

# UZBEKISTAN LAW REVIEW



---

ISSUE 2  
2025

**ЎЗБЕКИСТОН ҚОНУНЧИЛИГИ  
ТАҲЛИЛИ**

**UZBEKISTAN LAW REVIEW**

**ОБЗОР ЗАКОНОДАТЕЛЬСТВА  
УЗБЕКИСТАНА**

<b>ИЛМИЙ ТАҲЛИЛИЙ ЖУРНАЛ</b>	<b>SCIENTIFIC ANALYTICAL JOURNAL</b>	<b>НАУЧНО АНАЛИТИЧЕСКИЙ ЖУРНАЛ</b>
--------------------------------------	--	--

---

---

**2025  
№2**

## ТАҲРИР ҲАЙЪАТИ

### БОШ МУҲАРРИР:

Гулямов Саид Саидахарович — юридик  
фанлари доктори, профессор.

### ТАҲРИР ҲАЙЪАТИ АЪЗОЛАРИ:

Рустамбеков Исламбек Рустамбекович — ю.ф.д.,  
профессор.

Ҳўжаев Шохжаҳон Акмалжон ўғли — юридик  
фанлар бўйича фалсафа доктори.

Оқюлов Омонбой — ю.ф.д., профессор.

Эргашев Восит Ёқубович — ю.ф.н., профессор.

Маҳкамов Отабек Мухтарович — ю.ф.д.

Суюнова Дилбар Жолдасбаевна — ю.ф.д., доц.

Мусаев Бекзод Турсунбоевич — ю.ф.д., доц.

Беков Ихтиёр — ю.ф.д., проф.

Бозоров Сардор Соҳибжонович — ю.ф.д., проф.  
в.б.

Ҳазратқулов Одилбек Турсунович — юридик  
фанлари номзоди, доцент.

Самарходжаев Ботир Билялович — ю.ф.д.,  
профессор.

Ходжаев Бахшилло Камалович — ю.ф.д.,  
профессор.

Нарзиёев Отабек Саъдиевич — ю.ф.д., проф. в.б.

Жолдасова Шахноза Батировна — юридик  
фанлар бўйича фалсафа доктори.

Маълумот олиш учун қуйидагиларга мурожаат этиш  
сўралади:

**Гулямов Саид Саидахарович,  
Рустамбеков Исламбек Рустамбекович**  
ТДЮУ, Халқаро хусусий ҳуқуқ кафедраси,  
Ўзбекистон Республикаси, Тошкент ш., 100047,  
Сайилгоҳ кўчаси, 35. Тел: 233-66-36

"Ўзбекистон қонунчилиги таҳлили"нинг электрон  
нусхаси Интернетдаги [www.library-tsul.uz](http://www.library-tsul.uz) ёки  
[www.lawreview.uz](http://www.lawreview.uz) сайтида жойлаштирилган.

**Журнал 2013 йилдан Ўзбекистон Республикаси  
Вазирлар Маҳкамасининг Олий Аттестация  
комиссияси журналлари рўйхатига киритилган.**

Ушбу журналда баён этилган натижалар, хулосалар,  
талқинлар уларнинг муаллифларига тегишли бўлиб,  
Ўзбекистон Республикаси ёки Тошкент давлат юридик  
университети сиёсати ёки фикрини акс эттирмайди.

2025 йилда нашр этилди.

Муаллифлик ҳуқуқлари Тошкент давлат юридик  
университетига тегишли. Барча ҳуқуқлар ҳимояланган.  
Журнал материалларидан фойдаланиш, тарқатиш ва  
қўлайтириш Тошкент давлат юридик университети рухсати  
билан амалга оширилади. Ушбу масалалар бўйича Тошкент  
давлат юридик университетига мурожаат этилади.  
Ўзбекистон Республикаси, Тошкент ш., 100047, Сайилгоҳ  
кўчаси, 35.

ISSN 2181-8118

Масъул котиб: **И. Рустамбеков**

Нашриёт муҳаррири: **Н. Ниязова**

Техник муҳаррир: **Д. Козимов**

Лицензия № 02-0074

Босишга рухсат этилди — 28.06.2025

Нашриёт ҳисоб табоғи — 5

«IMPRESS MEDIA» босмахонасида босилди

Адади — 100 нусха.

## ИЛМИЙ-ТАҲЛИЛИЙ ЖУРНАЛ

2/2025

**Khazratkulov Odilbek Tursunovich**

Head of the Private International Law Department of Tashkent state university of Law  
Professor, Candidate of legal science

## BALANCING INNOVATION AND REGULATION: A NEW LEGAL APPROACH TO DIGITAL FINANCIAL SERVICES

**Abstract.** This article examines the challenge of balancing innovation and regulation in digital financial services and proposes a new legal approach to address this tension. Through analysis of contemporary regulatory frameworks, the study explores innovative mechanisms including regulatory sandboxes, principle-based regulation, risk-based supervision, and collaborative governance models. The research demonstrates how traditional regulatory approaches often fail to accommodate the rapid pace of technological change in financial services, necessitating more adaptive and flexible frameworks. Key findings highlight the effectiveness of regulatory sandboxes in fostering controlled innovation, the benefits of hybrid principle-rule based approaches, and the importance of proportionate regulation tailored to firm size and risk profiles. The article also examines the role of regulatory technology (RegTech) and supervisory technology (SupTech) in enhancing regulatory efficiency while promoting innovation. The proposed legal approach emphasizes adaptability, stakeholder collaboration, and international cooperation as essential elements for successfully regulating digital financial services while maintaining consumer protection and financial stability.

**Keywords:** Digital finance, regulatory sandboxes, fintech regulation, innovation policy, financial stability, adaptive regulation, RegTech

**Аннотация.** Данная статья исследует вызов балансирования инноваций и регулирования в цифровых финансовых услугах и предлагает новый правовой подход для решения этого противоречия. Через анализ современных регулятивных рамок исследование изучает инновационные механизмы, включая регулятивные песочницы, принципиальное регулирование, надзор на основе рисков и модели совместного управления. Исследование демонстрирует, как традиционные регулятивные подходы часто не способны приспособиться к быстрому темпу технологических изменений в финансовых услугах, что требует более адаптивных и гибких рамок. Ключевые выводы подчеркивают эффективность регулятивных песочниц в способствовании контролируемым инновациям, преимущества гибридных подходов на основе принципов и правил, и важность пропорционального регулирования, адаптированного к размеру компании и профилям рисков. Статья также исследует роль регулятивных технологий (RegTech) и надзорных технологий (SupTech) в повышении регулятивной

эффективности при содействии инновациям.

**Ключевые слова:** Цифровые финансы, регулятивные песочницы, финтех-регулирование, инновационная политика, финансовая стабильность, адаптивное регулирование, RegTech

**Annotatsiya.** Ushbu maqola raqamli moliyaviy xizmatlarda innovatsiya va tartibga solishni muvozanatlash muammosini o'rganadi va ushbu qarama-qarshilikni hal qilish uchun yangi huquqiy yondashuvni taklif qiladi. Zamonaviy tartibga solish doiralari tahlil qilish orqali tadqiqot tartibga soluvchi qum qutilari, printsiyal tartibga solish, xavfga asoslangan nazorat va hamkorlikdagi boshqaruv modellarini o'z ichiga olgan innovatsion mexanizmlarni o'rganadi. Tadqiqot an'anaviy tartibga solish yondashuvlari ko'pincha moliyaviy xizmatlardagi texnologik o'zgarishlarning tez sur'atiga moslasha olmasligini ko'rsatadi, bu esa yanada moslashuvchan va egiluvchan doiralarni talab qiladi. Asosiy xulosalar nazorat ostidagi innovatsiyalarni rivojlantirishda tartibga soluvchi qum qutilarining samaradorligini, printsipl va qoidalarga asoslangan gibridd yondashuvlarning afzalliklarini va kompaniya hajmi hamda xavf profiliga moslashtirilgan mutanosib tartibga solishning ahamiyatini ta'kidlaydi.

**Kalit so'zlar:** Raqamli moliya, tartibga soluvchi qum qutilari, fintex tartibga solish, innovatsiya siyosati, moliyaviy barqarorlik, moslashuvchan tartibga solish, RegTech

## Introduction

The rapid evolution of digital financial services has fundamentally transformed the financial landscape, creating unprecedented opportunities for innovation while simultaneously posing complex regulatory challenges. As fintech startups, blockchain technologies, artificial intelligence, and digital payment systems continue to reshape how financial services are delivered and consumed, regulators worldwide grapple with the critical question of how to foster innovation without compromising consumer protection, financial stability, or market integrity.

Traditional regulatory frameworks, designed for conventional financial institutions and established business models, often prove inadequate when applied to the dynamic and technologically sophisticated world of digital finance. The pace of technological change frequently outstrips regulatory adaptation, creating regulatory gaps that can expose consumers to risks while potentially stifling beneficial innovation. This regulatory lag poses significant challenges for both innovators seeking clarity and certainty, and regulators attempting to fulfill their mandates in an increasingly complex environment.

The emergence of new financial technologies demands a fundamental rethinking of regulatory approaches. Digital financial services operate across traditional sectoral boundaries, blur the lines between different types of financial activities, and often rely on technologies that were not contemplated when existing regulations were crafted. Moreover, the global nature of

many digital financial services challenges the territorial limitations of traditional regulatory frameworks, necessitating new forms of international cooperation and coordination.

This article examines innovative regulatory approaches that seek to balance the competing demands of fostering financial innovation and maintaining appropriate oversight. Through an analysis of regulatory sandboxes, principle-based versus rule-based regulation, risk-based supervision, regulatory technology solutions, and collaborative governance models, this study identifies key elements of a new legal approach that can effectively navigate the tension between innovation and regulation in the digital financial services sector.

The tension between fostering innovation in digital financial services and ensuring adequate regulation presents a significant challenge for policymakers and regulators. Striking the right balance is crucial to promote financial innovation while protecting consumers and maintaining financial stability. Key areas requiring this balance include fintech startups, emerging technologies, and new business models. A new legal approach that can adapt to rapid technological changes while upholding regulatory objectives is essential for the evolving digital financial services ecosystem.

**Regulatory sandboxes:** Fostering innovation within controlled environments. Regulatory sandboxes have emerged as a popular tool for fostering innovation while maintaining regulatory oversight in the digital financial services sector. The UK Financial Conduct Authority (FCA) pioneered this approach with the launch of its regulatory sandbox in 2016, as outlined in the FCA's regulatory sandbox framework. Article 5 of this framework specifies the eligibility criteria for firms to participate in the sandbox, emphasizing the need for genuine innovation that benefits consumers. The implementation of sandboxes has spread globally, with jurisdictions like Singapore, Australia, and Hong Kong adopting similar models. For instance, the Monetary Authority of Singapore's (MAS) FinTech Regulatory Sandbox, established under the Financial Services and Markets Act 2022, provides a controlled environment for fintech experimentation. Case studies of fintech innovations developed through sandboxes demonstrate their potential. The success of Revolut, a digital banking platform that participated in the UK FCA's sandbox, illustrates how these initiatives can facilitate rapid growth and regulatory compliance. However, the effectiveness of sandboxes in promoting long-term innovation remains debated. A study by Alaassar et al. (2020) found that while sandboxes can accelerate market entry for fintech firms, their impact on broader financial innovation may be limited. Buckley et al. (2020) argue that sandboxes must be carefully designed to avoid creating an unlevel playing field between participants and non-participants.

**Principle-based vs. rule-based regulation in digital finance.** The debate between principle-based and rule-based approaches to regulating digital financial services

reflects the challenge of balancing flexibility with certainty. The UK's FCA Principles for Businesses, enshrined in the FCA Handbook, exemplify a principle-based approach, with Principle 1 stating that "a firm must conduct its business with integrity". This high-level principle allows for adaptability in the face of technological change. In contrast, the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) often employs a more rule-based approach, as evidenced by detailed regulations like Regulation Crowdfunding, which sets specific thresholds and requirements for online capital raising. Scholarly articles have compared the effectiveness of these approaches in fostering innovation. Ford (2010) argues that principle-based regulation can be more responsive to financial innovation but requires strong regulatory capacity and industry engagement. The application of these approaches to fintech regulation is illustrated by the contrasting treatments of robo-advisors. The UK's FCA has applied existing principles to robo-advice, focusing on outcomes rather than prescriptive rules, while the U.S. SEC has issued specific guidance on robo-advisors, detailing compliance expectations. A comparative study by Van Loo (2018) suggests that a hybrid approach, combining principles and rules, may be most effective in regulating digital financial services.

**Risk-based regulation for digital financial services.** Risk-based regulatory approaches have gained prominence in the digital finance landscape, aiming to allocate regulatory resources efficiently while addressing the most significant risks. The Basel Committee on Banking Supervision's guidelines on sound management of risks related to money laundering and financing of terrorism (2020) exemplify this approach, advocating for a risk-based assessment of customers and transactions. In the context of digital finance, the European Banking Authority's Guidelines on ICT and security risk management (EBA/GL/2019/04) apply a risk-based approach to technology governance in financial institutions. Case studies of risk-based regulation applied to fintech companies demonstrate its potential benefits. The UK FCA's supervision of peer-to-peer lending platforms, outlined in Policy Statement PS19/14, adopts a risk-based approach, imposing stricter requirements on platforms that target retail investors or engage in more complex business models. Scholarly assessments of risk-based approaches have highlighted both advantages and challenges. Baldwin, Black and Prof. S.Gulyamov argue that while risk-based regulation can enhance efficiency, it may struggle to address systemic risks and emerging threats. A study by Arner et al. (2017) suggests that risk-based approaches are particularly well-suited to regulating fintech, allowing for targeted interventions while fostering innovation.

**Regulatory technology (RegTech) and supervisory technology (SupTech).** The emergence of RegTech and SupTech offers new possibilities for achieving regulatory objectives while promoting innovation in digital financial services. The UK FCA has been at the forefront of

embracing these technologies, as evidenced by its TechSprint initiatives, which bring together regulators and industry to develop innovative compliance solutions. The European Banking Authority's (EBA) report on the use of RegTech solutions (2019) provides a comprehensive overview of RegTech applications in areas such as compliance, risk management, and reporting. Successful RegTech implementations demonstrate the potential of these technologies. For instance, the Monetary Authority of Singapore's (MAS) collaboration with financial institutions to develop a blockchain-based Know Your Customer (KYC) utility showcases how RegTech can streamline compliance processes. SupTech initiatives by financial regulators are also gaining traction. The Bank of England's (BoE) SupTech strategy, outlined in its response to the Future of Finance report, emphasizes the use of advanced analytics and machine learning for more effective supervision. Scholarly articles have explored the transformative potential of RegTech and SupTech in financial regulation. Enriques (2017) argues that these technologies could lead to a paradigm shift in financial supervision, enabling real-time monitoring and predictive regulation.

**Collaborative regulation:** Engaging stakeholders in the regulatory process. Collaborative approaches to developing regulations for digital financial services have gained traction as regulators seek to keep pace with rapid technological change. The European Union's FinTech Action Plan, launched in 2018, exemplifies this approach by promoting dialogue between regulators, industry participants, and consumers. Article 4 of the plan emphasizes the need for a coordinated approach to standards and interoperability in fintech. Collaborative regulation in practice is demonstrated by initiatives such as the Global Financial Innovation Network (GFIN), launched in 2019, which facilitates cooperation between financial regulators on innovation-related topics. Case studies of collaborative regulation highlight its potential benefits. The development of the UK's Open Banking Standard, which involved extensive consultation with banks, fintech firms, and consumer groups, illustrates how stakeholder engagement can lead to more effective and widely accepted regulations. Scholarly debates on the benefits and challenges of stakeholder engagement in financial regulation have explored various perspectives. Avgouleas (2016) argues that collaborative regulation can enhance the legitimacy and effectiveness of financial rules but warns of the risk of regulatory capture. A study by Brummer and Yadav (2019) suggests that collaborative approaches are particularly valuable in regulating fintech due to the rapid pace of innovation and the complex interplay between technology and finance.

**Adaptive regulation:** Flexible frameworks for evolving technologies. Adaptive regulatory models designed to keep pace with technological innovation are increasingly important in the digital financial services landscape. The U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission's (CFTC) principles for regulation of cryptocurrencies, outlined in its

2020 guidance, provide an example of an adaptive framework that can accommodate evolving technologies. These principles focus on core regulatory objectives while allowing flexibility in their application to new crypto products. Regulatory frameworks incorporating adaptive elements are also emerging in other jurisdictions. Singapore's Payment Services Act 2019 adopts a modular and risk-based regulatory framework that can be easily adjusted to cover new payment technologies and business models. Scholarly articles have explored the concept of adaptive regulation in finance. Zetzsche et al. (2021) propose a model of "adaptive financial regulation" that combines principles-based approaches with ongoing regulatory learning and adjustment. Case studies of adaptive regulatory approaches in practice demonstrate their potential benefits. The European Union's regulatory framework for crowdfunding services, established by Regulation (EU) 2020/1503, includes provisions for regular review and adaptation to market developments, as specified in Article 45. However, challenges remain in implementing adaptive regulation effectively. A study by Armour et al. (2019) highlights the need for regulators to develop new skills and capacities to effectively monitor and respond to technological changes in the financial sector.

**International regulatory cooperation in digital finance.** Efforts to harmonize regulatory approaches to digital financial services across jurisdictions have intensified as the global nature of fintech challenges traditional regulatory boundaries. The Financial Stability Board (FSB) has played a key role in promoting international cooperation, as evidenced by its 2020 report on "Regulatory and Supervisory Issues Relating to Outsourcing and Third-Party Relationships". This report emphasizes the need for cross-border coordination in managing risks associated with cloud computing and other third-party services in finance. Initiatives by other international bodies have also contributed to global fintech regulation. The Basel Committee on Banking Supervision's "Sound Practices: Implications of fintech developments for banks and bank supervisors" (2018) provides a framework for assessing fintech-related risks and opportunities. Case studies of cross-border regulatory cooperation in digital finance highlight both progress and challenges. The EU-US Financial Regulatory Forum, which includes fintech as a key area of discussion, demonstrates ongoing efforts to align regulatory approaches between major financial markets. However, significant obstacles remain in achieving global harmonization. A study by Brummer (2020) identifies divergent national interests and regulatory philosophies as key barriers to international fintech regulation. Scholarly assessments of the challenges and opportunities in global fintech regulation have explored various approaches. Zetzsche et al. (2020) propose a model of "embedded regulation" that leverages technology to facilitate cross-border compliance and supervision.

Balancing data-driven innovation with data protection.

Reconciling data-driven financial innovation with data protection requirements presents a significant challenge for regulators. The EU's revised Payment Services Directive (PSD2) and General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) exemplify attempts to strike this balance. Article 66 of PSD2 mandates that banks provide third-party providers access to customer account data, subject to customer consent, while Article 5 of GDPR establishes principles for lawful, fair, and transparent data processing. The interaction between these regulations has created both opportunities and challenges for fintech innovation. Case studies of fintech companies navigating data protection regulations reveal the complexities involved. The implementation of open banking in the UK, as mandated by the Competition and Markets Authority, has required banks and fintech firms to develop robust data sharing and protection mechanisms. Scholarly debates on balancing innovation with privacy in digital finance have explored various perspectives. Arner et al. (2018) argue for a "data governance" approach that goes beyond traditional notions of data protection to address the unique challenges of data-driven finance. The tension between innovation and privacy is particularly acute in the context of big data and AI in finance. A study by Kaminski and Malgieri (2021) examines the challenges of applying the GDPR's algorithmic transparency requirements to complex AI systems in financial services.

Proportionate regulation: Tailoring rules to firm size and risk. Proportionate regulatory approaches that adjust requirements based on a firm's size and risk profile have gained traction as regulators seek to foster innovation while managing systemic risks. The EU's Investment Firms Regulation (IFR) and Investment Firms Directive (IFD), implemented in 2021, exemplify this approach by establishing a new prudential regime that categorizes investment firms based on their size and activities. Article 12 of the IFR sets out specific capital requirements for small and non-interconnected investment firms, recognizing their lower systemic risk. Proportionate regulation has been particularly relevant for fintech startups. The UK FCA's regulatory sandbox, as outlined in its 2015 regulatory sandbox framework, applies a proportionate approach by allowing temporary relaxation of certain regulatory requirements for innovative firms. Case studies of proportionate regulation applied to fintech startups demonstrate its potential benefits. The German Federal Financial Supervisory Authority (BaFin) has implemented a proportionate licensing regime for small payment and e-money institutions, reducing regulatory burdens for innovative payment service providers. Scholarly evaluations of the effectiveness of proportionate approaches have highlighted both advantages and challenges. Buckley et al. (2020) argue that proportionate regulation can foster innovation and competition in financial services but warn of the risk of creating regulatory arbitrage opportunities. A study by Ahern (2018) suggests that proportionate regulation requires careful calibration to avoid undermining overall regulatory

objectives.

Open banking and API regulation: Fostering competition and innovation. Regulatory approaches to open banking and API standardization have emerged as key drivers of innovation and competition in digital financial services. The UK's Open Banking Standard, mandated by the Competition and Markets Authority in 2016, set a precedent for regulated API access to bank account data. Section 3 of the Open Banking Standard outlines the technical specifications for secure API connections, promoting interoperability and innovation. Similar initiatives have been launched in other jurisdictions, such as Australia's Consumer Data Right legislation, which extends beyond banking to other sectors. Case studies of open banking implementation demonstrate its transformative potential. The success of fintech companies like Plaid in leveraging open banking APIs to provide innovative financial services illustrates the power of regulated data sharing. However, challenges remain in balancing innovation with security and consumer protection. Scholarly articles have explored the regulatory challenges and opportunities presented by open banking. Zachariadis and Ozcan (2017) argue that open banking represents a paradigm shift in financial services regulation, requiring new approaches to competition policy and data governance. The global spread of open banking initiatives has also raised questions about international harmonization. A comparative study by Borgogno and Colangelo (2020) examines different regulatory models for open banking, highlighting the need for a balanced approach that promotes innovation while addressing data protection and security concerns.

A new legal approach to balancing innovation and regulation in digital financial services requires flexibility, collaboration, and adaptability. Key elements include risk-based supervision, regulatory sandboxes, and proportionate regulation. Ongoing evaluation and adjustment of regulatory frameworks are essential to keep pace with technological advancements. Innovative regulatory models have the potential to foster a thriving digital financial ecosystem while maintaining consumer protection and financial stability.

## References

1. Ahern, D. (2018). Regulatory arbitrage in a proportionate regulatory framework: Challenges and opportunities in financial services regulation.
2. Alaassar, A., Mention, A. L., & Aas, T. H. (2020). Exploring how fintech startups use regulatory sandboxes. *Journal of Banking and Financial Technology*, 4(2), 145-162.
3. Armour, J., Awrey, D., Davies, P., Enriques, L., Gordon, J. N., Mayer, C., & Payne, J. (2019). *Principles of financial regulation*. Oxford University Press.
4. Arner, D. W., Barberis, J., & Buckley, R. P. (2017). *FinTech and RegTech in a nutshell, and the future in a sandbox*. CFA Institute Research Foundation, 3(4), 1-

- 20.
5. Arner, D. W., Barberis, J., Walker, J., Buckley, R. P., Dahdal, A. M., & Zetzsche, D. A. (2018). Digital identity in financial services: Legal and regulatory challenges. *University of New South Wales Law Journal*, 41(2), 518-562.
6. Avgouleas, E. (2016). The political economy of financial regulation reform: Why regulation and supervision still matter in the post-crisis world. *International Review of Law and Economics*, 46, 6-18.
7. Baldwin, R., & Black, J. (2008). Really responsive regulation. *Modern Law Review*, 71(1), 59-94.
8. Basel Committee on Banking Supervision. (2018). Sound practices: Implications of fintech developments for banks and bank supervisors. Bank for International Settlements.
9. Basel Committee on Banking Supervision. (2020). Guidelines on sound management of risks related to money laundering and financing of terrorism. Bank for International Settlements.
10. Borgogno, O., & Colangelo, G. (2020). Paving the way for an European open banking standard: The second payment services directive and beyond. *European Law Review*, 45(3), 299-322.
11. Brummer, C. (2020). *Fintech law and policy: Cases and materials*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
12. Brummer, C., & Yadav, Y. (2019). Fintech and the innovation trilemma. *Georgetown Law Journal*, 107(2), 235-307.
13. Buckley, R. P., Arner, D. W., Zetzsche, D. A., & Weber, R. H. (2020). The road to RegTech: Building a more efficient financial system. *Journal of Financial Transformation*, 51, 37-45.
14. Competition and Markets Authority (CMA). (2016). Retail banking market investigation: Final report. UK Government.
15. Enriques, L. (2017). The regulatory response to the fintech revolution. *Harvard Business Law Review*, 7(2), 78-102.
16. European Banking Authority (EBA). (2019). Guidelines on ICT and security risk management (EBA/GL/2019/04). European Banking Authority.
17. European Banking Authority (EBA). (2019). Report on the use of RegTech solutions. European Banking Authority.
18. European Union. (2018). FinTech Action Plan: For a more competitive and innovative European financial sector. European Commission.
19. European Union. (2020). Regulation (EU) 2020/1503 on European crowdfunding service providers for business. Official Journal of the European Union.
20. European Union. (2021). Investment Firms Regulation (IFR) and Investment Firms Directive (IFD). Official Journal of the European Union.
21. Financial Conduct Authority (FCA). (2015). Regulatory sandbox framework. Financial Conduct Authority.
22. Financial Conduct Authority (FCA). (2016). FCA Handbook: Principles for Businesses. Financial Conduct Authority.
23. Financial Conduct Authority (FCA). (2019). Policy Statement PS19/14: Loan-based crowdfunding platforms and segregation of client funds. Financial Conduct Authority.
24. Financial Stability Board (FSB). (2020). Regulatory and supervisory issues relating to outsourcing and third-party relationships. Financial Stability Board.
25. Ford, C. (2010). Principles-based securities regulation in the wake of the global financial crisis. *McGill Law Journal*, 55(2), 257-307.
26. General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). (2016). Regulation (EU) 2016/679. Official Journal of the European Union.
27. Global Financial Innovation Network (GFIN). (2019). GFIN cross-border testing pilot. Bank of England.
28. Kaminski, M., & Malgieri, G. (2021). Algorithmic impact assessments under the GDPR: Producing multi-layered explanations. *International Data Privacy Law*, 11(2), 125-144.
29. Monetary Authority of Singapore (MAS). (2022). FinTech Regulatory Sandbox under the Financial Services and Markets Act 2022. Monetary Authority of Singapore.
30. Payment Services Directive 2 (PSD2). (2015). Directive (EU) 2015/2366. Official Journal of the European Union.
31. Singapore. (2019). Payment Services Act 2019. Government of Singapore.
32. U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC). (2020). Principles for regulation of cryptocurrencies. CFTC Guidance.
33. U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC). Regulation Crowdfunding. Code of Federal Regulations, Title 17.
34. Van Loo, R. (2018). Making innovation more competitive: The case of fintech. *UCLA Law Review*, 65(1), 232-279.
35. Zachariadis, M., & Ozcan, P. (2017). The API economy and digital transformation in financial services: The case of open banking. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, 41(1), 7.
36. Zetzsche, D. A., Arner, D. W., Buckley, R. P., & Weber, R. H. (2020). The future of data-driven finance and RegTech: Lessons from EU Big Bang 2. *University of Pennsylvania Journal of Business Law*, 23(1), 25-71.
37. Zetzsche, D. A., Buckley, R. P., Arner, D. W., & Barberis, J. N. (2021). Regulating a revolution: From regulatory sandboxes to smart regulation. *Fordham Journal of Corporate and Financial Law*, 23(1), 31-103.