

Contribution ID: d27c11b1-e081-402b-a975-a5620af95b38

Date: 26/06/2020 12:08:55

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 (<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32000L0046>) and EMD2 (<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32009L0110>)) and the first Payment Services Directive (PSD1 (<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32007L0064>)) 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 (<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32015L2366>)) 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](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32009R0924) (<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32009R0924>).

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](https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/finance-consultations-2019-crypto-assets_en) (https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/finance-consultations-2019-crypto-assets_en). 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](https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/finance-consultations-2019-financial-services-digital-resilience_en) (https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/finance-consultations-2019-financial-services-digital-resilience_en) 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.europ.eu (<mailto:fisma-retail-payments@ec.europ.eu>).

More information:

- [on this consultation \(https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/finance-consultations-2020-retail-payments-strategy_en\)](https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/finance-consultations-2020-retail-payments-strategy_en)
- [on the consultation document \(https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/2020-retail-payments-strategy-consultation-document_en\)](https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/2020-retail-payments-strategy-consultation-document_en)
- [on payment services \(https://ec.europa.eu/info/business-economy-euro/banking-and-finance/consumer-finance-and-payments/payment-services_en\)](https://ec.europa.eu/info/business-economy-euro/banking-and-finance/consumer-finance-and-payments/payment-services_en)
- [on the protection of personal data regime for this consultation \(https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/2020-retail-payments-strategy-specific-privacy-statement_en\)](https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/2020-retail-payments-strategy-specific-privacy-statement_en)

About you

* Language of my contribution

English

* I am giving my contribution as

Company/business organisation

* 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 organisation

Corporate Treasury association

* Age range

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

* First name

Tarek

* Surname

Tranberg

Email (this won't be published)**Organisation name***255 character(s) maximum****Organisation size**

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

Transparency register number*255 character(s) maximum*

Check if your organisation is on the transparency register (<http://ec.europa.eu/transparencyregister/public/homePage.do?redir=false&locale=en>). It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

***Country of origin**

Please add your country of origin, or that of your organisation.

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):

Corporate treasury

*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 (https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/better-regulation/specific-privacy-statement_en)

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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Payments in a physical shop	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Payments for on-line shopping	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Payments of invoices	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Payments to public administrations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cross-border payments/transfers within the EU	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cross-border payments/transfers to/from outside the EU	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Question 2. Please rank your preferences for low-value payments¹ (1 to 4, 4 being the least-preferred option) between the following means of payment:

¹ 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

Question 2.1 Please explain your answer to question 2:

5,000 character(s) maximum

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

The driving factors behind the choice of payment instrument are the speed of execution, the security of the means of payment and the ability to limit fraudulent behaviour, as well as the administrative effort associated with the choice of payment means. Equally transparency over the full journey of a payment and the ability to enrich the data to improve reconciliation are contributing factors in determining the most appropriate means of payment.

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

Question 3.1 Please explain your answer to question 3:

5,000 character(s) maximum

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

Card payment are easy to use by consumers. Mobile app payments depend on the availability of the necessary technical infrastructure at both the point of sale and from the consumer side.

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:

5,000 character(s) maximum

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

There are obstacles with regard to executing tax payments to public authorities, which in many EU countries requires the entity executing the payment to hold a local account. A larger facilitation of cross-border payments for public services would reduce obstacles to cross-border business activities in the single market.

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:

5,000 character(s) maximum

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

There are hurdles across some jurisdictions with regard to collection of direct debit payments from consumers across borders.

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)?

5,000 character(s) maximum

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

This is a secure (through customer authentication) and fast way of executing cross-border transactions and achieve seamless integration with bank APIs.

“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:

5,000 character(s) maximum

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

We would agree that it would be beneficial to provide consumers with a consent dashboard to allow them to manage all third party providers to which they have established relationships and to whom they have granted access.

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?

5,000 character(s) maximum

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

Europe would benefit from a greater top down regulatory harmonisation. There remain too many differences in payment methods between countries as well as a discrepancy in the availability of individual methods. For example, instant payment execution can mean different things in different jurisdictions, with variations in maximum amounts that can be paid through instant payment architecture, as well as divergences in execution time in the different national schemes. IBAN structures vary per country, internet banking requirements are different, and bank presence in individual jurisdictions does not necessarily mean that all available payment services are being offered to all bank customers in other EU jurisdictions.

EU policymakers ought to drive forward a greater push towards cross-border payment harmonisation through uniform Regulation across the single market. In the meantime full implementation of SEPA and PSD2 are steps in the right direction towards achieving this objective. In parallel, harmonisation of rules should be combined with mandatory uptake of new payment solutions such as SCT Inst. and Request to Pay, as it is only through mandatory implementation and uptake that genuine harmonised implementation across the single market can be achieved.

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"](https://ec.europa.eu/commission/sites/beta-political/files/communication_-_towards_a_stronger_international_role_of_the_euro.pdf) ([https://ec.europa.eu/commission/sites/beta-political/files/communication - towards a stronger international role of the euro.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/commission/sites/beta-political/files/communication_-_towards_a_stronger_international_role_of_the_euro.pdf)), 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:

5,000 character(s) maximum

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

Achieving a wider implementation of instant payments on the basis of an EU harmonised scheme would ensure that the EU payments landscape becomes a true single market and that cross-border barriers to payments in the EU are removed to the largest extent possible. Use of Regulation to require mandatory implementation of instant payments and other emerging payments solutions such as Request To Pay could be one way of achieving this objective, paired with harmonised rules on e.g. maximum amounts and settlement periods.

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

5,000 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 Directive 2014/92/EU (https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32014L0092)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. Development of new payment schemes, for example SEPA Direct Debit Inst. Scheme or QR interoperability scheme ²	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e. Additional standardisation supporting payments, including standards for technologies used to initiate instant payments, such as QR or others	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f. Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

² 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:

5,000 character(s) maximum

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

Request to pay for which the EPC is currently developing a rulebook is a promising solution that could simplify payment processes and reduce reliance on comparatively less efficient direct debits.

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

5,000 character(s) maximum

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

There is a need for achieving greater harmonisation across all national card and SCT schemes to foster greater convenience, speed, and availability of cross-border payments in the EU. There should be no difference in security, ease, speed, and availability of services between national payments and cross-border payments in the EU.

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

Question 13.1 Please explain your answer to question 13:

5,000 character(s) maximum

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

To ensure broader market penetration and quicker harmonisation across the single market it would be advisable to make implementation and adherence to SCT Inst. mandatory as swiftly as possible.

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:

5,000 character(s) maximum

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

Instant payments increase the risk of payment fraud if systems are compromised. The funds are irrevocably booked within seconds, with no means of payment reversal in the event of fraud.

From our point of view there are also open questions with regard to internal AML processes would be handled on the side of financial institutions in the context of funds being instantly booked.

Additionally, from an operational perspective there needs to be a guarantee for minimum harmonisation with regard to execution and settlement periods in order to give end-users operational certainty when using instant payments.

Equally, even if wider and more harmonised adoption of instant payments is desirable, any framework put in place would need to safeguard end-user and consumer protection - with respect to instant payments for example there would need to be a recourse mechanism that would allow for mistaken payments to be retrieved.

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:

5,000 character(s) maximum

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

Whilst we agree in principle that there should be a stop gap mechanism in place to halt the execution of instant payments in the event of severe market stress that threatens the stability of individual institutions, there are open questions of where the ultimate backstop to prevent an institution from failing would be. Given instant payments would be executed and settled almost instantaneously, there would need to be a guarantee that supervisors can step in in a timely manner to halt payment execution before payment outflows cause critical failures.

Such a stopgap mechanism would also need to be clear on interactions with the overnight Liquidity Coverage Ratio calibrations and the general moratorium powers that supervisors have for banks.

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

Question 16.1 Please explain your answer to question 16:

5,000 character(s) maximum

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

Use of SCT Inst. ought to be the preferred choice for EU merchants as it is likely to be the cheapest and fastest option available to them.

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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Refund services	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Question 17.1 Please explain your answer to question 17:

5,000 character(s) maximum

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

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

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, further guidance or development of new standards to facilitate cross-border interoperability
- Yes, another type of action
- No, I do not see a need for action
- Other
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

Question 19.1 Please explain your answer to question 19:

5,000 character(s) maximum

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

We would ask for the greatest possible integration of identification methods such as the Legal Entity Identifier (LEI) into EU financial services legislation. This would go a significant way towards a harmonised EU approach to electronic identification and operating a single standard for preventing fraud across the single market.

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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The increasing importance of e-commerce	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Contactless payments	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The shrinking availability of ATMs	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Digital wallets	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cash backs for card payments	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
EU or national Regulation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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:*5,000 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:

5,000 character(s) maximum

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

EU legislation should keep open the option of using cash as a means of payment to avoid a detrimental impact on persons with a limited ability to gain access to a bank account and the corresponding electronic means of payment. It would also enable those who either cannot or will not use digital services to remain active economic participants.

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 checked="" type="radio"/>
EU legislation adding 'free-of-charge cash withdrawals' to the list of services included in the "payment account with basic features" referred to in the Payment Accounts Directive	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ensure that cash is always accepted as a means of payment at point of sale	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>
-------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

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:

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.
PSD2 has facilitated access to the market for payment service providers other than banks	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PSD2 has increased competition	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PSD2 has facilitated innovation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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"/>

Question 23.1 Please explain your answer to question 23:

5,000 character(s) maximum

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

Broadly speaking PSD2 has enabled more innovation to take place through delivering more open access to data. At the same time, however, there is a need for ensuring proportionality within the PSD2 framework to continue enabling innovation. For example Corporate Payments Factories or Shared Services Centres of non-financial groups should not be subject to licencing provisions as payment providers.

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:

5,000 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:

5,000 character(s) maximum

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

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:

5,000 character(s) maximum

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

Legislation should always encourage rather than stifle innovation. The same approach that is relevant for Digital Finance and FinTech more broadly is applicable in the payments space. There should always be room for the development of new payment solutions, so long as industry safety standards are adhered to.

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?):

5,000 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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"/>

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:

5,000 character(s) maximum

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

Standards are necessary in order to have homogenous interfaces. This is the prerequisite for automation. Specific APIs are often used to maintain or force customer loyalty, making it difficult to switch between providers.

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"](https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/finance-consultations-2019-crypto-assets_en) (https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/finance-consultations-2019-crypto-assets_en).

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:

5,000 character(s) maximum

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

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

5,000 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:

5,000 character(s) maximum

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

Ensuring a greater alignment between the prudential regimes for payments institutions and e-money institutions could contribute to levelling the playing field, whilst avoiding undue regulatory burdens being placed on nascent FinTech companies.

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

5,000 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

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:

5,000 character(s) maximum

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

In the absence of a top-down approach towards harmonisation and implementation across the single market, interoperability will not be achievable.

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 \(https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/finance-consultations-2019-digital-payments-strategy_en\)](https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/finance-consultations-2019-digital-payments-strategy_en)).

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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Mandatory access to such technical services creates additional security risks	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Question 34.1 Please explain your answer to question 34:

5,000 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:

5,000 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

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

5,000 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?

5,000 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% (<https://remittanceprices.worldbank.org/en>). 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:

5,000 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:

5,000 character(s) maximum

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

Introducing a ceiling through legislation on the average cost of remittances would ensure that there is a real transmission of value.

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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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:

5,000 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:

5,000 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:

5,000 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:

Useful links

More on this consultation (https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/finance-consultations-2020-retail-payments-strategy_en)

(https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/finance-consultations-2020-retail-payments-strategy_en)

Consultation document (https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/2020-retail-payments-strategy-consultation-document_en) (https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/2020-retail-payments-strategy-consultation-document_en)

More on payment services (https://ec.europa.eu/info/business-economy-euro/banking-and-finance/consumer-finance-and-payments/payment-services_en)

(https://ec.europa.eu/info/business-economy-euro/banking-and-finance/consumer-finance-and-payments/payment-services_en)

Specific privacy statement (https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/2020-retail-payments-strategy-specific-privacy-statement_en) (https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/2020-retail-payments-strategy-specific-privacy-statement_en)

More on the Transparency register (<http://ec.europa.eu/transparencyregister/public/homePage.do?locale=en>)

(<http://ec.europa.eu/transparencyregister/public/homePage.do?locale=en>)

Contact

fisma-retail-payments@ec.europa.eu
