

Basic concepts and design choices of a digital euro

Market Advisory Group



Digital euro project team

10 November 2021

Overview

1 Basic concepts

2 Design choices

What do we mean by "digital euro" and why consider it?

Digital euro would be a central bank liability made available in digital form for use in retail payments

Possible advantages in a range of scenarios, particularly:

Against declining use of cash as a means of payment



Tackling **sovereignty** concerns related to foreign CBDCs or private digital means of payment in the euro area



Supporting **digitalisation** in the European economy

<u>Objective</u>: To maintain public **access** and full **usability** of **central bank money** in a world in which consumers and firms turn more and more to electronic payments.

Monetary anchor for digital payments



Today: confidence in private money is underpinned by its convertibility on a one-to-one basis with the monetary anchor (cash) Central banks can commit to **supply** cash, but...

what if **demand** for it declines due to insufficient usability as a means of payment?

How can convertibility be maintained in the long term if there is insufficient demand for the monetary anchor? Sovereign money needs to evolve and adapt to the changing needs of commerce

... while maintaining the equilibrium with private monies

. . .

Maintaining the equilibrium commercial bank monies / central bank money

- Aim to offering CBDC through supervised intermediaries
 - Central banks do not have any ambition to offer front-end payment services. This does not exclude the possibility to provide a digital euro app.
 - Central banks do not have any ambition to take away deposits from banks' balance sheets.
- The opportunity to distribute the safest/most liquid asset in an economy has great value for any payment initiator

See speech by F. Panetta: Central bank digital currencies: a monetary anchor for digital innovation https://www.ecb.europa.eu/press/key/date/2021/html/ecb.sp211105~08781cb638.en.html

The success in functions of money paradox

Not a form of investment:

On digital euro accounts/wallets with limited balances...

Maximise usability as means of exchange:

... the vast majority of daily payments should be possible, without the user being too much concerned about funding the account/wallet



Scope vs Time: the Swiss army knife dilemma

Minimum <u>viable</u> product Optimum

 Too limited scope may provide insufficient value to consumers & merchants & financial intermediaries Minimum <u>valuable</u> product **?**

• A digital euro cannot be a "Swiss army knife" from day one...

 ... while retaining sufficient flexibility to add on top in future releases Broad scope

Optimum

• Time, costs and project risks may increase over-proportionally with certain scope elements

Overview

1 Basic concepts

2 Design choices

Online

- Is the standard for electronic payments today
- Provides tested levels of security
- Requires high capacity for settling transactions (volume & latency)
- Supports many payment use cases

Offline

A payment that is executed without live supervision but can be considered valid

- No material such payment instrument is currently widely used in Europe
- Requires **prefunding** of the device
- May enables highest privacy of transactions
- Was **proven potentially viable** in Eurosystem experimentations, with some limitations:
 - Device brought online from time to time
 - Needs safe creation & distribution channels



Hardware that **stores** information and **executes** valid operations [≠ trusted **execution** environment]

Account-based system and/or bearer instrument?

Two types of (possibly co-existing) digital euro

Account-based





Settlement

Example: bank transfers, major electronic payment solutions

Bearer

Transaction and settlement



Example: cash payments, some prepaid card (e.g. 'Oyster card')

Tools to avoid disintermediation

<u>Aim</u>:

- Design digital euro as means of payment
- A digital euro will need to be designed so that it does **not interfere** with the transmission of monetary policy.
- **Prevent large holdings** as risk-free investment

Options:

- Tiering, with **unattractive rates** applied to holdings beyond threshold
- Set **quantity limits** on individual users' holdings

Design options with different degrees of privacy (I)

* Always in line with rules on data protection

- Privacy of holdings and transactions: identity checked at onboarding; information on users' identity, holdings and transactions not shared by user with intermediaries
- Selective privacy: identity checked at onboarding; only larg<u>er</u>-value transactions subject to monitoring and user identification for regulatory purposes [*current practice for large cash payments but not foreseen in electronic payments*]

Design options with different degrees of privacy (II)

* Always in line with rules on data protection

- **Transparent for compliance only**: Transactions transparent to obliged entities **for compliance monitoring** [*current formal practice for electronic payments*]
- Transparent to intermediary also for commercial purposes: Intermediaries may use data on payment behaviour to offer additional services [de facto standard for most electronic payment solutions]

Role of intermediaries in core services

Types of **services**

- Onboarding of users
- Gateway and support
- Funding/defunding
- Provision of users' interface
- Customer care



Types of **intermediary** ≻ 'supervised' - TBD

Role of intermediaries in value-added services

- ECB/Eurosystem to provide basic transaction services and enable more advanced services
- Intermediaries to develop value added service and innovate, differentiate and compete on the market



Settlement model and back-end structure

1. Centralised

- Does not mean 'single node'
- Standard for digital retail payments, extensively tested

2. And/or Distributed ledger

- Distributed validation
- Automated payments customizable by end users

3. And/or Local storage

- Most similar to cash
- Necessary for offline







Integration

Digital euro aims for:

- Integration with different end-user access solutions
- Interoperability with the financial market ecosystem
- Possible integration with **digital identity (e-ID)** and **e-ID wallets**

Design choices on:

- Interoperation with existing market solutions
 - end-user
 - merchant
- Industry standards

Advanced functionalities

For instance **automation of payments**, aka 'programmability'

Can be done at different levels along two dimensions

- Where the code is executed
 - Central infrastructure
 - Intermediary's system
 - User's device

- Who can program it

- Back-end operator
- Intermediaries
- End users / firms



Cross-border and cross-currency use

Payments outside euro area (cf. discussion on global context)

- Cross-border
- Cross-currency

Options to restrict use outside a certain area

- Based on geo-location of user
- Short-term expiry of digital euro solution (e.g. for incoming travel)
- No restriction entitled users can also use it abroad

Thank you for your attention!