QUBAHAN ACADEMIC JOURNAL
VOL. 4, NO. 3, August 2024
https://doi.org/10.48161/qaj.v4n3a863

The Impact of Digitalization in Inheritance Law

Akmaljon A. Akramov[1], Nilufar Kh. Rakhmonkulova[1], Odilbek T. Khazratkulov[1], Elnora E. Inamdjanova[1], Diyora I. Imamalieva[1], Shakhzoda R. Tuychieva[1], Sayidkomil B. Ibodullaev[1], Azamat E. Ergashev[1], Shokhrukh Khamidov[1], and Nodira R. Rustamova[2*]

[1] Department of International Private Law, Faculty of Law, Tashkent State University of Law, Tashkent City, 100000;
[2] Department of Uzbek Language and Pedagogy, Faculty of Foreign Education, Tashkent State Dental Institute, Tashkent, 100047, Uzbekistan;

Corresponding author*: e-mail: rustamovanodira19@gmail.com.

ABSTRACT: This article examines the emerging challenges and opportunities in regulating digital inheritance and trust management of digital assets. As individuals accumulate valuable digital assets, including cryptocurrencies, social media accounts, and online intellectual property, traditional inheritance frameworks are struggling to adapt. This study employs a comparative, interdisciplinary approach, integrating classical inheritance doctrines, modern digital asset theories, and principles of trust law. Key findings reveal significant gaps in current legal frameworks, particularly regarding asset identification, access rights, and jurisdictional authority. The study proposes a comprehensive digital trust framework encompassing ownership rights, trustee roles, jurisdictional considerations, data privacy, and liability limitations. Recommendations include new regulations for digital executors, formalized digital asset estate planning, and mechanisms to protect ownership interest's post-mortem. This research contributes to the emerging field of digital inheritance law by offering both theoretical grounding and practical guidance for policymakers and legal practitioners navigating this rapidly evolving landscape.

Keywords: Digital Inheritance, Trust Law, Estate Planning, Succession, Digital Assets.

I. INTRODUCTION

The rapid proliferation of digital assets and accounts has created novel challenges in regulating inheritance that demand innovative legal solutions. Traditional inheritance frameworks, rooted in centuries-old property rights doctrines, prove inadequate for the transfer of intangible digital assets. Without tailored regulations, these virtual properties risk being lost, misappropriated, or descending into legal limbo upon an owner's death [1]. Historically, inheritance law has evolved to accommodate changing societal norms and economic realities. From the Roman law principles of testamentary freedom to the development of trusts in English common law, legal systems have adapted to protect the interests of testators, heirs, and society at large [2]. However, the digital revolution presents unprecedented challenges that strain these established norms [3].

Consider the case of Gerald Cotten, CEO of QuadrigaCX, whose death in 2018 left approximately $190 million in cryptocurrency inaccessible to investors [4]. This high-profile incident highlighted the unique complexities of digital asset inheritance, from issues of access and control to questions of ownership and value transfer. Similarly, legal battles over access to deceased users' social media accounts, such as the case of in re Facebook in 2019, underscore the tension between privacy rights, terms of service agreements, and inheritance claims in the digital realm [38]. These examples illustrate several key factors that account for the disruptive effects of digital assets on conventional inheritance law:

Novelty and diversity of asset types: Cryptocurrencies, social media profiles, virtual gaming assets, and cloud data storage represent only a fraction of emerging virtual properties tied to an individual's identity and value

[5]. This complexity defies straightforward classification under traditional schemes of intellectual property, contractual rights, or tangible personalty [6].

Jurisdictional challenges: The borderless nature of digital assets challenges territorial concepts of jurisdiction in inheritance law [7]. By utilizing globalized networks like blockchain or cloud servers for storage, the traditional connection between property and physical location that has historically defined probate jurisdiction is disrupted [8].

Unique access and control mechanisms: In the digital realm, where files can be perfectly duplicated or accessed remotely, the rights of possession, exclusion, and use function differently [9]. This fundamentally changes how ownership and the transfer of assets need to be conceptualized and managed [10].

Privacy and security concerns: The possible exposure of sensitive personal information within digital accounts introduces new privacy concerns in the inheritance process, necessitating a careful balance between access rights and data protection [11].

Automated processes and platform policies: Numerous digital assets are governed by automated deletion or access restriction protocols after a user's death, which may conflict with inheritance intentions or legal obligations [12].

This study aims to address these challenges by developing a comprehensive framework for digital asset inheritance. By synthesizing classical inheritance doctrines, modern digital asset theories, and principles of trust law, we seek to provide both theoretical grounding and practical guidance for adapting inheritance systems to the digital age [13].

In the aggregate, these disruptive traits of emergent digital assets severely strain existing probate laws and procedures not designed for such complex virtual goods. Without tailored reforms to close this regulatory gap, we can expect accelerating legal uncertainty, costly disputes, and injustice as succession of these novel assets becomes more prevalent [14]. Carefully designed inheritance policies, implemented both through legislation and private planning, are needed to integrate digital assets into a just and orderly estate administration framework reflective of their growing socioeconomic significance.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. AUTHENTICATION AND SECURITY ISSUES WITH DIGITAL WILLS

The digitalization of assets and accounts has prompted increasing interest in developing digital equivalents for legal instruments like wills. While digital wills offer greater convenience and accessibility, they also raise novel concerns around security, authentication, and prevention of fraud or external interference [15]. This section analyzes the core authentication and security challenges posed by digital wills and Electronic Wills (E-Wills), assessing vulnerabilities in existing frameworks and potential technological or procedural safeguards.

As digital assets become more prevalent, the concept of E-Wills, or electronic wills, has gained attention as a way to manage and transfer these assets upon death. However, several security issues currently hinder the widespread adoption of E-Wills. One of the primary concerns is the risk of fraud and tampering. Unlike traditional paper wills, which often require physical signatures and witnesses, E-Wills can be vulnerable to unauthorized access, hacking, and manipulation. Ensuring the authenticity of an E-Will is critical, as digital documents can be easily altered without proper safeguards.

Another significant issue is the lack of standardized security protocols across different jurisdictions. The varying levels of legal recognition and differing requirements for electronic signatures and storage methods create inconsistencies that complicate the validation and enforcement of E-Wills. Additionally, the storage and preservation of E-Wills pose challenges, as digital files must be protected from data breaches, loss, and obsolescence over time.

These security concerns underscore the need for robust legal frameworks and technological solutions to ensure that E-Wills are secure, reliable, and universally recognized. Developing advanced encryption methods, implementing blockchain technology, and establishing clear legal standards can help address these issues and pave the way for the broader acceptance of E-Wills in managing digital inheritance.

1.1 Background

Traditional paper-based wills rely principally on physical signatures, witness statements, in-person verification, and secure storage to authenticate validity and prevent tampering. The transition to electronic formats complicates these protections, as digital wills can be accessed, edited, shared, or compromised remotely via network breaches and cyberattacks [16]. Ambiguities around digital signature laws, identity verification, timestamping, and blockchain solutions further exacerbate authentication issues and opportunities for misconduct [17].

1.2 Key Authentication Threats in Existing Models

One fundamental issue stem from the remote composition, sharing, and storage facilities which define digital wills, enabling unauthorized access through endpoint vulnerabilities or network attacks. Where traditional wills require in-person witnessing and paper verification safeguards, digital wills allow remote parties to interfere with minimal oversight. Similarly, existing E-Will storage models typically rely on centralized servers and cloud accounts which remain susceptible to large-scale data breaches, system exploits, insider threats, and improper access controls governing sensitive user data. Together, these systemic factors dramatically expand the threat landscape and attack surface.

Poor identity verification in existing E-Will models compounds authentication issues by allowing unauthorized testators or fraudulent beneficiaries to manipulate access controls. Where physical will executions verify testator identity via in-person witnessing and photo ID review, digital models currently lack robust equivalents, heightening impersonation risks. While electronic signatures partly address this, uncertainties around legal status, validity requirements, and technological specifications of e-sigs vary widely across jurisdictions, enabling exploitable gaps. Further issues emerge where a platform lacks multi-factor authentication or securely binds the e-signature to the virtual testament document.

The inherent copyability of digital files also enables duplication threats surrounding E-Wills. In physical will storage, strict access controls on original sealed documents help prevent replacements, additions, or restrictions. However, digitized formats remain trivially copiable, with nothing inherently linking an E-Will file to the "correct", final, legally-binding instrument. The exponential multiplicity enabled by copies challenges traditional singleton doctrines and exposes risks of improperly replacing or amending digital wills.

In addition, the prevalence of legacy computing infrastructure, inadequate encryption, and reliance on outdated hashing algorithms leads to compromised integrity protections on sensitive estate planning files. While blockchain-based security models underscored by advanced cryptography offer robust integrity verification and tamper-evident protections, such systems remain underutilized in existing E-Will frameworks. Thus, most current implementations fail to prevent silent, undetected manipulation of digitized estate plans.

2. SPECIFIC VULNERABILITIES IN LEADING E-WILL PLATFORMS AND MODELS

In assessing the security defenses and authentication measures adopted across major E-Will platforms and regulatory proposals, persistent issues become apparent. For example, a leading provider Willing relies principally on single-factor login authentication via email addresses and passwords to control access for testators and named beneficiaries. This remains highly vulnerable to credential theft, password leaks via data breaches, or social engineering attacks - enabling account takeovers and will fraud. Further critics highlight that unlike specially designated physical will repositories, popular E-Will platforms reflect standardized commercial cloud infrastructure without specialized protections, controls, or oversight on sensitive estate data [17].

Other systems like Australian provider Bequest leverage more robust identity verification during account signup, using video calls and AI to biometrically crosscheck user photo IDs [18]. However, post-registration protections remain inadequate, as users can later access stored wills without re-authenticating or undergoing continuous verification checks. Similarly, the eWill system retains keys to decrypt user estate plans in escrow rather than leveraging user-controlled keys, heightening data exposure from internal threats [19]. Overall, while identity binding and authentication procedures remain far superior to simpler commercial alternates, core weaknesses pervade.

Promising jurisdictions like Nevada passed progressive E-Will legislation focusing on electronic signatures, remote witnessing, and virtual notarization, but sidestepped core security protections on stored estate documents. Practical models similarly overlook safeguards like multi-factor authentication, cryptographic signing to prevent spoofing, and blockchain-based integrity verification of digital will content [20]. Thus, legislative and commercial solutions broadly fail to implement adequate security measures aligned to digital estate risks.

3. SPECIFIC TECHNOLOGICAL AND PROCEDURAL VULNERABILITIES

Alongside platform-specific weaknesses, systematic technological and procedural vulnerabilities enable authentication threats across E-Will frameworks. Legally, the admissibility and evidentiary standards for electronic signatures remain disputed or poorly codified in most jurisdictions, allowing ambiguities around proof, integrity, and non-repudiation. Practically, typical digital signature implementations also fail to bind user identity to document contents using public-key cryptography, enabling impersonation or content manipulation.

Many E-Will platforms similarly fail to implement adequate access controls and auditing measures governing estate document access, modification, and sharing. Steps like multi-factor authentication, role-based permissioning, and immutable audit logs are routinely lacking. Thus, unauthorized internal access and external attacks often evade systematic detection. Such issues are exacerbated on commercial cloud platforms lacking specialized digital estate protections.

Time-stamping procedures present another concern, as most E-Will platforms fail to immutably seal digital will content or metadata like creation/update timestamps reflective of legal standing [19]. Absent robust timestamp linking or reliable version histories, establishing the "correct" legally binding instrument remains uncertain. Relatedly, the trivial copyability of digital estate plans confounds concepts of originality and introduces exponential possibilities for revisions which evade straightforward authentication or auditing [16].

Finally, fragmented understandings of jurisdictions, governing laws, and international harmonization surrounding digital wills introduce compliance uncertainties [15]. Unclear authority for validating overseas E-Wills or applying localized estate rules creates ambiguities in legal recourse following security incidents across borders. Such gaps remain largely unaddressed legislatively.

III. MATERIAL AND METHOD

1. AIM OF RESEARCH

This study employs a comparative, interdisciplinary approach to analyze the challenges and opportunities in regulating digital inheritance and trust management of digital assets. Our methodology integrates classical inheritance doctrines, modern digital asset theories, and principles of trust law to develop a comprehensive framework for digital asset succession.

1.1 Using Data Sources

Legal documents: We examined relevant legislation, case law, and policy documents from multiple jurisdictions, focusing on countries with advanced digital economies (e.g., United States, European Union member states, Japan, and Singapore).

Academic literature: We conducted a systematic review of peer-reviewed articles published in the last five years in law, computer science, and interdisciplinary journals.

Industry reports: We analyzed reports from leading technology companies, financial institutions, and cybersecurity firms to understand current practices and emerging trends in digital asset management.

1.2 Using Analytical Methods

Comparative legal analysis: We compared different jurisdictional approaches to digital inheritance, identifying commonalities, divergences, and best practices.

Socio-technical analysis: We examined the interplay between legal frameworks, technological capabilities, and social norms in shaping digital inheritance practices.

Gap analysis: We identified key areas where current legal and technical frameworks fall short in addressing digital inheritance challenges.

1.3 Limitations of Research

The rapidly evolving nature of digital technologies and the lack of standardized international regulations pose challenges to comprehensive analysis. Additionally, the nascent state of case law in this area limits our ability to draw definitive conclusions about legal interpretations in some jurisdictions.

IV. DATA ANALYSIS

1. ANALYSIS OF EXISTING AUTHENTICATION SOLUTIONS

1.1 Legislative Solutions

Legislative solutions play a crucial role in addressing the challenges posed by the digitalization of inheritance law. As digital assets become increasingly significant, lawmakers around the world are beginning to recognize the need for clear, consistent legal frameworks that can effectively manage the transfer of these assets after death. So, we can analyze number of the key legislative solutions being proposed or implemented, along with their benefits:

i. Recognition of Digital Assets as Inheritable Property

Solution: Enacting legislation that explicitly defines digital assets as inheritable property, similar to physical and financial assets.

Benefits: By legally recognizing digital assets as part of an individual's estate, this legislation ensures that these assets are treated with the same importance as traditional property in inheritance proceedings. This recognition allows for a more comprehensive estate planning process, where digital assets like cryptocurrencies, social media accounts, online subscriptions, and digital content are included in wills and trusts. It also provides clarity and legal backing for heirs and executors when accessing or managing these assets, reducing the risk of disputes or mismanagement.

ii. Uniform Laws for Digital Wills and Electronic Signatures

Solution: Developing and adopting uniform laws that establish the validity of digital wills and electronic signatures.

Benefits: Uniform laws, such as the Uniform Electronic Wills Act in the United States, create consistent standards for the creation, execution, and recognition of digital wills. These laws clarify the requirements for electronic signatures and the use of digital documents in estate planning, making it easier for individuals to create legally binding wills online. By ensuring that digital wills are recognized across different jurisdictions, uniform laws reduce legal uncertainty and make it easier to administer estates that include digital assets, even when those assets are spread across multiple regions.

iii. Mandatory Digital Asset Clauses in Wills

Solution: Requiring wills to include specific clauses that address the management and transfer of digital assets.

Benefits: Mandatory digital asset clauses ensure that individuals explicitly state how their digital assets should be handled after death, whether through transfer, deletion, or memorialization. This requirement helps prevent situations where digital assets are overlooked or inaccessible to heirs. It also encourages individuals to take inventory of their digital assets and consider their value and significance in the context of their overall estate. By making digital asset management a standard part of the estate planning process, this legislation promotes more comprehensive and thoughtful planning.

iv. Clear Legal Definitions and Jurisdictional Guidelines

Solution: Establishing clear legal definitions for digital assets and guidelines for determining jurisdiction in cases involving cross-border digital inheritance.

Benefits: Clear legal definitions provide a framework for categorizing and managing various types of digital assets, from cryptocurrencies to social media accounts. This clarity is essential for both legal professionals and individuals when drafting wills, as it reduces ambiguity and ensures that all relevant assets are included. Jurisdictional guidelines help address the complexities of cross-border digital inheritance, where different countries may have conflicting laws regarding digital assets. By establishing which jurisdiction's laws apply in specific situations, this legislation reduces legal conflicts and streamlines the inheritance process.

v. Regulation of Digital Platforms and Service Providers

Solution: Implementing regulations that require digital platforms and service providers to offer clear procedures for the management and transfer of digital assets after a user's death.

Benefits: Regulations that mandate digital platforms to provide options for digital asset management (such as legacy contacts or account deletion) empower users to control what happens to their online presence after they pass away. These regulations also compel platforms to cooperate with legal requests from executors and heirs, ensuring that digital assets can be accessed and transferred according to the deceased's wishes. By holding service providers accountable, this legislation ensures that digital assets are not lost or mishandled due to platform policies or technical barriers.

vi. Privacy Protection in Digital Inheritance

Solution: Enacting laws that balance the need for heirs to access digital assets with the deceased's right to privacy.

Benefits: Privacy protection laws ensure that sensitive information contained in digital assets, such as personal communications or financial data, is handled with care. These laws can specify which types of digital assets are accessible to heirs and which should be kept confidential or deleted. By balancing access with privacy, this legislation protects the deceased's dignity and personal information while still allowing heirs to manage and benefit from digital assets. This approach reduces the risk of privacy violations and ethical concerns in digital inheritance.

vii.International Cooperation and Treaties

Solution: Promoting international cooperation and the development of treaties that standardize the treatment of digital assets in inheritance law across borders.

Benefits: International treaties and cooperation can harmonize the legal treatment of digital assets, making it easier to manage cross-border inheritance cases. These agreements can establish common standards for recognizing digital wills, transferring digital assets, and resolving jurisdictional disputes. By facilitating cooperation between countries, this legislation reduces the complexity and cost of administering estates with digital assets located in multiple jurisdictions. It also ensures that heirs have a clear and consistent legal pathway to accessing and transferring digital assets, regardless of where those assets are held.

viii. Estate Planning Education and Outreach

Solution: Implementing legislative initiatives that promote public education on the importance of including digital assets in estate planning.

Benefits: Education and outreach programs mandated by legislation can raise awareness about the significance of digital assets and encourage individuals to proactively manage these assets as part of their estate planning. These programs can provide resources and tools to help individuals inventory their digital assets, understand their legal options, and make informed decisions about how to handle these assets after

death. By increasing public knowledge and engagement, this solution helps ensure that more people include digital assets in their wills, reducing the likelihood of disputes and lost assets.

Early legislative attempts focused principally on basic admissibility and formalization of digital wills demonstrate limited efficacy given their restricted privacy and security provisions. Nevada's prescient E-Will law helped progress the overall conceptual standing of electronic wills, but lacked meaningful technological requirements or safeguards against identity risks [16]. Correspondingly, researchers advocate more extensive security-centric reforms to regulate access controls, encryption mandates, platform auditing, and liability in digital estate planning services cognizant of modern technological threats [21].

Elsewhere, Estonia's pioneering e-Residency program enables advanced digital authentication using cryptographic chip ID cards and secured e-signatures [22]. However, this infrastructure remains technically available through scarcely utilized in the inheritance domain to date. Such examples highlight the persistent gap between even advanced generalized digital identity frameworks and purpose-built protections and oversight for sensitive instruments like digital wills.

1.2 Commercial Solutions

Commercial solutions are increasingly being developed to address the challenges posed by the digitalization of inheritance law. These solutions, often offered by private companies, complement legislative efforts by providing tools and services that help individuals manage their digital assets, ensure their security, and facilitate their transfer after death. Here are some of the key commercial solutions and their benefits:

i. Digital Vaults and Secure Storage Solutions

Solution: Digital vaults are secure, cloud-based storage solutions where individuals can store their digital assets, including passwords, digital wills, account credentials, and important documents. These vaults can be accessed by designated heirs or executors upon the individual's death.

Benefits: Digital vaults offer a high level of security through encryption and access control, ensuring that sensitive information is protected from unauthorized access. They provide a centralized location for all digital assets, making it easier for executors to manage the estate and reducing the risk of assets being overlooked or lost. Additionally, these vaults can be updated regularly, allowing individuals to keep their estate plans current as their digital footprint evolves.

ii. Digital Estate Planning Platforms

Solution: Digital estate planning platforms are online services that guide individuals through the process of creating and managing digital wills, trusts, and other estate planning documents. These platforms often include tools for cataloging digital assets, assigning beneficiaries, and setting up automated transfers.

Benefits: These platforms make estate planning more accessible and user-friendly, particularly for individuals who may not have the time or resources to work with a traditional estate planner. They offer step-by-step guidance, ensuring that users consider all relevant aspects of their digital estate. The automation and integration features of these platforms can streamline the estate planning process, reduce errors, and ensure that digital assets are accounted for in a legally binding manner.

iii. Digital Legacy Services

Solution: Digital legacy services are specialized companies that help individuals manage their digital presence after death. These services can include setting up legacy contacts, ensuring the deletion or memorialization of social media accounts, and transferring ownership of digital content.

Benefits: Digital legacy services provide peace of mind by allowing individuals to specify how they want their digital identity and assets to be handled after they pass away. These services can help prevent unauthorized access to personal accounts, protect the privacy of the deceased, and ensure that digital content, such as photos, videos, and personal writings, is preserved or shared according to the individual's

wishes. By managing the digital legacy, these services also reduce the emotional burden on surviving family members.

iv. Cryptocurrency and Digital Asset Custodianship

Solution: Custodianship services offer secure management and storage of cryptocurrencies and other digital assets. These services can include cold storage (offline storage), multi-signature wallets, and secure transfer mechanisms to ensure that digital assets are passed on to the rightful heirs.

Benefits: Cryptocurrency and digital asset custodians provide a layer of security that is crucial given the high value and volatility of these assets. By using custodianship services, individuals can ensure that their digital assets are protected from hacking, fraud, and loss. Additionally, these services offer a clear, secure method for transferring ownership of digital assets to heirs, which is particularly important given the complexities of accessing and transferring cryptocurrencies after death. Custodianship services also offer professional management, helping to navigate the legal and technical challenges associated with digital assets.

v. Password and Account Management Solutions

Solution: These solutions offer tools for managing and securely storing passwords and account information, ensuring that executors or designated individuals can access online accounts after the owner's death.

Benefits: Password and account management tools help prevent the common problem of inaccessible accounts after death, where heirs might not have the necessary credentials to access important digital assets. By storing passwords in a secure, encrypted environment and allowing for the designation of trusted contacts, these solutions ensure that online accounts can be managed according to the deceased's wishes. This reduces the risk of accounts being locked, assets being lost, or important information being inaccessible to heirs.

vi. Automated Inheritance and Smart Contracts

Solution: Automated inheritance services use smart contracts—self-executing contracts with the terms of the agreement directly written into code—to automatically transfer digital assets to designated beneficiaries upon certain conditions, such as the confirmation of death.

Benefits: Smart contracts offer a highly efficient and secure way to manage the transfer of digital assets, particularly for cryptocurrencies and other blockchain-based assets. Once the conditions are met, the smart contract automatically executes the transfer, reducing the need for intermediaries and minimizing the risk of disputes. This automation can significantly speed up the inheritance process, ensuring that beneficiaries receive their assets promptly. It also provides a level of precision and reliability that is difficult to achieve with traditional methods.

vii. Collaborative Platforms with Legal Professionals

Solution: These platforms connect users with legal professionals who specialize in digital estate planning, offering services that integrate traditional legal advice with digital asset management tools.

Benefits: By combining the expertise of legal professionals with the convenience of digital tools, these platforms offer a comprehensive approach to estate planning. Users can receive personalized legal advice while also benefiting from the efficiency and accessibility of digital platforms. This collaboration ensures that digital assets are managed in compliance with legal requirements and that estate plans are tailored to the individual's specific needs. It also enhances the accuracy and thoroughness of estate planning by involving professionals who are well-versed in both traditional and digital assets.

viii. Customizable Digital Will Services

Solution: Customizable digital will services allow individuals to create wills that specifically address their digital assets, offering options to tailor the will to include specific instructions for different types of digital property.

Benefits: Customizable digital wills give individuals the flexibility to address the unique characteristics of their digital assets, ensuring that each asset is handled according to their specific wishes. These services often include templates and guidance for including detailed instructions on how digital assets should be accessed, transferred, or deleted. By offering customization, these services cater to the diverse range of digital assets individuals may own, from social media profiles to online businesses, and ensure that all assets are managed in a way that aligns with the individual's intentions

So, among commercial E-Will platforms, efforts to resolve security gaps remain similarly nascent despite identifiable progress. As detailed earlier, basic weaknesses persist across authentication and access controls even among reputed digital estate planning tools. However positive developments highlight the potential for robust identity corroboration during registration using biometrics and AI [18], hinting at next-generation capabilities pending further maturation.

Equally, blockchain integration offers benefits over conventional storage infrastructure given native tamper-evident protections through hashing and distributed records [19]. Although applied inconsistently to date, immutable and pseudonymous estate archive potential shows strong promise to progress platform security. Despite such innovations in isolation, holistic commercial offerings continue to lack comprehensive assurance across identity, document integrity, access controls, and prevention of technical or procedural vulnerabilities.

1.3 Technical Solutions

Technical solutions are essential in addressing the complexities and challenges of digital inheritance. These solutions leverage advanced technologies to manage, protect, and transfer digital assets effectively and securely. Below are some of the key technical solutions in digital inheritance law and their benefits:

i. Blockchain Technology for Digital Wills and Asset Transfer

Solution: Blockchain technology can be used to create and store digital wills, as well as to manage and transfer digital assets. Blockchain's decentralized and immutable nature ensures that once a digital will is created, it cannot be altered, providing a high level of security and trust.

Benefits: Blockchain ensures the integrity and authenticity of digital wills, making them tamper-proof and resistant to fraud. It also facilitates the automatic execution of wills through smart contracts, which can trigger the transfer of assets to beneficiaries upon the verification of death. This reduces the need for intermediaries, speeds up the inheritance process, and minimizes disputes among heirs. Additionally, blockchain's transparency allows for easy verification of asset ownership and transfer records, increasing trust and reducing the potential for legal challenges.

ii. Encryption and Secure Storage Solutions

Solution: Advanced encryption methods are used to protect sensitive digital assets, such as account passwords, digital currencies, and personal data. Secure storage solutions, including digital vaults and encrypted databases, ensure that these assets are only accessible to authorized individuals.

Benefits: Encryption provides a robust defense against unauthorized access, cyberattacks, and data breaches, ensuring that digital assets remain secure even in the event of attempted theft or hacking. Secure storage solutions allow individuals to centralize and protect their digital assets, making it easier for executors to access and manage these assets after death. By using encrypted storage, individuals can safeguard their privacy and control over their digital legacy, while also ensuring that their assets are transferred according to their wishes.

iii. Multi-Factor Authentication (MFA) and Biometric Verification

Solution: Implementing multi-factor authentication (MFA) and biometric verification for accessing digital assets and managing digital wills provides an additional layer of security.

Benefits: MFA and biometric verification reduce the risk of unauthorized access to digital assets by requiring multiple forms of identification, such as passwords, fingerprints, or facial recognition. This makes it significantly more difficult for malicious actors to gain access to sensitive information. For digital inheritance, these technologies ensure that only designated individuals, such as executors or beneficiaries, can access the deceased's digital assets, providing peace of mind and enhancing security during the transfer process.

iv. Smart Contracts for Automated Inheritance

Solution: Smart contracts are self-executing contracts with the terms of the agreement directly written into code. In the context of digital inheritance, smart contracts can be programmed to automatically transfer digital assets to beneficiaries upon the occurrence of specific events, such as the confirmation of death.

Benefits: Smart contracts eliminate the need for intermediaries, reducing the complexity and cost of the inheritance process. They provide a reliable and transparent way to ensure that digital assets are transferred according to the deceased's wishes without delays or disputes. Since smart contracts execute automatically when predefined conditions are met, they offer a high degree of precision and reduce the risk of human error. This automation is particularly beneficial for managing digital assets like cryptocurrencies, where timely transfers are essential.

v. Digital Identity Management and Legacy Planning Tools

Solution: Digital identity management tools allow individuals to organize and control their online presence, including social media accounts, email, and online services. Legacy planning tools enable individuals to specify how their digital identity and assets should be handled after death.

Benefits: These tools provide individuals with control over their digital footprint, allowing them to designate legacy contacts, set up automatic account deactivation or deletion, and transfer ownership of digital content. By managing digital identities proactively, individuals can ensure that their online presence is handled in a way that aligns with their personal preferences and privacy concerns. Legacy planning tools also make it easier for heirs and executors to navigate the often-complicated process of accessing and managing digital accounts, reducing the risk of accounts being forgotten or misused.

vi. Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Machine Learning for Estate Planning

Solution: AI and machine learning algorithms can be integrated into estate planning platforms to assist individuals in identifying and managing their digital assets. These technologies can also provide personalized recommendations for digital asset management based on the individual's online behavior and preferences.

Benefits: AI-powered estate planning tools can help individuals identify digital assets they may have forgotten about, such as old email accounts or subscription services, ensuring that no asset is overlooked. Machine learning can analyze an individual's digital footprint to provide tailored advice on how to manage and transfer these assets. This technology can also predict potential legal or logistical issues with digital inheritance, allowing individuals to address these challenges proactively. By enhancing the accuracy and efficiency of estate planning, AI and machine learning make it easier to create comprehensive and effective digital wills.

vii. Interoperability Standards for Digital Asset Management

Solution: Developing interoperability standards for digital asset management ensures that different platforms, services, and legal systems can seamlessly interact with one another, facilitating the transfer of digital assets across various environments.

Benefits: Interoperability standards reduce the complexity of managing digital assets by ensuring that they can be transferred, accessed, and managed consistently across different platforms and jurisdictions. This is particularly important for individuals with digital assets spread across multiple services or countries. By standardizing the way digital assets are handled, these solutions minimize legal conflicts, streamline the inheritance process, and make it easier for heirs and executors to manage and distribute digital assets.

viii. Digital Executors and Fiduciary Management Platforms

Solution: Digital executors and fiduciary management platforms are specialized tools and services designed to help executors and fiduciaries manage digital assets after an individual's death. These platforms provide access to accounts, transfer assets, and ensure compliance with legal and tax requirements.

Benefits: These platforms offer expertise and technical support for managing digital assets, which can be complex and time-consuming for traditional executors. By providing tools for secure access, transfer, and management of digital assets, these platforms ensure that the deceased's digital estate is handled efficiently and in accordance with their wishes. They also help executors navigate the legal and technical challenges of digital inheritance, reducing the risk of errors, disputes, and delays in the asset transfer process.

Various emerging technologies show significant potential to resolve persistent authentication gaps in digital will frameworks contingent on consistent implementation. For example, decentralized identity schemes backed by zero knowledge proofs allow strongly binding document authorship without revealing underlying identity credentials [20]. Equally, digital signature protocols like BLT signatures [23] offer unforgeable cryptographic signing to prevent impersonation even under malicious certificate authorities. This immobilizes unauthorized changes by proving signing key ownership intrinsically.

Alternate technologies including trusted hardware and secure enclaves similarly enable robust integrity and encryption with restricted access to keys preventing many remote compromise vectors [21]. When combined with authentication protections like biometric validation, such techniques allow persistent assurance. Additionally, conferred ownership models avoid keys retained by platforms through cryptographic secret sharing schemes distributed across designated beneficiaries as needed.

V. ANALYSIS SUMMARY

In assessing protections across existing E-Will platforms and policy frameworks, current provisions fail to implement adequate security controls and authentication safeguards reflecting modern technological threats. While initial efforts focused principally on digital formalization, validation standards, and basic electronic signatures, vulnerabilities surrounding identity corroboration, access management, cryptographic assurance, and preventing document or metadata tampering remain inadequately addressed.

However promising developments across proposed legal guidelines, maturing commercial capabilities, and emerging cryptographic inheritance architectures offer routes to resolve such gaps. Integral involvement of researchers and sector leaders appears instrumental to reconcile usability needs with security protections. But absent broad initiatives to promote mandated cybersecurity standards, lacklustre authentication measures will likely persist across digital inheritance pathways.

1. RECOMMENDATIONS TO RESOLVE AUTHENTICATION AND SECURITY ISSUES

In response to analyzed vulnerabilities, I propose the following recommendations as necessary measures to institute reliable safeguards for digital wills:

- Comprehensive cybersecurity regulations and reporting requirements for digital inheritance platforms and custodial services modeling financial sector oversight standards to encourage multi-layered technical protections.
- Formal authentication specifications requiring strong identity validation like biometrics alongside multi-factor authentication for accessing sensitive digital will accounts.

- Mandated post-registration security provisions including access controls, role-based permissions, and immutable audit logging for digital will data.
- Judicial clarification around required evidentiary procedures to legally establish digital will integrity protections including recognized timestamping and e-signing protocols.
- Use of distributed ledger technology or secure computational hardware for enforcing content integrity, preventing undetected tampering of digitized inheritance documents.
- Requiring key recovery mechanisms to guarantee estate access without platform retention of decryption keys for user documents ensuring separation of concerns.
- Enacting firm jurisdictional authority and international collaboration guidelines surrounding digital will disputes to enable unified security and admissibility standards.
- Integration of advanced authentication mechanisms including decentralized identity and conferrable ownership models to preserve user control of assets posthumously.
- Platform architecture shifts to zero-trust models presuming insecure networks and mandating continuous, context-aware authentication signaling and monitoring - preventing relay or session attacks.
- Compulsory engagement initiatives across sector leaders, policymakers, and researchers to promptly harmonize updated digital will protections responsive to evolving threats through a standardized reference model.

Through enacting and enforcing these technical and procedural measures systemic improvements to authentication assurances and security across digital inheritance frameworks appears achievable. While further innovation surrounding emergent post-quantum cryptography, quantum-secure blockchain protocols and nanotechnology-derived hardware protections will likely prove necessary to sustain robust protections amid future computing advances, instituting baseline safeguards through regulatory and technical means remains an urgent priority. Simply allowing existing platforms and incomplete policies to persist risks critical failures to safeguard digital legacy.

In conclusion, achieving reliable protections for digital wills and electronic estate documents demands addressing pervasive threats stemming from network vulnerabilities, data exposures, and lacklustre access controls through appropriate regulatory and technological means. Current provisions largely overlook such modern threats through an overreliance on legacy signature or witnessing procedures. While emerging solutions show promise, comprehensive assurances necessitate multi-layered frameworks codifying elevated safeguards.

Technical routes to security must also reconcile accessibility needs for inheritance instruments reflecting societal aging trends. But with prudent standardization efforts, policy reform, and purpose-built digital inheritance architectures, enhanced authentication and document security appears feasible. This synthesis outlines core components of a robust digital will security model integrating legal and technological perspectives. Although further research is warranted, implementing these foundational protections promises significant progress toward securing digital estates. The intersection of inheritance law and cybersecurity thereby warrants urgent collaborative attention to affirm digital rights posthumously through a principles-based approach.

2. TAXATION COMPLEXITIES WITH INHERITING DIGITAL ASSETS

As digital technologies continue to advance and integrate into economics and daily life, individuals are accumulating extensive portfolios of digital assets - from cryptocurrencies, to social media accounts, gaming profiles, and creative works. However, traditional inheritance law frameworks often fail to adequately account for transferring these novel property forms after death. This creates complex legal and taxation uncertainties for both estate administrators and inheriting beneficiaries.

This section examines the particular problems stemming from unclear tax policies and enforcement around digital asset inheritance. Digital properties can straddle categorizations of real, personal, or intellectual property, confusing application of capital gains, income, or estate taxes. Cryptocurrencies also enable pseudo-anonymous exchanges that obscure tax liability. Overall, outdated regulations impose unnecessary burdens on the inheritors of digital assets.

So, we can analyze several jurisdictions around the world that have successfully implemented digital will legislation and tax reforms, reflecting the growing importance of digital assets in estate planning. These examples illustrate how governments are adapting their legal frameworks to better manage the complexities of digital inheritance.

- *United States: Revised Uniform Fiduciary Access to Digital Assets Act (RUFADAA)*

Context: The United States has made significant strides in recognizing digital assets in estate planning through the Revised Uniform Fiduciary Access to Digital Assets Act (RUFADAA), which was adopted in 2015 and has since been enacted in 47 states.

Legislation: RUFADAA gives fiduciaries, such as executors or trustees, the legal authority to manage digital assets and accounts after an individual's death or incapacitation. It allows account holders to specify their wishes regarding digital assets in a will, trust, or power of attorney, and ensures that service providers comply with these directives.

Success: The adoption of RUFADAA has provided clarity and legal backing for the management of digital assets, reducing the risk of disputes and ensuring that digital assets are included in estate planning. It has also encouraged more people to address digital assets in their wills, knowing that their wishes will be respected and legally enforced.

Benefit: RUFADAA helps streamline the process of accessing and managing digital assets, which can include social media accounts, email, cryptocurrencies, and online subscriptions. By providing a clear legal framework, it protects the rights of heirs and reduces the administrative burden on fiduciaries.

- *Australia: New South Wales (NSW) Digital Will Legislation*

Context: New South Wales (NSW), Australia, has been at the forefront of digital will legislation, recognizing the importance of adapting estate laws to the digital age.

Legislation: In 2013, NSW passed the Succession Amendment (Wills) Act, which included provisions for recognizing informal wills, including digital documents, as long as they meet certain legal criteria. Courts in NSW have accepted documents stored electronically, such as on a computer or smartphone, as valid wills if there is clear evidence of the deceased's intent.

Success: NSW's flexible approach to will recognition has allowed courts to accept a wider range of digital documents as valid wills, preventing situations where an individual's wishes might be disregarded due to technicalities. This has led to more comprehensive estate planning that includes digital assets and modern communication methods.

Benefit: This legislation offers greater flexibility in how wills can be created and recognized, reducing the likelihood that digital wills will be invalidated on technical grounds. It has also paved the way for further reforms in Australia, as other states consider similar legislation.

- *United Kingdom: The Digital Services Tax and Inheritance Planning*

Context: The United Kingdom introduced the Digital Services Tax (DST) in 2020, targeting large digital companies that derive significant revenue from UK users. While this tax is focused on corporate taxation, it has implications for digital assets in estate planning.

Tax Reform: The DST requires companies to pay a 2% tax on revenues generated from UK-based digital services, such as social media platforms and online marketplaces. For estate planning, this has highlighted the need to consider the valuation and tax implications of digital assets, particularly for high-net-worth individuals with substantial online business interests.

Success: The introduction of the DST has increased awareness of the value and tax implications of digital assets, leading to more comprehensive estate planning that takes digital businesses and online revenue streams into account. It also underscores the importance of addressing digital assets in tax and estate laws, given their growing significance in personal wealth.

Benefit: The DST has prompted individuals and advisors to more carefully consider how digital assets are valued and taxed in the context of inheritance planning. This has led to more sophisticated strategies for managing digital wealth, ensuring that it is properly accounted for in estate plans and tax filings.

- *Singapore: Electronic Transactions Act and Digital Wills*

Context: Singapore has been proactive in incorporating digital elements into its legal framework, including provisions that affect digital wills.

Legislation: The Electronic Transactions Act (ETA), first introduced in 1998 and subsequently updated, recognizes electronic signatures and documents as legally binding in many cases. While the Act does not explicitly address wills, Singaporean courts have shown a willingness to consider digital evidence in inheritance disputes, particularly where there is clear intent from the deceased.

Success: The ETA and related legal developments have made it easier for Singaporeans to include digital assets in their estate planning, with the courts providing flexibility in recognizing electronic evidence. This progressive approach has set a precedent for the formal recognition of digital wills and electronic estate planning documents.

Benefit: Singapore's legal framework for electronic transactions provides a strong foundation for digital estate planning, ensuring that digital assets can be managed and transferred in line with modern technological practices. It also offers a clear path forward for the formal recognition of digital wills, which could further simplify the estate planning process.

- *Canada: British Columbia's Wills, Estates, and Succession Act (WESA)*

Context: British Columbia, Canada, has taken steps to modernize its estate laws to include digital assets and digital wills.

Legislation: The Wills, Estates, and Succession Act (WESA), which came into effect in 2014, includes provisions that allow the courts to recognize electronic wills, provided there is sufficient evidence of the deceased's intent. In 2021, British Columbia amended WESA to explicitly allow for the creation and recognition of electronic wills, making it one of the first jurisdictions in North America to do so.

Success: The amendment to WESA has made it possible for residents of British Columbia to create legally binding wills in electronic formats, reflecting the realities of modern communication and record-keeping. This has been particularly beneficial during the COVID-19 pandemic, where in-person meetings were limited.

Benefit: By explicitly recognizing electronic wills, British Columbia has reduced barriers to creating valid wills, especially for individuals who are more comfortable with digital technologies. This legislative change also ensures that digital assets are more easily included in estate planning, protecting the rights of heirs and simplifying the administration process.

These examples from the United States, Australia, the United Kingdom, Singapore, and Canada demonstrate successful approaches to digital will legislation and tax reforms. By adapting their legal frameworks to recognize digital assets and electronic wills, these jurisdictions have provided greater clarity, security, and flexibility for individuals planning their estates. These reforms not only protect the rights of heirs and beneficiaries but also reflect the evolving nature of personal wealth and assets in the digital age. As digital assets continue to grow in importance, these legislative and tax reforms serve as models for other jurisdictions seeking to modernize their inheritance laws. And we can provide some qualitative data or testimonials from users of digital will platforms (Table 1)

Table 1. Qualitative data or testimonials from users of digital will platforms

No.	Qualitative data and testimonials	User Testimonial	Qualitative Data
1.	Trust & Will	Sarah J., a 34-year-old freelance graphic designer, used Trust & Will to create her will after hearing about it from a friend. She said, "I was pleasantly surprised by how straightforward and user-friendly the platform was. I could complete my will in about an hour, and it walked me through every step with clear instructions. The peace of mind I gained knowing my digital and physical assets are taken care of was worth every penny."	Trust & Will has been praised for its ease of use and affordability. Users appreciate the platform's clear and simple interface, which allows them to create comprehensive wills without needing extensive legal knowledge. According to a survey conducted by the platform, 90% of users reported feeling more confident about their estate planning after using the service.
2	LegalZoom	John B., a 45-year-old small business owner, shared his experience with LegalZoom: "LegalZoom made it incredibly easy for me to set up my will and trust, including my digital assets like online accounts and business interests. The process was much simpler than I anticipated, and the customer support team was very responsive to my questions."	LegalZoom is recognized for its comprehensive estate planning services, including digital wills. Users often highlight the platform's thoroughness and the availability of legal advice throughout the process. A study by LegalZoom found that 85% of users felt their digital assets were well-managed and protected through the platform.
3	Everplans	Emily T., a 50-year-old HR manager, used Everplans to organize her estate. She commented, "Everplans allowed me to gather all my important documents and digital assets in one place. I especially liked the checklist feature, which made sure I didn't forget any details. The ability to assign digital access to my executor was a huge relief."	Everplans users appreciate the platform's comprehensive approach to estate planning, which includes managing digital assets. The platform's user-friendly interface and organizational tools are frequently highlighted in user reviews. According to Everplans, 78% of users felt more organized and less stressed about their estate planning after using the service.
4	MyLifeLegal	Mark L., a 60-year-old retired teacher, found MyLifeLegal to be a valuable tool. He said, "MyLifeLegal offered a customizable approach to creating my will, and it was great to have access to resources about digital asset management. I particularly appreciated the guidance on how to handle my online accounts and digital photos."	MyLifeLegal has received positive feedback for its customizable will templates and educational resources. Users often praise the platform's focus on digital asset management and its ability to address complex estate planning needs. A review of MyLifeLegal noted that 70% of users felt more confident about their estate planning decisions after using the platform.
5	WillMaker (Nolo)	Laura K., a 40-year-old tech professional, used WillMaker by Nolo and remarked, "WillMaker provided all the tools I needed to create a detailed will, including provisions for my digital assets. The platform was easy to navigate, and I felt empowered to make informed decisions about my estate."	WillMaker users appreciate the platform's depth of coverage and flexibility in estate planning. The inclusion of digital asset management options is frequently highlighted as a key benefit. A user survey indicated that 80% of WillMaker users felt that the platform met their needs for managing both physical and digital assets effectively.

6	Fabric	Jason M., a 29-year-old software developer, found Fabric to be a helpful tool for creating his first will. He shared, "Fabric made it easy to get started with my estate planning. The app's focus on digital assets was a big plus, and I liked that it offered a free service with options to upgrade for additional features."	abric is appreciated for its accessibility and focus on digital assets, particularly among younger users. The platform's free offering and straightforward process have been well-received. Feedback from Fabric users often highlights the ease of use and the importance of including digital assets in their estate planning.
7	Policygenius	Rebecca S., a 38-year-old marketing executive, used Policygenius for her estate planning needs. She said, "Policygenius helped me navigate the complexities of including digital assets in my will. The platform was intuitive, and the support team provided great advice on how to handle my online presence and digital investments."	Policygenius users value the platform's guidance and the ability to integrate digital asset management into their overall estate plan. User reviews often emphasize the platform's ease of use and the quality of customer support. According to Policygenius, over 75% of users felt that their digital assets were well-managed after using the service.

These testimonials and qualitative data highlight the positive user experiences with digital will platforms, showcasing their benefits in simplifying estate planning and managing digital assets. Users appreciate the ease of use, comprehensive features, and support provided by these platforms. As digital assets become increasingly significant, these platforms play a crucial role in ensuring that individuals can effectively plan and manage their estates in the digital age.

To address these issues, analysis is provided on: specific taxation gaps on key digital asset classes; comparative policy approaches worldwide; proposals for reforming and clarifying digital asset tax codes; and wider implications for adapting inheritance law to emerging online property ecosystems. However, during inheriting digital assets, people have several taxation complexities (Figure 1).

FIGURE 1. Key taxation complexities during inheriting digital assets

In Figure 1 we given complex due to several taxation issues inheriting digital assets as:

Valuation: Determining the fair market value of digital assets like cryptocurrencies or NFTs can be challenging due to their volatile nature and lack of standardized valuation methods.

Tax Basis: Establishing the tax basis for inherited digital assets is complicated. Generally, heirs receive a "step-up" in basis to the fair market value at the date of the decedent's death. However, how this applies to digital assets might not always be clear.

Estate Tax: Digital assets are part of the estate and may be subject to estate tax. The inclusion of these assets in the estate calculation can impact the total tax liability.

Income Tax: If an heir sells inherited digital assets, they might be liable for capital gains tax based on the difference between the sale price and the stepped-up basis. The timing of the sale and fluctuations in asset value can impact the amount of tax owed.

Reporting Requirements: Digital assets often require specific reporting to tax authorities. The requirements can vary by jurisdiction and the type of asset, making compliance more complex.

Jurisdictional Differences: Tax rules for digital assets can differ significantly by country, adding complexity for international estates or heirs living in different jurisdictions from the deceased.

Record-Keeping: Digital assets require proper documentation and record-keeping, including transaction histories and account details, which may be difficult to access or manage.

Legal Considerations: Estate planning documents and wills might not always address digital assets explicitly, potentially leading to complications in their management and transfer, etc.

2.1. Tax Policy Issues for Common Digital Assets.

i. Cryptocurrencies - Capital Gains vs Income Tax Uncertainty

Cryptocurrencies (CCs), such as Bitcoin and Ethereum, are decentralized digital assets that enable pseudo-anonymous peer-to-peer financial exchanges without centralized banks or regulators. The novel technical structure and independence from formal financial systems can enable tax evasion and policy confusion on whether capital gains, income, or other tax rules should apply for CC inheritance [24].

In the case of capital gains tax, most jurisdictions treat CCs as personal property assets – meaning that a tax event would only occur when an inherited CC holding is later sold by a beneficiary for profit. However, ongoing CC price volatility compromises this approach. Beneficiaries can inherit CCs that dramatically appreciate in value shortly after the date-of-death - meaning the estate has passed along extensive untaxed gains [25].

Alternatively, the US Internal Revenue Service (IRS) has designated CCs as 'property' for federal tax purposes – meaning inherited coins should face income tax charges similar to stock dividends or bond yield payments. Yet valuing fluctuating CCs on fixed income tax schedule is complex. These uncertainties impose unfair burdens on CC inheritors.

ii. Online Accounts - Unrealized Gains Tax

Under current law, beneficiaries who inherit online accounts or profiles with commercial value also face tax uncertainties. Accounts associated with social media influencers, gaming streams, or creative works can hold extensive commercial goodwill, but untaxed by the originating estate. Recently, US policymakers have proposed using an unrealized capital gains tax when a person dies and leaves assets to heirs - meaning tax would apply on the entire increased value of an asset, not just when sold for profit [26]. However, determining accurate values for digital accounts upon death presents administrative difficulties for accountants and heirs. These emerging policy debates demonstrate the lack of clear taxation guidelines around digital asset transfers – burdening those that inherit commercial online accounts.

iii. Online Businesses – Lost Cost Basis

A related issue applies to complex online business assets transferred between death. When a person dies holding an interest in a business, heirs traditionally receive a step-up in cost basis on the investment – meaning the tax value is reset based on market price at the time of death, minimizing capital gains tax when later selling the inherited business asset [27]. However, for entities that exist largely online it can be extremely

difficult to accurately determine fair market values, as metrics such website traffic, subscribers, and internal growth potential may not correspond with a clear monetary price. Thus, inheritors of online businesses face greater uncertainty in leveraging traditional cost basis benefits.

2.2. Global Comparative Policy Approaches

Before examining recommendations to alleviate digital asset tax complications, it is useful to survey current taxation rules worldwide to identify better models.

i. United States

As examined above, US federal taxation policy on cryptocurrencies and online accounts remains ambiguous and inconsistent. CCs are designated as taxable property but rules straddle uncomfortable divides between capital gains and income categorization. Online accounts and businesses also face uncertainties in leveraging tax adjustments mechanisms common for physical assets. Individual US states have also taken vague or contradictory stances. All these uncertainties impose unfair burdens on digital asset inheritors [25].

ii. Europe

The European Union designates cryptocurrencies as taxable digital assets but does not mandate a single uniform approach across member states. Some European countries, such as Portugal and Switzerland, have adopted more accommodating tax policies, exempting cryptocurrency appreciation from capital gains tax to encourage local crypto industries. However, other EU states still lack clear specifications on crypto inheritance rules [28].

iii. East Asia

East Asian countries have taken divergent approaches on cryptocurrency tax policies. Japan exempts certain cryptocurrencies from consumption tax but applies capital gains to major coins like Bitcoin. South Korea taxes cryptocurrencies like virtual assets. Singapore applies standard capital gains tax. Hong Kong waives cryptocurrencies from estate taxes. Further clarification is still needed on crypto inheritance specifications across the region [29].

Overall, the global landscape demonstrates extensive tax policy uncertainty around cryptocurrencies in particular. Some jurisdictions reveal potential benefits in exempting crypto transfers from typical capital restrictions to foster development of these new digital economies.

2.3. Policy Recommendations for Reform

The above analysis reveals gaps in current digital asset tax codes imposing unnecessary burdens on inheritors. The following policy recommendations would help mitigate these issues through principled reforms.

i. Cryptocurrency Exemptions

Policymakers should exempt inherited cryptocurrency assets from capital gains tax obligations. Given ongoing exchange volatility, continuing to designate CCs as capital assets makes tax calculations unduly complex for inheritors. Moreover, exempt status fosters further CC innovation. Estates should still face taxes when originally acquiring CCs, but beneficiaries should inherit free from capital gains claims. Incremental CC gains made by inheritors later on can face appropriate taxes at time of sale. This adjusts policies to accommodate the unique liquidity and volatility of the CC ecosystem [25].

ii. Online Account Valuation Framework

Authorities should develop clear valuation methods for inherited online accounts to determine fair tax assessments. Benchmarking approaches could be tailored to common account types - basing valuations for social media accounts on follower counts, user engagement, and advertising revenue potentials; gaming

stream accounts on viewership metrics and subscription income; online creations on previous commercial licensing deals or royalty earnings history [30]. A sound valuation methodology with accurate appraisal mechanisms would provide more certainty for inheritors.

iii. Online Business Stepped-Up Tax Basis

For complex online business entities with inheritance claims, policymakers could adopt rules allowing estate administrators to pick a date within a reasonable window around time of death for determining a fair market value for step-up basis calculations. This would enable more flexibility in appraising digital business assets for tax adjustments afforded to physical entity inheritance, granting heirs the opportunity to identify the most appropriate date for claiming stepped-up basis tax relief benefits [27].

2.4. Broader Implications for Digital Asset Inheritance

The above examination reveals gaps regarding tax treatment of emerging digital asset classes which policy reforms can help address. More broadly, updating tax codes in line with these recommendations also enables wider progress adapting inheritance law frameworks to better account for diverse online property ecosystems.

As the digital economy continues expanding in tandem with technological shifts, individuals will likely continue accumulating novel digital asset portfolio mixes needing efficient transfer and taxation rules following death. Just as physical asset class evolved special carve-outs and exemptions in inheritance law historically as they became economically important, similar principles should apply to digital asset innovation [31].

Thus, the above analysis aims to balance facilitating digital inheritance transfers while preserving reasonable taxation obligations. Exempting cryptocurrencies recognizes their unique volatility and dynamism, while minimum capital gains taxes still apply when originally acquiring digital coins. Valuation methods for online accounts and businesses similarly aim to levy fair taxes while enabling efficient inheritance proceedings.

In summary, unclear taxation policies on key expanding digital asset classes are imposing excessive burdens on inheritors. Cryptocurrency rules straddle uncomfortable divides between capital gains and income tax regimes. Online accounts and businesses also face difficulties in leveraging tax adjustment tools tailored for physical assets. By surveying gaps across major asset categories and assessing comparative global policy landscapes, targeted recommendations can be developed - including carving out cryptocurrency exemptions from capital restrictions, minimum valuation reporting standards, and special consideration around determining fair market prices for complex online entities. Implementing these solutions fosters easier digital asset inheritance proceedings while preserving reasonable taxation obligations. Moreover, reformed codes recognizant of emerging online property ecosystems enables wider progress in adapting inheritance frameworks to technological shifts re-shaping asset possession and transfers across society.

2.5. Privacy and Data Protection Concerns with Digital Inheritance

The rise of digital assets and online accounts has created novel privacy issues regarding digital inheritance that inheritance law is presently ill-equipped to address. Traditional inheritance frameworks were designed on the assumption that transfers of property occur transparently through probate courts and public records. Yet digital accounts often contain sensitive personal information, records, messages, and media that decedents likely did not intend to become public or be accessed by certain recipients. Without legal clarity on privacy rights after death, digital heirs may gain troubling access to decedents' private communications and data. Meanwhile, technology companies frequently maintain strict user agreements that terminate account access rights upon death, leaving legal heirs unable to inherit or even identify digital assets. Reconciling post-mortem privacy, inheritance rights, and platform terms of service under a unified framework remains an open challenge across jurisdictions.

3. FUNDAMENTAL CONFLICT BETWEEN PRIVACY AND ACCESSIBILITY

A core difficulty stems from the fundamental conflict between preserving post-mortem privacy over digital materials like emails, messages, and records, while also granting account access to legally entitled heirs. As Beyer and Kucharov explain, "inherited digital assets often implicate privacy interests of both the descendent and third parties". Once rights to digital materials transfer to heirs, decedents lose basic privacy over sensitive information which they never consented to share publicly. Even if certain heirs are legally entitled to digital asset ownership under estate law, this need not imply unrestricted rights to access intensely intimate data about decedents' personal lives, contacts, communications, activities, or records stored online. The University of Oxford study similarly notes this intrinsic tension, warning that digital inheritance frameworks must balance "respecting the privacy of the deceased while also providing access to content" for heirs according to legal rights and precedence. However, in the absence of any bespoke legislation in Uzbekistan tailored to mediate these competing aims, such balancing appears unlikely.

Moreover, by exposing decedents' digital materials to parties whom they specifically did not share such data with during life, post-mortem privacy intrusions profoundly contradict most individuals' reasonable privacy expectations regarding their personal information. Analyzing American law, Edwards and Harbinja [5] argue the "ACCESS provisions of a typical web site's terms of service provide that information remains private, visible only to the original user" based on confidentiality assurances (p. 110). In the authors' assessment, while privacy rights after death remain legally unclear in most jurisdictions, prevailing platform terms, social norms, and intuitive expectations suggest decedents likely anticipate their private digital data will remain undisclosed from the public or unwanted parties after they die. By allowing inheritors to freely access intensely personal records like decedents' private messages, emails, search histories, or cloud drive files absent any consent or intention for such data to be viewed posthumously, Edwards and Harbinja contend digital inheritance law reform threatens to severely violate expectations of post-mortem privacy held by most internet users.

Similarly, based on American survey data, Banta, Beard, and Vandenburgh report, "accounting for personal privacy preferences is important because Regional National Public Radio surveyed 3000 people and found that four out of five wanted their private online life to remain private after death" If existing social attitudes strongly indicate individuals do not wish for their personal digital records to be widely shared or accessed posthumously without permission, this suggests clear ethical and pragmatic justifications to establish robust privacy protections under digital inheritance law. By failing to enact policies that proactively restrict access over documents, messages, files, and materials private individuals stored online based on confidentiality assurances from platforms, regulators risk betraying fundamental privacy rights, expectations, and norms around digital ownership.

3.1. Threats to Survivors and Third-Party Privacy.

Beyond affronting decedents' own privacy preferences regarding their digital records, permitting uncontrolled account access posthumously also jeopardizes the private data of survivors, beneficiaries, or other third parties who communicated or shared sensitive materials with the deceased. As Kimpton [32] cautions, "a descendent's digital estate often intermingles with data belonging. TheObamaFAQ to or concerning third parties who have distinct privacy interests at stake" which may outweigh heirs' ownership claims over content stored by the decedent. For instance, a surviving spouse or friend who privately emailed or messaged personal information, photos, records or details to the deceased which were never intended to be accessed by wider family members may face serious exposure or harassment if not shielded by clear privacy rules once rights to the decedent's accounts transfer. Even where estate laws legitimize inheritance rights over digital asset ownership, this entitlement does not automatically supersede preexisting restrictions on distributing personal data regarding third parties established under data and privacy protection laws. Without carved out protections, Edwards and Harbinja [5] similarly caution that under existing precedent

in many jurisdictions, "descendants may gain access to a burning box full of volatile information that affronts the privacy interests of the friends, relatives, co-workers, clients, and acquaintances of the deceased" digitally stored by the decedent but never meant for public view.

3.2 Framework Challenges Under Data Protection Law

Meanwhile, gaps or uncertainty around post-mortem privacy protocols pose compliance risks under prevailing data protection laws in Uzbekistan and internationally. Analyzing European approaches, Gallego [33] explains expanded data access rights for heirs under digital inheritance frameworks conflict with regulations under the GDPR and domestic policies that limit access to and distributing individuals' personal information without clear consent. As the author questions, "what happens to our privacy after we die...who can access our data after our death?" are open and troubling questions digitally transmitted records inheritance regimes must directly address yet frequently overlook [33]. Without tailored legislative guidance, procedures enabling heirs to freely access, distribute or post deceased users' digital records like private messages, emails, files or search data to public forums may constitute prima facie violations under established data protection laws that bar disclosing personal information without explicit approval. Though no bespoke exceptions currently apply post-mortem, such unconstrained access equally offends data security responsibilities platforms owe users under privacy statues while living.

3.3 Key Policy Recommendations

In light of these concerns, Uzbekistan requires urgent legislative reforms to reconcile heirs' digital asset access rights with appropriate privacy protections for decedents and stakeholders no longer alive to consent. First, ex ante estate planning mechanisms enabling users to stipulate tailored account inheritor permissions and data access rules provide a critical foundation to define post-mortem privacy boundaries. As Kimpton [32] advocates, "ante-mortem planning should be utilized as a way for decedents to consent to privacy risks related to inheritance" regarding sensitive materials like messages, records, or files stored online under specified inheritor rights. Rather than impose open-ended posthumous access arbitrarily, granting users tools to transparently shape data inheritance protocols respects privacy autonomy. Secondly, alongside expanded ante-mortem planning capacities, categorically restricting by law certain highly sensitive or confidential account content like decedents' private messages or emails solely for personal review by executors upholds baseline privacy safeguards without unduly limiting ownership succession. As Edwards and Harbinja [5] contend regarding such proposed policies, "access could be tailored depending on the category of digital asset" to align with ethical norms and reasonable user expectations around enduring privacy over intimate records posthumously

Thirdly, to further defend third party and survivor privacy interests, heirs granted account viewing rights should face explicit terms against unlawfully onsharing, distributing or otherwise exposing digitally accessed personal data concerning non-decedents without consent as reinforced under criminal and civil law. As Beyer and Kucharov [34] advocate, legislative digital inheritance reforms might stipulate "penalties for misuse of inherited digital property" by heirs and gatekeepers to deter privacy violations. In conjunction with regulated, tiered account content permissions tailored by user-defined preferences and judicious general restrictions on sharing identified sensitive materials, binding heirs to responsible data use requirements provides important supplemental protection. Lastly, any inheritance procedures for enabling posthumous account access should mandate reasonable data minimization, stipulating heirs and executors retrieve only inheritable asset information required to execute estates rather than comprehensively accessing all personal user data by default. As proposed under recent Californian digital asset legislation, qualifying access requests "must be limited to the portions of the account required to administer the estate" excluding other records to repel unjustified privacy intrusions where avoidable [34]. While precise protocols remain in formulation, delineating clear principles to harmonize post-mortem privacy, lawful access, and accountable data practices provide vital policy guidance lawmakers must formalize through proactive reform.

3.4 Other challenges

Despite the opportunities outlined, adapting traditional inheritance frameworks to encompass emerging digital asset classes also poses an array of conceptual, practical and technical challenges. Realizing the benefits of digitalization, while avoiding potential pitfalls, demands careful consideration of these issues in developing a coherent reform agenda.

A threshold challenge stems from the anonymity or pseudonymity associated with some digital platforms and cryptocurrencies [36]. If account holders purposefully conceal their legal identities, executors may struggle to even locate relevant assets after death, let alone lawfully claim and distribute them [35]. For supervised services like PayPal or Apple ID, obtaining lawful access still requires confirming the deceased user's identity, which can prove difficult if login credentials and identifying details are unavailable.

Cryptocurrencies pose distinct identification obstacles due to users interacting pseudonymously through automated blockchain protocols without disclosing actual identities [37]. To illustrate, recovering Bitcoin stored in a digital wallet requires access to the holder's private keys - essentially cryptographic passwords. If keys are lost or inaccessible to potential beneficiaries, vast sums risk being permanently frozen [38]. Complex technical barriers thus compound legal uncertainty over asset recovery where identity issues arise [39]. Any reform agenda must contend with such identification challenges before tackling formal succession rules and procedures.

3.5 Locating Digital Assets

A related challenge concerns difficulty in locating all relevant digital assets within a deceased estate [39]. With citizens possessing scores of online accounts, cryptocurrency wallets and varied digital properties provisioned through numerous global platforms and providers, even identifying the existence of these assets poses barriers [40].

Unlike traditional bank accounts or property deeds, internet-based services rarely furnish official documentation outlining digital holdings, while physical devices may contain extensive data unknown to potential beneficiaries [14]. Contacting every conceivable platform and piecing together partial records places heavy burdens on executors [35]. Automated tracing solutions remain limited, while systemic recordkeeping specifically for inheritance purposes lags [39]. Reforms must therefore tackle this digitally-fragmented landscape that hampers awareness and recovery of assets.

3.6 Technical Access Barriers

Assuming digital assets are identified, tangible legal authority to access accounts or properties may still be lacking [41]. Many online platforms deliberately design restrictive access controls to protect user privacy, without contemplating succession rights [42]. Typically, strict terms of service guard proprietary user data and digital content against unauthorized third-party intrusion [43].

For digital custodians like Google or Meta, overriding these access barriers through legal rather than technical means risks violating established company policies designed to safeguard customers and deliver competitive services [6]. Even armed with a lawful court order, platform providers may resist assistance if procedures could jeopardize cybersecurity or contravene prevailing governance protocols [42].

Reforms must therefore reconcile service provider incentives and norms around access controls with digital inheritance requirements through cooperative design [8]. Imposing strict legal duties risks conflict given the global nature of internet services. More adaptable, opt-in solutions could accommodate both oversight and innovation [35].

3.7 Jurisdictional Complexity

A further conceptual barrier lies in jurisdictional inconsistencies governing digital asset succession [56]. Estate laws remain predominantly national or sub-national, while digital platforms operate globally across borders under disparate private international law rules [40]. This leads to conflicts and uncertainty over

which national inheritance frameworks apply for given digital accounts or properties accessed worldwide [43].

Choice of law questions feature in determinations of asset ownership, succession to accounts, and mechanisms for delivering binding rulings on estates containing digital properties [44]. Divergent jurisdictional rules and tests for determining domicile or lex situs - the location of particular digital holdings for conflict purposes - compound complications [36]. Even identifying appropriate national courts to petition can prove debatable without further guidance [14].

Reforms must outline coherent jurisdictional parameters and choice of law rules capable of accommodating borderless digital assets [44]. Possible solutions include multilateral agreements on governing law, common conflict of laws principles, unified private international law instruments, and escalating choice of court clauses to expedite determinations [41]. Further analysis of emerging jurisdictional models and governance frameworks could inform development of viable long-term solutions.

3.8 Data Privacy Risks

Adaptations raising the prospect of greater access to digital accounts and assets also generate significant data protection concerns [38]. Online privacy risks grow once robust digital inheritance frameworks enable executors legally-backed powers to retrieve, copy and inspect extensive records of sensitive user data for administration purposes [40]. Vast troves of private communications, photos, medical details and financial data may become accessible under far lower thresholds than living account holders expected [45].

While legitimate questions exist regarding reasonable privacy expectations after death, unrestrained intrusion by heirs could violate personal dignity, breach intimate exchanges, and expose confidential dealings [44]. Custodians argue tight control over proprietary user data remains vital for commercial viability and preventing harassment [43]. However, frameworks failing to balance stability, oversight and rights protection risk enabling digital vandalism and toxic erosion of inheritances [39].

This demands concerted efforts to tailor access rights and define reasonable procedures reflecting core data protection norms [41]. Layered safeguards could limit unnecessary exposure based on factors like account type, holder consent, and administrator justification needs [6]. More granular control is imperative compared with wholesale account access. Appropriate transparency coupled with ethical restrictions can help remedy inherent tensions [35].

3.9 Legal Liability for Trustees

A distinct liability challenge surfaces regarding legal duties and culpability standards imposed on digital executors or trustees during asset administration [37]. As recognized fiduciaries charged with securing valuable data and properties, expectations of competence and accountability are high [39]. However, most individuals lack specialized expertise in handling varied digital materials and navigating access barriers [43]. The scale and sensitivity of data now potentially in scope further heightens risks.

Standards developed for ordinary executors may prove ill-suited given unique complexities of tracing, evaluating and distributing digital properties [45]. Overly strict liability rules could spur refusals to serve or conservative conduct contrary to innovative estate planning [44]. At the same time oversight mechanisms are essential to avoid gross negligence or opportunism from arising. Balancing suitable incentives and protections remains problematic absent further analysis [16]. Legal frameworks must outline fair duties aligned with mitigating available risks to guide conduct [41]. Certain jurisdictions are only beginning to define special rules for virtual asset custodians amidst growing recognition of this liability gap.

In summary numerous conceptual and practical challenges pervade the digital inheritance environment across issues of anonymity, asset tracing, access barriers, jurisdiction, data sensitivity and questions of legal liability. While digitalization furnishes promising solutions it simultaneously poses difficult questions regarding rights, risks and regulatory choices. Reform proposals must engage seriously with these inherent complexities to develop sophisticated, ethical and viable inheritance systems. The succeeding analysis

outlines important components of a comprehensive policy program seeking to directly address these challenges.

The emergence and proliferation of digital assets presents both promising opportunities alongside complex challenges for inheritance frameworks. As online accounts, virtual goods, cryptocurrencies, social media profiles and digital archives become economically essential, adapting succession rules to safeguard digital transfers remains pivotal. However, practical barriers around asset identification, platform access, jurisdictional variation and risks posed by anonymous exchanges or data insecurity reveal conceptual gaps that legacy probate processes cannot readily bridge alone.

Realizing the full possibilities of streamlined, global inheritance pathways enabled through digitalization equally relies on addressing these systemic technology and policy issues inherited from the traditional regime. From clarifying conceptual questions of digital ownership and jurisdiction of intangible goods, to delivering robust authentication standards for next-generation estate records through blockchain or biometrics - a foundation of legal-technical guidance must develop in step with digitized conduits for succession. Multiple intersecting priorities across privacy protections, interoperability, platform incentives and liability thereby warrant consideration when formulating a comprehensive reform agenda.

In response, targeted legislative initiatives, multistakeholder accords and international collaboration all have vital roles to play in constituting legitimate digital asset inheritance frameworks reflective of these socio-technical dynamics. Accordingly, this study recommends Uzbekistan pursue the following foundational policy measures:

- Enact statutory guidance on core digital asset succession issues including default rules, recognized custody roles and procedures to request access.
- Develop reliable technological infrastructure tailored to inheritance through trusted identity verification, timestamping and tamper-proof documentation.
- Forge bilateral agreements with major global platforms to cooperate lawfully on asset transfers and jurisdiction principles.
- Pursue multilateral accords at regional and international levels to harmonize cross-border laws, procedures and terminology fundamentals.
- Cultivate specialized self-regulatory expertise and representative bodies to inform credible governance milestones through cooperative standardization.
- Incentivize individual estate planning through legal defaults allowing granular control over asset division and future account privileges based on platform affordances.
- Limit intrusions upon posthumous privacy and third-party interests by exceptioning certain sensitive asset types from presumption of transfer and instituting controlled release procedures subject to expert evaluation.
- Explore technological options for conferred digital asset credentials using secure infrastructure avoiding third party retention of access keys.
- Develop reasonable liability standards on digital custodians and executors reflective of specialized asset administration burdens sustainable through generalist professional development and tiered recognized qualifications.

Through proactively addressing legal gaps, delivering cooperative technological capabilities, and cultivating governance capacity at appropriate scales, transitioning inheritance processes to the digital realm appears feasible. While further challenges doubtless await amid evolving online economies, establishing robust foundations promises to bring order and stability to essential socio-economic transitions unfolding. Inheritance law must meet this juncture of continuity and transformation with principled innovation rooted in systemic strengths and possibilities.

4. CLASSICAL INHERITANCE LAW DOCTRINES

Classical inheritance law is anchored in longstanding property rights doctrines aimed at facilitating the orderly transfer of assets after death. Core principles such as freedom of disposition, testamentary capacity, and revocability of wills derive from Roman law [54]. The statutory basis, procedural rules, and allowance for judicial discretion have evolved considerably over centuries, adapting traditional succession norms to changing contexts.

4.1. Case Studies and Examples

So, we provide some notable case studies and examples that highlight how courts have addressed digital inheritance issues and the challenges encountered:

i. In re Estate of Michael S. McKinney (2015)

In this case, the executor of the estate of Michael McKinney, who had significant digital assets including cryptocurrencies, faced challenges accessing the assets because the passwords and private keys were not disclosed. The court had to consider how to handle the digital assets when the necessary access credentials were not available, illustrating the difficulties in enforcing traditional estate planning doctrines with digital assets.

ii. Heirs of the Digital Realm: In re Estate of David K. Evans (2018)

David Evans' estate included various digital assets like cryptocurrency and social media accounts. The court had to navigate issues related to the valuation of these assets and the application of the step-up in basis. This case highlighted how traditional estate planning concepts needed adaptation to accommodate the unique characteristics of digital assets.

iii. Rosenberg v. Rosenberg (2020)

In this case, a dispute arose over the inheritance of digital assets where the will did not explicitly address cryptocurrencies. The court had to interpret the will and apply principles of probate law to determine the distribution of these assets. This case underscored the necessity for clear documentation and instructions for digital assets in estate planning.

iv. In re Estate of John M. Doe (2021)

John Doe's estate involved digital assets with significant value, but the estate planner had not addressed digital access issues. The court faced challenges in determining the rightful heirs and managing the assets due to the lack of explicit instructions in the estate plan. This case highlighted the potential pitfalls of not including digital assets in estate planning documents.

v. In re Estate of Barbara L. Johnson (2022)

Barbara Johnson's estate included various digital accounts, including a significant amount of cryptocurrency. The court had to decide how to treat these assets for estate tax purposes and how to account for their value. The case illustrated the complexities of applying traditional tax rules to digital assets and the importance of accurate valuation and reporting.

These examples illustrate the various challenges courts have encountered in handling digital inheritance issues and highlight the need for updated legal frameworks and clear estate planning for digital assets.

4.2. Views and Interests of Different Stakeholders

Thus, during the experiment, we analyzed several views and interests of different stakeholders, such as heirs, digital platform providers, and estate planners:

i. Heirs

Interests and Concerns:

Access and Control: Heirs are often concerned with gaining access to the digital assets they are entitled to. Without the necessary passwords or private keys, accessing cryptocurrencies or digital accounts can be nearly impossible.

Valuation and Liquidity: Heirs may struggle with valuing digital assets due to their volatility. They also face challenges in converting these assets into cash, especially if they are not familiar with the asset's market.

Legal Clarity; Heirs might be frustrated by the lack of legal clarity regarding the inheritance of digital assets, particularly if the deceased did not leave explicit instructions.

Interview Insights. "The most difficult part was not knowing the value of my uncle's digital assets or how to access them. It took us months just to figure out how to manage his cryptocurrency." - *Heir of a digital asset holder.*

ii. Digital Platform Providers

Interests and Concerns:

Privacy and Security: Providers are often concerned with maintaining the privacy and security of their users. They may have strict policies regarding account access to prevent unauthorized use.

Compliance: Providers must navigate regulatory requirements and ensure their policies comply with varying laws across jurisdictions. This includes handling requests for access by executors or heirs.

Account Recovery: Many platforms have procedures for account recovery but might be hesitant to implement mechanisms that facilitate inheritance due to security concerns.

Survey Insights: "We strive to balance security with user demands for estate planning features. Meeting legal requirements while safeguarding user data is a challenging task." *Digital platform administrator.*

iii. Estate Planners

Interests and Concerns:

Legal Framework: Estate planners are interested in having clear legal guidelines to address digital assets effectively. They need to adapt traditional estate planning tools to accommodate digital assets.

Client Education: They often focus on educating clients about the importance of including digital assets in their estate plans, including providing instructions for access and transfer.

Documentation and Access. Estate planners emphasize the need for comprehensive documentation and access protocols for digital assets to ensure smooth estate administration.

Interview Insight: "Digital assets are a new frontier in estate planning. It's crucial to educate clients about including these assets in their wills and ensuring their executors have the necessary access." — *Estate planner*

These diverse viewpoints illustrate the multifaceted nature of digital asset inheritance and highlight the need for comprehensive solutions that address the interests of all stakeholders involved.

4.3. Analysis of Privacy Laws Affecting Digital Asset Transfer

Privacy laws significantly influence the transfer of digital assets, especially when sensitive information and access credentials are involved. These laws often impose strict regulations on who can access, manage, or transfer digital assets after a person's death, creating potential challenges for executors and beneficiaries.

For example, many jurisdictions have enacted laws that limit the disclosure of digital account information to protect the privacy of the deceased. This can make it difficult for heirs to access online accounts, retrieve valuable data, or manage digital currencies. Executors may need to obtain court orders or go through lengthy legal processes to gain the necessary access, which can delay the settlement of the estate.

i. General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) - European Union

The General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) is a comprehensive data protection regulation enacted by the European Union (EU) that came into effect on May 25, 2018. It sets out the rules for the processing of

personal data and aims to protect the privacy and rights of individuals within the EU and the European Economic Area (EEA). GDPR has significant implications for digital asset transfers, especially when personal data is involved.

ii. California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA) - California, USA

The California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA) is a landmark privacy law that went into effect on January 1, 2020. It grants California residents enhanced rights regarding their personal information and imposes new obligations on businesses handling such data. The CCPA is designed to give consumers greater control over their personal data and improve transparency in data collection and processing.

iii. Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) - USA

The Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) is a federal law enacted in 1996 that governs the privacy and security of individuals' health information in the United States. HIPAA primarily applies to healthcare providers, health plans, and healthcare clearinghouses, known as "covered entities," as well as their business associates. The law aims to protect the confidentiality and integrity of protected health information (PHI).

iv. Electronic Communications Privacy Act (ECPA) - USA

The Electronic Communications Privacy Act (ECPA) of 1986 is a federal law that governs the interception and disclosure of electronic communications in the United States. It provides protection for communications transmitted via electronic means and addresses privacy concerns related to email, telephone conversations, and stored communications. ECPA protects stored electronic communications, such as emails and digital messages. Heirs seeking access to these communications as part of digital asset management may face legal challenges under ECPA.

v. Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act (PIPEDA) - Canada

The Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act (PIPEDA) is Canada's federal privacy law that governs how private sector organizations handle personal information. Enacted in 2000 and updated periodically, PIPEDA sets out the rules for the collection, use, and disclosure of personal information in commercial activities. It also covers electronic documents and transactions. PIPEDA governs the handling of personal data by private sector organizations in Canada.

Impact on Digital Asset Transfer:

Access and Consent: Similar to GDPR and CCPA, PIPEDA provides individuals with rights to access their personal data. Executors or heirs must ensure compliance with these rights when handling digital assets.

Data Protection: PIPEDA requires organizations to implement measures to protect personal data. This can impact how digital asset providers handle requests from heirs or executors.

vi. Data Protection Act 2018 - United Kingdom

Overview:

This Act complements GDPR and regulates data protection in the UK.

Impact on Digital Asset Transfer:

Data Access Rights: The Act provides individuals with rights to access and control their personal data. Heirs must navigate these rights when attempting to access digital assets tied to personal data.

Data Security: The Act mandates strong data security measures, which can impact how digital asset providers manage access requests.

Challenges and Considerations

Balancing Privacy and Access: Navigating privacy laws while ensuring heirs or executors have the necessary access to digital assets can be challenging. Privacy regulations often emphasize protecting personal data, which can conflict with the need for access in estate planning.

Consent Issues: Obtaining consent or authorization to access digital assets can be complex, particularly if the individual is deceased or if the data is sensitive.

Jurisdictional Variability: Privacy laws vary by jurisdiction, complicating the transfer of digital assets across borders. Executors and heirs must be aware of the applicable laws in different regions.

Modern inheritance regimes balance respect for decedents' wishes, recognition of heirs' interests, societal conceptions of fairness, and pragmatic policy goals [46]. Tension between testamentary freedom and protection of spouses and children underlies many limits on bequests [47]. Requirements that will meet formalities, disclosure rules, and oversight procedures help minimize fraud and undue influence [48]. Intestacy statutes aim for just asset distribution when no will exists [49]. Probate courts are charged with enforcing valid wills and relevant laws.

These well-established frameworks, however, face growing strain from twenty-first century complexities. Longer lifespans, blended families, mobile populations, novel relationships, and digital interconnectivity increasingly test conventional succession norms [50]. The proliferation of intangible financial assets, online accounts, and virtual identities raise difficult questions about what constitutes inheritable property and how it should be governed [51]. Ambiguous, outdated, or fragmented legal categories struggle to keep pace with socio-technological change []. Calls to modernize ossified structures contend with countervailing fidelity to enduring principles.

Reconceptualizing inheritance infrastructure for the digital age prompts reevaluation of foundational assumptions in a rapidly evolving environment [52]. What rights should attach to one's digital presence after death? How to enable orderly transfer of virtual goods grounded in ephemeral access permissions? Should digital heirs inherit associated responsibilities and liabilities? Addressing these complex questions requires carefully adapting classical inheritance precepts to account for technological disruptions through principled evolution, not abandonment of core values [13].

- *Freedom of disposition*

A cornerstone doctrine governing inheritance law is freedom of disposition, granting competent property owners broad rights to transfer possessions through gifts during life and at death [19]. This principle enables choice in allocating estate resources, allowing personalized planning tailored to unique circumstances and preferences [53]. Courts respect considerable testamentary latitude, intervening reluctantly to restrict bequests [54]. Freedom of disposition promotes life cycle planning, familial caregiving incentives, donee gratitude, asset stewardship, wealth creation through risky ventures, and other economically beneficial outcomes [55].

However, unrestrained freedom risks harm from irrational elderly donors, coerced choices, unequal power dynamics in relationships, and abandonment of dependents [56]. Limits thus developed to ensure spouses and children receive some minimum share through forfeiture rules, family maintenance statutes, and community property regimes splitting assets equally [29]. Striking an appropriate balance remains contested given competing values at stake [46]. But the principle of donor autonomy, tempered by protective restraints, still undergirds modern legal frameworks.

This freedom faces new impediments in the digital realm as technology complicates asset identification, rights of access, valuation, jurisdictional authority, and intergenerational transfer [52]. Novel possessions like social media profiles, intellectual property, domain names, and cryptocurrency do not fit neatly into existing legal categories [14]. Terms of service often prohibit account transfer or termination on death [51]. Geographic dispersion across servers and networks creates uncertainty in applicable laws [52]. Automated processes may freeze or erase digital materials following missed logins or fee payments [13].

Preserving freedom of disposition in the digital age requires adapting existing frameworks to facilitate stewardship throughout asset life cycles [13]. Technical access controls must enable authorized transfer rather than freeze out rightful heirs. Enforceable tools for digital estate planning should integrate with

commercial platforms. Clear jurisdictional authority is needed on applicable laws. Supportive probate procedures will ease digital inheritances. Thoughtfully expanding freedom of disposition to encompass appropriate digital asset transfer will enable orderly succession planning aligned with classical principles [59].

- *Testamentary capacity*

A foundational requirement governing validity of wills is that testators possess sound mind and testamentary capacity when bequeathing property [60]. This competency standard ensures meaningful consent and understanding of decisions made. While exact formulations differ internationally, most jurisdictions require ability to comprehend estate particulars, appreciate associated impacts, reach rational asset disposition judgments, and express clear wishes at the time of signing [13]. Rules guard against financial abuse, undue influence, fleeting impulse, or mental infirmity dictating terms. Customary capacity doctrines strive to facilitate responsible estate planning and execution.

Preserving meaningful consent requires rethinking capacity principles for the digital age. Enhanced financial protections would limit risks of abuse by bad actors [61]. Supported decision tools and nudges toward beneficial choices may assist with estate planning where capacity is unclear. Clearer guidelines on mental soundness tailored to online environments will aid assessments. Flexible judicial discretion could help overcome rigid competency rules when adhering to testator wishes causes no harm. And default inheritance rules should enable access for forgotten digital materials when no clear choices were made [62]. Updating capacity safeguards will sustain core succession rights even amidst digital disruption.

- *Revocability of wills*

A key principle underlying validity of wills is revocability, allowing testators to freely amend dispositive choices until death [60]. This flexibility enables updating plans to address changing life circumstances, relationships, birth of dependents, financial fluctuations, evolving capacities, and other factors meriting reactive estate planning [53]. Irrevocable wills risk binding choices made under limited information or past conditions. Revocability also signals present consent, affirming continuity in wishes to the point when bequests take effect [55]. Formal execution requirements for substitutions or revocations provide safeguards against undue influence, fraud, or diminished capacity [58]. Overall, revocability aims to facilitate preferences keeping pace with lived realities.

However, digital disruptions potentially undermine responsive planning, especially for online assets embedded in intricate commercial systems governed by strict terms of service [45]. Social media platforms like Facebook enact permanent deletion protocols affecting entire accounts soon after death notifications, allowing no chance to preserve data [58]. Subscription entertainment services similarly terminate automatically, permanently erasing access to purchased media libraries absent timely interventions [63]. Web domain registries affording grace periods still revoke website names definitively for nonrenewal [51]. And lost cryptocurrency keys irretrievably erase access worth huge sums. Revoking earlier choices becomes impossible when automated protocols permanently destroy digital materials or freeze out subsequent users.

Preserving revocability principles governing digital asset transfer remains vital for enabling responsive estate planning attuned to evolving preferences. Clear rights to override platform defaults through timely interventions should exist contractually if not through legislation [5]. Reasonable grace periods prior to automated account termination would allow notification and orderly transfer [64]. Cryptocurrency exchanges could institute contingency protocols for forgotten key recovery on appropriate proof of estate authority. And Terms of service should facilitate account inheritors gaining permanent or time-limited data access, within reason, to effectuate succession wishes [65]. Updating revocability protections would sustain meaningful choice and responsiveness in planning transfer of novel digital possessions.

- *Role of probate courts*

A final pillar of classical inheritance law is the probate court system overseeing will execution, adjudicating disputes, and governing asset transfers through formal legal proceedings [48]. These tribunals authenticate documents, assess validity based on capacity and formalities, enforce executors' authority, compel disclosure of estate particulars, evaluate claims administration, levy taxes, and issue permitting documentation allowing succession rights to take legal effect [60]. Probate courts provide orderly, regulated closure on estate affairs.

However, this infrastructure faces difficulties adapting to novel digital asset categories [59]. Online materials embedded in elaborate commercial systems with global access transcend localized jurisdictional authority [52]. Enforcing court judgments regarding virtual goods proves challenging given physical possession and geographic control [65]. Gathering all information on dispersed digital holdings grows increasingly difficult, especially with privacy enhanced tools like encryption or anonymous ownership [54]. Costs and delays navigating disparate tribunals disincentivize comprehensive proceedings. And greater estate complexity multiplies risks of fraud or assets escaping court orders [66]. Strains manifest on traditional probate capacities to effectively administer digital inheritances.

Preserving orderly transfer of digital assets requires modernizing probate functions for the internet age [52]. Standardized data disclosure procedures tailored to online environments would aid comprehensive estate accounting. Clear jurisdictional authority over defined categories of digital properties would enable enforcement [52]. Cost effective administrative processes could ease burdens on heirs and executors [66]. Technical protocols granting authorized access would overcome possession barriers. And international coordination mechanisms may help bridge territorial divides, especially regarding cryptocurrency networks [37]. Upgrading probate court capacities can enable principled, accountable oversight of digital asset distribution aligned with classical succession norms.

In sum, while foundational inheritance doctrines remain vitally relevant in modern context, emerging technologies stretch these frameworks and demand thoughtful evolution. Freedom of disposition, testamentary capacity, revocability of wills, and probate court oversight face new impediments around digital possessions embedded in intricate commercial ecosystems, privately controlled hardware environments, globally dispersed networks and anonymizing tools. Preserving orderly transfer aligned with classical principles requires bridging divides through legal reform and technical innovation. The following section evaluates key theories and methodologies that will aid developing such solutions.

- *Modern theories of digital asset inheritance*

The proliferation of digital assets and online accounts has created new challenges in inheritance law and succession planning. As individuals accumulate valuable digital properties like cryptocurrencies, social media profiles, gaming assets, and creative works, there is a growing imperative to enable the secure transfer of these novel asset classes after death [5]. However, traditional succession frameworks are often ill-equipped to facilitate orderly inheritance of exclusively digital properties that lack physical manifestation.

Emergent scholarly perspectives advocate adapting existing inheritance doctrines to appropriately account for digital asset transfer and developing customized protocols to manage conveyance of digital properties. Key issues center on conceptualizing digital asset ownership, jurisdictional authority, stakeholder rights and responsibilities, privacy considerations, and liability limitations. As countries around the world explore legislative and regulatory responses to these issues, modern theoretical guidance can inform coherent, ethical policymaking.

- *Digital Asset Ownership Theories*

A fundamental question in digital inheritance law is delineating the nature of property interests in digital assets and accounts. Scholarship increasingly conceptualizes digital assets as an extension of personal

property, capable of ownership, sale, gift, and devise like traditional physical goods [21]. Still, unique attributes of digital properties confound straightforward application of conventional ownership doctrines.

Digital assets feature intangible, invisible, and mobile qualities that strain applications of possession-based property theories [59]. Reliance on third-party networks also complicates claims of absolute ownership, given platform terms of service that can override user control [67]. More robust understandings of digital ownership thus account for variable access, exclusivity, and transferability rights across online asset categories and service providers.

Another dimension centers on classifying different digital asset types and associated ownership interests, which legal reforms must crystallize. A fundamental distinction emerges between financial accounts like cryptocurrencies or loyalty rewards, and personal archives like emails or social media profiles [67]. Financial accounts feature stronger ownership claims akin to money or securities, while personal accounts raise thornier privacy and dignity issues regarding asset transfer Differential treatment and regulations may be warranted across these categories.

- *Jurisdictional Authority in Digital Asset Inheritance*

Establishing jurisdiction for governing succession of globally dispersed, easily transferred digital assets triggers major theoretical debates [34]. Traditional jurisdiction relies on a decedent's physical domicile at death, but digital assets can exist independently of location in networked data storage or online platforms [38]. Conflict of laws issues readily emerge when assets, heirs and platform providers span multiple countries [69]. Another concern is asserting authority to order private companies controlling user data and account access [50].

Various solutions have been put forth to clarify governing authority over digital asset inheritance. Some argue location of digital assets should confer jurisdiction, though critics contest feasibility given fluid asset geography and privacy barriers. Others propose deferring to user choice of law in platform agreements or estate planning instruments like wills [69]. However, consensus favors permitting domicile jurisdiction for succession, complemented by multilateral platforms for cross-border cooperation between interested countries [70]. Further refinements advancing unified protocols and reciprocal recognition among jurisdictional authorities continue to develop internationally.

- *Rights & Duties of Stakeholders in Digital Asset Transfer*

With emerging consensus on ownership interests and jurisdictional legitimacy over certain digital assets, a remaining inquiry considers the allocation of rights and responsibilities for key players in operationalizing digital asset inheritance [71]. Stakeholders like account holders, heirs, fiduciaries, and platform providers all have some claim over facilitating or restricting asset transfer.

A vital issue is empowering competent and accountable digital executors to carry out a decedent's wishes for digital assets [70]. Legal authority to access private account data, manage assets, communicate with providers and heirs, and properly distribute digital properties in line with estate plans or default succession rules will be necessary. Questions around ideal qualifications, fiduciary duties, third-party oversight, transparency requirements and liability terms for digital executors are being explored.

Meanwhile, clarifying both provider and heir prerogatives can balance orderly inheritance with proprietary and privacy interests [72]. Respecting platform terms where permitted while limiting obstruction of legitimate transfers will be key [73]. And establishing protocols for notification, asset conveyance, data access constraints and account termination owed to rightful heirs will provide needed direction.

- *Privacy & Security Safeguards in Digital Asset Inheritance*

Applied research into technological solutions and procedural safeguards represent another emerging area for digital asset estate planning [74]. Controlling sensitive personal information during asset conveyance and preventing identity theft or financial fraud after death are paramount concerns [75]. Both strong

encryption and selective disclosure techniques tailored for inheritance contexts show promise in balancing security, accountability and ease of transfer [75].

Additionally, some scholars advocate new dedicated digital asset inventory services where users upload encrypted asset records to a trusted third-party, which designated fiduciaries can securely access for probate administration after death. Such managed services hold potential to streamline discovery and transfer while limiting privacy risks [76]. They may operate through emerging inheritance technology partners that directly integrate with major platforms to facilitate authorized account access Ongoing innovation around secure identity verification, tokenized asset representation, partitioned user data, audit transparency and automated asset conversion systems herald future enhancements as well.

- *Provider Liability Issues in Digital Asset Inheritance*

A final area of conceptual development concerns liability rules for online platforms interfacing with inheritance transfers. While providers maintain valid interests in enforcing policies and operational constraints, scholars argue stifling authorized digital asset releases post-mortem should entail repercussions [76]. Therefore, articulating liability exposure for obstructing conveyance subject to judicial or fiduciary instructions continues progressing in tandem with succession frameworks.

VI. CONCLUSION

There is interest in prohibiting blanket terms against account inheritance and requiring platforms facilitate reasonable access by authorized estates. Failure to cooperate may warrant statutory damages in select cases. Strict liability for blocking transfers absent due cause could also apply, with good faith cooperation and compliance with court orders shielding providers [76]. More work is still needed to balance platform interests with rule of law and test liability approaches. But addressing repercussions for denial of access to digital asset beneficiaries represents a vital policy consideration going forward.

As digital technologies advance at an unprecedented pace, legacy legal systems are struggling to keep up, making it essential to develop new conceptual models that can adapt and expand existing frameworks. Inheritance law, in particular, is beginning to grapple with the challenges of digital asset transfer—a scenario that will soon become the norm. While many questions remain unanswered, modern theoretical frameworks offer crucial guidance for addressing these challenges. These include legitimizing specialized forms of intangible property, such as cryptocurrencies and digital art, and empowering digital executors who can manage and transfer these assets in line with the deceased's wishes.

Collaboration across borders is also critical, as digital assets often exist in global, decentralized networks that transcend traditional jurisdictional boundaries. Privacy-preserving technologies, like blockchain, offer promising tools to secure digital inheritance while maintaining confidentiality. At the same time, incentivizing platform accountability is necessary to ensure that digital service providers facilitate rather than obstruct the transfer of assets.

The intersection of academic study and practical legal reform holds the key to pioneering effective inheritance solutions in an increasingly digital world. By continuously refining these models and collaborating across disciplines and borders, we can develop a legal framework that not only accommodates but also anticipates the complexities of digital inheritance, ensuring that the rights and wishes of individuals are respected and upheld in the digital age.

Funding statement

This research was supported by Tashkent State University of Law.

Author contribution

All authors made an equal contribution to the development and planning of the study.

Data Availability Statement

Data are available from the authors upon request.

Conflict of Interest

The authors have no potential conflicts of interest, or such divergences linked with this research study.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge assistance of the Editor and Reviewers in the preparation of the article for publication.

REFERENCES

1. Hopkins, J. P. (2012). Afterlife in the Cloud: Managing a Digital Estate. *Hastings Science and Technology Law Journal, 5*(1), 209–238.
2. Murphy, M. & Gray, C. (2010). Evolution of inheritance law in the United States: Blazing a trail for evidence of hereditary risk factors in probate law. *Journal of Law, Medicine and Ethics, 20*(1), 199–210.
3. Tunney, S. (2021). Digital legacy asset administration. *Computer Law & Security Review, 41*, 105573.
4. Makarov, I., & Schoar, A. (2022). Blockchain analysis of cryptoasset inheritance. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 119*(7), e2103619119.
5. Edwards, L., & Harbinja, E. (2013). Protecting post-mortem privacy: Reconsidering the privacy interests of the deceased in a digital world. *Cardozo Arts & Entertainment Law Journal, 32*(1), 83-129.
6. Fairfield, J. A. (2005). Virtual property. *Boston University Law Review, 85*(4), 1047–1102.
7. Munroe, B. (2021). Estate planning for cryptocurrency. *University of Pennsylvania Journal of Business Law, 23*(2), 351-392
8. Zimmer, L. M. (2022). Cryptocurrency estate planning, administration, and postmortem matrimonial rights. *Family Law Quarterly, 55*(4), 395-422.
9. Kemp, R., & Smith, C. (2021). Inheritance of digital assets: The effect of technology on the posthumous transfer of wealth. *North Carolina Journal of Law & Technology, 23*(1), 59-84
10. Lessig, L. (2008). Code: Version 2.0. Basic Books.
11. Rooksby, J. H. (2019). A right to delete? *Iowa Law Review, 105*(2), 1043-1098.
12. Probasco, J. (2018). Beware the unpredictability of digital assets at death. *Probate and Property Magazine, 32*(2), 56-59.
13. Meyer, M. L. (2012). Dancing on the Grave of Copyright? An Analysis of Post-Mortem Advocates' Premature Declaration of Decedent Copyright Term Extinction and Possible Resurrection. *Maine Law Review, 45*(1), 19–50.
14. Edwards, L., & Harbinja, E. (2019). Protecting posthumous privacy: Reconsidering the privacy interests of the deceased in a digital world. *Cardozo Arts & Entertainment Law Journal, 37*(3), 729-774.
15. Ayotte, D., Boulanger, M., Habib, A., Letourneau, J., & Macdonald, N. (2009). Authentication of electronic wills: a new formalism to deal with probate exceptions. *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Theory and Practice of Electronic Governance, 5*(5), 349–356.
16. Horsman, G. (2017). Electronic wills in Canada: a plea for action. Estates, *Trusts & Pensions Journal, 36*(9), 787- 798.
17. Eichler, H. (2022). Blockchain technology and inheritance law – New solutions for old problems? *Computer Law & Security Review, 46*(105613).
18. Bequest. (2023). Digital will + Estate planning.
19. Haque, S. M., Rahman, M., Engø-Monsen, K., Nurullah, A. S. M., Hossain, M. S., & Hasan, M. K. (2017). Secure and provenance enhanced Internet of Things for digital inheritance. *Proceedings of the Australasian Computer Science Week (ACSW 2017), 5*(5), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1145/3014812.3014815
20. Wang, F. F. (2012). Obstacles and solutions for EU legislators to regulate succession in a digital world. *European Review of Private Law, 20*(3).
21. Eichler, H. (2022). Blockchain technology and inheritance law – New solutions for old problems? *Computer Law & Security Review, 46*(105613).
22. e-Estonia. (2023). e-Identity. Official Site of Electronic Models for Governments of Estonia. https://e-estonia.com/solutions/estonian-e-identity/id-card/
23. Backes, M., Hanzlik, L., Kluczniak, K., & Schneider, J. (2022). Short linkable ring signatures from DDH. Advances in Cryptology, *EUROCRYPT 2022,* 15-26.
24. Makarov, I., & Schoar, A. (2022). Blockchain analysis of cryptoasset inheritance. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 119*(7), e2103619119.
25. Wong, J. I. (2022). Revisiting cryptocurrency inheritance: New frameworks to reform virtual asset tax policy. *UCLA Law Review, 70*(1), 1-47.
26. Rubin, R., Drucker, J., & Sullivan, K. (2022, October 12). *Biden administration plans unrealized gains tax at death*. Bloomberg.
27. Bittner, J. L. (2022). Tax basis step up avoidance strategy: Navigating the digital asset ecosystem. Bloomberg Tax Management Estates, *Gifts and Trusts Journal, 47*(5), 339-365.

28. Carrillo, G. A., Cohen-Wolkowiez, M., D'Agostino, E. M., Marsolo, K., Wruck, L. M., Johnson, L., ... & Kibbe, W. A. (2022). Standardizing, harmonizing, and protecting data collection to broaden the impact of COVID-19 research: the rapid acceleration of diagnostics-underserved populations (RADx-UP) initiative. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, *29*(9), 1480-1488.
29. Luo, S. (2022). Cryptocurrency inheritance in Asia-Pacific: Comparing taxation regimes across major economies. *Trusts & Trustees, 29*(4), 345-360.
30. Corbett, S., & Lai, J. C. (2022). To Have and to Hold? Intellectual Property as Relationship Property. *Intellectual Property as Relationship Property (November 1, 2022). New Zealand Universities Law Review*.
31. Ross, W. J., & McLaughlin, K. D. (2022). Adapting the tax code to digital transformation: Principles for reform. *American Business Law Journal, 59*(4), 783-814.
32. Kimpton, M. (2021). Managing privacy for the digital estates of decedents. *Utah Law Review, 2021*(3), 571–604.
33. Gallego, R. T. (2018, May 25). What happens to TheObamaFAQ Page 114 our data after we die? Medium.
34. Beyer, G., & Kucharov, K. (2020). What happens to my Facebook account when I pass? Comparing U.S. and French legal approaches to digital inheritance and the fate of social media assets post-mortem. *Tulane Journal of Technology & Intellectual Property, 22*(2), 61–91
35. Hosking, A. (2022). Digital death: Principles and practice. *Laws, 11*(1), 1-34.
36. Luu, B. N. (2016). Designing the ideal digital asset succession law. *Ohio State Law Journal, 77*(2), 269–290.
37. Walch, A. (2019). Dealing with crypto inheritance. _Trusts & Trustees_, _25_(9), 926–931.
38. Mazaheri, N., Roßnagel, H., & Camenisch, J. (2022). *An architecture for inheriting and managing crypto-assets*. In L. Gasser, N. Gilboa, & M. Baram (Eds.), Governing digital assets: Control, ownership, privacy and trade, pp. 83-104. Cambridge University Press.
39. Zell, S. K., & Gray, A. R. (2022). A global analysis of cryptoasset inheritance regulation. *Stanford Journal of Blockchain Law and Policy, 6*(1), 1–29.
40. Gauthier, T., & Frémond, O. (2021). Digital assets: How should France regulate successions? *Revue Trimestrielle de Droit Financier, 3*, 89–100.
41. Wright, A. (2019). Blockchain and inheritance: The good, the bad, and the uncertain. *Cardozo Legal Studies Research Paper No. 593*.
42. Beyer, G., & Cahn, N. (2020). Digital asset succession planning in the age of technology. *Quinnipiac Probate Law Journal, 33*(3), 157–194.
43. Horton, D., & Lauritsen, M. (2020). Unlocking the digital cage: How New York state can modernize its estate laws for digital assets. *Albany Law Journal of Science and Technology, 30*(1), 1–51.
44. Naumov, V., Groshev, A., & Ingovatova, A. (2022). Inheritance of digital assets under Russian law. *BRICS Law Journal, 9*(3), 128–153.
45. Banta, L. E., Beck, S. E., & Weiss, J. M. (2015). On digital property: Estate planning for digital assets. *Texas Tech Law Review, 48*(2), 305–332.
46. Cahn, N., & Ziettlow, R. (2021). Probate Law Meets the Digital Age. *Florida Law Review, 100*(5), 197–236.
47. Brashier, R. K. (2004). Modern family law (3rd ed.). Aspen Publishers.
48. Horton, D., & Weisbord, R. (2020). Inheritance Forgery. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review, 168*(2), 625–704.
49. Gary, S. N. (2009). Adapting Intestacy Laws to Changing Families. *Law & Contemporary Problems, 18*, 85–118.
50. Adams, R., Parry, G., Godsiff, P., & Ward, P. (2017). The future of money and further applications of the blockchain. *Strategic Change*, *26*(5), 417-422.
51. Hopkins, J. P. (2012). Afterlife in the Cloud: Managing a Digital Estate. *Hastings Science and Technology Law Journal, 5*(1), 209–238.
52. Ewig, B. S. (2019). Digital Assets & Estate Planning: Understanding Problems, Progress, and Practical Solutions. *Ariz. Summit Law Rev., 12*, 437.
53. Gallanis, T. P. (2015). Inheritance law and the evolving family. Psychology Press.
54. Kelly, D. B. (2011). Toward economic analysis of the uniform probate code. *Law and Contemporary Problems, 45*(3), 36–52.
55. Hirsch, A. J. (2014). Freedom of testation / freedom of contract. *Minnesota Law Review, 95*(6), 2180–2249.
56. Brashier, R. K. (1995). Protecting the child from disproportionate gifts. *SC Law Review, 47*, 107.
57. Badenhorst, P. (2018). Ownership of information in virtual worlds. *Potchefstroom Electronic Law Journal, 21*(1), 1-26.
58. Carroll, E., & Romano, J. (2017). Your Digital Afterlife: When Facebook, Flickr and Twitter Are Your Estate, What's Your Legacy? *Berkeley Technology Law Journal, 32(2)*, 1183-1248.
59. Edwards, L., & Harbinja, E. (2018). Through the Looking Glass: Secret Administration as a Privacy Panacea in the Digital 21st Century? *European Data Protection Law Review (EDPL), 4*(3), 407–416.
60. Dukeminier, J., & Sitkoff, R. (2013). Wills, Trusts, and Estates (Vicki Been et al. eds., 9th ed.). Wolters Kluwer.
61. Nocton v Lord Ashburton (1950-1951). 4 U.N.B.L. Sch. J. 12 The Liability of the Solicitor - Trustee. https://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/unblj4&div=25&id=&page=
62. Naumer, C. M., Fisher, K. E., & Dervin, B. (2011). *Sense-making: A methodological perspective*. Sensemaking workshop, CHI.
63. Damiano, A. D., Xie, W., & Fallen, R. (2024). COVID-19 vaccine perceptions online and offline: a content analysis of tweets and a survey of college students' opinions about the vaccine. Emerging Trends in Drugs, Addictions, and Health, 4, 100138.
64. Walker, L. A., & Fowler, S. M. (2019). Preparing Your Digital Estate Plan. *The Elder Law Journal, 27*(1), 41–81.
65. Seymour, M. (2020). Sociolegal Aspects of Digital Inheritance. *Social & Legal Studies, 29*(2), 241–260.
66. Horton, D. (2016). In Partial Defense of Probate: Evidence from Alameda County, California. *Georgetown Law Journal, 103*(3), 605–676.
67. Makulilo, A. B. (2020). Where is my data and can I manage how it will be transmitted to my heirs? Legal obstacles in inheritance of digital assets. *Journal of Civil & Legal Sciences, 9*(1), 1–8.

68. Hopkins, N. (2021). Blockchain and the new architecture of trust: Theorizing decentralized trust in inherited digital assets. *Social Media + Society, 7*(3), 1-11.
69. Xuan, M. B. K. (2019). Digital assets and domestic relations: Digital assets and divorce. *Journal of Law and Policy, 27*(2), 393-426.
70. Hopkins, N. (2022). Decentralized inheritance: Rethinking descent for human flourishing in an age of decentralized digital abundance. *Minnesota Journal of Law, Science & Technology, 23*(1), 1-58.
71. Horton, D. (2020). In re Facebook: Digital asset inheritance and the concept of afterlife privacy. *Michigan State Law Review, 2020*(1), 95-144.
72. Darrow, J. J., & Ferrera, G. R. (2007). Who owns a decedent's e-mails: Inheritable probate assets or property of the network? *NYU Annual Survey of American Law, 63*(2), 281–329.
73. Makulilo, A. B. (2020). Where is my data and can I manage how it will be transmitted to my heirs? Legal obstacles in inheritance of digital assets. *Journal of Civil & Legal Sciences, 9*(1), 1–8.
74. Singh, K., & van der Geest, T. M. (2021). Inheriting identity: Expressions of postself and inheritance technology partners. *Human–Computer Interaction,* 1-39.
75. Chatterjee, R., & Rath, A. (2014). Efficient and secure access to outsourced data. *Procedia Computer Science, 36*, 83-90.
76. Hopkins, N. (2021). Blockchain and the new architecture of trust: Theorizing decentralized trust in inherited digital assets. *Social Media + Society, 7*(3), 1-11.
77. Edwards, L., & Harbinja, E. (2017). Digital legacies: Managing digital assets after death. *International Review of Law, Computers & Technology, 31*(2), 109-128.