the virtual currency market, providing insight into the future of EU financial regulation in the digital era.*

**KEYWORDS:** financial security, financial innovation, regulatory harmonization, virtual currencies

## 1. Introduction

This paper aims to assess the evolution of virtual currency legislation in the European Union, leading up to the elaboration of the Markets in Cryptoassets (MiCA) law. The aim is to analyse how MiCA influences the harmonization of regulatory frameworks among EU member states, tackles the issues of a previously disjointed system, and establishes a model for next legislative endeavours in the digital financial sector.

How has the regulatory approach to virtual currencies changed in EU member

states, and how does the MiCA regulation intend to unify these different national frameworks to create a cohesive, secure, and innovative digital financial sector in the EU?

The emergence of virtual currencies has initiated a worldwide discussion about the necessity of regulatory supervision in a financial environment that is becoming more digital and decentralized. In the European Union, regulating virtual currencies has become a crucial issue due to their disruptive impact on traditional financial systems and the significant legal,

economic, and security issues they pose. Establishing a clear legal framework for virtual currencies in the EU is essential to safeguard consumers, prevent financial crimes, and promote a stable and dynamic digital market.

Before the enactment of the Markets in Crypto-assets (MiCA) law, EU member states had varied legal approaches towards virtual currencies. Some governments promptly introduced specialized legislation, while others chose a more careful strategy by utilizing current financial regulations or providing non-binding recommendations. The variation represented the early stage of the technology and the different levels of integration and influence virtual currencies had throughout the EU. The outcome was a fragmented regulatory landscape where identical virtual currency operations could have been handled differently based on jurisdiction, resulting in regulatory arbitrage and uncertainty for both businesses and consumers.

This article aims to examine the development of virtual currency regulations in EU member states and the significant impact of MiCA on influencing the future of digital finance in the bloc. We aim to analyse the evolution of EU regulations from initial stages to the comprehensive MiCA framework, in order to understand how the EU is working towards establishing a unified and progressive regulatory environment that tackles the distinct challenges and opportunities posed by virtual currencies.

## **2. Literature Review**

Academic research and policy evaluations on virtual money show that various EU member states approached the topic cautiously and with a spirit of exploration. Researchers have recorded a phase of observation and analysis as countries dealt with the consequences of cryptocurrencies on national financial systems (European Central Bank, 2012). Early academic articles frequently examined

the legal categorization of virtual currencies, discussing whether they should be considered as cash, commodities, or a distinct asset category (Böhme, Christin, Edelman & Moore, 2015).

Recent policy analyses often discuss the difficulty member states encountered when trying to enforce current financial legislation on virtual currency. Some governments tried to include virtual currencies in anti-money laundering (AML) laws, while others concentrated on consumer protection frameworks (FATF, 2014). The European Central Bank's previous reports on virtual currencies warned about their use and potential impact on financial stability but did not offer clear regulatory guidelines (European Central Bank, 2015). Regulators had complex problems at the initial stages. Financial regulatory agencies in EU member states have highlighted the challenge of developing regulations that can match the rapid speed of technology advancements in the virtual currency sector (ESMA, 2016). Reports consistently emphasized the absence of consumer protection measures, pointing out the risks of fraud, hacking, and the lack of options for consumers in cases of theft or loss (EBA, 2014).

An important issue identified in policy evaluations was the lack of a cohesive strategy throughout the EU. As a result, regulatory arbitrage occurred, allowing businesses to select the most advantageous legal jurisdictions, which could weaken regulatory standards (Zohar, 2015). The European Banking Authority (EBA) and other regulatory authorities urged a unified approach towards virtual currencies to maintain fair competition and safeguard the financial market's integrity throughout the EU (European Parliament, 2016).

The research suggests that the initial reactions of EU member states paved the way for the realization that a unified approach, like the one later seen in MiCA, was essential for dealing with the intricacies of regulating virtual currencies efficiently.

Scholarly articles and white papers have constantly emphasized the necessity of a unified regulatory approach to virtual currencies in the European Union to standardize practices and reduce legal ambiguity for stakeholders.

The main reason for harmonization is the borderless characteristic of virtual currencies, which reduces the effectiveness of national regulations and poses issues for cross-border enforcement and oversight. Scholars contend that the absence of EU-wide regulation may lead to varying consumer and investor protection standards, thus eroding trust in the financial system and hindering innovation (European Parliament, 2018).

White papers from business groups and think tanks have pointed out the risk of regulatory arbitrage in the crypto industry, where businesses may opt to operate in jurisdictions with less strict regulations, thereby causing a decline in regulatory standards. This may lead to heightened money laundering and financial crime threats, as well as unfair competition between EU member states (Demertzis & Wolff, 2018).

Scholarly papers have highlighted the market fragmentation caused by different national legislation. This fragmentation may impede the establishment of a unified market for digital services, a primary goal of the EU's overarching digital economy plan. It is crucial to have a unified method to encourage innovation, provide legal clarity, and ensure fair competition for all involved in the market (Zohar, 2015).

Harmonization is necessary to combine the promotion of technical innovation with the preservation of the financial system. White papers propose that a cohesive regulatory framework could support the ethical advancement of blockchain and crypto-assets technology, while simultaneously managing systemic risks and maintaining financial stability (Houben & Snyers, 2018).

Overall, the literature emphasizes the need for a comprehensive EU-wide strategy

to regulate the fast-changing digital asset market and create a secure, competitive, and innovative environment for virtual currencies.

### **3. Key Drivers for Regulatory Harmonization**

One of the main reasons for the call for a unified strategy for regulating virtual currencies in the EU is the division of the market. Each member state initially created its own set of regulations, resulting in a fragmented regulatory environment. The fragmentation hindered virtual currency enterprises from operating internationally and impeded the development of a cohesive digital single market, a primary objective of the EU (European Commission, 2017).

Varying levels of protection for consumers and investors existed due to the inconsistent regulatory environment across the EU. The discrepancy presented hazards such as fraud, market manipulation, and financial loss resulting from insufficient security measures. It was acknowledged that a unified method was needed to set EU-wide consumer protection regulations, guaranteeing equal safety and options for all individuals in the virtual currency sector (EBA, 2014).

The presence of differing national legislation led to legal ambiguity, creating an uncertain scenario for both businesses and consumers. Companies encountered challenges in adhering to regulations and legal procedures, hindering innovation and investment. Establishing a unified regulatory framework was viewed as a way to offer the necessary legal certainty for the business to prosper, attract investments, and become part of the larger financial system (ESMA, 2019).

Notable cyber-attacks and fraudulent schemes have underscored the weaknesses in the virtual currency market and the necessity for thorough regulation. The Mt. Gox exchange hack and ICO-related frauds highlighted the risks of virtual currencies

and emphasized the need for a comprehensive EU-wide regulatory framework to safeguard the market's integrity and its participants (Tapscott & Tapscott, 2016).

All these combined, underscored the necessity for a comprehensive EU-wide law to handle the issues of virtual currencies, and resulted in the creation of the Markets in Cryptoassets (MiCA) regulation.

#### **4. The Path towards MiCA**

The EU institutions took a series of actions to address the issues and prospects of virtual currencies, leading to the development of the Markets in Cryptoassets (MiCA) law.

At first, EU institutions conducted preliminary research to comprehend the consequences of virtual currencies. For instance, the European Commission initiated multiple consultations to collect feedback from stakeholders regarding the advantages and drawbacks of virtual currencies and the blockchain technology that supports them (European Commission, 2018). These consultations were crucial in influencing the Commission's strategy regarding digital finance.

The Fourth Anti-Money Laundering Directive (AMLD4) was amended to encompass virtual currency exchanges and wallet providers, obligating them to do client due diligence and report suspicious activities (European Parliament and the Council of the European Union, 2015). This was a crucial development in subjecting virtual currency operations to EU financial oversight.

The European Court of Justice (ECJ) influenced the regulatory framework. The ECJ's verdict on the Hedqvist case ruled that transactions exchanging virtual currency for traditional money are VAT-exempt. This decision considers virtual currencies as a form of payment and establishes a legal precedent for their adoption in the EU (European Court of Justice, 2015).

The European Banking Authority (EBA) provided crucial recommendations and

opinions that impacted the regulatory process. The EBA's 2014 judgment highlighted over 70 hazards linked to virtual currency usage, including issues like money laundering and consumer protection. It recommended the establishment of an EU-wide regulatory framework to tackle these concerns. The EBA's assessments emphasized the necessity of a thorough regulatory structure and helped drive progress towards MiCA.

Responding to these changes, the European Commission introduced the Digital Finance Package, which included a legislative proposal for MiCA. This concept aimed to establish a unified regulatory framework for crypto-assets not included in current EU financial services laws, to encourage innovation while mitigating risks (European Commission, 2020a). MiCA was created to regulate different categories of crypto-assets, such as utility tokens, asset-backed tokens, and e-money tokens. It focuses on aspects like licensing criteria, operational guidelines for service providers, and safeguards for consumers.

The actions of EU institutions, decisions of the ECJ, and opinions of the EBA together established the foundation for MiCA. They established the essential legal and regulatory foundation, identified deficiencies in current frameworks, and emphasized the need for a unified strategy to promote a secure and dynamic market for virtual currencies in the EU.

#### **5. MiCA's Legislative Journey, Provisions and Their Implications for Member States**

The legislative process for the Markets in Cryptoassets (MiCA) legislation was a complex effort that included consultation, proposal, and consideration by the European Union's institutions.

The process commenced with thorough stakeholder consultations, which are a standard part of the EU's legislative processes. The consultations were conducted to collect perspectives from a diverse variety of

participants, such as industry professionals, consumer groups, financial institutions, and legal scholars. The purpose was to identify the demands and concerns of the market, the potential risks and benefits of crypto-assets, and the perspectives on how they should be regulated (European Commission, 2020c).

The European Commission created a proposal for MiCA as part of its larger Digital Finance Package after consulting with stakeholders. The idea aimed to provide a legal framework to promote innovation, ensure fair competition, protect consumers, and uphold financial stability. The legislation covered the approval and monitoring of crypto-asset service providers, the functioning of digital asset trading platforms, and obligations for consumer disclosure (European Commission, 2020b).

Subsequently, the idea was sent to the European Parliament for additional examination. The Parliament's committees overseeing economic and monetary matters thoroughly analysed the idea, assessing its impact on the financial system and the digital economy. Members of the European Parliament (MEPs) addressed the proposal, suggesting changes and expressing concerns about some parts of the regulation (European Parliament, 2021).

Simultaneously, the Council of the European Union, which represents the governments of the member states, also examined the MiCA draft. The Council had the authority to propose modifications and had to reach an agreement with Parliament on the final version of the legislation.

Key concerns sparked significant arguments during the legislative process. The discussion focused on defining several kinds of crypto-assets and determining which assets should be regulated under MiCA. MEPs debated consumer protection measures, such as transparency standards and safeguards against market misuse. However, the responsibilities and jurisdiction of the supervisory authority, and whether it

should be a national or EU-wide entity, were a source of disagreement. Finding a balance between promoting innovation and maintaining stringent regulatory standards was a crucial focus of the discussions. Additionally, due to the possible major impact of stablecoins on the financial system, there were extensive talks on how to regulate them to avoid dangers to financial stability.

The plan underwent refinement and amendments during the legislative process in response to arguments and feedback from stakeholders. The result was a detailed legislative framework designed to tackle the intricacies of the crypto-asset market, encourage innovation, and safeguard EU residents.

### ***5.1. MiCA's Core Provisions***

MiCA's regulatory framework includes various provisions aimed at standardizing the treatment of crypto-assets throughout the European Union. Key components consist of:

- **Licensing and Authorization:** MiCA mandates that crypto-asset service providers must acquire a license to function within the EU. This aligns the authorization procedure and guarantees that all suppliers adhere to uniform operational and governance criteria.

- **Consumer Protection:** the rule establishes stringent transparency and disclosure measures to guarantee that consumers are well-informed about the hazards linked to crypto-assets. This involves transparent communication regarding pricing, fees, and the dangers associated with investing in crypto-assets.

- **Market Abuse Rules:** MiCA establishes rules to deter market manipulation and insider trading in the crypto-asset markets, mirroring those in place for conventional financial markets.

- **Stablecoin Regulation:** MiCA imposes a stricter regulatory framework for asset-referenced tokens and e-money tokens due to their potential to influence financial

stability. This includes regulations regarding capital, investor rights, and supervision.

- Supervisory structure: the law defines supervisory obligations for national agencies and sets up a framework for collaboration among member states and with the European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA).

### ***5.2. Implications for Member States***

MiCA intends to address regulatory inconsistencies across EU member states by establishing a standardized set of standards for the entire EU. This harmonization is anticipated to have various consequences for national laws.

Firstly, member states must harmonize their national legislation with the regulations outlined in MiCA. This may require repealing or amendment of current regulations that do not align with the new EU-wide requirements. Secondly, MiCA decreases legal ambiguity for crypto-asset service providers and fosters a more foreseeable regulatory framework by setting explicit regulations at the EU level. Also, a uniform licensing procedure will allow service providers approved in one EU member state to conduct operations throughout the EU, easing cross-border commerce and investment. The focus on consumer protection is anticipated to boost confidence in crypto-assets as a valid and secure investment choice in the EU. Finally, member states will go through a transition procedure to integrate MiCA into their national legislative systems. This could require establishing new regulatory bodies or broadening the authority of current ones to supervise the crypto-asset market.

MiCA is a key advancement towards creating a more connected and efficient European Union financial market for crypto-assets. The regulations aim to tackle the issues arising from the fast-changing digital banking sector, while also maintaining the EU's competitiveness and leadership in technical advancements (European Parliament, 2021).

### ***5.3. The Future of Virtual Currency Regulation in the EU Post-MiCA***

The Markets in Cryptoassets (MiCA) regulation is set to significantly impact the virtual currency market in the European Union in the long term. By implementing a unified legal framework, MiCA aims to decrease market fragmentation and foster an appropriate environment for innovation among both startups and established businesses in the EU. The EU might attract blockchain and crypto-related enterprises by implementing clear regulations, which could result in higher investment and job opportunities in the area.

Implementing a standardized method for consumer protection and market integrity may increase consumer trust in virtual currencies, potentially resulting in greater acceptance and incorporation into the mainstream financial system. The law could promote the creation of new cryptocurrency goods and services that adhere to EU norms, enhancing the integration of virtual currencies with conventional financial services.

As the virtual currency industry progresses, MiCA may require further refining and expansion in certain areas. The EU may need to adjust MiCA or establish new legislation to address emerging technologies like decentralized finance (DeFi) platforms and non-fungible tokens (NFTs) in the crypto area.

The EU may want to influence worldwide regulatory norms for virtual currencies to maintain uniformity and prevent regulatory arbitrage. This may entail collaborating with international organizations such as the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) and other prominent economies to create coordinated strategies. Due to increasing worries about the ecological consequences of specific blockchain technologies, especially those that need substantial energy usage for mining, upcoming legislation might prioritize sustainability within the cryptocurrency sector.

Moreover, the increasing market capitalization of virtual currencies raises concerns about their possible influence on financial stability. The EU might explore methods to oversee and reduce systemic risks linked to the cryptocurrency industry. Ongoing initiatives to educate consumers about the risks and benefits of virtual currencies are essential for consumer education and awareness. Upcoming legislative endeavours may involve promoting digital literacy and responsible investment practices.

MiCA is a crucial achievement in advancing a secure, creative, and harmonized virtual currency market in the EU. Continuous assessment and legislative agility are crucial for maintaining an efficient regulatory framework that supports the expansion of the digital economy as the industry changes.

## 6. Conclusion

The journey of achieving regulatory harmonization for virtual currencies in the European Union has been complicated and beneficial, demonstrating the EU's dedication to promoting a safe and cutting-edge financial environment. The journey towards harmonization of virtual currencies has been influenced by the combined efforts of member states, EU institutions, industry players, and consumers, starting with varied national responses to the need for a uniform strategy.

The enactment of the Markets in Cryptoassets (MiCA) law is a significant

milestone, creating a thorough and unified regulatory framework that applies across the entire EU. MiCA's provisions tackle market fragmentation, consumer protection, and financial stability issues, while also laying the foundation for a thriving digital economy. By establishing precise regulations and criteria, MiCA improves the credibility of the virtual currency market and positions Europe to excel as a prominent figure in the digital financial industry.

Looking ahead, the importance of ongoing coordination among EU member states is crucial. Implementing and developing MiCA effectively will necessitate continuous communication, mutual learning, and collaborative efforts. Member states need to collaborate to adjust their national legislation, supervise the crypto-asset service providers operating within their borders, and maintain the competitiveness, security, and regulatory integrity of the EU's financial sector.

Regulating virtual currencies in the EU is a continuously evolving process. As the industry changes and new challenges and opportunities emerge, MiCA will need to be refined. The groundwork has been established for a regulatory strategy that harmonizes the potential for innovation with the necessity for protection, guaranteeing that virtual currencies can achieve their maximum capabilities in a way that advantages all European Union citizens.

## REFERENCES

- Böhme, R., Christin, N., Edelman, B., & Moore, T. (2015). Bitcoin: Economics, Technology, and Governance. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 29, Issue 2, 213-38.
- Demertzis, M., & Wolff, G.B. (2018). The Economic Potential and Risks of Crypto Assets: Is a Regulatory Framework Needed? *Bruegel Policy Contribution*, Issue 14.
- European Banking Authority (EBA). (2014). *Opinion on 'Virtual Currencies'*.
- European Central Bank. (2012). *Virtual Currency Schemes*.
- European Central Bank. (2015). *Virtual Currency Schemes – A Further Analysis*.

- European Commission. (2017). *FinTech Action Plan: For a More Competitive and Innovative European Financial Sector*.
- European Commission. (2018). *Public Consultation on FinTech: A More Competitive and Innovative European Financial Sector*.
- European Commission. (2020a). *Digital Finance Package*.
- European Commission. (2020b). *Proposal for a Regulation on Markets in Crypto-Assets, and amending Directive (EU) 2019/1937*.
- European Commission. (2020c). *Public Consultation on an EU Framework for Markets in Crypto-Assets*.
- European Court of Justice. (2015). *Case C-264/14, Skatteverket v. David Hedqvist*.
- European Parliament. (2016). *Virtual Currencies and Central Banks Monetary Policy: Challenges Ahead*.
- European Parliament. (2018). *Virtual Currencies: Challenges Following Their Introduction*.
- European Parliament and the Council of the European Union. (2015). *Directive (EU) 2015/849*.
- European Parliament. (2021). *Legislative Train Schedule: Markets in Crypto-assets Regulation (MiCA)*.
- European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA). (2016). *Advice to the European Commission on Initial Coin Offerings and Crypto-Assets*.
- European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA). (2019). *Advice on Initial Coin Offerings and Crypto-Assets*.
- Financial Action Task Force (FATF). (2014). *Virtual Currencies Key Definitions and Potential AML/CFT Risks*.
- Houben, R., & Snyers, A. (2018). Crypto-Assets: Key Developments, Regulatory Concerns, and Responses. *European Parliament's Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs (ECON)*.
- Tapscott, A., & Tapscott, D. (2016). *Blockchain Revolution: How the Technology Behind Bitcoin is Changing Money, Business, and the World*. Portfolio Penguin.
- Zohar, A. (2015). Bitcoin: Under the Hood. The myths, the hype, and the true worth of bitcoins. *Communications of the ACM*.