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Why use or subscribe on a payment service?

Usability
- Network effects, critical mass, 2-sided markets
- Convenience

Safety
- Trustworthy payment service provider
- Trade off between safety and convenience

Price
- Economies of scale
A legacy problem

• Incumbent payment services often enjoy an initial competitive advantage
  • A high cash usage makes cash cheap and other payment services relatively more expensive (Hungary, Germany, Japan)
  • If cards are dominant at the point of sale it may be difficult to launch non-card based alternatives (Sweden?)
  • In a country with a banked population, the bank account is the natural starting point

• On the other hand...
  • A large share of unbanked consumers may turn to alternative suppliers of payment services (China, Kenya)
  • Non-banks with a critical mass of consumers signed up can use this to counter and overcome the incumbents advantage (China)
The two studies

• Korella
  • Striking differences in payment behavior between Germany and (metropolitan) China
  • Large differences in the countries’ institutional set up
  • Interesting discussion on drivers that could explain the differences

• Ilyes and Varga
  • Large and complete data set allowing for a comprehensive analysis of payment choices
  • Store size most important factor for card acceptance
  • Interesting non-monotonic relationship between payment value and card usage
Difficulties to address

- Most of the literature is descriptive – we “observe” the outcome but only guess “why”
  - Possible difference between statistical and casual relationships

- The pricing of payment services towards consumers and businesses is to a large extent left out
  - Important but difficult to get data on

- The choice situation differs a lot between small and large businesses
  - Small businesses have a binary choice, e.g. card or no cards
  - Large businesses have with several cash registers may take cards at one, several or all cash registers
A question to Ilyes and Varga

• Your data is from the years 2015 and 2016

• Interchange Fee Regulation (4-party schemes)
  • 2015-12-09: caps interchange fees for debit- and credit cards to 0.2 per cent and 0.3 per cent.
  • 2016-06-09: detailed merchant fee specification, honor all cards rule no longer applies, separation between scheme and processor

• The pricing of debit- and credit cards may have changed within the observed period
  • Are there changes in card acceptance relationships between 2015 and 2016?
  • Are there changes in card acceptance relationships between Q1-Q2 and Q3-Q4 in 2016
A question to Korella

• The logic behind two-sided markets works both ways
  • Critical mass attracts users on the other side but loss of mass may make them abandon a payment method

• Sweden
  • Only 15 per cent of POS transactions are made in cash
  • Cash is costly for businesses
  • How low can the cash usage be before merchants stop accepting cash?
  • 50 per cent of the merchants thinks they have stopped 2025 or earlier

• Metropolitan China has a share of cash close to that in Sweden. Change seem to be fast. When will the Chinese merchants stop taking cash?
Summing up

• Two interesting but different papers
  • One that describes two very different countries
  • One that builds on a huge and complete data set

• Common theme: the slow or fast adoption on electronic payment services
  • Snapshots of long-term changes in the retail payment landscape
  • Countries move at different speed but in the same direction

• Sooner or later there will be implications for cash
  • Understanding the choice of payment methods may allow policymakers to be proactive
The demand for cash – the other side of the coin

Cash in circulation outside the bank sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEK bn</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Nominal demand (left scale)
- Value in relation to GDP (right scale)