Practice Toolkit

Dr Alexander Ressos, TEP
Of Counsel, KGP Legal LLC
Attorney-at-Law (Switzerland and Germany), Solicitor (England & Wales and Hong Kong)

The sixteen parts before this one explain the law of digital assets in Switzerland and Singapore in the order a lawyer thinks: nature of the asset, regulatory perimeter, anti-money-laundering duties, tax, enforcement, structuring. This final part rearranges the same material in the order a client acts. A founder who has to decide by Friday whether the token sale needs a FINMA ruling does not want to re-read Part E. She wants a sequence of questions, each with a consequence and with a pointer to the chapter that carries the reasoning. That is what the decision guides in Chapter I provide. The checklists in Chapter II translate the duties described elsewhere into things a compliance officer can tick off. Chapter III offers model clauses and document skeletons that have survived negotiation in both jurisdictions. Chapter IV sets out procedural roadmaps with time and cost ranges, which move as fees and thresholds change. Chapter V is a directory of the authorities and bodies a practitioner deals with, described by what they do and how one approaches them. Chapter VI closes with forty questions clients ask, grouped by the type of client who tends to ask them.

Two cautions apply to the whole part. First, a toolkit compresses. Each decision guide reduces a chapter of analysis to a page of sequence, which means that borderline cases will fall through the cracks of the table. Where the guide says "probably" or "usually", the longer chapter explains why the answer is only probable. The cross-references are therefore part of the tool, and I have tried to place them where a reader will actually need them. Second, the state of the law is that of 30 June 2026. Checklists and roadmaps age faster than doctrine, because they depend on fee schedules, portal designs and supervisory practice that change without a legislative act.

The part also serves a function the earlier parts cannot. Comparative handbooks tend to describe each jurisdiction well and the choice between them badly. The decision guides here force the comparison, because each asks the same question of both legal systems and shows where the answers diverge. A custody arrangement that is insolvency-remote in Zug may be a bare contractual claim in Singapore, while the opposite can be true for a trust structure. A token that FINMA treats as a pure utility token may be a capital markets product in the eyes of MAS. The tables make those divergences visible on one page, which is where the planning conversation usually starts.

Nothing in this part replaces the formal opinion that a regulator, a bank or an auditor will eventually ask for. Its purpose is earlier and more modest: to let the reader walk into that conversation knowing which questions matter, which documents will be requested and which answers the other side is likely to give.

Copyright © 2026 Dr Alexander Ressos, TEP – Of Counsel, KGP Legal LLC. SingaporeIQ is an information website and gives no legal advice. For Singapore law advice through KGP Legal LLC, please write to alexander.ressos@kgplegal.com.sg