



**Electronic Money Association**

68 Square Marie-Louise

Brussels 1000

Belgium

[www.e-ma.org](http://www.e-ma.org)

Francesco Mauro  
Head of Supervisory Review, Recovery and Resolution  
European Banking Authority  
Tour Europlaza  
20 avenue André Prothin  
CS 30154  
92927 Paris La Défense CEDEX  
France

Submitted by email to [Dirk.Haubrich@eba.europa.eu](mailto:Dirk.Haubrich@eba.europa.eu)

31 October 2022

Dear Mr Mauro,

**Re: EMA response to the EBA's [Consultation on draft revised guidelines on methods for calculating contributions to deposit guarantee schemes \(EBA/CP/2022/10\)](#)**

The EMA is the EU trade body representing electronic money issuers and alternative payment service providers. Our members include leading payments and e-commerce businesses worldwide, providing online payments, card-based products, electronic vouchers, and mobile payment instruments. Most members operate across the EU, most frequently on a cross-border basis. The comments provided below reflect those of the EMA as a whole; individual members may hold different views. A list of current EMA members is provided at the end of this document.

I would be grateful for your consideration of our comments and proposals.

Yours sincerely,

Chief Executive Officer  
Electronic Money Association

## EMA responses

### Question 4:

*Do you have comments on the proposed approach to account for covered deposits held in beneficiary accounts or other deposits where there is uncertainty to the coverage, as set out in section 4.3 of the Guidelines?*

### EMA response:

1. The EMA is in support of treating safeguarded funds of payment institutions ('PIs') and e-money institutions ('EMIs') as covered funds for the purposes of the DGSD, as this will protect PIs' and EMIs' businesses in the event of credit institution ('CI') failure. E-money holders will indirectly benefit from this protection, as it will allow PIs and EMIs to honour the claims of their customers on an ongoing basis. Coverage by the DGSD will thus increase the strength of the safeguarding regime already in place for PIs and EMIs.
2. We also agree with the approach to calculating contributions relating to funds held in safeguarding accounts outlined in section 4.3, para. 23 of the Guidelines:

*In relation to Article 7(3) of the DGSD, if a member institution does not accurately determine the precise amount of covered deposits in beneficiary accounts or established maximum amount of covered deposits in such accounts, the DGS should assume all funds in the beneficiary accounts to be covered for the purpose of calculating contributions. Where a member institution reports the precise amount of covered deposits in such accounts, or an established maximum amount of covered deposits in beneficiary accounts, the DGS should take these figures into account when calculating the member institution's contributions. The competent authority in cooperation with the designated authority should determine which information is necessary to take into account the precise amount or the established maximum amount of covered deposits in a beneficiary account.*

These options give firms the flexibility to provide the information to the DGS that best achieves the twin aims of keeping contributions to a minimum and keeping information costs to a minimum. Both these costs are important for the payment services and e-money sectors given the increasing difficulty for PIs and EMIs to obtain safeguarding accounts and the increased costs associated with these accounts. We note in this respect the EBA's assessment that there would only be a small impact of the inclusion on the overall amount of covered deposits.

3. However, we would like to take this opportunity to stress to the EBA that funds received by EMIs in exchange for issued e-money are not funds to which 'the depositor is not absolutely entitled' in accordance with Article 7(4) DGSD. Funds safeguarded by EMIs with a CI are funds to which EMIs are absolutely entitled, with customers' interests in these funds having been transferred to the e-money that they hold and can spend at merchants. EMIs may invest these funds, derive income from them and may even substitute them with an appropriate insurance or guarantee. In the UK, this understanding

of the legal status of safeguarded funds has been confirmed in the *Ipagoo* litigation.<sup>1</sup> While we are in support of treating safeguarded funds of both PIs and EMIs as covered funds for the purposes of the DGSD (see point 1 above), we think it is important that EBA guidance should not cast doubt on the legal status of safeguarded funds received in exchange for e-money. This doubt is created when e-money safeguarding accounts are described as ‘beneficiary accounts.’ To this end, we request amendment of the guidance text in section 4.3, para. 23 as follows:

*In relation to Article 7(3) of the DGSD or where deposits are otherwise deemed to be covered by the guarantee, as is the case with the safeguarded funds of Electronic Money Institutions, if a member institution does not accurately determine the precise amount of covered deposits in beneficiary or e-money safeguarding accounts or established maximum amount of covered deposits in such accounts, the DGS should assume all funds in the beneficiary or e-money safeguarding accounts to be covered for the purpose of calculating contributions. Where a member institution reports the precise amount of covered deposits in such accounts, or an established maximum amount of covered deposits in beneficiary or e-money safeguarding accounts, the DGS should take these figures into account when calculating the member institution’s contributions. The competent authority in cooperation with the designated authority should determine which information is necessary to take into account the precise amount or the established maximum amount of covered deposits in a beneficiary or e-money safeguarding account.*

4. We would also like to make the EBA aware that in the event of CI failure, payment of the covered funds to payment services customers/e-money holders directly would endanger the day-to-day running business of PIs and EMIs, which may themselves be unaffected by the CI failure. Customers of these firms are generally unaware that funds they have transferred to the PI or EMI are held in safeguarding accounts with a CI and would not expect repayment of these funds unless explicitly requested. Therefore, payment should be made to an alternative safeguarding account held with a different CI in the first place, with direct payment of the covered funds to payment services customers/e-money holders only to be considered in the event of a linked failure of a PI or EMI. While we realise that the guidance currently consulted on is chiefly concerned with the calculation of contributions by member institutions, we request the EBA’s support for this approach, which is already in the process of adoption in the UK.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *Re Ipagoo LLP (In Administration)* [2021] EWHC 2163 (Ch); *Re Ipagoo LLP (In Administration)* [2022] EWCA Civ 302. For an account of the debate and a more detailed legal analysis, see Jacques, J (2022) ‘E-money and Trusts: A Property Analysis’ 138(Oct) *Law Quarterly Review*, 605-623.

<sup>2</sup> [Bank of England CP9/22 – Depositor Protection](#), section 5.

## Members of the EMA, as of October 2022

[AAVE LIMITED](#)

[Account Technologies](#)

[Airbnb Inc](#)

[Airwallex \(UK\) Limited](#)

[Allegro Group](#)

[Amazon](#)

[American Express](#)

[ArcaPay Ltd](#)

[Azimo Limited](#)

[Banked](#)

[Bitstamp](#)

[BlaBla Connect UK Ltd](#)

[Blackhawk Network Ltd](#)

[Boku Inc](#)

[Booking Holdings Financial Services](#)

[International Limited](#)

[CashFlows](#)

[Checkout Ltd](#)

[Circle](#)

[Citadel Commerce UK Ltd](#)

[Contis](#)

[Corner Banca SA](#)

[Crypto.com](#)

[Curve](#)

[eBay Sarl](#)

[ECOMMPAY Limited](#)

[Em@ney Plc](#)

[emerchantpay Group Ltd](#)

[Etsy Ireland UC](#)

[Euronet Worldwide Inc](#)

[Facebook Payments International Ltd](#)

[Financial House Limited](#)

[First Rate Exchange Services](#)

[FIS](#)

[Flex-e-card](#)

[Flywire](#)

[Gemini](#)

[Global Currency Exchange Network](#)

[Limited](#)

[Globepay Limited](#)

[GoCardless Ltd](#)

[Google Payment Ltd](#)

[HUBUC](#)

[IDT Financial Services Limited](#)

[Imagor SA](#)

[Ixaris Systems Ltd](#)

[MANGOPAY](#)

[Modulr FS Europe Limited](#)

[MONAVATE](#)

[Moneyhub Financial Technology Ltd](#)

[Moorwand](#)

[MuchBetter](#)

[myPOS Payments Ltd](#)

[NOELSE PAY](#)

[NoFriction Ltd](#)

[Nuvei Financial Services Ltd](#)

[OFX](#)

[OKTO](#)

[One Money Mail Ltd](#)

[OpenPayd](#)

[Own.Solutions](#)

[Park Card Services Limited](#)

[Paymentsense Limited](#)

[Paynt](#)

[Payoneer Europe Limited](#)

[PayPal Europe Ltd](#)

[Paysafe Group](#)

[Plaid](#)

[PPRO Financial Ltd](#)

[PPS](#)

[Ramp Swaps Ltd](#)

[Remitly](#)

[Revolut](#)

[Ripple](#)

[Sable International FX Limited](#)

[Securiclick Limited](#)

[Skrill Limited](#)

[Soldo Financial Services Ireland DAC](#)

[Square](#)

[Stripe](#)

[SumUp Limited](#)

[Syspay Ltd](#)

[Transact Payments Limited](#)

[TransferMate Global Payments](#)

[TrueLayer Limited](#)

[Trustly Group AB](#)

[Uber BV](#)

[Vitesse PSP Ltd](#)

[Viva Payments SA](#)

[Weavr Limited](#)

[WEX Europe UK Limited](#)

[Wirex Limited](#)

[Wise](#)

[WorldFirst](#)

[WorldRemit LTD](#)

[Yapily Ltd](#)

