

# Consultation on a retail payments strategy for the EU

Fields marked with \* are mandatory.

## Introduction

This consultation is now available in 23 European Union official languages.

Please use the language selector at the top of this page to choose your language for this consultation.

Consumers and companies make payments to fulfil their everyday needs and activities. Today, in Europe, they have at their disposal a broad range of payment options, but digitalisation and innovation bring new opportunities to make payments faster, easier, more transparent, and affordable, in particular in cross-border situations.

In accordance with its Work Programme for 2020, the Commission will adopt a Strategy on an integrated EU Payments Market (hereinafter “Retail Payments Strategy for the EU” or “RPS”). It is to be submitted alongside the Digital Finance Strategy, which will be adopted to promote digital finance in Europe while adequately regulating the risks, and in light of the mission letter of Executive Vice-President Dombrovskis.

This strategy will be an important contribution to reinforcing the international role of the euro. Payments are strategic: where decisions are made, where data is stored, where infrastructures are located are of considerable importance in terms of the EU’s sovereignty. This strategy will aim at both strengthening Europe’s influence and consolidating its economic autonomy. Safe and efficient payment systems and services can also make a strong contribution to improving the EU’s ability to deal with emergencies such as the Covid-19 outbreak. Contactless payments in shops can help to contain the spread of viruses. Innovative, non-cash, payments solutions can enable all Europeans to make the purchases they need even if they are confined at home. This crisis is further accelerating the digitalization of the economy and, consequently, of payments. Instant payments are in this context becoming more strategic than ever before.

This consultation, together with the consultation on a new Digital Finance Strategy, is a key step towards the adoption of a Retail Payments Strategy for Europe.

Payments are vital to the economy and to growth, while the smooth functioning of payment systems is paramount to financial stability. The use of non-cash means of payment has consistently increased over the years in the EU and this trend is expected to continue with digitalisation.

EU legislation in the payments sphere has played a key role in promoting a fair, transparent, innovative, and competitive payments market in the EU. The E-money Directives ([EMD1](#) and [EMD2](#)) and the first Payment Services Directive ([PSD1](#)) introduced a licensing regime that allowed for the issuance of E-money and the provision of payment services by non-

bank financial institutions. This prompted the development of a number of FinTechs operating in the payments sphere, a trend that further accelerated due to the changes introduced by the second Payment Services

Directive ([PSD2](#)) which enabled new business models based on the sharing of data, such as payment initiation services (PIS) and account information services (AIS). At the same time, PSD2 elevated the general level of the security of payment transactions through the implementation of strong customer authentication (SCA). PSD2 has become a worldwide reference in terms of open banking and secure transactions. The EU regulatory framework in the payments sphere supports the Single Euro Payments Area (SEPA), whose objective is to make cross-border payments in euro as cost-efficient and safe as domestic payments, in particular through [Regulation 924/2009 on cross-border payments](#).

Technology has also shaped the evolution of the retail payments market. Indeed, payments are a dynamic, constantly evolving business, heavily relying on technology. Over the last decade, they have been influenced by an unprecedented development of a broad range of technologies. In an increasingly connected world, consumer expectations are also evolving, making speed, convenience and ubiquity the new expected normal, at no expected additional cost. European citizens also count on the benefits of a truly integrated Single Market, which should allow them to make cross-border payments in the EU as easily and as fast as at home.

As for many sectors, digitalisation and the use of innovative technologies bring new opportunities for payments, such as: a more diverse offering of services enabled by access to mobile and internet networks; systems enabling payments credited to beneficiaries in just a few seconds (the so-called “instant payments”); potentially fully automated payments associated with the development of the Internet of Things; and the execution of smart contracts in a blockchain environment. Other technologies, such as those supporting e-ID, can also be leveraged to facilitate customer on-boarding and payments authentication in domestic and cross-border contexts.

The size of the Single Market also offers opportunities for payment businesses to scale-up beyond the domestic sphere, for pan-European payment solutions to emerge, and potentially for European-scale champions in payments to become competitive globally. This would also facilitate payments in euro between the EU and other jurisdictions and reduce EU dependency on global players, such as international card schemes, issuers of global “stablecoins” and other big techs. The Commission launched in December 2019 a [public consultation to gather information and inputs regarding the regulation of cryptoassets, including stablecoins](#). The present consultation will therefore not include questions on this topic, as payment related aspects were also included in that consultation.

However, digitalisation also brings potential new risks, such as heightened opportunities for fraud, money laundering and cyber-attacks (in this regard, the Commission launched a [public consultation on improving resilience against cyberattacks in the financial sector](#) in December 2019). It also has an impact on competition and market structures in view of the growing role played by new market actors currently outside the scope of payments legislation, such as big tech companies benefitting from a large customer base. Also, the possible impact of “stablecoins” on monetary sovereignty has prompted many central banks to investigate the issuance of central bank digital currencies (CBDCs). Nor should we neglect the potential risks, in a digital world, of financial exclusion – including with regard to the access to basic payment services, such as cash withdrawals.

Other challenges arise from a yet incomplete roll-out of instant payments in Europe. It will be important to avoid outcomes that re-create fragmentation in the Single Market, when a substantial degree of harmonisation has been achieved in the framework of SEPA.

As the emergence of new risks and opportunities accelerates with digitalisation, the development of the FinTech sector and the adoption of new technologies, the EU must adopt a strategic and coherent policy framework for payments. The RPS will be an opportunity to put together, in a single policy document, the main building blocks for the future of payments in Europe.

In line with the Better Regulation Principles, the Commission is herewith inviting stakeholders to express their views. The questionnaire is focused around four key objectives:

- 1. Fast, convenient, safe, affordable and transparent payment instruments, with pan-European reach and “same as domestic” customer experience;**

2. An innovative, competitive, and contestable European retail payments market;
3. Access to safe, efficient and interoperable retail payments systems and other support infrastructures;
4. Improved cross-border payments, including remittances, facilitating the international role of the euro.

The outcome of this consultation will help the Commission prepare its Retail Payments Strategy, to be published in Q3 of 2020.

---

**Please note:** In order to ensure a fair and transparent consultation process **only responses received through our online questionnaire will be taken into account** and included in the report summarising the responses. Should you have a problem completing this questionnaire or if you require particular assistance, please contact [fisma-retail-payments@ec.europa.eu](mailto:fisma-retail-payments@ec.europa.eu).

More information:

- [on this consultation](#)
- [on the consultation document](#)
- [on payment services](#)
- [on the protection of personal data regime for this consultation](#)

## About you

---

### \* Language of my contribution

- ☐ Bulgarian
- ☐ Croatian
- ☐ Czech
- ☐ Danish
- ☐ Dutch
- ☐ English
- ☐ Estonian
- ☐ Finnish
- ☒ French
- ☐ Gaelic
- ☐ German
- ☐ Greek
- ☐ Hungarian
- ☐ Italian
- ☐ Latvian
- ☐ Lithuanian
- ☐ Maltese
- ☐ Polish

- ☐ Portuguese
- ☐ Romanian
- ☐ Slovak
- ☐ Slovenian
- ☐ Spanish
- ☐ Swedish

\* I am giving my contribution as

- |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Academic/research institution | <input type="radio"/> EU citizen                          | <input type="radio"/> Public authority |
| <input type="radio"/> <b>Business association</b>   | <input type="radio"/> Environmental organisation          | <input type="radio"/> Trade union      |
| <input type="radio"/> Company/business organisation | <input type="radio"/> Non-EU citizen                      | <input type="radio"/> Other            |
| <input type="radio"/> Consumer organisation         | <input type="radio"/> Non-governmental organisation (NGO) |  |

\* Type of business association

- ☐ **A trade organisation representing the payments** industry
- ☐ A trade association representing merchants
- ☐ Other

\* Please specify what other type of business association

\* Type of company/business organisation

- ☐ **Credit institution**
- ☐ **Payment institution**
- ☐ **Electronic money institution**
- ☐ Merchant (physical shop)
- ☐ Online merchant
- ☐ Other

\* Please specify what other type of company/business organization

\* The 280 members of the ASF's are financing companies, credit institutions or specialized banks, investment firms, payment institutions and electronic money institutions. Their common feature is to offer specialized financings to companies and households. All their activities are authorised, regulated and supervised by either the ACPR (national competent banking authority) or the AMF (Financial Markets Authority). ASF member institutions provide 20% of the credits to the private sector. They are specialized in equipment leasing, consumer credit, real estate financing, real estate leasing, factoring, guaranties, investment services, and renewable energy sofergie.

\* Type of non-governmental organisation

- ☐ Diaspora organisation
- ☐ Other

\* Age range

☐ Under 15 years old

- ☐ Between 15 and 30 years old
- ☐ Between 30 and 60 years old
- ☐ Over 60 years old

\* Please specify what other type of non-governmental organisation

\* Type of public authority

- ☐ EU body
- ☐ International body other than EU
- ☐ Governmental body
- ☐ Regulatory authority
- ☐ Supervisory authority
- ☐ Central bank
- ☐ Standard setting body
- ☐ Other

\* Please specify what other type of public authority

\* First name

KARINE

\* Surname

RUMAYOR

\* Email (this won't be published)

k.rumayor@asf-france.com

\* Scope

- ☒ International
- ☐ Local
- ☒ National
- ☐ Regional

\* Organisation name

ASSOCIATION FRANCAISE DES SOCIETES FINANCIERES (ASF)

\* Organisation size

- ☐ Micro (1 to 9 employees)
- ☐ Small (10 to 49 employees)
- ☐ Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- ☐ Large (250 or more)

Transparency register number









.97303386616-87

\* Country of origin

- |   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Afghanistan         | <input type="radio"/> Djibouti           | <input type="radio"/> Libya            | <input type="radio"/> Saint Martin                     |
| <input type="radio"/> Åland Islands       | <input type="radio"/> Dominica           | <input type="radio"/> Liechtenstein    | <input type="radio"/> Saint Pierre and Miquelon        |
| <input type="radio"/> Albania             | <input type="radio"/> Dominican Republic | <input type="radio"/> Lithuania        | <input type="radio"/> Saint Vincent and the Grenadines |
| <input type="radio"/> Algeria             | <input type="radio"/> Ecuador            | <input type="radio"/> Luxembourg       | <input type="radio"/> Samoa                            |
| <input type="radio"/> American Samoa      | <input type="radio"/> Egypt              | <input type="radio"/> Macau            | <input type="radio"/> San Marino                       |
| <input type="radio"/> Andorra             | <input type="radio"/> El Salvador        | <input type="radio"/> Madagascar       | <input type="radio"/> São Tomé and Príncipe            |
| <input type="radio"/> Angola              | <input type="radio"/> Equatorial Guinea  | <input type="radio"/> Malawi           | <input type="radio"/> Saudi Arabia                     |
| <input type="radio"/> Anguilla            | <input type="radio"/> Eritrea            | <input type="radio"/> Malaysia         | <input type="radio"/> Senegal                          |
| <input type="radio"/> Antarctica          | <input type="radio"/> Estonia            | <input type="radio"/> Maldives         | <input type="radio"/> Serbia                           |
| <input type="radio"/> Antigua and Barbuda | <input type="radio"/> Eswatini           | <input type="radio"/> Mali             | <input type="radio"/> Seychelles                       |
| <input type="radio"/> Argentina           | <input type="radio"/> Ethiopia           | <input type="radio"/> Malta            | <input type="radio"/> Sierra Leone                     |
| <input type="radio"/> Armenia             | <input type="radio"/> Falkland Islands   | <input type="radio"/> Marshall Islands | <input type="radio"/> Singapore                        |
| <input type="radio"/> Aruba               | <input type="radio"/> Faroe Islands      | <input type="radio"/> Martinique       | <input type="radio"/> Sint Maarten                     |
| <input type="radio"/> Australia           | <input type="radio"/> Fiji               | <input type="radio"/> Mauritania       | <input type="radio"/> Slovakia                         |
| <input type="radio"/> Austria             | <input type="radio"/> Finland            | <input type="radio"/> Mauritius        | <input type="radio"/> Slovenia                         |
| <input type="radio"/> Azerbaijan          | <input type="radio"/> France             | <input type="radio"/> Mayotte          | <input type="radio"/> Solomon Islands                  |
| <input type="radio"/> Bahamas             | <input type="radio"/> French Guiana      | <input type="radio"/> Mexico           | <input type="radio"/> Somalia                          |



<input type="radio"/> Bahrain	<input type="radio"/> French Polynesia	<input type="radio"/> Micronesia	<input type="radio"/> South Africa
<input type="radio"/> Bangladesh	<input type="radio"/> French Southern and Antarctic Lands	<input type="radio"/> Moldova	<input type="radio"/> South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands
<input type="radio"/> Barbados	<input type="radio"/> Gabon	<input type="radio"/> Monaco	<input type="radio"/> South Korea
<input type="radio"/> Belarus	<input type="radio"/> Georgia	<input type="radio"/> Mongolia	<input type="radio"/> South Sudan
<input type="radio"/> Belgium	<input type="radio"/> Germany	<input type="radio"/> Montenegro	<input type="radio"/> Spain
<input type="radio"/> Belize	<input type="radio"/> Ghana	<input type="radio"/> Montserrat	<input type="radio"/> Sri Lanka
<input type="radio"/> Benin	<input type="radio"/> Gibraltar	<input type="radio"/> Morocco	<input type="radio"/> Sudan
<input type="radio"/> Bermuda	<input type="radio"/> Greece	<input type="radio"/> Mozambique	<input type="radio"/> Suriname
<input type="radio"/> Bhutan	<input type="radio"/> Greenland	<input type="radio"/> Myanmar /Burma	<input type="radio"/> Svalbard and Jan Mayen
<input type="radio"/> Bolivia	<input type="radio"/> Grenada	<input type="radio"/> Namibia	<input type="radio"/> Sweden
<input type="radio"/> Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba	<input type="radio"/> Guadeloupe	<input type="radio"/> Nauru	<input type="radio"/> Switzerland
<input type="radio"/> Bosnia and Herzegovina	<input type="radio"/> Guam	<input type="radio"/> Nepal	<input type="radio"/> Syria
<input type="radio"/> Botswana	<input type="radio"/> Guatemala	<input type="radio"/> Netherlands	<input type="radio"/> Taiwan
<input type="radio"/> Bouvet Island	<input type="radio"/> Guernsey	<input type="radio"/> New Caledonia	<input type="radio"/> Tajikistan
<input type="radio"/> Brazil	<input type="radio"/> Guinea	<input type="radio"/> New Zealand	<input type="radio"/> Tanzania
<input type="radio"/> British Indian Ocean Territory	<input type="radio"/> Guinea-Bissau	<input type="radio"/> Nicaragua	<input type="radio"/> Thailand
<input type="radio"/> British Virgin Islands	<input type="radio"/> Guyana	<input type="radio"/> Niger	<input type="radio"/> The Gambia
<input type="radio"/> Brunei	<input type="radio"/> Haiti	<input type="radio"/> Nigeria	<input type="radio"/> Timor-Leste
<input type="radio"/> Bulgaria	<input type="radio"/> Heard Island and McDonald Islands	<input type="radio"/> Niue	<input type="radio"/> Togo
<input type="radio"/> Burkina Faso	<input type="radio"/> Honduras	<input type="radio"/> Norfolk Island	<input type="radio"/> Tokelau
<input type="radio"/> Burundi	<input type="radio"/> Hong Kong	<input type="radio"/> Northern Mariana Islands	<input type="radio"/> Tonga
<input type="radio"/> Cambodia	<input type="radio"/> Hungary	<input type="radio"/> North Korea	<input type="radio"/> Trinidad and Tobago
<input type="radio"/> Cameroon	<input type="radio"/> Iceland	<input type="radio"/> North Macedonia	<input type="radio"/> Tunisia
<input type="radio"/> Canada	<input type="radio"/> India	<input type="radio"/> Norway	<input type="radio"/> Turkey
<input type="radio"/> Cape Verde	<input type="radio"/> Indonesia	<input type="radio"/> Oman	<input type="radio"/> Turkmenistan
<input type="radio"/> Cayman Islands	<input type="radio"/> Iran	<input type="radio"/> Pakistan	<input type="radio"/> Turks and Caicos Islands
<input type="radio"/> Central African Republic	<input type="radio"/> Republic	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Iraq		Palau	Tuvalu
 Chad	 Ireland	 Palestine	 Uganda
 Chile	 Isle of Man	 Panama	 Ukraine
China	Israel	Papua New Guinea	United Arab Emirates



- |  |                                  |   |  |
|--|----------------------------------|---|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Christmas Island                 | <input type="radio"/> Italy      | <input type="radio"/> Paraguay                                    | <input type="radio"/> United Kingdom                       |
| <input type="radio"/> Clipperton                       | <input type="radio"/> Jamaica    | <input type="radio"/> Peru  | <input type="radio"/> United States                        |
| <input type="radio"/> Cocos (Keeling) Islands          | <input type="radio"/> Japan      | <input type="radio"/> Philippines                                 | <input type="radio"/> United States Minor Outlying Islands |
| <input type="radio"/> Colombia                         | <input type="radio"/> Jersey     | <input type="radio"/> Pitcairn Islands                            | <input type="radio"/> Uruguay                              |
| <input type="radio"/> Comoros                          | <input type="radio"/> Jordan     | <input type="radio"/> Poland                                      | <input type="radio"/> US Virgin Islands                    |
| <input type="radio"/> Congo                            | <input type="radio"/> Kazakhstan | <input type="radio"/> Portugal                                    | <input type="radio"/> Uzbekistan                           |
| <input type="radio"/> Cook Islands                     | <input type="radio"/> Kenya      | <input type="radio"/> Puerto Rico                                 | <input type="radio"/> Vanuatu                              |
| <input type="radio"/> Costa Rica                       | <input type="radio"/> Kiribati   | <input type="radio"/> Qatar                                       | <input type="radio"/> Vatican City                         |
| <input type="radio"/> Côte d'Ivoire                    | <input type="radio"/> Kosovo     | <input type="radio"/> Réunion                                     | <input type="radio"/> Venezuela                            |
| <input type="radio"/> Croatia                          | <input type="radio"/> Kuwait     | <input type="radio"/> Romania                                     | <input type="radio"/> Vietnam                              |
| <input type="radio"/> Cuba                             | <input type="radio"/> Kyrgyzstan | <input type="radio"/> Russia                                      | <input type="radio"/> Wallis and Futuna                    |
| <input type="radio"/> Curaçao                          | <input type="radio"/> Laos       | <input type="radio"/> Rwanda                                      | <input type="radio"/> Western Sahara                       |
| <input type="radio"/> Cyprus                           | <input type="radio"/> Latvia     | <input type="radio"/> Saint Barthélemy                            | <input type="radio"/> Yemen                                |
| <input type="radio"/> Czechia                          | <input type="radio"/> Lebanon    | <input type="radio"/> Saint Helena Ascension and Tristan da Cunha | <input type="radio"/> Zambia                               |
|  | <input type="radio"/>            | <input type="radio"/>   | <input type="radio"/>                                      |
| <input type="radio"/> Democratic Republic of the Congo | <input type="radio"/> Lesotho    | <input type="radio"/> Saint Kitts and Nevis                       | <input type="radio"/> Zimbabwe                             |
| <input type="radio"/> Denmark                          | <input type="radio"/> Liberia    | <input type="radio"/> Saint Lucia                                 |  |

\* Field of activity or sector (if applicable):

*at least 1 choice(s)*

- ☐ **Payment services**
- ☐ payment initiation and account information services
- ☐ Money remittance services
- ☐ Acquiring services
- ☐ **Ancillary services to payments**
- ☐ Technical service provider
- ☐ Payment system operator
- ☐ Payments scheme
- ☐ **Card scheme**
- ☐ Fintech
- ☐ Other
- ☐ Not applicable

\* Please specify your activity field(s) or sector(s):

--

## \* Publication privacy settings

The Commission will publish the responses to this consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

☐ **Anonymous**

Only your type of respondent, country of origin and contribution will be published. All other personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number) will not be published.

☐ **Public**

Your personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number, country of origin) will be published with your contribution.

☐ I agree with the [personal data protection provisions](#)

## Section 1: Questions for the general public

**Question 1. Please rate the usefulness of instant payment services – which are credited to the beneficiary within seconds – for the following different use cases:**

N.A. stands for "Don't know / no opinion / not relevant"

	1 (not useful)	2 (useful)	3 (very useful)	N. A.
Person to person payments	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Payments in a physical shop	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Payments for on-line shopping	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Payments of invoices	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Payments to public administrations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cross-border payments/transfers within the EU	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cross-border payments/transfers to/from outside the EU	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Please specify what are the other user case(s) you refer to:**

5000 character(s) maximum  
including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

**Question 2. Please rank your preferences for low-value payments<sup>1</sup> (1 to 4, 4 being the least-preferred option) between the following means of payment:**

<sup>1</sup> defined as payments below 30 euros, based on the definition of low-value payments in EU retail payments legislation

	1	2	3	4
Cash	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Paper-based (such as cheques)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Payment instrument with a physical support (such as cards)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Fully de-materialised payment instrument (such as mobile apps)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Question 2.1 Please explain your answer to question 2:**

5000 character(s) maximum  
including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

**Question 3. Please rank your preferences for retail payments above 30 euros (from 1 to 4, 4 being the least-preferred option) between the following means of payment:**

	1	2	3	4

Cash	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Paper-based (such as cheques)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Payment instrument with a physical support (such as cards)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Fully de-materialised payment instrument (such as mobile apps)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

### Question 3.1 Please explain your answer to question 3:

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

In the Single Euro Payments Area, citizens and companies should be able to send and receive cross-border payments in euro from any bank account in the EU (using SEPA credit transfers or SEPA direct debits). This should be valid for all types of beneficiaries of both the public and the private sector.

### Question 4. Have you ever experienced any obstacles when using your bank account in the EU to receive payments from or send payments to a public administration holding an account in another EU country?

- ☐ Yes, as a consumer
- ☐ Yes, in a professional capacity (e.g. business / self-employed)
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

#### Question 4.1 If you did experience obstacles, please specify by giving examples:

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

**Question 5. Have you ever experienced any obstacles when using your bank account in the EU to receive or send payments from/to an account held in another EU country from/to a utilities company or other service providers?**

- ☐ Yes, as a consumer
- ☐ Yes, in a professional capacity (e.g. business / self-employed)
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 5.1 If you did experience obstacles, please specify by giving examples:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

When you buy goods or services, particularly online, you may have the option to pay via “payment initiation services” offered by a different payment service provider than your bank. These services enable you to make a payment directly from your bank account (using a credit transfer), instead of using a payment card or another payment instrument offered by your bank. In order to pay using these services, you need to use your online banking credentials to authorise the transaction.

**Question 6. As a consumer, have you ever made use of such payment initiation services?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ I do not know what these services are
- ☐ No opinion / not relevant

**Question 6.1 If you have made use of such payment initiation services, what do you consider to be the most important aspect when making use of such services (e.g. convenience, safety, discounts offered by merchants)?**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

**Question 6.1 If you never made use of such payment initiation services, please provide us with the reasons why:**



- ☐ I was not offered the possibility
- ☐ I don't know if I can trust such services
- ☐ I do not want to share my online banking credentials with anyone
- ☐ Other

**Question 6.2 Please specify for what other reason(s) you never used such payment initiation services:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

“Account information service” providers enable you to share certain data pertaining to your bank account(s) in order to manage your finance or receive for example, financial advice.

**Question 7. Have you ever made use of such account information services?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No, and I do not know what these services are
- ☐ No opinion / not relevant

In order to deliver their services, providers of payment initiation and account information services need to access only the necessary data from your bank account with your consent.

**Question 8. As a consumer, would you find it useful to be able to check the list of providers to which you have granted consent with the help of a single interface, e.g. a “consent dashboard”?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ I do not know
- ☐ No opinion / not relevant

**Question 8.1 Please explain your answer to question 8:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

**Question 9. What would be your proposals and recommendations to the European Commission on payments?**

**What would you expect the future Retail Payments Strategy to achieve?**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

## Section 2: Questions for all stakeholders

---

Ensuring the EU's economic sovereignty is a priority of the Commission. The Commission's Work Programme for 2020 includes the adoption of a Communication on strengthening Europe's economic and financial sovereignty. As laid down in the [Commission's Communication "Towards a stronger international role of the euro"](#), supporting the international role of the euro is instrumental. Efficient payments in euro will support these objectives, and will also contribute to making our financial infrastructures more resilient to extraterritorial sanctions, or other form of pressure, from third countries.

**Question 10. Please explain how the European Commission could, in the field of payments, contribute to reinforcing the EU's economic independence:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

**Question 11. Please explain how the retail payments strategy could support and reinforce the international role of the euro:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

## A. Fast, convenient, safe, affordable and transparent payment instruments with pan-European reach and “same as domestic” experience

### Instant payments as the new normal

Digitalisation and new technologies have fostered the emergence of innovative players with new payment services offerings, based in particular on instant payment systems and related business models. As these new payment services offerings are mostly domestically focused, the landscape at EU level is very fragmented. In particular, such fragmentation results from:

1. the current levels of adherence to the SEPA Instant Credit Transfer (SCT Inst.) scheme, which vary between Member States (MS);
2. the fact that in some MS instant credit transfers are a premium service while in others they are becoming “a new normal” and
3. the non-interoperability across borders of end-user solutions for instant credit transfers.

At the same time, there is a rapidly rising consumer demand for payment services that work across borders throughout Europe, and that are also faster, cheaper and easier to use.

### Question 12. Which of the following measures would in your opinion contribute to the successful roll-out of pan-European payment solutions based on instant credit transfers?

N.A. stands for "Don't know / no opinion / not relevant"

	1 (irrelevant)	2 (rather not relevant)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather relevant)	5 (fully relevant)	N. A.
a. EU legislation making Payment Service Providers' (PSP) adherence to SCT Inst. Scheme mandatory	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. EU legislation mandating the replacement of regular SCT with SCT Inst.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. EU legislation adding instant credit transfers to the list of services included in the						

payment account with basic features referred to in <a href="#">Directive 2014/92/EU</a>						
d. Development of new payment schemes, for example SEPA Direct Debit Inst. Scheme or QR interoperability scheme <sup>2</sup>						
e. Additional standardisation supporting payments, including standards for technologies used to initiate instant payments, such as QR or others						
f. Other						

<sup>2</sup> For the purpose of this consultation, a scheme means a single set of rules, practices and standards and/or implementation guidelines agreed between payment services providers, and if appropriate other relevant participants in the payments ecosystem, for the initiation and/or execution of payment transactions across the Union and within Member States, and includes any specific decision-making body, organisation or entity accountable for the functioning of the scheme.

## Please specify what new payment schemes should be developed according to you:

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

## Please specify what kind of additional standardisation supporting payments should be developed:

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

**Please specify what other measures would contribute to the successful roll-out of pan-European payment solutions based on instant credit transfers:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

**Question 13. If adherence to SCT Inst. were to become mandatory for all PSPs that currently adhere to SCT, which of the possible following end-dates should be envisaged?**

- ☐ By end 2021
- ☒ By end 2022
- ☐ By end 2023
- ☐ Other
- ☐ Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Please specify what other end-date should be envisaged if adherence to SCT Inst. were to become mandatory:**

Some exceptions to this rule should be explored, in particular for small, highly specialized credit institutions which would see no benefit in adhering to the SCT Inst scheme. In our opinion, the adherence to SCT Inst. should remain optional for these entities.

**Question 13.1 Please explain your answer to question 13:**

**Question 14. In your opinion, do instant payments pose additional or increased risks (in particular fraud or money laundering) compared to the traditional credit transfers?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 14.1 If you think instant payments do pose additional or increased risks compared to the traditional credit transfers, please explain your answer:**

**Question 15. As instant payments are by definition fast, they could be seen as aggravating bank runs. Would an ad-hoc stopgap mechanism be useful for emergency situations, for example a mechanism available to banks or competent authorities to prevent instant payments from facilitating faster bank runs, in addition to moratorium powers (moratorium powers are the powers of public authorities to freeze the flow of payments from a bank for a period of time)?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 15.1 If you think an ad-hoc stopgap mechanism would be useful for emergency situations, please explain your answer and specify under which conditions:**

From a merchant's perspective, payment solutions based on instant credit transfers may require adjustments to the merchant's current IT, accounting, liquidity management systems, etc. On the other hand, current card-based payment solutions do not require such adjustments. Merchant service charges may also differ, depending on the type of payment solution offered to the merchant (card-based or SCT-based).

**Question 16. Taking this into account, what would be generally the most advantageous solutions for EU merchants, other than cash?**

- ☐ Card-based solutions
- ☐ SCT Inst.-based solutions
- ☐ Other
- ☐ Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Please specify what other solution(s) other than cash would be the most advantageous for EU merchants:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

**Question 16.1 Please explain your answer to question 16:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

**Question 17. What is in your view the most important factor(s) for merchants when deciding whether or not to start accepting a new payment method?**

**Please rate each of the following proposals:**

N.A. stands for "Don't know / no opinion / not relevant"

	1 (unimportant)	2 (rather not important)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather important)	5 (fully important)	N. A.
Merchant fee	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The proportion of users using that payment method	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Fraud prevention tools /mechanisms	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Seamless customer experience (no cumbersome processes affecting the number of users completing the payment)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reconciliation of transactions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



Refund services						
Other						

**Please specify what other important factor(s) you would foresee:**

The risk of the fraud and the fluidity in the transaction of payment are very important.

**Question 17.1 Please explain your answer to question 17:**

**Question 18. Do you accept SEPA Direct Debit (SDD) payments from residents in other countries?**

- ☒ Yes, I accept domestic and foreign SDD payments
- ☐ No, I only accept domestic SDD payments
- ☐ I do not accept SDD payments at all
- ☐ Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 18.1 If you do accept SEPA Direct Debit (SDD) payments from residents in other countries, please explain why:**

Some institutions may consider that in some cases, there remains a risk to accept SDD payments from residents in other countries for fraud and money laundering reasons, as regards local legislation and supervision

## **Leveraging on the development of digital identities (digital ID)**

The issue of use of digital ID for customer on-boarding is addressed in the digital finance consultation. However as financial services evolve away from traditional face-to-face business towards the digital environment, digital identity solutions that can be relied upon for remote customer authentication become increasingly relevant. PSD2 has introduced “strong customer authentication” (SCA), which imposes strict security requirements for the initiation and

processing of electronic payments, requiring payment service providers to apply SCA when a payer initiates an electronic payment transaction. In some Member States, digital identity schemes have been developed for use in bank authentication based on national ID schemes. However until now such schemes are focused on the domestic markets and do not function across borders. On the other hand, many other “SCA compliant” digital identity solutions have been developed by financial institutions or specialist identity solution providers that rely on other means to identify and verify customers.

**Question 19. Do you see a need for action to be taken at EU level with a view to promoting the development of cross-border compatible digital identity solutions for payment authentication purposes?**

- ☒ Yes, changes to EU legislation
- ☐ Yes, another type of action
- ☐ No, I do not see a need for action
- ☐ Other
- ☐ Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Please specify what other need(s) for action you would foresee or what other type(s) of action you would recommend:**

On credit institutions side, it could be more efficient to share data with merchants to prevent the risk of fraud.

It could be interesting for Members to propose an electronic identity.

Our goal should be a pan-European system with an access to accounts and initiation of payment facilitated and secured by a third party. It is important to emphasize the need for a European identification system as same as Know Your Customer (KWC) to improve the customer experience and fight against fraud. This identification system could be very useful to identify one person with a multi-banked profil.

**Question 19.1 Please explain your answer to question 19:**

**Promoting the diversity of payment options, including cash**

Digitalisation has contributed to an increase in non-cash payments. However, a large percentage of daily payment transactions still rely on cash.

**Question 20. What are the main factors contributing to a decreasing use of cash in some countries EU countries?**

**Please rate each of the following factors:**

N.A. stands for "Don't know / no opinion / not relevant"

	1 (irrelevant)	2 (rather not relevant)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather relevant)	5 (fully relevant)	N. A.
Convenience of paying digitally	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The increasing importance of e-commerce	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Contactless payments	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The shrinking availability of ATMs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The cost of withdrawing cash	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Digital wallets	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cash backs for card payments	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
EU or national Regulation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Please specify which EU or national regulation(s) may contribute to a decreasing use of cash in some countries in the EU:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

**Please specify what other factor(s) may contribute to a decreasing use of cash in some countries in the EU:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

**Question 21. Do you believe that the EU should consider introducing measures to preserve the access to and acceptance of cash (without prejudice to the limits imposed by Member States for large cash transactions)**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 21.1 Please explain your answer to question 21:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*













including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

**Question 22. Which of the following measures do you think could be necessary to ensure that cash remains accessible and usable by EU citizens?**

**Please rate each of the following proposal:**

N.A. stands for "Don't know / no opinion / not relevant"

	1 (irrelevant)	2 (rather not relevant)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather relevant)	5 (fully relevant)	N. A.
Promote a sufficient coverage of ATMs in the EU, including in remote areas	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
EU legislation adding 'free-of-charge cash withdrawals' to the list of services included in the "payment account with basic	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

features” referred to in the Payment Accounts Directive						
Ensure that cash is always accepted as a means of payment at point of sale						
Other						

**Question 22.1 Please specify what other measures would be necessary to ensure that cash remains accessible and usable by EU citizens:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

## B. An innovative, competitive and contestable European retail payments market

The current EU legal framework for retail payments includes EMD2 and PSD2. To ensure that both Directives produce their full-intended effects and remain fit for purpose over the next years, the Commission is seeking evidence about:

1. PSD2 implementation and market developments;
2. experience with open banking;
3. adequacy of EMD2 in the light of recent market developments; and
4. prospective developments in the retail payments sphere.

The topic of open banking is also included, from a broader perspective, in the Digital Finance consultation referred above.

### PSD2 implementation and market developments

Two years after the entry into force of PSD2 and without prejudice to its future review, it is useful to collect some preliminary feed-back about the effects of PSD2 on the market.

**Question 23. Taking into account that experience with PSD2 is so far limited, what would you consider has been the impact of PSD2 in the market so far?**

**Please rate the following statements:**

	1 (strongly disagree)	2 (rather disagree)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather agree)	5 (fully agree)	N. A.
PSD2 has facilitated access to the market for payment service providers other than banks	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PSD2 has increased competition	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PSD2 has facilitated innovation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PSD2 has allowed for open banking to develop	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PSD2 has increased the level of security for payments	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

### Please specify what other impact PSD2 had in the market so far:

The development of pan-European scheme is crucial to build homogenous solutions for all entities in the future. PSD2 impact cannot be fully measured at this stage. The credit institutions have been modifying their IT system to accept API. Therefore, it's too early for them to evaluate PSD2 impacts on the market. It seems relevant to analyze the aggregation's services effects on the market payment before to extend the scope to new actors or refit the legislation.

Question 23.1 Please explain your answer to question 23:

**Question 24. The payments market is in constant evolution. Are there any activities which are not currently in the list of payment services of PSD2 and which would raise specific and significant risks not addressed by current legislation?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 24.1 Please explain your answer to question 24:**

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

**Question 25. PSD2 introduced strong customer authentication to mitigate the risk of fraud or of unauthorised electronic payments. Do you consider that certain new developments regarding fraud (stemming for example from a particular technology, a means of payment or use cases) would require additional mitigating measures to be applied by payment services providers or users?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 25.1 Please explain your answer to question 25 and specify if this should be covered by legislation:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

*including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.*

In order to mitigate the risk of fraud or of unauthorised electronic payments, we do consider credit institutions should be authorised to share their data with other regulated actors, and with merchants (for credit consumer).

In addition, RGPD cannot be a barrier if the finality is to prevent fraud.

**Question 26. Recent developments have highlighted the importance of developing innovative payment solutions. Contactless payments have, in particular, become critical to reduce the spread of viruses.**

**Do you think that new, innovative payment solutions should be developed?**

- ☐ Yes



- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 26.1 If you answered yes to question 26, please explain your answer:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

**Question 27. Do you believe in particular that contactless payments (based on cards, mobile apps or other innovative technologies) should be further facilitated ?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 27.1 Please explain your answer to question 27.**

**(Please consider to include the following elements: how would you promote them? For example, would you support an increase of the current ceilings authorised by EU legislation? And do you believe that mitigating measures on fraud and liability should then be also envisaged?):**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

## Improving access to payment accounts data under PSD2

Since 14 September 2019, the PSD2 Regulatory Technical Standards on Strong Customer Authentication and Common and Secure Standards of Communication are applicable, which means that account servicing payment service providers (ASPSPs) must have at least one interface available to securely communicate – upon customer consent – with Third-party providers (TPPs) and share customers' payment accounts data. These interfaces can be either a dedicated or an adjusted version of the customer-facing interface. The vast majority of banks in the EU opted for putting in place dedicated interfaces, developing so-called Application Programming Interfaces (APIs). This section will also consider recent experience with APIs.

Some market players have expressed the view that in the migration to new interfaces, the provision of payment initiation and account information services may be less seamless than in the past. Consumer organizations have raised questions with regard to the management of consent under PSD2. The development of so-called “consent dashboards” can, on the one hand, provide a convenient tool for consumers who may easily retrieve the information on the different TPPs to which they granted consent to access their payment account data. On the other hand, such dashboards may raise competition issues.

**Question 28. Do you see a need for further action at EU level to ensure that open banking under PSD2 achieves its full potential?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**28.1 If you do see a need for further action at EU level to ensure that open banking under PSD2 achieves its full potential, please rate each of the following proposals:**

N.A. stands for "Don't know / no opinion / not relevant"

	1 (irrelevant)	2 (rather not relevant)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather relevant)	5 (fully relevant)	N. A.
Promote the use of different authentication methods, ensuring that the ASPSPs always offer both a redirection-based and an embedded approach	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Promote the development of a scheme involving relevant market players with a view to facilitating the delegation of Strong Customer Authentication to TPPs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Promote the implementation of consent dashboards allowing payment service users to manage the consent to access their data via a single interface	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other						

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

## Question 28.2 Please specify what other proposal(s) you have:

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

## Question 29. Do you see a need for further action at EU level promoting the standardisation of dedicated interfaces (e.g. Application Programming Interfaces – APIs) under PSD2?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

### Question 29.1 Please explain your answer to question 29:

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

## Adapting EMD2 to the evolution of the market and experience in its implementation

Since the entry into force of EMD2 in 2009, the payments market has evolved considerably. This consultation is an opportunity to obtain feedback from stakeholders with regard to the fitness of the e-money regime in the context of market developments. The aspects related to cryptocurrencies are more specifically addressed in the [consultation on crypto-assets including “stablecoins”](#)

## Question 30. Do you consider the current authorisation and prudential regime for electronic money institutions (including capital requirements and safeguarding of funds) to be adequate?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

### Question 30.1 Please explain your answer to question 30:

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

**30.2 If you do you not consider the current authorisation and prudential regime adequate, what are most relevant factors as to why the prudential regime for electronic money institutions may not be adequate?**

**Please rate each of the following proposals**

N.A. stands for "Don't know / no opinion / not relevant"

	1 (irrelevant)	2 (rather not relevant)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather relevant)	5 (fully relevant)	N. A.
Imbalance between risks and applicable prudential regime	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Difficulties in implementing the prudential requirements due to unclear or ambiguous legal requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Difficulties in implementing the prudential requirements stemming from practical aspects (e.g. difficulties in obtaining an insurance for the safeguarding of users' funds)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**30.3 Please specify what are the other factor(s) make the prudential regime for electronic money institutions not adequate:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Under PSD2 and EMD2, the authorisation regimes for the provision of payment services and the issuance of E-money are distinct. However, a number of provisions that apply to payment institutions apply to electronic money institutions mutatis mutandis.

**Question 31. Would you consider it useful to further align the regime for payment institutions and electronic money institutions?**

- ☐ Yes, the full alignment of the regimes is appropriate
- ☐ Yes, but a full alignment is not appropriate because certain aspects cannot be addressed by the same regime
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 31.1 Please explain your answer to question 31:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

**31.2 Please state which differences, if any, between payment institutions and electronic money institutions might require, a different regime:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

**Payment solutions of the future**

As innovation is permanent in the payments sphere, this consultation also considers potential further enhancements to the universe of payment solutions. One of them is the so-called “programmable money”, which facilitates the execution of smart contracts (a smart contract is a computer program that runs directly on a blockchain and can control the transfer of crypto-assets based on the set criteria implemented in its code). In the future, the use of smart contracts in a blockchain environment may call for targeted payment solutions facilitating the safe execution of smart contracts in the most efficient way. One of the relevant potential use cases could be the automation of the manufacturing industry (Industry 4.0).

**Question 32. Do you see “programmable money” as a promising development to support the needs of the digital economy?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 32.1 If you do see “programmable money” as a promising development to support the needs of the digital economy, how and to what extent, in your views, could EU policies facilitate its safe deployment?**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

*including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.*

## **C. Access to safe, efficient and interoperable retail payment systems and other support infrastructures**

---

In Europe, the infrastructure that enables millions of payments every day has undergone significant changes over the last decade, most notably under the umbrella of SEPA. However, some issues remain, such as: ensuring the full interoperability of European payment systems, in particular those processing instant payments and ensuring a level playing field between bank and non-bank payment service providers in the accessibility of payment systems. Furthermore, some Member States have put in place licensing regimes for payment system operators in addition to central bank oversight, while others have not.

### **Interoperability of instant payments infrastructures**

With regard to SCT and SDD, under EU law it is the obligation of operators or, in absence thereof, of the participants in the retail payment systems, to ensure that such systems are technically interoperable with the other retail payment systems.

**Question 33. With regard to SCT Inst., do you see a role for the European Commission in facilitating solutions for achieving this interoperability in a cost-efficient way?**

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 33.1 Please explain your answer to question 33:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*



including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

## Ensure a fair and open access to relevant technical infrastructures in relation to payments activity

(This topic is also included, from a broader perspective, in the [digital finance consultation](#)).

In some Member States, legislation obliges providers of technical services supporting the provision of payment services to give access to such technical services to all payment service providers.

### Question 34. Do you agree with the following statements?

N.A. stands for "Don't know / no opinion / not relevant"

	1 (strongly disagree)	2 (rather disagree)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather agree)	5 (fully agree)	N. A.
Existence of such legislation in only some Member States creates level playing field risks	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
EU legislation should oblige providers of technical services supporting the provision of payment services to give access to such technical services to all payment service providers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Mandatory access to such technical services creates additional security risks	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

### Question 34.1 Please explain your answer to question 34:

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

## 34.2 If you think that EU legislation should address this issue, please explain under which conditions such access should be given:

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

### Facilitating access to payments infrastructures

In a competitive retail payments market, banks, payment and e-money institutions compete in the provision of payment services to end users. In order to provide payment services, payment service providers generally need to get direct or indirect access to payment systems to execute payment transactions. Whereas banks can access any payment system directly, payment institutions and e-money institutions can only access some payment systems indirectly.

#### Question 35. Is direct access to all payment systems important for payment institutions and e-money institutions or is indirect participation through a bank sufficient?

- ☐ Yes, direct participation should be allowed
- ☐ No, indirect participation through banks is sufficient
- ☐ Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

#### Question 35.1 Why do you think direct participation should be allowed?

You can select as many answers as you like.

- ☐ Because otherwise non-banks are too dependent on banks, which are their direct competitors
- ☐ Because banks restrict access to bank accounts to non-banks providing payment services
- ☐ Because the fees charged by banks are too high
- ☐ Other reasons

#### Question 35.2 Please specify the other reason(s) why you think direct participation should be allowed:

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

---

**Question 35.1 Why do you think indirect participation through banks is sufficient?**

You can select as many answers as you like.

- ☐ Because the cost of direct participation would be too high
- ☐ Because banks offer indirect access at reasonable conditions
- ☐ Other reasons

**Question 35.2 Please specify the other reason(s) why you think indirect participation through banks is sufficient:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

**Please add any relevant information to your answer(s) to question 35 and sub-questions:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

**Question 36. As several – but not all – Member States have adopted licensing regimes for payment system operators, is there a risk in terms of level playing field, despite the existence of central bank oversight?**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

## D. Improved cross-border payments, including remittances, facilitating the international role of the euro

---

While there has been substantial progress towards SEPA, cross-border payments between the EU and other jurisdictions, including remittances, are generally more complex, slow, opaque, inconvenient and costly. According to the World Bank's Remittance Prices Worldwide database, the [average cost of sending remittances currently stands at 6.82%](#). Improving cross-border payments in general, including remittances, has become a global priority and work is being conducted in the framework of international fora such as the Financial Stability Board and the Committee on Payments and Market Infrastructures to find solutions to reduce that cost. The United Nations Sustainable Development goals also include the reduction of remittance costs to less than 3% by 2030. Reducing the costs of cross-border payments in euro should also contribute to enhancing the international role of the euro.

### Question 37. Do you see a need for action at EU level on cross-border payments between the EU and other jurisdictions?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

#### Question 37.1 Please explain your answer to question 37:

*5000 character(s) maximum*

*including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.*

### Question 38. Should the Commission play a role (legislative or other) in facilitating cross-border payments between the EU and the rest of the world?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

### Question 39. Should the Commission play a role in facilitating remittances, through e.g. cost reduction, improvement of services?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

#### Question 39.1 Please explain your answer to question 39 and specify which role the Commission should play – legislative or non-legislative:

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

**Question 40. Taking into account that the industry is developing or implementing solutions to facilitate cross-border payments between the EU and other jurisdictions, to what extent would you support the following actions:**

N.A. stands for "Don't know / no opinion / not relevant"

	1 (irrelevant)	2 (rather not relevant)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather relevant)	5 (fully relevant)	N. A.
Include in SEPA SCT scheme one-leg credit transfers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Wide adoption by the banking industry of cross-border payment trackers such as SWIFT's Global Payments Initiative	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Facilitate linkages between instant payment systems between jurisdictions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Support "SEPA-like" experiences at regional level outside the EU and explore possible linkages with SEPA where relevant and feasible	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Support and promote the adoption of international standards such as ISO 20022	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

## Please specify what other action(s) you would support:

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

## Question 40.1 Please explain your answer to question 40:

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

## Question 41. Would establishing linkages between instant payments systems in the EU and other jurisdictions:

- ☐ Reduce the cost of cross-border payments between the EU and other jurisdictions?
- ☐ Increase the costs of cross-border payments between the EU and other jurisdictions?
- ☐ Have no impact on the costs of cross-border payments between the EU and other jurisdictions?
- ☐ Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

## Question 41.1 Please explain your answer to question 41:

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

## Additional information

---

Should you wish to provide additional information (e.g. a position paper, report) or raise specific points not covered by the questionnaire, you can upload your additional document(s) here:

The maximum file size is 1 MB.

You can upload several files.

Only files of the type pdf,txt,doc,docx,odt,rtf are allowed