[2025] 15(1) *Ars æqui* · 36-45 DOI: https://doi.org/10.61801/Arsaequi.2025.282

Where Soft Law is the Only Law: Digital Goods in Comparative Perspective

Emanuel Sebastian CĂLIN*

Received: 15 December 2025 • Accepted: 23 December 2025 • Published: 29 December 2025

Abstract: In the rapidly evolving digital economy, the legal qualification and regulation of digital goods remain ambiguous and fragmented. Despite their growing economic and societal relevance, digital goods are often governed not by binding legal norms (hard law), but by non-binding guidelines, private contracts, and platform-specific terms of service – the so-called soft law. This article explores the legal vacuum surrounding digital goods, analysing the challenges posed by the absence of uniform definitions, the reliance on private ordering, and the inconsistent application of existing legal categories across jurisdictions. Through a comparative and interdisciplinary lens, the study examines how current legal systems struggle to keep pace with technological innovation, resulting in legal uncertainty regarding ownership rights, consumer protection, taxation, and the cross-border transfer of digital goods. The paper argues for the development of a coherent national and European Union regulatory framework that transcends soft law approaches and provides clear, enforceable, and future-proof norms for the classification, use, and transfer of digital goods in a globalised environment.

Keywords: digital goods; digital assets; soft law; regulatory framework; European Union law.

1. Introduction

In the rapidly evolving global digital economy, the distinction between physical and intangible goods has become increasingly blurred. The emergence of digital goods, such as downloadable content, software, tokens (including NFTs) and virtual items has fundamentally reshaped the ways in which value is created, exchanged, and owned. However, while the economic and societal significance of digital goods continues to grow, their legal status remains ambiguous and fragmented. Existing legal systems, including the Romanian legal system, often fail to provide coherent frameworks for their classification, transfer, and protection.

* Faculty of Law and Administrative Sciences, Ovidius University of Constanța, Romania.
E-mail: calin.emanuel@365.univ-ovidius.ro
An earlier draft of this paper was presented at the 5th International Student Conference on Law and Administrative Sciences, held on 9 May 2025 at the Ovidius University of Constanța.

The current regulatory landscape is characterised by a predominance of soft law mechanisms: industry guidelines, platform-specific terms of service, private contracts, and non-binding policy instruments, such as the proposed *Global Code of Digital Enforcement*[1] or the *UNIDROIT Principles on Digital Assets and Private Law*[2]. These tools have stepped in where binding legal norms (or hard law) are either outdated, insufficient, or entirely absent. While soft law offers flexibility and adaptability, it also generates legal uncertainty, particularly in areas such as ownership rights, consumer protection, cross-border enforcement, and taxation.

This article addresses the resulting legal vacuum by analysing the lack of uniform definitions, the reliance on private ordering, and the inconsistent application of legal categories across jurisdictions. Through a comparative and interdisciplinary approach, the study examines how legal systems struggle to keep pace with technological innovation and identifies the normative gaps that remain unaddressed.

The subsequent sections are organised as follows: First, the paper introduces key concepts related to digital goods and law to establish the analytical framework (§2). Second, it critically reviews soft law and hard law approaches, assessing their strengths and limitations in regulating digital assets (§3). Third, it examines the need for a unified and enforceable regulatory framework that transcends the limitations of soft law (§4). Finally, it concludes by summarizing the findings and offering recommendations for future legislative development (§5).

2. Defining the Digital Realm: Key Concepts

A legal framework may be defined as a set of beliefs, ideas, principles and rules enforced by public authorities in order to regulate behaviour, thus ensuring social order and the protection of fundamental rights. The strength of a country's legal framework is thus closely linked to socio-political stability and directly impacts citizens' quality of life.

In economic theory, some authors differentiate between *goods* and *assets*. Assets represent items of long-term, relatively high economic value (i.e., real estate, exotic cars, works of art), whereas goods are defined as objects, tangible or intangible, of economic importance. However, for the purposes of this analysis, such a distinction will not be maintained. Given the semantic inconsistencies in the analysed literature and legal norms and the volatile nature of some digital goods (e.g., NFTs, cryptocurrencies), the terms goods and assets will be used interchangeably.

UNIDROIT briefly defines the concept of a *digital asset* as "an electronic record which is capable of being subject to control"[3]. Matthias Lehmann adopts an illustrative approach, stating that

> "the notion of 'digital assets' ... primarily covers crypto-assets ... Yet it also encompasses other assets recorded electronically, such as items in computer games ... which may be of significant economic value"[4].

[1] UIHJ, *Global Code of Digital Enforcement* (Brussels: Bruylant 2021).

[2] UNIDROIT, *UNIDROIT Principles on Digital Assets and Private Law* (UNIDROIT 2023).

[3] Ibid., 11.

[4] M Lehmann, 'Digital Assets in the Conflict of Laws' (2024) *Singapore Journal of Legal Studies* 198.

The European Law Institute (ELI) offers a more comprehensive definition, describing *digital assets* as

> "any record or representation of value that … is exclusively stored, displayed and administered electronically, … capable of being subject to a right of control, enjoyment or use, regardless of whether such rights are legally characterised as being of a proprietary, obligational or other nature; and … capable of being transferred from one party to another, including by way of voluntary disposition"[5].

Among the various categories of digital goods, *crypto-assets* (also known as *cryptocurrencies*) are among the most heavily regulated categories of digital assets, due to their prominent role in the decentralisation of financial services. This decentralised nature has made them highly relevant in both legitimate innovation and illicit activity, as the lack of governmental oversight can facilitate transactions associated with criminal conduct. In response to these challenges, the European Union adopted *Regulation (EU) 2023/1114 on Markets in Crypto-Assets* (MiCA), establishing a comprehensive legal framework aimed at enhancing transparency, consumer protection, and market integrity in the crypto-asset sector. In the preamble, MiCA defines *crypto-assets* as "digital representations of value or of rights that have the potential to bring significant benefits to market participants"[6], the value of the crypto-assets being *subjective and based only on the interest of the purchaser of the crypto-asset*[7]. MiCA also presents the importance of proper regulation of crypto-assets, stating that

> [the absence of a framework in this regard] "can lead to a lack of user confidence in those assets, which could significantly hinder the development of a market in those assets and lead to missed opportunities …, alternative payment instruments or new funding sources for Union companies"[8].

The term *token* has multiple meanings depending on the context. In general, a token represents a unit of value or utility on a particular blockchain network. However, the *Global Code of Digital Enforcement* defines a *token* as a "hardware or software device required for a user to access an application or network system more secure"[9].

Crypto-assets operate on *distributed ledger technology*, a "digital system for recording the transaction of assets in which the transactions and their details are recorded in multiple places at the same time"[10]. Most commonly, this is accomplished through *blockchain*, a "technology for storing and transmitting information without a control organ, in the form of a distributed database whose information sent by users (…) are verified and grouped at regular time intervals

5 ELI, *ELI Principles on the Use of Digital Assets as Security* (European Law Institute 2022) 17.

6 Regulation (EU) 2023/1114 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 31 May 2023 on markets in crypto-assets, and amending Regulations (EU) No 1093/2010 and (EU) No 1095/2010 and Directives 2013/36/EU and (EU) 2019/1937 [2023] OJ L 150/40.

7 Ibid.

8 Ibid.

9 See Glossary, in UIHJ, *Global Code of Digital Enforcement* (n 1).

10 *Ibid.*

in blocks, thus forming a chain secured by cryptography"[11]. Given their singular architecture, blockchains can be implemented in different ways depending on the degree of decentralisation they pursue. In practice, four main types are distinguished: Public, Private, Hybrid and Consortium blockchains, each with specific advantages and disadvantages[12].

Cryptography, as defined by IBM in an online article, is the practice of developing and using coded algorithms to protect and obscure transmitted information so that it may only be read by those with the permission and ability to decrypt it[13]. One of the core tenets of modern cryptography is confidentiality, alongside integrity, authentication and non-repudiation, principles that ensure secure and trustworthy data exchange in digital environments.

3. Soft Law vs. Hard Law Approaches: A Critical Review

The concepts of *soft law* and *hard law* are generally examined within the framework of public international law. *Soft law* encompasses a variety of non-binding instruments, including guidelines, codes of conduct, recommendations and policy declarations, created by international or regional organizations, national governments, judicial and standard-setting bodies[14]. In the context of the European Union, documents such as recommendations and opinions serve as a precursor to future legislation and can contribute to the uniform application of EU principles across Member States. Despite its non-binding nature, soft law may significantly influence behaviour and normative expectations. By contrast, *hard law* refers to legally binding norms, such as statutes, treaties, regulations or judicial decisions, which create rights and obligations and are enforceable by public authorities.

This section aims to present the key instruments regulating digital assets to assess the current landscape. Subsections 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3. explore the most influential soft law instruments to date, highlighting their potential to shape the future of digital assets. In contrast, Section 3.4. examines examples of hard law approaches to provide a snapshot of the present regulatory framework.

3.1. The Global Code of Digital Enforcement

The *Global Code of Digital Enforcement* (hereinafter *Code*), presented during the UIHJ's 24th International Congress in Dubai (2021), aims to define universal principles applicable to key aspects of digital enforcement in civil matters and ethical obligations inherent in the use of AI. The authors of the Code believe that the principles underlined in the Code should serve as inspiration for legislators and a guide of good practices in the execution of enforceable titles.

Some of the most relevant principles for the matter at hand, included in the Code, are:

1. *Respect for fundamental rights (Article 1)* – as defined by national laws, constitutions, declarations and international conventions.
2. *Respect for the ethical principles of digital use (Article 2)* – including human dignity,

[11] Ibid.

[12] GeeksforGeeks, 'Types of Blockchain', available at https://www.geeksforgeeks.org/types-of-blockchain/ accessed 2 May 2025.

[13] IBM, 'What is cryptography?', available at https://www.ibm.com/think/topics/cryptography accessed on 17 April 2025.

[14] M Shaw, *International Law* (6th edn, Cambridge University Press 2008) 117-118.

non-discrimination, transparency, respect for personal data and privacy, social responsibility of developers.[15]

3. *Prevention of risks associated with the use of artificial intelligence* (Article 3)– through risk analysis and documentation resulting from the use of AI, certification and assessment procedures, and *regulatory frameworks*.
4. *Territorial jurisdiction of judicial officers or enforcement agents (Article 12)* – governed by the debtor's domicile or the place where it is identified and accessible[16].
5. Legal framework of digital assets and definition of seizure procedures (articles 37, 39) – the categories, the legal nature of digital assets and the seizure procedures adapted to digital assets should be defined by national law.
6. *Principles relating to access to crypto-assets (Articles 47-49)* – prior service or notification of the enforcement order, national crypto-assets databases or registers, the obligation for the debtor to declare crypto-assets and sanctions for non-declaration.
7. *Fate of seized crypto-assets (Article 57)* – seized crypto-assets should be transferred to the creditor or be the subject of a forced judicial sale.

Equally important is the *Glossary* section, that defines many technical terms related to digital assets and enforcement.

3.2. ELI Principles

The *ELI Principles on the Use of Digital Assets as Security* (hereinafter *ELI Principles*), published in 2022, are a set of guidelines developed by the European Law Institute to address the use of digital assets as collateral in securing obligations such as loans or debts. These principles clarify and facilitate *the position of those claiming an entitlement to digital assets*[17]:

1. Principle 1 specifies that the ELI Principles do not apply to the seizure of digital assets by public bodies, but rather to security interests created by agreement by private parties.
2. Principle 2 states that for a digital asset to be used as security, an agreement between a security provider and a secured creditor is required.
3. Principle 3 is more complex, addressing matters such as applicable law, the effects of creating a valid security interest and the right of the parties to make provisions for fluctuations in the value of the digital asset.
4. Principle 4 covers the effectiveness of security interests and applicable law. It introduces rules regarding statutory transaction fillings and notice filling systems, similar

[15] See PM Lourenço, 'The Judicial Officer and Digitisation – Delivering The Added Value: The Human Touch', in D Walker (ed), *Cyberjustice, de nouvelles opportunités pour l'huissier de justice. Cyberjustice, New Opportunities for the Judicial Officer: XXIVth International Congress of the International Union of Judicial Officers, Dubai, 22-25 November 2021* (Brussels: Bruylant 2021) 203; MG Păun, 'Digital Discipline: Upholding Ethical Integrity in the Judicial Officer's Engagement with Technology', in P Gielen (ed), *L'huissier de justice : le tiers de confiance. The judicial officer: the trusted third party* (Brussels: Bruylant 2024) 621.

[16] S van Erp, 'Digital Assets… The "Phantom Debtor', in Walker (ed), *Cyberjustice, de nouvelles opportunités pour l'huissier de justice* (n 15) 220.

[17] ELI, *ELI Principles on the Use of Digital Assets as Security* (n 5) 11.

to those governing real-world assets, as defined by national law.

5. Principle 5 oversees the enforcement and extinction of security interests. A security interest is extinguished when all secured obligations have been discharged.

In the *Sources and Final Notes* section, the authors note that, unlike the United States, which has the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC), the European Union does not yet have a common framework. The UCC, though soft law (as it is a recommendation), is a model followed by most U.S. states.

3.3. UNIDROIT Principles

Another such instrument, covering different topics, but not without its shortcomings[18], is the *UNIDROIT Principles on Digital Assets and Private Law* (hereinafter *UNIDROIT Principles*). These are applicable to digital asset transaction across legal systems, with the "aim to reduce legal uncertainty which practitioners, judges, arbitrators, legislators and market participants would otherwise face in the coming years in dealing with digital assets"[19]. UNIDROIT recommends states adopt legislation based on the presented principles to increase the predictability of such transactions, both nationally and internationally, thus decreasing the costs related to such transactions. It should be noted that the principles apply only to a subset of digital assets, that is, assets that are capable of being subject to control.

Section I defines the scope, key terms, general principles and the concept of linked assets. Similar to the ELI Principles, the UNIDROIT Principles focus on private law relating to digital assets (*Principle 1*). In the official commentary of *Principle 2*, it is interesting to take into consideration *Illustration 4*, regarding the fact that password protected social media pages are not digital assets, due to the fact that social media platforms involve *licensing arrangements* (Terms and Conditions) that do not grant the users ownership of such pages, and *Illustration 5*, which argues that even though Excel or Word files may be considered digital assets, Principles law may not have any material impact or utility. *Principle 3* establishes that digital assets can be owned and treated as property and that principles specific to digital assets will take priority. However, for all issues not specifically addressed by the principles (including whether a person has a proprietary right or the validity of transfers or the creation of security rights, etc.), general laws (property law, contract law) will apply. *Principle 4* links digital assets with other assets, the fate of the digital assets affecting the other assets.

Section II: Private International Law seeks to determine the applicable law governing proprietary issues related to digital assets. Primarily, the applicable law is the national law explicitly specified in the digital asset itself, the system on which it is recorded, or the issuer's statutory seat. If no such specification exists, fallback rules defer to the principles specified by the forum state and, ultimately, to the rules of private international law.

Section III, Principle 6 defines the control of a digital asset as the exclusive ability to prevent others from obtaining the benefits of the asset, the ability to obtain those benefits, and the exclusive ability to transfer these rights to another person. Additionally, the digital asset or

[18] M LEHMANN, 'Digital Assets in the Conflict of Laws' (n 4) 209.

[19] UNIDROIT, *UNIDROIT Principles on Digital Assets and Private Law* (n 2) 1.

system must allow the person to identify themselves as holding these abilities. Exceptions exist, where shared control is explicitly permitted by the asset's design or agreement.

Section IV, Principle 10 defines custody in the context of digital assets, requiring a custody agreement between the *custodian* and *client* (or *sub-custodian*). A custody agreement must meet the following criteria: the service is provided as part of the provider's business; the provider is obligated to obtain and maintain the asset for the client and the client lacks exclusive control over the asset. However, the asset may not be part of the provider's estate in the event of the provider's insolvency.

3.4. Hard Law Approaches

While not creating legal rights and obligations, the UCC is influential because most U.S. states model their legislation on it. The 2022 amendments of the UCC address emerging technologies (DLT, AI, NFTs, cryptocoins, Controllable Electronic Records etc.) in a manner similar to the UNIDROIT Principles (the UCC 2022 amendments precede the UNIDROIT Principles). According to the Uniform Law Commission, 38 out of 53 U.S. states have either introduced or enacted the 2022 UCC amendments[20].

The United Kingdom[21], Singapore and New Zeeland have yet to adopt specific legislation regarding digital assets. Courts are attempting to determine the applicable law to digital assets in the context of tort and restitution claims[22]. However, there is not a consensus regarding important legal issues. For example, in a decision noted by Sjef van Erp[23], the Court of Appeal of New Zeeland rejected ownership of what was qualified at the time as pure information (footage of an incident in a bar)[24]. This view was not embraced by the New Zeeland Supreme Court[25], reflecting ongoing judicial debate and uncertainty in the treatment of digital assets.

The *Regulation (EU) 2023/1114 on markets in crypto-assets*, while focused specifically on crypto-assets rather than digital assets in general, represents an important step in regulating digital assets within the European Union, especially since crypto-assets are among the primary applications of DLT. The regulation establishes uniform requirements for the issuance, public offering and trading of crypto-assets within the European Union. It specifies rules for transparency, governance, authorisation, market integrity and the protection of crypto-asset holders and service clients, including measures to prevent market abuses such as insider trading and unlawful disclosure of information. The regulation applies to natural and legal persons but excludes certain groups and types of crypto-assets. It categorises crypto-assets into three types: e-money tokens, asset-referenced tokens and other crypto-assets. Furthermore, the regulation includes provisions for future integration with the European Single Access Point

[20] Uniform Law Commission, *UCC 2022 Amendments* (Uniform Laws https://www.uniformlaws.org/committees/community-home?CommunityKey=1457c422-ddb7-40b0-8c76-39a1991651ac) accessed 1 May 2025.

[21] UK Law Commission, *Digital Assets: Final Report* (Law Com No 412, 27 June 2023); UK Law Commission, *Digital Assets as Personal Property: Supplemental Report and Draft Bill* (29 July 2024) HC 188 of session 2024–25; for draft clauses consulted on, see UK Law Commission, *Digital Assets as Personal Property: Short Consultation on Draft Clauses* (February 2024) https://consult.justice.gov.uk/law-commission/digital-assets-as-personal-property-draft-clauses/ accessed 1 May 2025.

[22] LEHMANN, 'Digital Assets in the Conflict of Laws' (n 4) 201.

[23] S VAN ERP, 'Ownership of digital assets', (2016) 5(2) *European Property Law Journal* 74.

[24] [2014] NZCA 329 (CA 518/2013).

[25] [2015] NZSC 147 (SC 82/2014).

(ESAP) to enhance accessibility and transparency[26].

Article 477 paragraph (3) of the Civil Code of the Republic of Moldova gives us a legal definition of digital assets, stating that a person's *digital assets* consist of "the digital content to which they have a right" and "the email account, network account, or other online account to which they have a right"[27]. Article 477 paragraph (1) defines *digital content* as "the data produced and delivered in digital form, such as computer programs, applications, games, music, video recordings or texts, regardless of whether they are accessed by download or streaming, from a physical medium or by any other means"[28]. In contrast, the Romanian legislator, possibly reluctant to define such concepts, has refrained from incorporating such definitions into the Civil Code. Instead, Government Emergency Ordinance no. 141/2021 defines the concept of *goods with digital elements* as "any mobile tangible item that incorporate digital content or a digital service, or is interconnected with them, so that, in the absence of the respective digital content or digital service, the goods would not be able to perform their functions"[29]. Additionally, article 5 defines *digital content* as "data produced and provided in digital format"[30].

4. Beyond Soft Law: Bridging the Gap in Digital Goods Regulation

The rapid expansion and development of the digital economy have exposed significant shortcomings in the legal qualification and regulation of digital goods. These deficiencies primarily arise from the lack of cohesive, binding regulatory frameworks (hard law) and an overreliance on soft law instruments. This dependency fosters legal uncertainty, particularly concerning ownership rights, consumer protection, taxation, cross-border transfer of digital assets, conflict-of-laws etc.

While soft law mechanisms offer flexibility and adaptability, they lack the enforceability needed to effectively manage the complexities and risks posed by digital goods, especially in a globalised and interconnected economy. Initiatives like Regulation (EU) 2023/1114 on markets in crypto-assets illustrate the potential of targeted legal instruments to address the complexities and risks inherent in digital goods, enhancing transparency, consumer confidence and market integrity. However, such measures remain fragmented and narrowly focused on specific subsets of digital goods or addressing specific issues, such as digital assets as security, rather than addressing the broader spectrum of digital assets which, as Matthias Lehman suggests, is required for a so-called "ideal rule"[31].This study emphasises the need for a unified and coherent regulatory framework at both national and European Union levels, where it is possible to accomplish using directives and regulations. Such a framework must move beyond the limitations of soft law, establishing enforceable and future-ready norms to address the diverse

[26] For an overview, see European Union, 'European crypto-assets regulation (MiCA)' (EUR-Lex) https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=LEGISSUM:4626998 accessed 1 May 2025.

[27] Civil Code of the Republic of Moldova, art 477(3), adopted by Law No 1107-XV of 6 June 2002, republished by Law No 133 of 15 November 2018, Official Gazette of the Republic of Moldova No 66–75, 1 March 2019 (Moldovan CC).

[28] Moldovan CC, art 477(1).

[29] Government Emergency Ordinance No 141 of 28 December 2021 on certain aspects related to contracts for the supply of digital content and digital services, art 2(1), Official Gazette of Romania No 1248, 30 December 2021 (GEO No 141/2021).

[30] GEO no. 141/2021, art 2(5).

[31] LEHMANN, 'Digital Assets in the Conflict of Laws' (n 4) 214.

challenges associated with the nature, classification, usage and transfer of digital goods. It should strike a balance between fostering technological innovation and ensuring robust legal protections, thereby facilitating the seamless and sustainable integration of digital goods into the national, trans-national and global economy.

The analysis further highlights the disparities in how jurisdictions approach digital assets. Where some states provide detailed definitions of digital assets, other states rely on a more fragmented and ad-hoc regulatory strategy.

Comparative evaluations of instruments like the UNIDROIT Principles, ELI Principles and the UCC 2022 amendments, combined with the opinions of scholars, underscore the importance of harmonizing national regulations to reduce legal ambiguity and support international trade.

The interplay of technology, law and commerce demands a proactive and forward-thinking legal strategy. Such an approach must settle and acknowledge the unique characteristics of digital goods while integrating them into existing legal frameworks. Developing a comprehensive and enforceable legal framework is not merely a regulatory necessity but a strategic imperative to align law with the realities of a digitalized world. Such a framework will pave the way for a resilient and equitable digital marketplace, fostering innovation while ensuring fairness, security and trust for all participants.

5. Conclusion

This article highlights the *ambiguity and fragmentation of the current legal framework* surrounding digital goods, a problem largely stemming from an over-reliance on soft law instruments. To overcome the inherent vulnerabilities of soft law, a robust hard law framework is essential, both at the national level and within the European Union legal framework. The analysis in Section 4 demonstrates the diversity of soft law approaches, which emphasize flexibility and innovation but remain insufficient in addressing the challenges of clear and predictable legal regulation and enforcement. A coherent legal framework is crucial to ensure consumer protection, legal circuit security, and transparency in cross-border transactions. As the digital goods market continues to evolve, *legislative intervention becomes increasingly necessary* to address its complexity and ensure a fair and stable digital economic environment.

To put these findings into practice, one may consider adopting the following principles for integrating digital goods into enforceable regulations:

1. *Legal definition and classification*. Digital goods should be clearly defined in national civil codes and EU instruments, ensuring consistency across jurisdictions.
2. *Ownership and transferability*. Establish enforceable rules recognizing digital goods as property capable of ownership, transfer, and security interests.
3. *Consumer protection and transparency*. Mandate clear contractual terms for digital goods transactions, including disclosure of rights and remedies for defects.
4. *Cross-border harmonization*. Adopt uniform conflict-of-law rules for digital goods transactions to reduce legal uncertainty in cross-border contexts.
5. *Integration with extant frameworks*. Ensure that digital goods regulation complements

existing hard law (e.g., MiCA) and incorporates soft law into binding norms.

Taken together, these principles aim to provide a foundation for future legislative efforts, ensuring that the regulation of digital goods evolves in step with technological innovation while safeguarding legal certainty and fairness in a globalized digital economy.

Bibliography

European Law Institute, *ELI Principles on the Use of Digital Assets as Security* (European Law Institute 2022)

Lehmann M, 'Digital Assets in the Conflict of Laws' (2024) *Singapore Journal of Legal Studies* 197-222

Lourenço PM, 'The Judicial Officer and Digitisation – Delivering the Added Value: The Human Touch' in D Walker (ed), *Cyberjustice, de nouvelles opportunités pour l'huissier de justice / Cyberjustice, New Opportunities for the Judicial Officer: XXIVth International Congress of the International Union of Judicial Officers, Dubai, 22–25 November 2021* (Bruylant 2021)

Păun MG, 'Digital Discipline: Upholding Ethical Integrity in the Judicial Officer's Engagement with Technology' in P Gielen (ed), *L'huissier de justice : le tiers de confiance / The Judicial Officer: The Trusted Third Party* (Bruylant 2024)

Shaw M, *International Law* (6th edn, Cambridge University Press 2008)

UIHJ, *Global Code of Digital Enforcement* (Bruylant 2021)

UNIDROIT, *UNIDROIT Principles on Digital Assets and Private Law* (UNIDROIT 2023)

Van Erp S, 'Ownership of Digital Assets' (2016) 5(2) *European Property Law Journal* 73-76

Van Erp S, 'Digital Assets… The "Phantom Debtor"' in D Walker (ed), *Cyberjustice, de nouvelles opportunités pour l'huissier de justice / Cyberjustice, New Opportunities for the Judicial Officer: XXIVth International Congress of the International Union of Judicial Officers, Dubai, 22–25 November 2021* (Bruylant 2021)