# NORTON ROSE FULBRIGHT

# Navigating the metaverse: A global legal and regulatory guide

Part 5: Transacting in the metaverse

# Introduction

In the space of a very short time, businesses are focusing on what the metaverse means for them. In addition to commercialising the opportunities available to them, such as new channels to market and enhanced customer engagement, businesses will need to understand and address the associated risks.

Such matters are extremely important for businesses, consumers, law-makers and lawyers alike. In this seven-part guide we consider the following key legal and regulatory issues in relation to the metaverse:

#### Part 1

### What is the metaverse?

Who are the current big players building it?

What will the metaverse mean for business?

What are key technical, operational and governance considerations?

#### Part 2

### Intellectual property and the metaverse

What are virtual reality worlds and virtual items?

Non-fungible tokens

How do traditional IP concepts sit with non-fungible tokens and other works in the metaverse?

#### Part 3

#### Anti-trust/competition law issues

Developer and participant conduct

Will the EU Digital Markets Act apply to the metaverse?

Competitors communicating and co-operating with each other in relation to metaverse offerings



#### Part 4

### Decentralised models and data issues

Data in the metaverse

Decentralised networks

Who is responsible for data protection law compliance?

Data subject consents

Special categories of data

Children and the metaverse

Data sharing

Data export and localisation

Responsibility for data breaches and cyber attacks

#### Part 5

#### Transacting in the metaverse

Buying "land" in the metaverse

What are the key issues when contracting in the metaverse ecosystem?

Non-fungible tokens, smart contracts and blockchain

**Financial crime** 

Will metaverse risk and control considerations be similar to those relevant to the Internet?

#### Part 6

# Digital marketing, adverting and social media in the metaverse

How will businesses be able to advertise in the metaverse?

Social media regulation

Regulating advertising content in the metaverse

Will AI have implications for marketing and the use of avatars in the metaverse?

#### Part 7

### AI and the metaverse

Why is AI relevant to the metaverse?

How might AI regulation impact upon the metaverse?

How to operationalise AI risk mitigation in the metaverse

Data protection and AI

# Overview of the legal and regulatory issues

The diagram shows the key legal issues and subject areas this guide covers. The breadth of issues means that mitigating risk associated with the metaverse is going to be a significant challenge for any business, but particularly so for a regulated business.

Deep fakes Avatars Smart contracts Data protection Digital advertising regulation Anti-trust Contractual Governing law Subliminal techniques Data sharing Jurisdiction Social media regulation Decentralised Metaverse strategy Buying land Artifical intelligence Borderless Cybersecurity Emotion recognition Blockchain Risk mitigation Financial crime NFTS Intellectual property rights **Digital identity** 

**Biometric data** 

Navigating the metaverse: A global legal and regulatory guide Part 5: Transacting in the metaverse

# Transacting in the metaverse

# Buying "land" in the metaverse

Typically in agreements for the purchase of "land" in the metaverse – often called a "simple agreement for future tokens", or SAFT – what the purchaser is buying is a non-fungible token – or NFT – that represents a particular piece of virtual real estate in the metaverse.

This begs the question about what exactly does a "piece of virtual real estate in the metaverse" mean – for example, a hosted space on a supplier's network accessible via the internet, access, a key or something else?

SAFTs typically end on issuance of land, so will not typically contain any commitments in relation to the ongoing relationship between the parties, such as access, availability, security etc. A supplier will typically argue that the ongoing relationship between the parties is governed by the terms of use on its website, but these may not deal with many of the issues already mentioned, so a purchaser may want the arrangements for ongoing services to be set out either in the SAFT or in another agreement.

The virtual land will probably have a business's branding all over it. Many of the IP issues discussed earlier (see *Intellectual Property and the metaverse*) apply generally in this context and are not repeated here, but specifically in relation to a land purchase a business may consider undertaking a brand audit to identify any potential gaps in its existing trade mark portfolio as regards the metaverse (both from an offensive and defensive perspective), and potentially to make new filings in key jurisdictions covering a broader range of goods/services for use in the metaverse.

A business may also explore with monitoring agencies how it can identify infringements and file takedowns of IP in the metaverse, particularly on NFT marketplaces. The business may also consider the possibility of copyright registrations of its assets in jurisdictions where copyright registrations are possible.

The business will also need to consider whether it will need controls around any intellectual property developed on its land – for example, do the terms of use require the business to grant the supplier hosting the land a licence of its content?

As a SAFT is typically for the purchase of a token redeemable for virtual land that does not exist yet, this can raise other issues for a business. A key issue is around custody of the NFT. If the purchaser agrees that the supplier will hold custody of the purchaser's land token, then the SAFT may need to contain detailed provisions regarding the custody arrangements – for example, whether the tokens will be held in hot or cold storage and what the supplier's liability is if something goes wrong with custody.

The location of the virtual site is important. There may be reputational issues for the business to consider. The business should insist on contractual provisions detailing the precise location of the land, and provisions detailing proximity to particular areas in the metaverse. It also has to have controls around companies purchasing land in close proximity to avoid reputational harm to its own business. For example, it may not want its virtual land to be sited right next to its competitors, nor near a business engaging in illegal or unethical conduct.

The land will contain the purchaser's content, which – like any software content – will need to be supported. The land purchaser will typically want the contract to provide for digital access to the land (that might mean uptime service levels, etc), and for remedies when the purchaser or its own customers are unable to access the land.

A purchaser may also want to provide for access for developers and other third parties to the software and data constituting content on the land in order to develop content. So here we need to be thinking about the land as akin to website content that the purchaser wishes to see developed and maintained.

A land purchaser should push for contractual provisions on IT/cyber security of the metaverse platform in general, and specific IT security provisions that relate to the land owned by it, and remedies if security is compromised.

Clearly a business would also need to consider whether the purchase or holding of the land NFT tokens constitutes a regulated activity in each case.

# What are the key issues when contracting in the Metaverse ecosystem?

Is there much difference between contracting over the internet and contracting in the metaverse ecosystem? When people and businesses first started contracting over the internet in the early nineties, a popular view was that existing laws somehow did not apply. That was not true then and it is not true now. Laws will apply to the metaverse, and the question simply is how.

We already have a range of treaties and conflicts of laws principles that determine – for example – what law is applicable, and which country's courts have jurisdiction when there is a dispute. They will continue to apply. The factual scenarios may just be more complicated.

Take the example of a business contracting with a digital avatar. In such a case, how does the business know who the other contractual party actually is, or where it is? There are KYC and AML issues for a business here, obviously, but there are also basic questions of contract law.

In some common law jurisdictions, for example, the courts are prepared to agree that a contract can be formed even when the identity of the other party is not known – particularly if it is at least ascertainable. All of this highlights the importance to a business of its own terms and conditions when interacting on the metaverse.

### Non-fungible tokens, smart contracts and blockchain

NFTs are used as the mechanism by which land is purchased in the metaverse. What rights does the NFT carry in that context and more generally?

The short answer is that the NFT carries the rights that either the contract or the NFT itself provides. It is important to remember that an NFT is a form of smart contract. A smart contract sits on a blockchain and may or may not constitute a legally binding contract, depending on the law applicable and what it actually provides.

A key issue with an NFT, as a smart contract, arises where the purchaser wishes to on-sell it. In that case, it will be necessary to consider how the subsequent buyer can enforce rights under the NFT against the original issuer (or person "minting" it), and how the original issuer can enforce restrictions (if any) against subsequent purchasers.

These are complicated questions and will require a review of both the terms of the NFT smart contract and any contract under which it has been issued.

It is also worth remembering that, as a smart contract, an NFT is subject to the same legal issues that any smart contract faces – for example, can you terminate a smart contract once it is operational, and can an NFT be amended later on?

# **Financial crime**

Clearly any business is going to need to be acutely aware of the risks, its own regulatory responsibilities in relation to financial crime and the reputational risks for it of financial crime in the metaverse.

There is a risk in particular of the metaverse facilitating under-regulated environments for money launderers and fraudsters to move large values of funds. Financial crime has proliferated over the internet, and the risks may even be greater in the metaverse when we throw into the mix additional uncertainties around avatars and digital identity and the spread of new forms of digital assets, such as cryptocurrencies, tokens and NFTs.

In the metaverse, financial transactions are probably going to be facilitated by using digital assets, digital currencies and decentralised finance platforms, and ownership of an asset might be recorded by an NFT. Banks in particular will likely be increasingly exposed to financial criminals whose financial crime activities are progressively less visible. Digital asset and digital currency exchanges might be hosted in the metaverse and may use bank accounts to process payments. Financial crime in the metaverse may also impact upon more traditional financial products and services, such as cash transactions, card payments and wire transfers, which will continue to act as gateways for illicit actors to convert digital funds to and from fiat currency. We might see more:

- Investment scams as investment scammers capitalise on the popularity of the metaverse, and fraud, say in the theft of digital assets and NFTs.
- Money laundering.
- Illegal transactions, such as drug sales or illegal gambling.
- Cyber attacks.

These kinds of problems are likely to be exacerbated by the fact that it can be extremely difficult to trace funds where the actors are anonymous - as seen currently in relation to disputes before the courts relating to cryptocurrency frauds on exchanges involving "persons unknown".

It is likely, therefore, that over time authorities will strengthen existing law enforcement efforts to cover such activities and to apply existing regulations to a growing range of metaverse platforms.

# Will metaverse risk and control considerations be similar to those relevant to the Internet?

The risk profile for many businesses – particularly regulated ones – in participating in the metaverse is of a different order when compared with the internet.

Businesses will have to come to grips with the challenges of avatars, digital identity, new types of digital assets and increasingly opaque transactions. These things will have an impact on a business's traditional activities as well as on new ones. This may have flow-on effects in relation to a business's contracts in relation to metaverse infrastructure, such as land purchases, as well as its terms and conditions relating to its products and services.

The regulatory issues for many regulated businesses relating to the metaverse are only just beginning to be considered by regulators, and there are clear implications for AML and KYC procedures and requirements.

In short, while we can see that the governance model for a business's participation in the internet has clear relevance, it may require significant adaption and augmentation on an ongoing basis in order to encompass the metaverse as it evolves.

Navigating the metaverse: A global legal and regulatory guide Part 5: Transacting in the metaverse

3 -

.

e

10 "

-

1

# **Key contacts**

#### Australia

### Nick Abrahams

**Global Co-leader, Digital Transformation Practice** Tel +61 2 9330 8312 nick.abrahams@nortonrosefulbright.com

### Belgium

### Jay Modrall

Senior Counsel Tel +32 2 237 61 47 jay.modrall@nortonrosefulbright.com

#### France

Nadège Martin Partner Tel +33 1 56 59 53 74 nadege.martin@nortonrosefulbright.com

#### Sébastien Praicheux

Partner Tel +33 1 56 59 54 25 sebastien.praicheux@nortonrosefulbright.com

#### Germany

#### Daniel Marschollek

Partner Tel +49 69 505096 215 daniel.marschollek@nortonrosefulbright.com

#### Hong Kong

Justin Davidson

Partner Tel +852 3405 2426 justin.davidson@nortonrosefulbright.com

### The Netherlands

#### Nikolai de Koning Counsel Tel +31 20 462 9407 nikolai.dekoning@nortonrosefulbright.com

#### **Ross Phillipson**

Senior Advisor Tel +61 8 6212 3449 ross.phillipson@nortonrosefulbright.com

#### Canada

### Maya Medeiros Partner Tel +1 604 641 4846

maya.medeiros@nortonrosefulbright.com

#### **Clement Monnet**

Counsel Tel +33 1 56 59 53 91 clement.monnet@nortonrosefulbright.com

#### **Geoffroy Coulouvrat**

Senior Associate Tel +33 1 56 59 52 98 geoffroy.coulouvrat@nortonrosefulbright.com

### Christoph Ritzer Partner

Tel +49 69 505096 241 christoph.ritzer@nortonrosefulbright.com

#### Japan

Sam Inohara Partner Tel +813 4545 3213 sam.inohara@nortonrosefulbright.com

#### **United Arab Emirates**

#### Adjou Ait Ben Idir Partner Tel +971 4 369 6393 adjou.aitbenidir@nortonrosefulbright.com

#### **United States**

Felicia J. Boyd Head of IP Brands, United States Tel +1 612 321 2206 felicia.boyd@nortonrosefulbright.com

#### **Sean Christy**

Partner Tel +1 404 443 2146 sean.christy@nortonrosefulbright.com

Chuck Hollis

Partner Tel +1 404 443 2147 chuck.hollis@nortonrosefulbright.com

Andrew Lom Global Head of Private Wealth Tel +1 212 318 3119 andrew.lom@nortonrosefulbright.com

Daniel Farris Partner-in-Charge, Chicago Tel +1 312 964 7730 daniel.farris@nortonrosefulbright.com

#### Susan Ross

Counsel Tel +1 212 318 3280 susan.ross@nortonrosefulbright.com

#### **Robert A. Schwinger**

Partner Tel +1 212 408 5364 robert.schwinger@nortonrosefulbright.com

#### **Rachael Browndorf**

Senior Associate Tel +1 303 801 2763 rachael.browndorf@nortonrosefulbright.com

#### United Kingdom

#### James Russell

Partner Tel +44 20 7444 3902 james.russell@nortonrosefulbright.com

#### Marcus Evans

EMEA Head of Information Governance, Privacy and Cybersecurity Tel +44 20 7444 3959 marcus.evans@nortonrosefulbright.com

#### Lara White

Partner Tel +44 20 7444 5158 lara.white@nortonrosefulbright.com

#### Sean Murphy

**Global Head of FinTech** Tel +44 20 7444 5039 sean.murphy@nortonrosefulbright.com

#### **Mike Knapper**

Head of Intellectual Property, EMEA Tel +44 20 7444 3998 mike.knapper@nortonrosefulbright.com

#### **Harriet Jones-Fenleigh**

Partner Tel +44 20 7444 2867 harriet.jones-fenleigh@nortonrosefulbright.com

#### Michael Sinclair Knowledge Director, Campaigns Tel +44 20 7444 2344 michael.sinclair@nortonrosefulbright.com

# NORTON ROSE FULBRIGHT

Norton Rose Fulbright is a global law firm. We provide the world's preeminent corporations and financial institutions with a full business law service. We have more than 3500 lawyers and other legal staff based in Europe, the United States, Canada, Latin America, Asia, Australia, Africa and the Middle East.

## Law around the world

nortonrosefulbright.com

Norton Rose Fulbright Verein, a Swiss verein, helps coordinate the activities of Norton Rose Fulbright members but does not itself provide legal services to clients. Norton Rose Fulbright has offices in more than 50 cities worldwide, including London, Houston, New York, Toronto, Mexico City, Hong Kong, Sydney and Johannesburg. For more information, see nortonrosefulbright.com/legal-notices. The purpose of this communication is to provide information as to developments in the law. It does not contain a full analysis of the law nor does it constitute an opinion of any Norton Rose Fulbright entity on the points of law discussed. You must take specific legal advice on any particular matter which concerns you. If you require any advice or further information, please speak to your usual contact at Norton Rose Fulbright.

© Norton Rose Fulbright LLP. Extracts may be copied provided their source is acknowledged. 50962\_EMEA - 09/23