MAI 2022

AFG - Targeted consultation on a digital euro





The AFG federates the asset management industry for 60 years, serving investors and the economy. It is the collective voice of its members, the asset management companies, whether they are entrepreneurs or subsidiaries of banking or insurance groups, French or foreigners. In France, the asset management industry comprises 680 management companies, with €4355 billion under management and 85,000 jobs, including 26,000 jobs in management companies.

The AFG commits to the growth of the asset management industry, brings out solutions that benefit all players in its ecosystem and makes the industry shine and develop in France, Europe and beyond, in the interests of all. The AFG is fully invested to the future.

Contribution ID: cf246f4a-1bc6-45b0-9cb4-5584505e1dbb

Date: 10/06/2022 12:40:24

Targeted consultation on a digital euro

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Introduction

In <u>March 2021</u>, the <u>Eurosummit</u> called for a stronger and more innovative digital finance sector and more efficient and resilient payment systems and stated that exploratory work on a digital euro should be taken forward.

The introduction of a digital euro aims to preserve the role of public money in a digital economy. Preserving the accessibility and usability of central bank money in the digital era is key to protect monetary sovereignty and the well-tested two-layer monetary system based on convertibility of regulated/supervised forms of money into central bank money. Central bank digital money would thus complement cash in providing a monetary anchor to the payments system by ensuring that private money can always be converted in safe public money. This would support confidence in the singleness of money and financial stability in the digital age.

In addition, the <u>digital finance and retail payment strategies of the Commission</u> adopted in September 2020 supported the emergence of competitive pan-European payment solutions and the exploration of a digital euro, while continuing to safeguard the legal tender status of euro cash (see also <u>ECB cash 2030 strategy</u>). The <u>ECB's retail payment strategy</u> shares similar objectives. The digital euro should be considered in the context of ongoing efforts to reduce the fragmentation of the EU retail payments market, promote competition and innovation, including the full roll-out of instant payments, and industry initiatives to offer pan-European payment services, such as the <u>European Payments Initiative</u>, while ensuring that cash remains widely accessible and accepted.

In October 2020, the <u>ECB issued its report on a digital euro</u> and between October 2020 and January 2021 the <u>ECB ran a public consultation on a digital euro</u>. The ECB's public consultation surveyed both the general public and the financial, payment and technology professionals and sought their opinion on the main features of a digital euro. Out of the 8221 responses, 94% of the respondents identified themselves as citizens. Central banks from non-euro area Member States also envisage issuing digital currencies. In addition, the <u>ECB commissioned a study on new digital payment methods</u> that provides a thorough understanding of the current payment habits of citizens of euro area Member States and specifically their attitudes toward digital payment methods.

For a digital euro to be used as the single currency, concurrently with euro banknotes and coins, it would require a Regulation of the co-legislator, upon a proposal by the Commission, on the basis of Article 133 TFUE. Moreover, additional legislative adjustments of the current EU legislative framework to adjust to the digital euro and possibly to digital currencies issued by central banks of non-euro area Member States may be needed (e.g, definition of funds under PSD2). The implementation of the digital euro within the legal framework, will generally fall under the competence of the ECB.

For this purpose, the present targeted consultation complements the ECB's public consultation. It aims to collect further information from industry specialists, payment service providers (including credit institutions, payment and e-money

institutions), payment infrastructure providers, developers of payment solutions, merchants, merchant associations, consumer associations, retail payments regulators, and supervisors, anti-money laundering (AML) supervisors, Financial Intelligence Units, and other relevant authorities and experts. This targeted consultation will gather further evidence on the following issues

- 1. Users' needs and expectations for a digital euro
- 2. The digital euro's role for the EU's retail payments and the digital economy
- 3. Making the digital euro available for retail use while continuing to safeguard the legal tender status of euro cash
- 4. The digital euro's impact on the financial sector and the financial stability
- 5. Application of anti-money laundering and counter terrorist financing (AML-CFT) rules
- 6. The privacy and data protection aspects
- 7. International payments with a digital euro

This targeted consultation in no way prejudges whether and how these issues will be covered in a legislative proposal by the Commission, or the future scope of that proposal.

For an overview of design options and policy issues discussed in that consultation, please refer to the <u>ECB report on a digital euro</u>.

Stakeholders are invited to explain their reasoning and provide quantitative evidence or estimates, where appropriate.

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 <u>fisma-digitaleuro@ec.europa.eu</u>.

More information on

- this consultation
- the consultation document
- the call for evidence accompanying this consultation
- ECB's report on the digital euro
- ECB's public consultation
- digital euro
- digital finance
- the protection of personal data regime for this consultation

About you

	Bulgarian
	Croatian
	Czech
0	Danish
	Dutch
•	English
0	Estonian
0	Finnish
0	French
0	German
	Greek
	Hungarian
	Irish
	Italian
	Latvian
	Lithuanian
	Maltese
	Polish
	Portuguese
	Romanian
0	Siovak
0	Slovenian
0	Spanish
0	Swedish
*I am	giving my contribution as
(i)	Academic/research institution
•	Business association
	Company/business organisation
	Consumer organisation
	EU citizen
	Environmental organisation
0	

*Language of my contribution

Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
Public authority
Trade union
Other
*First name
Myriam
*Surname
Dana-Thomae
*Email (this won't be published)
m.dana-thomae@afg.asso.fr
*Organisation name
255 character(s) maximum
AFG (Association Française de Gestion Financière)
*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. 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.
Afghanistan Djibouti Libya Saint Martin
Åland Islands Dominica Liechtenstein Saint Pierre and Miquelon

0	Albania	0	Dominican	0	Lithuania	Saint Vincent
			Republic			and the
						Grenadines
	Algeria		Ecuador	0	Luxembourg	Samoa
	American Samoa		Egypt	0	Macau	San Marino
	Andorra		El Salvador		Madagascar	São Tomé and
						Príncipe
0	Angola		Equatorial Guinea	(C)	Malawi	Saudi Arabia
0	Anguilla		Eritrea		Malaysia	Senegal
	Antarctica		Estonia		Maldives	Serbia
	Antigua and		Eswatini		Mali	Seychelles
	Barbuda					
0	Argentina		Ethiopia		Malta	Sierra Leone
	Armenia		Falkland Islands	0	Marshall Islands	Singapore
	Aruba		Faroe Islands	0	Martinique	Sint Maarten
	Australia		Fiji	0	Mauritania	Slovakia
	Austria		Finland	0	Mauritius	Slovenia
	Azerbaijan	0	France	0	Mayotte	Solomon Islands
0	Bahamas		French Guiana		Mexico	Somalia
	Bahrain		French Polynesia	0	Micronesia	South Africa
	Bangladesh		French Southern		Moldova	South Georgia
			and Antarctic			and the South
			Lands			Sandwich
						Islands
	Barbados		Gabon	0	Monaco	South Korea
0	Belarus		Georgia		Mongolia	South Sudan
0	Belgium		Germany		Montenegro	Spain
0	Belize		Ghana		Montserrat	Sri Lanka
	Benin		Gibraltar		Morocco	Sudan
0	Bermuda		Greece	0	Mozambique	Suriname
0	Bhutan		Greenland		Myanmar/Burma	Svalbard and
						Jan Mayen
	Bolivia		Grenada		Namibia	Sweden

	Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba	0	Guadeloupe		Nauru	0	Switzerland
0	Bosnia and Herzegovina	0	Guam	0	Nepal	0	Syria
0	Botswana		Guatemala	0	Netherlands	0	Taiwan
0	Bouvet Island	0	Guernsey	0	New Caledonia	0	Tajikistan
0	Brazil		Guinea	0	New Zealand	0	Tanzania
0	British Indian Ocean Territory	0	Guinea-Bissau	0	Nicaragua	0	Thailand
0	British Virgin Islands	0	Guyana	0	Niger	0	The Gambia
0	Brunei		Haiti		Nigeria	0	Timor-Leste
0	Bulgaria		Heard Island and		Niue	0	Togo
			McDonald Islands	3			
0	Burkina Faso		Honduras		Norfolk Island	0	Tokelau
0	Burundi		Hong Kong	0	Northern	0	Tonga
					Mariana Islands		
0	Cambodia		Hungary	0	North Korea	0	Trinidad and
							Tobago
0	Cameroon		Iceland	0	North Macedonia	0	Tunisia
0	Canada		India	0	Norway	0	Turkey
	Cape Verde		Indonesia	0	Oman	0	Turkmenistan
0	Cayman Islands		Iran	0	Pakistan	0	Turks and
							Caicos Islands
0	Central African		Iraq		Palau	0	Tuvalu
	Republic						
0	Chad		Ireland		Palestine	0	Uganda
0	Chile		Isle of Man	0	Panama	0	Ukraine
0	China		Israel		Papua New	0	United Arab
					Guinea		Emirates
0	Christmas Island		Italy		Paraguay	0	United Kingdom
	Clipperton		Jamaica	0	Peru	0	United States

©	Cocos (Keeling)	Japan	0	Philippines	0	United States
	Islands					Minor Outlying
						Islands
	Colombia	Jersey		Pitcairn Islands	0	Uruguay
	Comoros	Jordan		Poland	0	US Virgin Islands
0	Congo	Kazakhstan	0	Portugal	0	Uzbekistan
0	Cook Islands	Kenya	0	Puerto Rico	0	Vanuatu
0	Costa Rica	Kiribati	0	Qatar		Vatican City
0	Côte d'Ivoire	Kosovo		Réunion		Venezuela
	Croatia	Kuwait		Romania		Vietnam
	Cuba	Kyrgyzstan		Russia		Wallis and
						Futuna
0	Curaçao	Laos		Rwanda		Western Sahara
	Cyprus	Latvia		Saint Barthélemy		Yemen
	Czechia	Lebanon		Saint Helena		Zambia
				Ascension and		
				Tristan da Cunha	l	
0	Democratic	Lesotho		Saint Kitts and		Zimbabwe
	Republic of the			Nevis		
	Congo					
0	Denmark	Liberia		Saint Lucia		
* [: a.l.al	of ooth day on ooth	ov (if amplicable)				
Field	of activity or sector	or (II applicable)				
	Credit institution					
	Financial Sector a					
	•	provider (other than o	cre	dit institutions)		
	Crypto asset serv	•				
	Payment services	association				
	Merchant					
	Merchant organis					
	Technology service	ce providers including	g s	oftware and hardw	var	е
<u></u>	IT solutions provide	der for payments				
	Industrial users of	f payment and value	tra	nsfer systems		
V	Investment mana	gement (e.g. hedge f	un	ds, private equity	fun	ids, venture
	capital funds, moi	ney market funds, se	cu	rities)		

Market infrastructure operation (e.g. CCPs, CSDs, Stock exchanges)
International Financial Institution (IFI)
Other
Not applicable

The Commission will publish all contributions to this targeted consultation. You can choose whether you would prefer to have your details published or to remain anonymous when your contribution is published. Fo r the purpose of transparency, the type of respondent (for example, 'business association, 'consumer association', 'EU citizen') is always published. Your e-mail address will never be published. Opt in to select the privacy option that best suits you. Privacy options default based on the type of respondent selected

*Contribution publication privacy settings

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

Anonymous

Only the organisation type is published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, your field of activity and your contribution will be published as received. The name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your name will not be published. Please do not include any personal data in the contribution itself if you want to remain anonymous.

Public

Organisation details and respondent details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published. Your name will also be published.

I agree with the personal data protection provisions

1. Users' needs and expectations

The digital euro would be available for retail payments [1]. Like cash, it would be public money (a direct central bank liability), but in electronic/digital form. The overarching policy objective of digital euro is to preserve the role of public money in the digital age by providing a digital public money alongside cash. This would protect the role of public money as a stabilising anchor for the payments system even as cash use declines, preserve monetary sovereignty and support the competitive provision of financial services. The digital euro may bring benefits to the retail payment market, financial inclusion, the digitalisation of the economy, the EU's open strategic autonomy [2] and the international role of the euro among others.

Achieving these objectives requires in turn that a digital euro is widely adopted and thus that it fulfils the needs and expectations of prospective users. It is therefore important to identify these.

¹ To be commonly understood as payments between consumer, businesses and public authorities.

² Open Strategic Autonomy enables the EU to be stronger both economically and geopolitically - by being: (i) Open to trade and investment for the EU economy to recover from the crisis and remain competitive and connected to the world (ii) Sustainable and responsible to lead internationally to shape a greener and fairer world, reinforcing existing alliances and engaging with a range of partners (iii) Assertive against unfair and coercive practices and ready to enforce its rights, while always favouring international cooperation to solve global problems.

Question 1. How important do you think the possible following aspects of the digital euro would be for people?

	(not important)	2 (rather not important)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather important)	5 (very important)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Availability of flexible privacy settings that can be adjusted to suit the payment occasion	0	0	0	0	0	•
Wide availability and user-friendly onboarding process	0	0	0	0	0	•
Always an option for the payer to pay anywhere / to anybody in the euro area with digital euro	©	•	0	0	0	•
Easy to use payment instrument (e.g. contactless, biometric authentication)	•	•	•	0	0	•
Account-based payment instrument[3]	0	©	©	0	0	•
Bearer-based payment instrument	0	0	0	0	0	•
Real time settlement / Instant reception of funds	0	0	0	0	0	•
Cost-free for payers	0	0	0	0	0	•
Payment asset is credit risk-free (central bank liability)	0	0	0	0	0	•
Offline payments (face to face without connectivity)	0	0	0	0	0	•

Ability to program conditional payments	0	©	©	0	0	•
Other benefits	0	0	0	0	0	•

³ The digital euro may function as an account based system (verification of transactions by an intermediary), as a bearer instrument (or token,
with verification by parties of a transaction), or a combination of the two. For further explanation, see the ECB report on digital euro. It must be
noted that DLT-based solutions are not exclusive of a specific design option, and can be carried out using an both account-based and bearer
based instrument.

To the	extent	you	deem	it	necessary,	please	explain	the	reasoning	of	your
answe	rs to qu	estio	n 1:								

000 character	r(s) maximum					
luding spaces	s and line breal	ks, i.e. stricter tl	nan the MS Wo	rd characters c	ounting method	

Question 2. How important do you think the following aspects of the digital euro would be for merchants?

	1 (not important)	2 (rather not important)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather important)	5 (very important)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Low acquiring/merchant fees	0	0	0	0	0	•
Better acquiring services	0	0	0	0	0	•
Standards for EU wide acceptance infrastructure (e.g. POS), allowing for pan-European payments	0	0	0	•	0	•
Account-based payment instrument	0	0	0	0	0	•
Bearer-based payment instrument	0	0	0	0	0	•
Real time settlement / Instant reception of funds	0	0	0	0	•	0
Offline payments (face to face without connectivity)	0	0	0	0	0	•
Other benefits	0	0	0	0	0	•

answers to question 2, providing quantitative evidence or estimates: 5000 character(s) maximum including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

To the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your

Question 3. In view of the most important value-added features you consider a digital euro may bring to people (see question 1), in which payment situations do you think the digital euro would bring that added value for **people**?

	(no added value)	(almost no added value)	(some added value)	4 (significant added value)	(very significant added value)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Paying with / transferring digital euros to a (natural) person face-to-face	•	0	0	0	•	•
Paying with/transferring digital euros to a (natural) person remotely	0	0	0	0	0	•
Paying for goods or services at a point of sale (face-to-face)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Paying for goods or services remotely (e-commerce)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Machine to machine Payments (Industry 4.0, IoT)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Paying in situations without connectivity – offline face to face payments	0	0	0	0	0	•
Other situations	0	0	0	0	0	•

⁴ Machine to Machine payments refer to smart contract based transfers of digital ass	sets between machines such as autonomous cars,
manufacturing machines, electricity charging stations and the like. Such transfers of continuous	digital assets are conditional upon meeting certain
requirements which are coded into the smart contract.	

To the extent you deem	it necessary, p	please explain	the reasoning	of your
answers to question 3, p	roviding quanti	itative evidence	or estimates:	

	(s) maximum	i a strictor the	on the MC Wer	d characters o	ounting mothed	
laing spaces	and line breaks	, i.e. stricter tria	an the MS Wor	d characters c	ounting method	•

Question 4. In view of the most important value-added features you consider a digital euro may bring to businesses/merchants (see question 2), in which payment situations do you think the digital euro would bring added value for **businesses/merchants**?

	(no added value)	(almost no added value)	(some added value)	4 (significant added value)	(very significant added value)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Getting paid in physical shops, marketplaces, etc.	0	0	0	0	0	•
Getting paid in e-commerce	0	0	0	0	0	•
Paying invoices	0	0	0	0	•	0
Trade finance	0	0	0	0	•	0
Machine to Machine payments	0	0	0	0	0	•
Paying in situations without connectivity – offline face to face payments	0	0	0	0	0	•
Others (please specify)	0	0	0	0	0	•

answers to question 4, providing quantitative evidence or estimates: 5000 character(s) maximum including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

To the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your

Question 5. How important would the following policy outcomes related to the possible issuance of a digital euro be in your opinion?

	1 (not important)	2 (rather not important)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather important)	5 (very important)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Providing access to public money in digital form for everyone	0	0	0	0	0	•
Monetary sovereignty	0	0	0	0	•	•
A stronger open strategic autonomy for the EU	©	©	©	0	•	0
A broader access to digital payments for people with less digital skills, disabilities or other physical vulnerabilities	©	0	0	•	0	•
A broader access to digital payments for unbanked people (i.e. without bank account)	•	0	0	0	0	•
Enabling for pan-European payments	0	0	0	0	•	0
Preserving privacy and data protection in payments	0	0	0	0	•	0
Development of the EU's digital economy innovation	0	0	0	0	•	0
Facilitating the provision of Europe-wide private payment solutions	0	0	0	0	0	•

Providing a European public alternative to the emerging new payment solutions such as crypto assets, stablecoins and foreign CBDCs	•	•	•	•	•	•
Decrease payment costs	©	0	0	0	©	•
Other (please specify)	0	0	0	0	0	•

answers to question 5, providing quantitative evidence or estimates: 5000 character(s) maximum including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

To the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your

Question 6. What aspects or features of the digital euro would be important to support financial inclusion?

	1 (not important)	2 (rather not important)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather important)	5 (very important)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Easy process of onboarding	0	0	0	0	0	•
No need for bank account	0	0	0	0	0	•
Easy payment process (initiating and authenticating a payment transaction)	0	0	0	0	0	•
Accessible device for payments (e.g. chipcards)	0	0	0	0	0	•
Enabling of offline, peer-to-peer transactions	0	0	0	0	0	•
Other (please specify)	0	0	0	0	0	•

To the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your answers to question 6, providing quantitative evidence or estimates:

2. The digital euro's role for the EU's payment systems and the digital economy

Over the past decades, the EU's retail payment market has significantly developed and the offering of payment solutions has broadened, with faster, safer and more secure payment solutions being offered to wider segments of the population. The access to payment accounts has also been facilitated by legislation granting the right to every citizens to a payment account with basic services. However, as stated in the Commission's Retail Payments Strategy, the market is still fragmented and is highly dependent on very few global players to provide payment solutions that work across border in the euro area, even though there are some new promising market initiatives. The digitalisation of the economy has also created new payment needs. Crypto-assets, stable coins and foreign CBDCs may also carve out a part in the EU's retail payment market. A digital Euro can have various design features. We would like to better understand how the digital euro could further improve pan-European payments, strengthen Europe's open strategic autonomy, improve competition and support the needs of the digital economy while encouraging private innovation.

2.1 The digital euro's role in supporting pan-European payments and strengthening Europe's open strategic autonomy

Question 7. What aspects or features of the digital euro would be important to support pan-European payments and to strengthen Europe's open strategic autonomy?

	1 (not important)	2 (rather not important)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather important)	5 (very important)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
A new form of pan-European instant digital payment complementing the existing offer for point of sale (POS, face to face payments in e.g. shops) and e-commerce without a (quasi) universal acceptance in physical and online shops	©	©	©	©	©	•
A new form of pan-European instant digital payment complementing the existing offer for point of sale (POS, face with a (quasi) universal acceptance in physical and online shops	0	©	©	©	©	•
A public digital means of payments that can be offered through all available payment solutions	0	0	0	0	0	•
A digital payment means allowing for online third-party validation of transactions	0	0	0	0	0	•
A digital payment means allowing for offline peer-to-peer transactions	0	0	0	0	0	•
A digital means of payment offering programmable payment features	0	0	0	0	0	•
Other (please specify)	0	0	0	0	0	•

For those aspects you deem most important, please explain your answers to question 7:

 line breaks, i.e. stric		

Question 8. How would the following aspects of a digital euro support a diversified and competitive retail payments market, where a variety of payment service providers offer a broad range of payment solutions?

	Positively affect	Negatively affect	Does not affect	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Allowing for the distribution of the digital euro to take place through regulated financial intermediaries (Payment Service Providers)	•	•	•	0
Offering another form of central bank money in the context of a declining use of cash for payments	©	©	©	•
Existence of holding caps or interest and fees on large holdings to limit the store of value in the form of digital euros (for financial stability reasons)	0	0	©	•
Using the digital euro acceptance network to foster pan-European private sector initiatives	0	0	0	•
Other (please specify)	0	0	0	•

To the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your answers to question 8, providing quantitative evidence or estimates:

5000 character(s) maximum

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

2.2 The digital euro's role for the digital economy

Question 9. How important the following possibilities for the use of a digital euro would be to support the development of the EU's digital economy?

	(not capable at all)	2 (rather not capable)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather capable)	5 (very capable)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Possibility for programmable payment functionalities provided through the digital euro solution	0	•	•	•	•	•
Possibility for integration with other payments solutions (independent of what technology they use)	©	0	0	0	0	•
Integration with platforms relying on distributed ledger technology (DLT)/blockchain ^[5] for smart contracts applications (beyond payments)	0	0	0	0	•	0
Possibility for micro and stream ^[6] payments	0	0	0	0	0	•
Machine to Machine payments (Industry 4.0, internet of things (IoT))[7]	0	0	0	0	0	•
A digital euro that connects with the European Digital Identity Wallet ecosystem	0	0	0	0	•	0
Other (please specify)	0	0	0	0	0	•

To the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your answers to question 9, including whether the elements of a digital economy outlined above would be better achieved if the digital euro is a bearer-based instrument or an account-based system, providing quantitative evidence or estimates:

5000 character(s) maximum

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

we do not understand the "Possibility for integration with other payments solutions (independent of what technology they use)" and will not be able to take position on this. Could you please clarify what this proposal means in this context?

Question 10. What use cases in your sector would you see for a digital euro?

Please briefly explain the use case(s) you see pertinent:

5000 character(s) maximum

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

The AFG federates the French asset management industry which strongly support the implementation of a digital euro as it will allow settlements on blockchains relying on a regulated digital money with a zero-counterparty risk guarantee.

It will be possible to invest in crypto-assets issued by blockchains with digital euros as well to settle subscriptions and redemptions of funds units in digital euros for unitholders.

Moreover, the immediacy of the blockchain represents a non-negligible advantage for the safety of DVPs. Conversely, other crypto-currencies or stable coins do not offer the same advantages as they are issued by private entities with less guarantees (privat crypto-currencies involve credit risk and liquidity's fragmentation) and cannot be used indifferently on any blockchain, neither for any type of transactions.e.g. a stable coin issued by a non-european entity. On our view, it is critical to preserve the European sovereignty and the digital euro will aim to reach this objective. It will facilitate cross-borders transfers, allow atomic settlement for digital assets and bring efficiency gains on the whole value chain. We are in favor to develop the digital euro for both wholesale (asset tokenisation, DVPs, collateral with fungible assets are key for asset managers) and retail as we are concerned equally by BtB and BtC transactions. CBDC (central bank digital currency) can coexist with fiat currencies, and is not intended to replace them, including cash. They should be an addition to provide new forms of reliable payments in new ecosystems.

⁵ A distributed ledger is a database that is shared and synchronized across multiple sites, institutions, or geographies, accessible by multiple server operators. A distributed ledger stands in contrast to a centralized ledger, which is the type of ledger that most companies use today. Blockch ains are a type of distributed ledger.

⁶ Stream payments relate to consecutive execution of micro payments to pay for on-demand services, e.g. video, music, electricity recharging.

⁷ Machine to Machine payments refer to smart contract based transfers of digital assets between machines such as autonomous cars, manufacturing machines, electricity charging stations and the like. Such transfers of digital assets are conditional upon meeting certain requirements which are coded into the smart contract.

3. Making the digital euro available for retail use while continuing to safeguard the legal tender status of euro cash

In the Euro area, the euro banknotes have the status of legal tender as stipulated by the <u>Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union</u>. The status of legal tender of coins denominated in euro is laid down in <u>Council Regulation No 974</u>/98. The concept of legal tender of euro cash as interpreted by the CJEU implies

- i. a general obligation in principle of acceptance of cash by the payee
- ii. at full face value
- iii. for the settlement of the monetary debt by a payer.

3.1 Providing legal tender status to the digital euro

Since a retail digital euro would be another form (digital, not physical) of central bank money, it could also be given legal tender status, as is the case for banknotes and coins. Legal tender status should ensure a wide acceptance of the digital euro. This would however have implications on its distribution and acceptance. In particular, legal tender status could imply that a payee cannot generally refuse a payment by a payer in digital euro and that the digital euro would have to be universally accessible.

The concept of legal tender is enshrined in Union law but not defined in detail. According to the ECJ, the status of legal tender implies that a means of payment having legal tender involves a default obligation to accept it at full face value in payments and a corresponding default right to pay with it, unless that obligation and right are restricted for reasons of public interest, or waived by contractual agreement. In principle, the status of legal tender does not preclude the parties from agreeing to use other means of payment or other currencies. If the concept of legal tender was defined in EU legislation, this would regulate legal tender in detail at Union level, and any exceptions could be specified.

This section seeks to address these issues and seeks to get your views as regards the potential impacts of the legal tender status in general and on your institution.

Possible introduction of legal tender for the digital euro

Question 11. To achieve the digital euro objectives, how important do you consider it is that a payer always has the option to pay with a digital euro as a form of currency having legal tender status?

- 1 Not important
- 2 Rather not important
- 3 Neutral
- 4 Rather important
- 5 Very important
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

To the extent you deem it necessary, please consider how this could be better achieved:

5000 character(s) maximum

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

It is difficult to assert whether the payer should systematically have the option to pay with a digital euro. However, may the digital euro be, one digital euro should have the same value than one "traditional" euro. The use of a different technology should be neutral on this aspect. If a transaction is executed in another currency, the conversion should be applied in the same conditions as it will be for "traditional" euros.

Question 12. Do you see advantages in regulating legal tender in detail at Union level, including any possible acceptance exceptions, by including a definition of legal tender status for the digital euro in EU legislation?

Voc
Yes

O No

Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

To the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your answers to question 12 and the advantages/disadvantages:

5000 character(s) maximum

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

We do not understand what exceptions are meant at question 12. Clarifications will be welcomed.

Question 13. Should the legal tender status of the digital euro take inspiration from the current legal tender status of banknotes and coins, while addressing the specificities of a digital form of payment?

Yes

ON No

Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

To the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your answers to question 13, for and against:

5000 character(s) maximum

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

	This question seems unclear to us. Further clarifications will be welcomed
Qı	uestion 14. If the legal tender of the digital euro was defined in EU
	gislation, would there be a need for (justified and proportionate) exceptions
	its acceptance?
	No
	Yes, for merchants not accepting digital means of payment
	Yes, for small merchants
	Yes, but exceptions should be further specified by Member States
	Others
	Don't know / no opinion / not applicable
T -	. The content way draw it was a second place and the was a single was a
	the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your
	swers to question 14, providing quantitative evidence or estimates:
	cluding spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.
Qı	uestion 15. Should there be a provision to require that the additional
ex	ceptions proposed by Member States are subject to approval by the
Ει	uropean Commission after consulting the ECB?
	Yes
	No
	Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

Please explain your answer to question 15:

5000 character(s) maximum

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

Question	16.	Should	there	be a	provision	for	administrative	sanctions	for
digital eu	ro no	n-accep	otance	?					

- Yes
- O No
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

Please explain your answer to question 16:

000 character(s) maximul cluding spaces and line br	ne MS Word characte	ers counting method.	

Question 17. If the legal tender status of the digital euro was defined in EU legislation, should it include rules that ensure digital euro is always an option for the payer, so following categories of payees cannot unilaterally exclude digital euro acceptance within its general contractual terms and conditions?

	Yes	No	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Government	0	0	•
Utilities providers	0	0	•
Large companies	0	0	•
Merchants that accept private electronic means of payment	0	0	•
Others	0	0	•

To the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your answers to question 17, providing quantitative evidence or estimates:

	5000 character(s) maximum including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.				
Est	imation of costs				
Whi	section mainly aims at assessing the costs incurred by stakeholders should the digital euro receive legal tender. le costs would very much depend on the design and functionalities of a digital euro, we are looking at broad nates and further explanation, including on cost drivers, which will inform Commission impact assessment.				
	estion 18. Technological and business developments might radically ange the current way of payment acceptance (e.g. phones used as				
ter	minals). Irrespective of digital euro, how do you expect the cost of the				
ac	ceptance infrastructure (not the transaction fees) to change with				
tec	hnological developments over the next 5 years?				
	1 - Significant decrease in cost				
	2 - Some decrease in cost				
	[◎] 3 - No change in cost				
	4 - Some increase in cost				
	5 - Significant increase in cost				
	Don't know / no opinion / not applicable				
	ease explain the reasoning of your answers to question 18, providing				
_	antitative evidence or estimates:				
	1000 character(s) maximum uding spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.				
	the automation process induced by the use of digital euros should decrease the costs at term. However, it is premature to provide with quantitative evidence or estimates at this stage.				

Question 19. The digital euro might be granted legal tender status that merchants would need to adhere to. Which and what type of additional costs would merchants face when starting to accept payments in digital euro?

	With legal tender status	Without legal tender status
Type of additional costs		

Please explain the reasoning of your answers to question 19, providing quantitative evidence or estimates:

uding space	s and line break	s, i.e. stricter th	nan the MS Wo	ord characters of	counting method	l

Question 20. For merchants to be equipped to accept the digital euro, new POS terminals, new software or new app-based POS solutions may be needed.

Please provide an estimate of the incremental costs necessary to accept payments in digital euro:

	Merchants already accepting electronic payments (in EUR per terminal)	Merchants not yet accepting electronic payments (in EUR per terminal)
One off costs related to (new) POS terminals for accepting payments in digital euro		
One-off costs related to software		
Annual cost for maintenance, licences, etc.		
Others		

ine breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word ch	
	aracters counting method.
	wers to question 20, providing
ine breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word ch	aracters counting method.
ould these costs differ denen	ding on whether the digital euro
-	ding on whether the digital earc
nt-based would be less costly	
r-based would be less costly	
ce	
/ no opinion / not applicable	
the reasoning of your answ	wers to question 21, providing
	wers to question 21, providing
the reasoning of your answ dence or estimates:	wers to question 21, providing
the reasoning of your answ dence or estimates:	
the reasoning of your answ dence or estimates:	
the reasoning of your answ dence or estimates:	
the reasoning of your answ dence or estimates:	
C i i	dence or estimates: ximum ne breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word ch ould these costs differ depen nt-based or bearer based? nt-based would be less costly based would be less costly

Question 22. How important would the aspects listed below be for Merchants to counterbalance the one-off investment cost of new point of sale (POS) terminals or software that can handle digital euro payments?

	1 (not important)	2 (rather not important)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather important)	5 (very important)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Possible savings on the transaction costs of digital euro payments	©	©	©	©	©	•
With the same (new) POS terminals purchased for digital euro payments, the possibility for merchants to accept other payment solutions offered by supervised private intermediaries	0	©	©	0	©	•
The possibility for merchant to accept digital euro payments from payers using a variety of devices e.g. smartphones, chipcards, wearables or other devices and contactless functionality (e.g. NFC antennas)	0	0	0	0	0	•
Others	0	0	0	0	0	•

ans	ours de surs atiens 00 mas vidinas surs mitativos evidences en catinostas.
	swers to question 22, providing quantitative evidence or estimates:
	000 character(s) maximum
Inci	uding spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.
Mei	rchant fees
sei ma	estion 23. For merchants to be equipped to accept the digital euro, rvices of intermediaries may be needed. Taking into account the (possible)
	indatory acceptance of the digital euro in case it has legal tender status, build any boundaries to the fees that may be applied to merchants be set? Yes
(ould any boundaries to the fees that may be applied to merchants be set? Yes
(ould any boundaries to the fees that may be applied to merchants be set?
(ould any boundaries to the fees that may be applied to merchants be set? Yes No
To	ould any boundaries to the fees that may be applied to merchants be set? Yes No Don't know / no opinion / not applicable
To	Yes No Don't know / no opinion / not applicable the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your
To ans	Yes No Don't know / no opinion / not applicable the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your swer to question 23, providing quantitative evidence or estimates:

Question 24. Please qualify the following statements with regard to how merchant fees could be designed

	1 (strongly disagree)	2 (rather disagree)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather agree)	5 (strongly agree)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Fees on digital euro payments should be based on real costs and a reasonable profit	•	•	0	0	0	•
Fees on digital euro payments could be based on the volume or value of transactions, if and insofar the volume or value has an impact on the real costs of intermediation	0	0	0	0	0	•
Multilateral interchange fees consistent with the Interchange Fee Regulation may be taken into account in the initial calibration of the fees on digital euro payments	0	0	0	0	0	•
Fees calculated in another way	0	0	0	0	0	•

To the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your answer to question 24, providing quantitative evidence or estimates:

Question 25. Should there be a prohibition on surcharges on payments with digital euro? Yes No Don't know / no opinion / not applicable To the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your answer to question 25, providing quantitative evidence or estimates: 5000 character(s) maximum including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.	5000 character(s) maximum	
digital euro? Yes No Don't know / no opinion / not applicable To the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your answer to question 25, providing quantitative evidence or estimates: 5000 character(s) maximum	including spaces and line breaks, i.e	e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.
digital euro? Yes No Don't know / no opinion / not applicable To the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your answer to question 25, providing quantitative evidence or estimates: 5000 character(s) maximum		
digital euro? Yes No Don't know / no opinion / not applicable To the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your answer to question 25, providing quantitative evidence or estimates: 5000 character(s) maximum		
digital euro? Yes No Don't know / no opinion / not applicable To the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your answer to question 25, providing quantitative evidence or estimates: 5000 character(s) maximum		
digital euro? Yes No Don't know / no opinion / not applicable To the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your answer to question 25, providing quantitative evidence or estimates: 5000 character(s) maximum		
digital euro? Yes No Don't know / no opinion / not applicable To the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your answer to question 25, providing quantitative evidence or estimates: 5000 character(s) maximum		
digital euro? Yes No Don't know / no opinion / not applicable To the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your answer to question 25, providing quantitative evidence or estimates: 5000 character(s) maximum		
digital euro? Yes No Don't know / no opinion / not applicable To the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your answer to question 25, providing quantitative evidence or estimates: 5000 character(s) maximum		
 Yes No Don't know / no opinion / not applicable To the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your answer to question 25, providing quantitative evidence or estimates: 5000 character(s) maximum 	Question 25. Should the	re be a prohibition on surcharges on payments with
 Yes No Don't know / no opinion / not applicable To the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your answer to question 25, providing quantitative evidence or estimates: 5000 character(s) maximum 	digital euro?	
No Don't know / no opinion / not applicable To the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your answer to question 25, providing quantitative evidence or estimates: 5000 character(s) maximum	-	
Don't know / no opinion / not applicable To the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your answer to question 25, providing quantitative evidence or estimates: 5000 character(s) maximum		
To the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your answer to question 25, providing quantitative evidence or estimates: 5000 character(s) maximum	No No	
To the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your answer to question 25, providing quantitative evidence or estimates: 5000 character(s) maximum	Don't know / no opini	on / not applicable
answer to question 25, providing quantitative evidence or estimates:	Borre Kilow / Ho opini	on / not applicable
answer to question 25, providing quantitative evidence or estimates:	T. 46	
5000 character(s) maximum	to the extent you deem	it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your
	answer to question 25, p	roviding quantitative evidence or estimates:
	5000 character(s) maximum	
	• *	e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

3.2 The legal tender status of euro cash

As mentioned in Commission retail payment strategy, while promoting the emergence of digital payments to offer more options to consumers, the Commission will continue to safeguard the legal tender of euro cash. The legal tender of euro banknotes as lex monetae is enshrined in Article 128(1) TFEU, according to which 'the banknotes issued by the European Central Bank and the national central banks shall be the only such notes to have the status of legal tender within the Union'. Furthermore Commission Recommendation of 22 March 2010 on the scope and effects of legal tender of euro banknotes and coins defines three core features for the legal tender: mandatory acceptance, acceptance at full face value and power to discharge from payment obligations (Official Journal L 83, 30.3.2010, p. 70–71.). Next to this, according to the ECJ, the status of legal tender implies that a means of payment having legal tender involves a default obligation to accept it at full face value in payments and a corresponding default right to pay with it, unless that obligation and right are restricted for reasons of public interest, or waived by contractual agreement. The Commission will assess whether recognising the legal tender status of the digital euro also results in a need to define in a binding EU legislative proposal the meaning of legal tender for cash, in line with CJEU jurisprudence, to ensure coherence. We would therefore like to understand better the implications of the possible granting of legal tender status to the digital euro for the definition of legal tender of cash.

Question 26. If it were decided to include a definition of legal tender status for the digital euro in EU legislation, please state your opinion on the following statements regarding the legal tender status of euro cash (banknotes and coins):

	Yes	No	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
The current situation where the legal definition of the legal tender status of cash is set out in the 2010 Recommendation and ECJ jurisprudence is adequate.	©	©	•
Legislative action at EU level is needed to enhance legal certainty and enshrine the legal tender status of euro cash in secondary law.	0	0	•

Please explain your answer to question 26:

5000 character(s) maximum

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

In principle, we are in favor of a legal tender status fro the digital euro which has to be defined in EU legislation. However, we do not have opinion on the best way to achieve it. In any case, we wish a legal tender status for the digital euro modeled on that of the euro cash.

Question 27. According to your organisation, is there a need for a further definition of justified exceptions to the general principle of mandatory acceptance if those are grounded on reasons related to the 'good faith principle' [8]?

Yes

[◎] No

Please explain your answer to question 27:

⁸ Notwithstanding the preliminary judgment of the CJEU in Joined Cases C 422/19 and C 423/19, which states in par. 55 that it is not necessary that the EU legislature lay down exhaustively and uniformly the exceptions to that fundamental obligation, provided that every debtor is guaranteed to have the possibility, as a general rule, of discharging a payment obligation in cash.

Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

	Yes	No	Don't know No opinior Not applicable
No party shall be obliged to accept more than 50 coins in any single payment (except for the issuing authority and for those persons specifically designated by the national legislation of the issuing Member State)	•	•	•
If refusal is for security reasons	0	0	•
If the value of the banknote tendered is disproportionate compared to the value of the amount to be settled	0	•	•
If a retailer has no change available	0	©	•
If there would be not enough change available as a result of that payment for a retailer to carry out its normal daily business transactions	0	0	•
Any other exception	0	0	•

Question 29. Should there be a provision to require that additional
exceptions to the mandatory acceptance principle may be proposed by Member States subject to approval by the European Commission after
consulting the ECB?
© Yes
No
Don't know / no opinion / not applicable
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.
Question 30. Should there be a provision for administrative sanctions for
cash non-acceptance?
© Yes
No
Don't know / no opinion / not applicable
Places explain your enguer to question 20.
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.
Question 31. Should the legislative proposal confirm the prohibition on
surcharges on payments with euro banknotes and coins?
© Yes
O No
Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

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.
Question 32. Since the effectiveness of the legal tender status of cash
presumes the widespread possibility of having access to it, should there be a
provision which aims to guarantee the availability of cash, such as an
obligation on Member States to adopt rules to ensure sufficient access to
cash and report these rules to the Commission and the ECB?
Yes
No
Don't know / no opinion / not applicable
Please explain your answer to question 32:
5000 character(s) maximum
including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.
4. The digital euro's impact on the financial sector and
financial stability

The digital euro could be distributed centrally by the Eurosystem or with the help of private sector intermediaries. In either case, the digital euro would likely have an influence on financial intermediaries' balance sheets, income statements, business model and services. In this section, we would like to understand better how financial intermediaries perceive the impact of the digital euro and how they could offer additional value to the digital euro, also depending on whether the digital euro is account based or bearer instrument/token based (see ECB Report on a digital euro of October 2020, section 5.1.5 on transfer mechanism for a presentation of the digital euro design options).

Question 33. What do you think the impacts of a digital euro would be on the business of providers of payment services and crypto-asset services?

	Positive impacts/challenges	Negative impacts/challenges
Credit institutions		
Other payment services providers	X	
Crypto-asset services providers	X	

Please explain your answer to question 33:

5000 charac	cter(s) maximul	m					
including spa	aces and line br	reaks, i.e. stricte	r than the MS V	Vord characters	s counting meth	iod.	

Question 34. How important would it be to limit the store of value function of the digital euro by, introducing holding caps, limitations to transactions, or different interest and/or fees disincentives on large holdings?

	1 (not important)	2 (rather not important)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather important)	5 (very important)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
For financial stability purposes (e.g. to prevent bank runs in crisis situations)	0	0	0	•	•	•
To prevent that the digital euro structurally disintermediates credit institutions (e.g. large conversion of bank deposits to digital euro)	0	0	0	0	0	•
Other	0	0	0	0	0	•

To the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your answers to question 34, providing quantitative evidence or estimates:

5000 character(s) maximum

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

The answer to question 34 depends on the way the digital euros will be distributed. If they will be distributed by credit institutions, it will not present any risk of disintermediation. Giving commercial banks the role of CBDC distributor may be an option to prevent the current ecosystem from being disrupted (credits and deposits would remain in the hands of commercial banks). Conversely, if they will be distributed by other actors (moreover if they are unregulated), then the risk will be proven.

Question 35. How would holding limits or disincentives to the store of value function affect the usability of the digital euro in the various use cases below?

	(significantly decrease in its usability)	2 (slight decrease in its usability)	3 (neutral)	4 (slight increase in its usability)	5 (significant increase in its usability)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Person-to-Person payments	0	0	0	0	0	•
Person-to-Business payments	0	0	0	0	0	•
Business-to-Business payments	0	0	0	0	0	•
Machine-to-Machine payments	0	0	0	0	0	•
Other	0	0	0	0	0	•

answers to question 35, providing quantitative evidence or estimates: 5000 character(s) maximum including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

To the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your

Question 36. How would a retail digital euro **without** any holding limits or disincentives for store of value function impact the following aspects of the **EU credit institutions**?

	(significant decrease)	2 (slight decrease)	3 (neutral)	4 (slight increase)	5 (significant increase)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Volume (value) of retail deposits	0	0	0	0	0	•
Volume (value) of corporate deposits	0	0	0	0	0	•
Liquidity / bank run risk	0	0	0	0	0	•
Volume (value) of new credit provision	0	0	0	0	0	•
Revenue from payment services	0	0	0	0	0	•
Net interest revenue	0	0	0	0	0	•
Ability to perform anti money laundering (AML) and other compliance obligations	0	0	0	0	0	•
Costs due to operational risk in retail payments	0	0	0	0	0	•
Other	0	0	0	0	0	•

To the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your answers to question 36, including whether your assessment would depend on whether the digital euro is a bearer-based instrument or is account-based and providing quantitative evidence or estimates:

	000 character(s) maximum
incl	luding spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.
	section 27. What are the ricks and impact on avadit institutions of the non
iss	lestion 37. What are the risks and impact on credit institutions of the non- suance of a digital euro, for example in the scenario of a successful ablecoin in the EU?
	000 character(s) maximum
incl	luding spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Question 38. How would a retail digital euro **without** any holding limits or disincentives for store of value function impact the following aspects of the **EU payment service** / **crypto-asset service providers (excluding credit institutions)**?

	(significant decrease)	2 (slight decrease)	3 (neutral)	4 (slight increase)	5 (significant increase)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Volume (value) of funds on payment accounts hosted by payment institutions, e-money institutions or crypto-asset service providers	•	•	•	•	0	•
Volume (value) of payments initiated by payment service providers or crypto-asset service providers from third party accounts	0	0	0	0	0	•
Direct revenue from payment or crypto-asset services	©	0	0	0	0	0
Revenues from investing the balance of payment or crypto-asset accounts	0	0	0	0	0	•
Revenues from data management	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ability to perform AML and other compliance obligations	0	0	0	0	0	0
Costs due to operational risk in retail payments and crypto-asset services	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0

To the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your answers to question 38, including whether your assessment would depend on whether the digital euro is a bearer-based instrument or account-based and providing quantitative evidence or estimates:

2000 character(s) maximum cluding spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.
MR

Question 39. Where could duly licensed financial intermediaries offer value in the distribution of the digital euro?

	1 (no value)	2 (almost no value)	3 (some value)	4 (significant value)	(very significant value)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Experience in on-boarding of customers	0	0	0	0	•	0
Experience in Know Your Customer (KYC) and AML checks	0	0	0	0	•	0
Efficient transaction verification and execution	©	©	©	0	•	0
Experience in customer management	©	©	©	0	•	0
Developing additional services using the digital euro	©	©	©	0	•	0
Existing IT system for customer, front and back office services that could be adapted to the digital euro	•	0	•	•	•	•
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0

answers to question 39, providing quantitative evidence or estimates: 5000 character(s) maximum including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

To the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your

Question 40. How much increase, do you expect, in payment service providers' (including credit institutions') expenses related to the distribution of the digital euro?

Please consider all possible cost elements (e.g. front office and back office services, administrative costs, IT costs, compliance cost etc.)

	(no increase at all)	2 (low increase)	querceivable increase)	4 (significant increase)	(very significant increase)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
One-off expenses	0	0	0	0	0	•
Annual expenses	0	0	0	0	0	•
Others	0	0	0	0	0	•

5000 character(s) maximum including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.
including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.
To the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of yo
answers to question 40, providing quantitative evidence or estimates/range
on these expenditures:
5000 character(s) maximum
including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.
Question 41. Using the digital euro, what additional services could you
inancial institution develop for your customers?
5000 character(s) maximum including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.
including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the Mo Word characters counting method.
- distribution of fund units via the blockchain with a DVP (delievery versus payment) settlement should be
dovoloped
developed.
- tokenization of assets
- tokenization of assets - subscription and redemptions by clients with digital euro
- tokenization of assets - subscription and redemptions by clients with digital euro - collateral with fungible assets
- tokenization of assets - subscription and redemptions by clients with digital euro
- tokenization of assets - subscription and redemptions by clients with digital euro - collateral with fungible assets
- tokenization of assets - subscription and redemptions by clients with digital euro - collateral with fungible assets - smarts contracts working on top of it
 tokenization of assets subscription and redemptions by clients with digital euro collateral with fungible assets

Please specify to what other expenses you refer in your answer to question

on the benefits expected from these additional services:

5000 character(s) maximum

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

It will allow to have the same setup than for stablecoins but among a larger community of users as the digital euro will be recognized regardless of the blockchain or the distribution channel. It will have a positive impact on fund assets as well, notably regarding the fongibility of collateral.

5. Application of anti-money laundering and counter terrorist financing (AML-CFT) rules

Intermediaries required to implement AML/CFT rules must conduct due diligence on their clients. These measures need to be performed for example, when a user opens an account, when transactions are carried out, or when there is a suspicion of money laundering or terrorist financing. While specific AML/CFT rules may need to be devised based on the exact design features of a digital euro, general views related to the implications of AML/CFT measures for intermediaries and estimation of compliance benefits/costs are welcome.

Question 42. How various design models of a digital euro would impact the AML/CFT compliance costs of private intermediaries?

	1 (no impact on costs)	(low increase of costs)	(regular increase of costs)	4 (high increase of costs)	(very high increase of costs)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Account-based digital euro, available online [9]	0	0	0	0	•	•
Bearer-based ^[10] digital euro, available online	0	0	0	0	0	•
Bearer-based digital euro, available offline	0	0	0	0	0	•

For each option of question 42, please provide quantitative/qualitative evidence or estimates if available:

5	5000 character(s) maximum						
ind	iding spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.						

Question 43. Intermediaries will have to perform a series of controls and checks according to AML/CFT requirements. In comparison with existing requirements applying to other means of payments, what would be the specific challenges with digital euro payments to best ensure prevention and combat of money laundering and the financing of terrorism?

5000 character(s) maximum

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

we consider that it will be more an adapation of the process linked to the use of a new technology than a specific challenge strictly speaking. The design of the digital euro shall be crafted in such a way not to make it riskier than the use of cash from an AML/CFT point of view. As the transaction in crypto-currencies (including CBDC) via blockchain are characterized by their immediacy, the AML/CFT screening should be performed on a continuous basis.

Question 44. In case the digital euro provides for a functionality that would allow the user to perform **low-value transactions offline**, what challenges do you think this functionality could generate in the prevention and combat of money laundering and the financing of terrorism?

5000 character(s) maximum

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

It depends on the way this functionality will be implemented and how these transactions will be monitored by the central banks and the intermediaries. The more demanding these controls will be, the less asset managers will be obliged to proceed to additional checks.

Offline transactions imply a missing piece in the traceability offered by blockchain technology. A challenge will be to guarantee the origins of the funds movements regarding this type of transactions.

⁹ In an account-based model, payments in digital euro would be initiated by end users but transferred by supervised intermediaries managing accounts on their behalf. In this scenario, AML/CFT requirements are expected to be performed by supervised intermediaries distributing the digital euro.

¹⁰ In a bearer-based model, payments in digital euro would be initiated and transferred by end users directly, without the need of a third party (supervised intermediary) playing a role in the transaction. Supervised intermediaries may be involved in the system, notably for the performance of AML/CFT requirements such as the onboarding of users, in addition to other activities such as the loading digital euro funds into digital euro wallets.

Question 45. In your opinion, how would the risks related to money laundering and terrorism financing of a digital euro allowing the user to perform low-value transactions offline (proximity payments) compare to other payment options listed below?

Please indicate in each line your assessment of the relative risks:

	(low-value offline digital euro transactions less risky)	(low-value offline digital euro transactions equally risky)	(low-value offline digital euro transactions more risky)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Digital euro online payments	0	•	•	0
Cash payments	•	0	0	0
Online payments in commercial bank money	0	•	0	0

For each option of question 45, please provide quantitative/qualitative evidence or estimates if available:

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

6. Privacy and data protection aspects

The ECB's public consultation on the digital euro indicated that future users of the digital euro see privacy as one of the most important elements. Ensuring an appropriate level of privacy and data protection for the user of a digital euro is important to foster public trust in a digital euro, which underpins its adoption and use. Any processing of personal data must be in line with the Union data protection legislation, including the <u>GDPR</u> and the <u>EUDPR</u>.

Question 46. Which features could appropriately enhance the privacy and data protection of the digital euro u s e r s ?

Note that these features are without prejudice to the lawful grounds of processing, as specified in Article 6 GDPR and the application of AML requirements, as appropriate^[11]:

¹¹ The processing of personal data is lawful when carried out in accordance with Article 6 GDPR. This includes, for example, the processing of personal data for the performance of a task carried out in the public interest (e.g. AML/CFT requirements) or for the performance of a contract.

	(not appropriate at all)	(rather not appropriate)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather appropriate)	5 (very appropriate)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Ability to mask the identity of the payer or the payee to each other ('peer-to-peer pseudonymity')	0	•	0	0	0	0
Ability to mask the identity of the payer or the payee to the other party's intermediary ('intermediary-to-intermediary pseudonymity')	•	•	0	0	•	0
Ability to limit the knowledge on the identity of the payer or the payee to the central bank, and/or other third party intermediaries not involved in the transaction	0	0	•	0	•	©
Ability to completely hide the identity of the payer and payee for low-value offline transactions	0	0	0	0	0	•

Please explain your answer to question 46:

5000 character(s) maximum

inc	sluding spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.
	It will be important to know the identity of the users in the wholesale environment, not in the retail one.

Question 47. The Commission has identified a number of potential activities related to digital euro that could entail the lawful processing of personal data by either private intermediaries or central banks in charge of initiating the digital euro transactions and services.

How appropriate are those activities for the lawful processing of personal data?

	(not appropriate at all)	2 (rather not appropriate)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather appropriate)	5 (very appropriate)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Fight against money laundering, organised crime / terrorism	©	0	0	0	•	•
Enforcement of tax rules	0	0	0	0	•	0
Payments settlement purposes	0	0	0	0	•	0
Management of operational and security risks	0	0	0	0	•	0
Enforcement of potential holding limits	0	•	0	0	0	0
Additional innovative online services and functionalities	0	•	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0

To the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your answers to question 47, providing quantitative evidence or estimates: 5000 character(s) maximum including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method. Question 48. Should the central bank be able to access personal data for the purposes listed below? Don't know -No opinion -Yes No Not applicable 0 Payments settlement purposes Operational resilience/security risks 0 assessment and mitigation purposes 0 AML/CFT 0 Fraud Other To the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your answers to question 48, providing quantitative evidence or estimates: 5000 character(s) maximum including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Question 49. Should users of a digital euro have the possibility to 'opt-in' and allow their personal data and payments transaction data to be used for commercial purposes, for example to receive additional services from intermediaries?

- Yes
- O No
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

To the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your answers to question 49, providing quantitative evidence or estimates:

5000 character(s) maximum

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

This option would be necessary, as offchain services require to share data sometimes. For this reason, the express consent of the User should be given. Moreover, the ability to redeem previously shared data once the services are no longer provided on demand of the User should be ensured.

7. International payments with a digital euro

While the digital euro is primarily aimed to be used within the euro area, questions about potential cross border use within or outside the EU (including by tourists and businesses) arise. While this may bring user benefits, its impacts on third countries' economies and monetary systems may be significant. While the ECB's consultation asked about the use outside of the euro area, we would like to better understand which use cases could be desired in the international context.

Question 50. How desirable would it be that the digital euro is available for the following users and use cases?

	(not desirable at all)	2 (rather not desirable)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather desirable)	5 (very desirable)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Euro area (EA) residents and intra EA payments	0	0	0	0	•	•
Non-resident visitors to the EA (tourism dimension)	0	0	0	0	0	•
Selected non-EA residents for trade purposes with third counties	0	0	0	0	0	•
All international retail transactions with third countries without limits on residency and geography of transactions (trade dimension)	0	0	0	•	0	•
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0

answers to question 50, providing quantitative evidence or estimates: 5000 character(s) maximum including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

To the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your

Question 51. If the digital euro is available for EU citizens living outside of the euro area, how do you assess the impact (risks) of the following aspects in these non-euro-area Member States?

	1 (no negative impact/ increase in risk)	2 (slight negative impact/ increase in risk)	3 (regular negative impact/ increase in risk)	4 (significant negative impact/ increase in risk)	5 (very significant negative impact/ increase in risk)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Financial disintermediation	0	0	0	0	0	•
Financial stability	0	0	0	0	0	•
Monetary autonomy	0	0	0	0	0	•
Capital movements	0	0	0	0	0	•
Others	0	0	0	0	0	0

To the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your answers to question 51, providing quantitative evidence or estimates:

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) below. Please make sure you do not include any personal data in the file you upload if you want to remain anonymous.

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

Useful links

More on this consultation (https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/finance-consultations-2022-digital-euro_en)

Consultation document (https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/2022-digital-euro-consultation-document en)

Call for evidence accompanying this consultation (https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/better-regulation/initiatives/plan-2021-13199_en)

ECBs report on the digital euro (https://www.ecb.europa.eu/pub/pdf/other/Report_on_a_digital_euro~4d7268b458 en.pdf)

ECBs public consultation (https://www.ecb.europa.eu/paym/digital euro/html/pubcon.en.html)

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

More on digital finance (https://ec.europa.eu/info/business-economy-euro/banking-and-finance/digital-finance_en

Specific privacy statement (https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/2022-digital-euro-specific-privacy-statement en)

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

Contact

fisma-digital-euro@ec.europa.eu



