COMPLIANCE MARKETING IN WEB3

Legal workshop on protecting
the project and the founder's interests

ANDREY VORONIN

Андрей Воронин

Compliance marketing in Web3

«Автор»
2026

Воронин А. П.

Compliance marketing in Web3 / А. П. Воронин — «Автор», 2026

"Compliance Marketing in Web3" by Andrey Pavlovich Voronin.Every tokenomics mistake is a ready-made criminal case or SEC fine. One wrong classification, one sloppy memo — and your RWA project becomes the evidence.This book is a tactical legal shield you can assemble fast under pressure. For founders, managers, compliance officers and counsel who carry real responsibility, it shows how to:respond to subpoenas and inquiries without creating worse facts, structure evidence by roles and timelines, choose negotiation and court tactics that limit leverage, navigate SEC, MiCA and Central Bank classification risks, build marketing that sells without looking like unregistered securities.You get working systems: RWA Shield Map, Regulatory Framework Tracker, Three Rounds Response Procedure and Safe Messaging Funnel.If an audit or regulatory letter lands tomorrow, you will know what to do first.

Содержание

Андрей Воронин
Compliance marketing in Web3

COMPLIANCE MARKETING IN WEB3
By Andrey Pavlovich Voronin

Every tokenomics mistake is either a ready-made criminal case or a revolving door of SEC fines. One wrong classification, one sloppy memo, one “we’ll fix it later” response, and your Real World Asset (RWA) project becomes the evidence. This book gives you a legal shield you can assemble quickly, when the clock is already running. You will learn how to respond to subpoenas and regulatory inquiries without inadvertently creating worse facts, how to structure evidence by role and timeline, and how to choose negotiation and court conduct that limits your opponent’s leverage. Instead of slow, theoretical advice, you get a tactical manual built for real pressure. If an audit starts tomorrow morning, you will know what to do first.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

This book can be worth millions to your business — in a good way. And it can protect your freedom.

If you're holding this book in your hands, you're most likely in one of the following categories:

• You want to launch a crypto business or a Web3 company;

• You're already developing a cryptocurrency, DeFi, or blockchain project;

• You're a manager, director, or company owner considering the implementation of Web3 technologies;

• You're an investor, a Family Office, or a representative of an investment fund evaluating digital economy projects;

• You're an entrepreneur who wants to enter the international market, attract capital, or build a new source of profit.

This book is not for crypto enthusiasts or those looking for a quick way to make money on the next token.

It's written for people who make decisions, take responsibility for money, employees, investors, and the future of their business.

A few important words before you begin

• Web3 is one of the fastest-changing industries in the global economy.

• Laws are updated.

• Regulators change requirements.

• New technologies, products, and business models emerge.

Therefore, treat this book not as a collection of dogmas, but as a system of thinking and practical tools.

If you understand the principles underlying the solutions described here, you'll be able to adapt to market changes significantly faster than most participants.

This book helps you build a sustainable, profitable, and legal business, avoid mistakes others have already made, and preserve an entrepreneur's most valuable resource: time.

It is also part of a series that covers 99% of the Web3 and DeFi space.

CHAPTER 1. DEFENSE, CRISIS, AND LITIGATION TACTICS

Hello! Ready? Then let's dive right into the situation...Imagine the following scenario: a notice from the court arrives on Friday afternoon, and by Monday you must file your position on the merits. At this point, the team usually tries to "quickly find the right documents" and "draft a response." Still, it loses not because of the arguments, but because it lacks a legal shield: no action plan, no evidence in the proper form, no negotiation strategy, and no agreed line of conduct in the proceedings.

In RWA projects, crises often look the same in form, but differ in legal triggers: a regulatory request, an investor's claim, a dispute under a contract with the issuer/operator, a complaint about marketing or disclosures, and a dispute over rights to an asset. In any of these scenarios, you need not "general readiness," but a consolidated structure that can withstand the pressure of time and chaos. This chapter gives you that structure.

After reading, you'll be able to assemble a "project's legal shield" in practice: create a crisis-response plan, break down evidence by roles and timelines, prepare a negotiation position, and choose a strategy for court conduct so that your opponent has no room to manipulate the facts. We'll rely on the link between prevention and containment, but the focus will remain on crisis defense: evidence, negotiations, and court — without unnecessary theory.

RWA Shield Map: how to build protection when things go wrong

This chapter is based on the RWA Shield Map: Prevention — Containment — Evidence — Court. This is not an abstract diagram, but a working map that lets you break down tasks by time and by owners: who gathers the facts, who formulates the position, who communicates with counterparties, and who is responsible for procedural actions.

First, you separate the "fire" from the "cause." The fire is an external event (a claim, a lawsuit, a request). The cause is how the project actually acted before the event: how transactions were documented, how information was provided, how risks were managed, how roles and authority were allocated. If you mix them up, you'll start answering the fire, but lose the dispute about the cause.

Move through the RWA Shield Map step by step and record the result at each stage. Practically, it looks like this:

Prevention: establish a "control loop" before the crisis

The task is to determine in advance where the evidence is and who owns it. You do this not for aesthetics: in a crisis, you won't have time to reconstruct correspondence, document versions, and action logs.

A practical example for RWA: set up a folder in advance called "Transactions and Confirmations," with separate subfolders for each operation type (issuance, transfer, servicing). Inside, store not only the final agreements, but also approval minutes, performance confirmations, and change logs. Assign folder owners and a versioning rule: "the latest agreed version" is fixed by date and signature.

Containment: stop chaotic actions and lock in the communication boundaries

Containment means stopping actions that create new grounds for claims and establishing a single communication window.

A specific rule: appoint a crisis coordinator and a single point of external response. Send any letters to investors and counterparties during the crisis only after approval. Otherwise, you'll get contradictory wording across different channels, and that directly undermines your court position.

Evidence: assemble a "package of facts" for a specific dispute

Evidence is not "all files in a row." It's a set that answers the court's and the opponent's questions: who did what, when, based on what, and exactly how this is confirmed.

Do it like this: compile a list of facts in the format "assertion → confirmation." For example: "The project provided the investor with information materials before payment" is confirmed by a letter/link/archive of the page and a sending log. "Risk notices were communicated in a specific version of the document" is confirmed by the document version, the date, and the publication log.

Court: choose a conduct tactic and a procedural route

Court is not only arguments; it's decisions on form: which motions to file, which evidence to present, how to respond to the opponent's motions, and how to behave at hearings.

Rule: you prepare in advance a "script for procedural responses" for typical events (adjournment, requests for evidence, clarification of the claim requirements, objections to documents). This reduces the risk of improvisation at the moment when you're already losing time.

Practical takeaway: the RWA Shield Map works like a checklist for distributing responsibility. If at each step you receive a measurable artifact (evidence folder, list of facts, an approved communication plan, a draft procedural line), you truly increase your chances of defending the project.

Scenario: an investor's claim and urgent court preparation for an RWA startup

Below is a realistic scenario based on the role of Ilya, a 36-year-old RWA startup lawyer acting as the crisis coordinator. He receives a claim from an investor: the investor asserts that the project promised certain return parameters and that key risks were not disclosed at the time of the decision. Within 10 days, the investor files a lawsuit for damages and asks the court to order the project to produce correspondence and internal materials.

Ilya's goal in the first 24 hours is to assemble a legal shield so that the court sees not "excuses," but a verifiable factual picture. He follows the RWA Shield Map and manages time.

Launch crisis coordination and lock in the framework

Ilya takes one action: he writes an internal message to the team and assigns owners responsible for evidence by direction (agreements, marketing materials, and communications with investors).

Expected result: all employees know that external letters are not sent now without approval; you eliminate new contradictions.

Conduct a “review of the claim” in 2 hours and convert it into a list of disputed facts.

Ilya takes the text of the claim and highlights the investor’s assertions in a table: “assertion → what we need to prove/refute → which documents to request.”

For example: “The project promised returns” requires verifying where and how the financial expectations were formulated, and whether they were a marketing estimate or a guarantee; “Risks were not disclosed” requires verifying which risk sections were available and in which version.

Collect an evidence package in two layers: mandatory and backup.

Ilya forms two sets. Mandatory ones are those without which the court won’t understand the facts—backup ones close loopholes.

Specific documents he collects in the “Investor X Facts Package”:
• The agreement/offer/contract under which the investor paid;
• An appendix with terms and risks (if any);
• An archive of marketing materials as of the publication date (a dated screenshot or page export);

• correspondence with the investor before the payment date (email/messenger/CRM log);
• internal approvals of wording (minutes or a lawyer/compliance letter with approval of a risk disclaimer);
• Confirmation of the fact that materials were delivered to the investor (a letter with a link, a letter with an attachment, and a sending log).
Expected result: you show the court a controlled history, not a collection of unrelated files.

Prepare a negotiation position in parallel with the court work.

Ilya prepares a short response to the investor, but not “at any cost to make peace.” He frames the position like this: we acknowledge disputed facts only where the evidence matches, and we propose discussing a settlement method tied to documents.

For example, he suggests: if the investor insists on specific wording, have him provide the exact quote and publication date, and the project will provide an archived version of the material with the date.

Expected result: you move negotiations from the emotional plane to the documentary plane and reduce the risk that the court will see you as “not responding to the facts.”

Align the court tactics and a plan for procedural actions.

Ilya makes three decisions before filing/receiving procedural documents:
a) Chooses which evidence to attach immediately to the response;
b) Determines on which issues to ask the court to order documents;

c) Prepares a template of objections to typical arguments: “guarantee of returns” and “risks were not disclosed.”

Expected result: you don’t miss procedural deadlines, and you avoid a situation where you “will supplement later,” while the court is already working with the case materials.

Quick checklist

- Appoint a crisis coordinator and a single point of external contact.
- Break down the claim into disputed facts: assertion → required confirmation.
- Collect a “Facts Package” from mandatory and backup documents, with dates and versions.
- Prepare a documentary negotiation position: request exact quotes and dates.
- Decide in advance what you will attach to the response and on which issues you will ask the court to order documents.

Practical takeaway: in a crisis, the winner is the one who turns the conflict into a verifiable map of facts. If Ilya, in the first 24 hours, receives a structured package of documents and a procedural line, he wins not in “the beauty of speech,” but in evidence discipline.

Typical mistakes and edge cases when assembling a legal shield

Errors in a crisis usually repeat. Below you’ll find the most frequent scenarios and targeted fixes in the logic of the RWA Shield Map.

Mistake: “We’ll collect all files and attach them”

What happens: The team uploads dozens of folders without structure or links to specific disputed facts. The court and the opponent don’t get answers to the questions “who/what/when/based on what,” and you look like a party trying to drown in volume.

Do this: Return to the list of disputed facts and collect, for each fact, the minimum sufficient confirmation. Remove duplicates and mark document versions.

Do this: Make a matrix “fact → document → page/fragment.”
Not this: attach “the whole drive” without showing where exactly the confirmation is.

Mistake: The team responds to the investor in parallel and gives contradictory wording

What happens: In the correspondence, different interpretations of the same condition appear (for example, about financial expectations or risks). In court, the opponent uses this as “an admission of inconsistency.”

Do this: Introduce a “single voice” mode. The crisis coordinator approves the wording; those responsible for evidence may not send external letters without approval.

Do this: Set the rule that an external message is sent only after verification against the checklist of terms and dates.

Not this: Let each employee write to the investor “in their own words” without oversight.

Mistake: You prepare a legal position, but you don’t prepare a procedural response to the court’s request

What happens: You’re morally ready to argue, but you miss procedural deadlines, don’t file motions, and don’t respond to clarification of requirements or requests for documents. The court

Interprets this as passivity.

Do this: Create a “procedural roadmap” for the next actions after receiving the statement of claim or a court order.

Do this: Record dates and assign responsible persons for each procedural action (response, motions, attachments, collection of confirmations).

Not this: Count on “finishing later,” while the court is already working with the case materials.

Practical takeaway: your legal shield breaks not because of weak arguments, but because of weak discipline. Restore control in evidence, communications, and procedure.

By the end of this chapter, you should have a working framework: you are not just “preparing for trial,” but assembling verifiable evidence, maintaining a single voice in negotiations, and planning procedural steps.

Next, we will go deeper into how to protect the project from regulatory risks and build a position with fewer points of entry.

CHAPTER 2. REGULATORY RISKS: SEC, MICA, AND THE CENTRAL BANK OF RUSSIA

Конец ознакомительного фрагмента.