

## Briefing Note | IIF-Elevandi Insights Forum

# The Business Model for CBDC Wallets + Connecting Innovation Lanes into a Global Path for Digital Assets

The Institute of International Finance (IIF) and Elevandi convened two Insights Forum Roundtables with senior leaders from the financial services industry and the public sector during the Singapore Fintech Festival. They were designed to explore critical issues we see in the development of Central Bank Digital Currencies (CBDC) and private digital assets. The roundtables were held under the Chatham House Rule and this note shares the issues and themes laid out for the session as well as key takeaways from the dialogue without attribution.

### **The Business Model for CBDC Wallets**

Participants in this session were selected to explore options for a workable economic and risk model for future CBDCs. Speakers were largely drawn from the c-suite and senior ranks of their institution but they brought diverse perspectives across the ecosystem for financial services ranging from global GSIB banks and payment networks to digital asset firms and central banks. Context and topic coverage for the session focused on the impact CBDC adoption would have on commercial banks.

**Retail central bank money and disruption of deposit takers-** If forthcoming Central Bank Digital Currency (CBDC) plans treat this instrument as part of the monetary base, then wallet custody service providers could be placed in a fundamentally different business than deposit-taking. This shift could reorganize the financial system. Some CBDC designs may envision private intermediaries hosting wallets, maintaining robust onboarding, AML/KYC/sanctions enforcement, cyber risk management, dispute resolution, customer service and continuing to perform other essential roles. What is less clear is where CBDC wallet custody generates the revenue stream to support these activities.

**Initial agenda topics were designed to reveal expectations and critical assumptions.** A successful CBDC deployment relies on the actions and contributions from a diverse group of participants. This is particularly true when considering a retail CBDC and end customer interactions. With that in mind, the following initial points were put forward to stimulate the discussion:

- **CBDC Moving from Theoretical Designs to Prototype-** In markets around the world, central banks are moving forward with CBDC development. The ECB has selected five companies to prototype user interfaces for the Digital Euro and several other have set designs and deployed prototypes. As these developments accelerate, the specifics of intermediation and roles are coming into focus. What models do we see emerging and what are the implications?
- **The Wallet in the Middle-** How will the economics of CBDC intermediation compare with today's fractional reserve lending model? If a retail CBDC is a direct liability on the central bank, can this custody still fund traditional commercial banking activities? What are the value added services wallet providers can deliver? How might we see roles and responsibilities in financial services change with the introduction of retail CBDC?
- **What's New-** In the emerging models for CBDC, what is changed for intermediaries? What legal frameworks might need to be modernized to enable the activities and roles envisioned? What opportunities for new value-added services and business lines are opened up for intermediaries by the launch of CBDCs? Would they support a new business model for financial services?

**Banks and other financial institutions are still questioning the fundamental need for CBDCs.** Several lead discussants and session participants questioned the underlying premise of retail CBDC moving forward rather than focusing on the details of a workable business model. There were strong questions about the policy objectives driving the development of CBDC and if the instruments would prove to be fit for purpose. That said, it was observed that significant progress has been made

## Briefing Note | IIF-Elevandi Insights Forum

since the launch of the Sand Dollar of the Bahamas (one of the first CBDC). The eCNY is in broad circulation, a Digital Rupee has been announced, the ECB is in advanced stages of analysis, the Bank of England has confirmed the likelihood of a retail CBDC, the US Fed has begun testing, and project Ubin in Singapore has seen several rounds of tests. This wave of action occurs against a backdrop of dwindling use of cash and rising demand for digital payments. Despite these developments, more of the discussion focused on questioning the need for CBDC and roles in the ecosystem rather than the economic and business model questions.

**Policy objectives and principles for CBDC initiatives-** Clearly identifying what governments and central banks sought to achieve through the development of CBDC was seen as an essential first step in determining if they are fit for purpose. Roundtable participants discussed a range of these objectives and related issues as they shared their views on:

- Efficiency- reduce the need for corresponding bank settlement.
- Automation- support private developments such as market makers for FX and cross-border payments.
- Compliance improvement- focus on designs that could drive beneficial change in KYC/AML.
- Innovation – support continued private innovation with sustainable business conditions.
- Financial Stability – CBDC should not facilitate flash bank runs during periods of stress.
- Privacy - this should be a key consideration for wallet design.

Anticipated impact areas and improvements include:

- Digital Identity – CBDC was seen as an opportunity to drive adjacent developments in digital identity and facilitate identification for rural and less served populations.
- Financial Innovation - CBDC provides an anchor for value in digital asset ecosystems and a platform for financial innovation and automation to be built on top of this base layer. Can facilitate stablecoin and tokenization.
- Financial Inclusion – frequently cited objective drew skeptical reactions from many of the private sector participants who questioned how this would be possible if requirements such as onboarding KYC, AML, and other account cost drivers remained consistent in a CBDC scenario.
- Taxation – support more automated and effective systems.

**CBDC can serve as an anchor into the fiat economy for tokenized assets** and make new instruments more accessible for a broader population. To achieve this, they must be broadly adopted and payments, in particular government payments, was seen as an important vector. In this scenario, leaving as much as possible to private market was seen as desirable. Participants were designing prototypes at both backend and frontend of these scenarios.

**Design considerations for CBDC have different central banks taking diverse stances for varying objectives while the private sector is focused on a few key points.** There was strong consensus, particularly among financial institution speakers, that two-tier distribution is the best model in most instances. Direct distribution to consumers by central banks was not seen as practical given the lack of capacity and experience in onboarding, KYC, AML, and customer service. Open designs for CBDC were seen as an opportunity for greater interoperability and private innovations, such as programmable functionality, to be built on top of CBDC. The private sector hopes that CBDC would be approached as an eco-system, not just the instrument, with a significant role for commercial banks in distribution.


Design questions outlined in the discussion included:

- Wholesale or retail CBDC?
- Should accounts remunerative or not?
- Should there be transaction limit or not?
- Issuance model - Who opens the account? The central bank or commercial bank?

## Briefing Note | IIF-Elevandi Insights Forum

- Can you dispense cash directly to CBDC wallet?
- Can you issue CBDC-backed stable coins?

**Wallet design and value limits** were a particular point of discussion within design considerations as the private sector participants emphasized the need to minimize conflicts and maximize synergy between CBDC instruments and private services and products. Tiered wallet design and limits were explored as one way to reduce the chance of bank runs with a debate about different methodologies and questions regarding the options. Should they be tiered by value limits? And should there be easier onboarding requirement for small balance wallets? Should wallets be limited by “price” with different interest rates offered? Or should control mechanisms be by stock or by flow? In the end, participants coalesced that value limits seemed the more practical option for tiered options.



**Use cases and adoption** were explored. Looking beyond broad policy objectives, the gathering discussed more specific applications areas. Some speakers questioned if CBDC was trying to solve problems that do not exist or if CBDC was fit for the purpose. Web 3.0, the metaverse, government response to shock scenarios, green finance monitoring and reporting, and the broader trend of tokenization were all mentioned in the discussion as potential drivers for CBDC development. An analogy to the internet in 1998 was used to share that future use cases are hard to predict but “build it, they will come” was the sentiment of those gathered. Ultimately, it was agreed that use case is a sovereign decision for governments to make; however, adoption is the key. CBDC will need to deliver real benefits to users and adoption will be a problem if the CBDC is not trusted. For those reasons, concerns about becoming a tool of surveillance and state control were explored. There were also questions about the additionality of CBDC; what could it do that private tokens could not? The discussion settled on additional trust and security in crisis/distress scenarios. There were also notes of caution about designing pilots and tests of CBDC with “free money” leading to false conclusions. In the end, it is up to consumer; CBDC won’t take off if consumers don’t want it.

**Wholesale vs retail CBDC** discussions highlighted significant differences for intermediaries between these scenarios. Do banks want to be liquidity providers? If CBDC is used for wholesale, will it help reduce counterparty risk? If so, this is an exciting opportunity. Many share the view that central banks don’t want to disrupt commercial banks’ capacity for credit creation and private money creation will remain. While there is certainty that central banks don’t want to deal with the minutiae of onboarding, fears of disruption still linger with commercial banks as they contemplate the possible outflow of money and unforeseen changes.

## Briefing Note | IIF-Elevandi Insights Forum

**Business model for commercial banks** in CBDC systems continues to be questioned. Consensus was that most banks have passed the disintermediation fear stage because most CBDC initiatives do not seem focused on replacing commercial banks in distribution, deposit taking, or lending. No one questioned the two-tier model. Public sector representatives offered that there is no reason to fear as long as CBDC only replaces physical cash. Meanwhile, commercial banks see potential opportunity if they can layer programmability on money. As they contemplate the emergence of CBDC, commercial banks are also starting to explore new possibilities such as becoming trusted advisors and service providers to central banks on CBDC development. There are still questions for commercial banks about a stable business model, unforeseen changes from the evolution to digital instead of physical cash, and responsibilities for cyber risk and cryptographic security management.

**Public policy and infrastructure** are seen to require collaboration between the public and private sectors, for instance, in minting and distribution. There was a sentiment that CBDC initiatives need to achieve more than just cash-replacement. Creating a platform for financial innovation and financial inclusion was seen as the guiding “north star”. Creating a monetary anchor in new tokenized ecosystems was put forward as a worthy objective. While infrastructure and maintenance costs for digitized systems may be expensive, participants were reminded that physical cash is expensive too. Observers saw the need to make CBDC sustainable when scaled up.

**Legal and regulatory frameworks encompassing all digital assets are urgently needed.** Current regulation was viewed as insufficient and there are concerns that responses could fragment between different instrument types thereby blocking interoperability for various public and private instruments. Three dimensions were offered for focus:

- Fraud -fix the lack of consistent oversight and standards.
- Consumer protection – address a diverse set of issues ranging from wallet switching concerns (make easy), to loss of privacy, to confusion over multiplicity of models, to recourse over “fat finger” mistakes in immutable distributed systems (It was noted that consumers use digital wallets today because of benefits from digital technology).
- Finality and settlement- modernize these rules and processes with new technology and its capabilities in mind. Infrastructure should be legally binding and legally enforceable. Questions remain if digital currencies are legal tender? Is settlement finality reversible? Answers depend on how CBDCs are designed and how legal frameworks are updated.

**Trust Problems** are likely to be significant. Privacy is key to engender trusts but there will be tensions in CBDC designs between transparency, wallet control, and desire for anonymity. Consumer protections needs to be in place and digital wallet must have legal underpinning to engender trust. Requirements for traceability, irreversibility, irrevocability highlight tensions. One participant summarized that trust in infrastructure and the public sector are critical with societal cohesion only existing when there is trust.

**In conclusion, CBDC is advancing** with significant activity in major economies in Europe, China, India, the US, and UK as well as many smaller markets. **Greater communication and coordination are needed between sectors if these efforts are to succeed.**

Continued

## Briefing Note | IIF-Elevandi Insights Forum

### **Connecting Innovation Lanes into a Global Path for Digital Assets**

The second roundtable convened a diverse array of actors from digital asset firms and financial institutions as well as public sector leaders responsible for innovation. The session was designed to share the different assumptions, forecasts, and plans of these institutions to create a clearer picture of how different ecosystem actors are aligned (or not) and how we can build toward interoperability.

**Identifying Critical Decision Points in Stablecoins and CBDCs - How will new forms of money fit together in a future global financial system?** Critical decision points are upon us in the development of stablecoins, tokenized deposits, and CBDCs. As the Bank for International Settlement (BIS) has aptly observed, choices for the future of the monetary system are fast approaching, and questions about adaptability and security need to be resolved at the same time across markets. Many different entities will have essential roles and are actively working on development; however, they are not well connected, are moving at different paces, and, sometimes, in divergent directions. To improve the trajectory toward interoperability, several priorities stand out:

- Identifying critical decision points for CBDC and stablecoin infrastructure development;
- Exploring an agenda for public-private cooperation toward more aligned, connected, and interoperable systems;
- Creating near-term action items for improving coordination and international standards; and
- Pinpointing ways to support a lower cost, more transparent, secure, and efficient global payments infrastructure.

**Decision Points in Digital Asset Development.** The design and development of CBDC, stablecoins, and tokenized assets are each dealing with a complex set of questions such as, privacy, immutability, settlement, finality and the different roles and responsibilities in their systems. These decisions are at the nexus of technology and societal values and will reflect these tensions. Many different entities have a role to play. Key assumptions, forecasts, and decisions are being made in different spheres of digital asset and tokenization development.

**Should governments be creating CBDC?** The overwhelming majority of participants in this session began by questioning the premise for retail CBDC and the accelerated push by governments to develop these new instruments. Participants also questioned the overall role of the public sector in creating new retail technology services. Instead, views were that regulation and oversight, with more direct shaping of next generation wholesale and settlement systems, was a better focus for government. Many of the issues discussed in the first roundtable session (*The Business Model for CBDC Wallets*) were revisited by this separate group of speakers including: CBDC objectives; requirements, roles, and responsibilities; and the business model for participants in a digital asset ecosystem.

**Instead of launching CBDCs,** digital asset firms would like to see governments focus on clear rules of the road, modernized regulation, and consistent oversight of different firms engaged in similar activities. Upgrading the public layer of technologies was also seen as a priority; however, speakers were looking for the public sector and central banks to focus on settlement and wholesale payment systems while increasing engagement and coordination to support private innovation.

**Working towards interoperability-** For digital assets to deliver on their potential, interoperability will be required between different systems and layers of new assets. Without interoperability, the net result of digital asset developments could be a more fragmented and less efficient landscape for the future of finance. This reality is widely recognized; however, the mechanisms to drive interoperability are less clear and only a few specifics featured in the discussion. Digital identity standards were offered as one example and projects testing the interoperability of various CBDC test and pilot instruments was another. The sense of the room was that much more needs to be done to identify points for public-private cooperation toward more aligned, connected, and interoperable systems.

## Briefing Note | IIF-Elevandi Insights Forum

**Improving Cross-Border Payments** The search for solutions to make cross-border payments lower cost, faster, more transparent, more secure, and more accessible is driving many to turn their attention to digital assets as part of the solution. The dialogue in the roundtable reflected a mix of optimism and reality on potential improvements in this area. Some focused on transformative potential for programable instruments and automation to solve pain points in fx and settlement while others focused on some intractable challenges in compliance and last mile delivery as the real issue which is beyond the reach of these technology improvements alone. Dialogue stayed at a higher level of discussion about general efficiency and automation rather than specific details and the sense was that digital assets would not be a near term solution to payments pain.

**Unlocking tokenization-** making markets more liquid and efficient by creating a trusted token technology integrated with real assets and the physical economy emerged as the most promising area for exploration. This vision has opportunity and important roles for public and private actors across the ecosystem and captured why forward thinkers continue to see promise for technology to transform how the economy stores and trades value.