

Targeted consultation on a digital euro

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Introduction

In [March 2021, the Eurosummit](#) 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 [digital finance and retail payment strategies of the Commission](#) 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 [ECB cash 2030 strategy](#)). The [ECB's retail payment strategy](#) 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 [European Payments Initiative](#), while ensuring that cash remains widely accessible and accepted.

In October 2020, the [ECB issued its report on a digital euro](#) and between October 2020 and January 2021 the [ECB ran a public consultation on a digital euro](#). 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 [ECB commissioned a study on new digital payment methods](#) 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 prejudices 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 [ECB report on a digital euro](#).

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 fisma-digital-euro@ec.europa.eu.

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

* Language of my contribution

- Bulgarian
- Croatian
- Czech
- Danish
- Dutch
- English
- Estonian
- Finnish
- French
- German
- Greek
- Hungarian
- Irish
- Italian
- Latvian
- Lithuanian
- Maltese
- Polish
- Portuguese
- Romanian
- Slovak
- Slovenian
- Spanish
- Swedish

* I am giving my contribution as

- Academic/research institution
- Business association
- Company/business organisation
- Consumer organisation
- EU citizen
- Environmental organisation
- Non-EU citizen

- Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
- Public authority
- Trade union
- Other

* First name

Andrey

* Surname

Martovoy

* Email (this won't be published)

martovoy@abbl.lu

* Organisation name

255 character(s) maximum

Luxembourg Bankers' Association (ABBL)

* 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.

3505006282-58

* 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

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

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

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

* Field of activity or sector (if applicable)

- Credit institution
- Financial Sector association
- Payment service provider (other than credit institutions)
- Crypto asset services provider
- Payment services association
- Merchant
- Merchant organisation
- Technology service providers including software and hardware
- IT solutions provider for payments
- Industrial users of payment and value transfer systems
- Investment management (e.g. hedge funds, private equity funds, venture capital funds, money market funds, securities)

- 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. **For 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?

| | 1 (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 | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Wide availability and user-friendly onboarding process | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Always an option for the payer to pay anywhere / to anybody in the euro area with digital euro | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Easy to use payment instrument (e.g. contactless, biometric authentication) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Account-based payment instrument ^[3] | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Bearer-based payment instrument | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Real time settlement / Instant reception of funds | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Cost-free for payers | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Payment asset is credit risk-free (central bank liability) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Offline payments (face to face without connectivity) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

| | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Ability to program conditional payments | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Other benefits | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

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 answers to question 1:

5000 character(s) maximum

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

Availability of flexible privacy settings should be one practical approach and not a case-by-case settings. We consider the ability to program conditional payments an attractive feature, but more mid-term.

The Digital euro should have offline capabilities to allow underbanked citizens the same level of access to the digital euro. Most smartphones and other portable devices have NFC (Near Field Communication) sensor capability which do not require access to the Internet to make merchant payments (e.g. tap to pay). Similar technology could be applied to CBDC transactions to support offline payments. Certain payment providers give consumers the ability to conduct offline payments through the use of QR codes. In these transactions, the merchant scans the consumers QR code to collect payment without the need for the consumer to have internet.

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 | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Better acquiring services | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Standards for EU wide acceptance infrastructure (e.g. POS), allowing for pan-European payments | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Account-based payment instrument | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Bearer-based payment instrument | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Real time settlement / Instant reception of funds | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Offline payments (face to face without connectivity) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Other benefits | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

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

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?

| | 1 (no added value) | 2 (almost no added value) | 3 (some added value) | 4 (significant added value) | 5 (very significant added value) | Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable |
|---|-----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Paying with / transferring digital euros to a (natural) person face-to-face | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Paying with/transferring digital euros to a (natural) person remotely | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Paying for goods or services at a point of sale (face-to-face) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Paying for goods or services remotely (e-commerce) | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Machine to machine Payments (Industry 4.0, IoT) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Paying in situations without connectivity – offline face to face payments | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Other situations | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

⁴ 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](#).

To the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your answers to question 3, providing quantitative evidence or estimates:

5000 character(s) maximum

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

There is minimal value added provided by the digital euro such that many of the capabilities can be performed by existing private providers using existing forms of money or digital alternatives of commercial bank money. For the average consumer there is not much difference or value added when comparing to existing solutions. If there are low level limits, it is unclear what a digital euro would provide above and beyond the guarantee provided by an insurance deposit scheme. From the consumer perspective, it does not look like a digital euro would offer significantly different value-added features vs what already exists or could be provided by private solutions. There may be a situation when existing private solutions could be actually cheaper (depending on the technology used and the form of delivery) of that digital euro.

If we are looking for greater financial inclusion as a goal in issuing the digital euro, more research should be conducted against a detailed design proposal to understand the reasons for that exclusion, the political and regulatory will to address those and the likelihood of lower-income and underbanked citizens using a CBDC to manage their finances.

We are of the view that this exclusion is either driven by a lack of trust on the financial system or not passing the rigorous KYC standards or requirements imposed on financial institutions to open an account and onboard a customer. In the latter case, this barrier would need to be addressed and clarity should be provided to financial intermediaries on KYC requirements and supervisory expectations.

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?

| | 1 (no added value) | 2 (almost no added value) | 3 (some added value) | 4 (significant added value) | 5 (very significant added value) | Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable |
|---|-----------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Getting paid in physical shops, marketplaces, etc. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Getting paid in e-commerce | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Paying invoices | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Trade finance | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Machine to Machine payments | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Paying in situations without connectivity – offline face to face payments | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Others (please specify) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

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

We judge the possibility to be paid in digital euro will bring important value added to merchants in personal and online payments. It will decrease the fees, improve the instability of liquidity for merchants, and may bring more safety (physical risks of theft compared to cash, and online fraud risks compared to e-commerce).

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 | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Monetary sovereignty | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| A stronger open strategic autonomy for the EU | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| A broader access to digital payments for people with less digital skills, disabilities or other physical vulnerabilities | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| A broader access to digital payments for unbanked people (i.e. without bank account) | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Enabling for pan-European payments | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Preserving privacy and data protection in payments | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Development of the EU's digital economy innovation | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Facilitating the provision of Europe-wide private payment solutions | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Providing a European public alternative to the emerging new payment solutions such as crypto assets, stablecoins and foreign CBDCs | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Decrease payment costs | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Other (please specify) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

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

It is hard to explain how the digital euro will contribute for a strong open strategic economy in the customers point of view, but from a geopolitical aspect it makes a lot of sense. Enabling for pan-European payments will give more control for EU payments.

Facilitating the provision of Europe-wide private payment solutions could be an opportunity for EPI (European Payments Initiative).

However, a digital euro, if not properly designed and calibrated, could have a significant impact on economic growth, reducing the availability and cost of credit for the economy as a whole, and could create financial stability implications. It would also have a high level of pro-cyclicality creating the possibility of bank system runs in times of stress. This is a very important consideration that would need to be carefully evaluated, particularly given the different microstructure and levels of savings of different countries within the EU.

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 | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| No need for bank account | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Easy payment process (initiating and authenticating a payment transaction) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Accessible device for payments (e.g. chipcards) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Enabling of offline, peer-to-peer transactions | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Other (please specify) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

To the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your answers to question 6, 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 believe that payments taken solely would enable financial inclusion, it is more about access to other financial services.

Features to support financial inclusion could include free educational resources, improving access, digital skills and improving credit availability.

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 | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 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 | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| A public digital means of payments that can be offered through all available payment solutions | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| A digital payment means allowing for online third-party validation of transactions | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| A digital payment means allowing for offline peer-to-peer transactions | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| A digital means of payment offering programmable payment features | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Other (please specify) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

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

5000 character(s) maximum

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

If digital euro doesn't drive acceptance as a universal approach, the currency will be very costly, it will compete with several solutions, and could fail in its objectives. The regulatory push is necessary. We consider that other technologies are coming in the development time, and the features could offer even more value as compared with the current banking system. It makes the voluntary approach much more acceptable.

Universal acceptance will not drive adoption but the lack of universal acceptance will be detrimental for the development of the digital euro in the context of pan-European payments.

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) | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Offering another form of central bank money in the context of a declining use of cash for payments | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 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) | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Using the digital euro acceptance network to foster pan-European private sector initiatives | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Other (please specify) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

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?

| | 1 (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 | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Possibility for integration with other payments solutions (independent of what technology they use) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Integration with platforms relying on distributed ledger technology (DLT)/blockchain ^[5] for smart contracts applications (beyond payments) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Possibility for micro and stream ^[6] payments | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Machine to Machine payments (Industry 4.0, internet of things (IoT)) ^[7] | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| A digital euro that connects with the European Digital Identity Wallet ecosystem | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Other (please specify) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

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. [Blockchain 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.](#)

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.

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.

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 [Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union](#). The status of legal tender of coins denominated in euro is laid down in [Council Regulation No 974/98](#). 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

Please explain your answer to question 11.

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.

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?

- Yes
- 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 see some advantages in regulating legal tender at the Union level as it implies that the same rules (and exceptions) will be applied across the EU. In this way, legal certainty and level playing field could be guaranteed.

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
- 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.

Question 14. If the legal tender of the digital euro was defined in EU legislation, would there be a need for (justified and proportionate) exceptions to 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

To the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your answers to question 14, 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 15. Should there be a provision to require that the additional exceptions proposed by Member States are 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 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 euro non-acceptance?

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

Please explain your answer to question 16:

5000 character(s) maximum

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

Question 17. 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 | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Utilities providers | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Large companies | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Merchants that accept private electronic means of payment | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Others | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

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.

Estimation of costs

This section mainly aims at assessing the costs incurred by stakeholders should the digital euro receive legal tender. While costs would very much depend on the design and functionalities of a digital euro, we are looking at broad estimates and further explanation, including on cost drivers, which will inform Commission impact assessment.

Question 18. Technological and business developments might radically change the current way of payment acceptance (e.g. phones used as terminals). Irrespective of digital euro, how do you expect the cost of the acceptance infrastructure (not the transaction fees) to change with technological 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

Please explain the reasoning of your answers to question 18, providing quantitative evidence or estimates:

5000 character(s) maximum

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

From the payment acceptance point of view, the synergy around every stakeholder using the same technology should entail a decrease in cost. On the other hand, it is important to highlight that the infrastructure cost can also lead to the increase in the implementation costs the digital euro.

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:

5000 character(s) maximum

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

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 | | |

Please specify to what other costs you refer in your answer to question 20:

5000 character(s) maximum

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

Please explain the reasoning of your answers to question 20, 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 21. Would these costs differ depending on whether the digital euro would be account-based or bearer based?

- Yes, account-based would be less costly
- Yes, bearer-based would be less costly
- No difference
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

Please explain the reasoning of your answers to question 21, 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 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 | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 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 | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 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) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Others | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

To the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your answers to question 22, providing quantitative evidence or estimates:

5000 character(s) maximum

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

Regarding the technologies that we expect being used for the implementation of the digital euro as QR codes and NFC, we see a strong possibility of savings in this question. The savings even can be a driver to stimulate the acceptance of the digital euro.

Merchant fees

Question 23. For merchants to be equipped to accept the digital euro, services of intermediaries may be needed. Taking into account the (possible) mandatory acceptance of the digital euro in case it has legal tender status, should any boundaries to the fees that may be applied to merchants be set?

- 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 23, 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 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 | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 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 | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 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 | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Fees calculated in another way | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

To the extent you deem it necessary, please explain the reasoning of your answer to question 24, 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 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.

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. | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Legislative action at EU level is needed to enhance legal certainty and enshrine the legal tender status of euro cash in secondary law. | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

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.

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]?

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.

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

Please explain your answer to question 27:

5000 character(s) maximum

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

Question 28. Which of the following exceptions should be defined?

| | Yes | No | Don't know - No opinion - 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) | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| If refusal is for security reasons | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| If the value of the banknote tendered is disproportionate compared to the value of the amount to be settled | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| If a retailer has no change available | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 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 | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Any other exception | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Please explain your answer to question 28:

5000 character(s) maximum

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

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

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
- 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 | | |
| Crypto-asset services providers | | |

Please explain your answer to question 33:

5000 character(s) maximum

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

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) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| To prevent that the digital euro structurally disintermediates credit institutions (e.g. large conversion of bank deposits to digital euro) | <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"/> |

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.

Even small amounts of CBDC will alter retail banks' deposit bases. We estimate that even if limits were very low the risk of disruption of the system remains significant depending on the customer adoption of a CBDC. Any limits may be difficult to maintain in the long term. Assuming a CBDC was viewed as an attractive tool for payments and store-of-value services, policymakers would likely face significant political pressure from households and businesses to increase or abandon such limits.

The design of the digital currency can involve setting minimal limits on the amount of CBDC a consumer could hold. This would, if consistently enforced, limit bank disintermediation but could also keep the CBDC from being useful for cross-border payments.

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?

| | 1 (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 | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Person-to-Business payments | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Business-to-Business payments | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Machine-to-Machine 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"/> |

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

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?

| | 1 (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 | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Volume (value) of corporate deposits | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Liquidity / bank run risk | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Volume (value) of new credit provision | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Revenue from payment services | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Net interest revenue | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Ability to perform anti money laundering (AML) and other compliance obligations | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| Costs due to operational risk in retail payments | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Other | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

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:

5000 character(s) maximum

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

Question 37. What are the risks and impact on **credit institutions of the non-issuance of a digital euro, for example in the scenario of a successful stablecoin in the EU?**

5000 character(s) maximum

including 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)**?**

| | 1 (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 | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Volume (value) of payments initiated by payment service providers or crypto-asset service providers from third party accounts | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Direct revenue from payment or crypto-asset services | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Revenues from investing the balance of payment or crypto-asset accounts | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Revenues from data management | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Ability to perform AML and other compliance obligations | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Costs due to operational risk in retail payments and crypto-asset 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"/> |

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:

5000 character(s) maximum

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

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) | 5 (very significant value) | Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable |
|---|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| Experience in on-boarding of customers | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Experience in Know Your Customer (KYC) and AML checks | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Efficient transaction verification and execution | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Experience in customer management | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Developing additional services using the digital euro | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Existing IT system for customer, front and back office services that could be adapted to the digital euro | <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"/> |

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

One goal of the use of an intermediated CBDC model would be to reduce destabilising disruptions to the well-functioning European financial system.

If the CBDC were a liability of the central bank, and the intermediary's role were limited to that of distribution and safekeeping services, there is the concern that, even with this intermediated model and design considerations, a CBDC would significantly alter retail banking with potentially fundamental consequences for the European financial system.

That said, programmability can also be built by private actors using properly regulated digital forms of private money. Banks and regulated non-banks could act as distributors for any CBDC. Intermediaries can increase the ease of use through integration of CBDC accounts into existing user interface experiences, payment rails, and maintaining access to CBDC balances through existing mobile apps and desktop channels consumers already use to manage their finances.

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.)

| | 1 (no increase at all) | 2 (low increase) | 3 (perceivable increase) | 4 (significant increase) | 5 (very significant increase) | Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable |
|------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| One-off expenses | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Annual expenses | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Others | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Please specify to what other expenses you refer in your answer to question 40:

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 answers to question 40, providing quantitative evidence or estimates/ranges 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 your financial institution develop for your customers?**

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 reasoning of your answer to question 41, and provide quantitative evidence or estimates/ranges 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.

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) | 2 (low increase of costs) | 3 (regular increase of costs) | 4 (high increase of costs) | 5 (very high increase of costs) | Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable |
|---|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Account-based digital euro, available online ^[9] | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Bearer-based ^[10] digital euro, available online | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Bearer-based digital euro, available offline | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

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.

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

5000 character(s) maximum

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

We think that AML/CTF compliance costs of private intermediaries would not increase or just a little bit in case of an account-based digital euro and bearer-based digital euro available online because these intermediaries have already set-ups linked to the AML/CTF requirements. However, in case of a bearer-based digital euro available offline, given the offline character of these account, it would be more difficult for intermediaries to collect the information required to comply with AML/CTF requirements which then implies an increase in cost. Justification of origin of funds when digital euros are brought back to banking institutions may be a challenge.

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 think that the AML/CTF requirements should be implemented appropriately in order to optimize the controls and the prevention and combat of money laundering and the financing of terrorism. The main controls should be carried out by the bank or the intermediary with which the user holds his/her digital euros. If the CBDE is issued, we believe that the partners should be regulated institutions. We believe that compliance with existing KYC/AML and sanctions enforcement standards and compliance with custody standards will be critical to the success of a CBDE.

Other controls may also be carried out by the other intermediaries in addition to the main controls.

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.

We think that the offline low-value transactions would create similar challenges already associated with cash transactions of similar amounts. However, depending on the characteristics of these transactions, for example if the transaction is recorded at a certain point in time, it should be easier to trace this transaction (vs cash) in order to prevent and combat money laundering and the financing of terrorism.

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:

| | 1 (low-value offline digital euro transactions less risky) | 2 (low-value offline digital euro transactions equally risky) | 3 (low-value offline digital euro transactions more risky) | Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| Digital euro online payments | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Cash payments | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Online payments in commercial bank money | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

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

5000 character(s) maximum

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

Cash has no tracing. Once digital euro offers individual balance transaction tracing even if anonymity is ensured, this solution should be safer when talking about money laundering issues.

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 [GDPR](#) and the [EUDPR](#).

Question 46. Which features could appropriately enhance the privacy and data protection of the digital euro users ?

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.

| | 1 (not appropriate at all) | 2 (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') | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Ability to mask the identity of the payer or the payee to the other party's intermediary ('intermediary-to-intermediary pseudonymity') | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 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 | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Ability to completely hide the identity of the payer and payee for low-value offline transactions | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Please explain your answer to question 46:

5000 character(s) maximum

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

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?

| | 1 (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 | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Enforcement of tax rules | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Payments settlement purposes | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Management of operational and security risks | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Enforcement of potential holding limits | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Additional innovative online services and functionalities | <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"/> |

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?

| | Yes | No | Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable |
|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| Payments settlement purposes | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Operational resilience/security risks assessment and mitigation purposes | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| AML/CFT | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Fraud | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Other | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

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
- 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.

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?

| | 1 (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 | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Non-resident visitors to the EA (tourism dimension) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Selected non-EA residents for trade purposes with third countries | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| All international retail transactions with third countries without limits on residency and geography of transactions (trade dimension) | <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"/> |

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

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 | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| Financial stability | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| Monetary autonomy | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| Capital movements | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| Others | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

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

5000 character(s) maximum

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

Additional information

Should you wish to provide additional information (e.g. a position paper, report) or raise specific points not covered by the questionnaire, you can upload your additional document(s) 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 \(https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/finance-consultations-2022-digital-euro_en\)](https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/finance-consultations-2022-digital-euro_en)

[Consultation document \(https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/2022-digital-euro-consultation-document_en\)](https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/2022-digital-euro-consultation-document_en)

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

[ECBs report on the digital euro \(https://www.ecb.europa.eu/pub/pdf/other/Report_on_a_digital_euro~4d7268b45t_en.pdf\)](https://www.ecb.europa.eu/pub/pdf/other/Report_on_a_digital_euro~4d7268b45t_en.pdf)

[ECBs public consultation \(https://www.ecb.europa.eu/paym/digital_euro/html/pubcon.en.html\)](https://www.ecb.europa.eu/paym/digital_euro/html/pubcon.en.html)

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

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

[Specific privacy statement \(https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/2022-digital-euro-specific-privacy-statement_en\)](https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/2022-digital-euro-specific-privacy-statement_en)

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

Contact

fisma-digital-euro@ec.europa.eu