

**Westpac Economics Team** 

economics@westpac.co.nz
westpac.co.nz/economics

**Kelly Eckhold,** Chief Economist **C** +64 21 786 758 ■ kelly.eckhold@westpac.co.nz



# **Risk Assessment Framework for ESAS Consultation Paper.**

The Reserve Bank of New Zealand (RBNZ) issued a consultation paper on 15 June 2023 discussing their intention to review the policy and criteria the RBNZ applies when granting firms access to the Exchange Settlement Account System (ESAS) used for wholesale New Zealand dollar payments. Westpac Economics decided to provide a submission for the Reserve Bank's consideration and this Bulletin contains our submission.

## Introduction.

1. The RBNZ's review of the criteria used to assess access to New Zealand's Exchange Settlement Account System (ESAS) is welcome and timely given advancements in the development of global payments systems and the increasing role of non-bank financial institutions in payments systems and financial market intermediation more generally. A root to branch review of ESAS access criteria has not been conducted for decades – hence this review is well overdue. We note that other central banks are conducting similar reviews – for example in the United States where the Federal Reserve is reviewing the framework for allowing access to its "Master Accounts" and in the United Kingdom the Bank of England has decided to allow some categories of non-bank payment service providers access to its RTGS system.<sup>1</sup>

# Key submissions.

2. Westpac broadly supports the description of the objectives of the ESAS payments system. Westpac agrees that system resiliency should be at the core of the RBNZ's strategy for managing ESAS. However, in Westpac's view resiliency of the system is affected by more than the structure and operational processes and features of ESAS itself. To this end, we consider that the described objectives should be more broadly defined to encompass the principle that ESAS participants should have strong risk management arrangements and be subject to robust regulatory and supervisory oversight. In widening access to ESAS beyond traditional market participants there is a risk that new entrants are not as robust from an operational and risk management perspective, as the banks that have historically participated in ESAS.

<sup>1</sup> See Bank of England (2017) bankofengland.co.uk/news/2017/july/boe-extends-direct-access-to-rtgs-accounts-to-non-bank-payment-service-providers and Federal Reserve Bank of St Louis (2022) stlouisfed. org/en/on-the-economy/2022/sep/fed-guidelines-master-account-access-payment-services for discussions on innovations in payments system access in the UK and US.

- In addition, and consistent with the above, we would suggest that the first bullet point of the stated objectives for ESAS be amended as follows:
  - "... without creating undue risks to the payments system",

be adjusted to reflect a more conservative stance of:

- "... without creating any significant risks to the payments system".
- Consideration should also be given to potential reputational risk issues that might arise because of new payments service providers being conferred with ESAS access. There is a risk that such access may be viewed by consumers and the wider public as an endorsement of such providers by the RBNZ. It is also likely that firms will utilise ESAS access as a selling point for their services. Accordingly, we would encourage the RBNZ to carefully consider the extent to which it wishes to be viewed as endorsing these new participants (for example in respect of crypto asset payments service providers or custodians).
- Additionally, there are risks associated with the interconnectedness of new ESAS participants. On the face of it, the criteria as specified appear to emphasize standalone risk management considerations which we think should be broadened to reflect the degree of interconnectedness of potential new entrants. If highly interconnected participants are granted access to ESAS, then these participants should be strongly regulated and supervised to prevent the accumulation of systemic risks.
- We would encourage the RBNZ to consider its capacity to supervise and regulate any new participants given their jurisdiction and business models may be very different to the entities currently supervised by the RBNZ.

# Response to consultation questions.

## Question 1. Do you have feedback on how we have described our objectives for ESAS?

- Westpac supports the high-level exposition of the objective. However, we consider that there is a need for the stated objectives to recognise that resiliency is related to more than the structure of ESAS itself. Participants need to have strong operational processes to successfully operate within ESAS and not create risks that might transmit to the wider system. Other factors that may also determine resilience may include:
  - strength of risk management arrangements of participants;
  - supervisory arrangements participants are subject to; and
  - participants' ability to access backup liquidity buffers in the event of idiosyncratic or systemic stress.
- It is important that the proposed policy considers the above factors, as it is likely that some potential new ESAS participants may not have robust operational, liquidity, risk management and risk mitigation arrangements and are not subject to the same supervisory oversight as traditional participants. Without such policy considerations, it is likely that increased systemic and operational risks will be placed on the ESAS system as well as RBNZ's balance sheet. Examples of this could include the need for the RBNZ to increase access to its discount window or open market operations, the need for overdraft arrangements, or adjustment of collateral requirements and eligibility.
- Accordingly, we submit that the proposed ESAS policy and objectives statement should emphasise that robust risk management and mitigation processes should be in place for any potential ESAS participant. In addition, and more specifically, we would suggest that in specifying the objectives of ESAS in the first bullet point of those objectives, the following amendment should be made:
  - "... without creating undue risks to the payments system",

be adjusted to reflect a more conservative stance of:

"... without creating any significant risks to the payments system".

## Question 2. Do you have any feedback on our considerations for opening up ESAS?

#### Understanding the motivations for why firms might seek ESAS access and considering the reputational risk implications.

- 10. We believe that the motivations for why an applicant may seek ESAS access is the key to understanding the benefits that ESAS access may confer to that applicant. Understanding an applicant's motivations for applying for ESAS access may also shed light on the risks that may be associated with that applicant.
- 11. The consultation document rightly notes that most firms can already receive the benefits of payments system services associated with ESAS through an agent bank. However, access through an agent bank comes with various costs and limitations

- which could motivate a firm to seek direct access. For example, firms may be incentivised to apply for access to ESAS to avoid sharing information on their payments flows with an agent bank.
- 12. It's important to note that ESAS access could in some way legitimise a firm and be used by the firm to market its services to the wider public. We think it would be useful for the RBNZ to recognise the reputational issues that might arise should the RBNZ be seen as somehow endorsing a new payments service provider by conferring ESAS access (especially if such access is conflated with perceptions of liquidity or deposit insurance support by the wider public).

#### Clearly articulate whether ESAS access is to facilitate wholesale or retail payments.

13. The policy considerations could be more clearly articulated with a description of the services the RBNZ considers might be better be facilitated by ESAS access. We would argue that the strongest case for ESAS access is that ESAS facilitates safer and more efficient wholesale market transactions. If the RBNZ agrees with this, then the policy could emphasise a wholesale market focus and include this consideration when examining the merits of individual applications. However, if there is a desire to consider applications from firms seeking to disintermediate the retail payments systems then some discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of this could be discussed in this draft policy.

#### More focus on systemic risk considerations.

- 14. The risk categories included in table 2 appear to be focused on the direct financial risks to the ESAS system as opposed to the much more interesting and important systemic risk considerations that might arise from the failure of an ESAS participant. We suggest that the current and potential future interconnectedness of a participant be expressly considered when evaluating the risks of its application.
- 15. We would encourage caution against putting in place a policy that might introduce a riskier set of more highly interconnected participants into the financial system. These concerns would be magnified should new interconnected participants not be adequately or easily regulated and supervised. In the absence of such considerations, the RBNZ may find that innovation is boosted at the costs of significantly increased systemic risks which may be difficult to contain.

### Consider the RBNZ's capacity to supervise and regulate new ESAS participants.

16. We would encourage the RBNZ to consider its capacity to effectively supervise and regulate the new classes of entities which might become eligible for ESAS access. New entrants may not be well covered by existing regulatory frameworks and may have business models that vary significantly from the types of firms the RBNZ currently supervises. In addition, new entities might be predominantly based or operating offshore and not well covered by foreign supervisory regimes if for example, such entities don't have direct payments system access in offshore jurisdictions.

# Question 3 (A): Do you consider that there are any substantive risks that are not included in the RAF that should be included in order to safeguard the continued operation of ESAS?

17. The risks set out in the consultation document seem comprehensive and we have no further comments on these.

#### Question 3 (B): Do you consider that any of the risks set out in the draft RAF have been misrepresented?

- 18. We do not consider that any of the risks have been misrepresented but believe that in assessing the risks it is important to take a comprehensive view of associated risks. A key risk issue that deserves consideration is the diversity in business models and regulatory frameworks that non-bank payment service providers and deposit takers are subject to. A good example might be crypto or stablecoin custodians or payment service providers who may not be regulated at all. Many of these entities may not be subject to robust liquidity regulation or regulatory supervision and may not have access to robust backup or emergency liquidity via a central bank or other committed facilities.
- 19. Adopting a very cautious approach to non-bank payment service providers would ensure a level playing field exists where all participants in ESAS are subject to equally robust supervisory and risk management requirements. Participants with more exotic business models should have the associated risks balanced by very robust liquidity backstops to ensure they do not import risk into ESAS, increase systemic risks or place the RBNZ in a position of having to offer emergency liquidity support.

## Question 3 (C): Is there any further feedback you would like to provide with regards to the draft RAF?

20. We do not have any further feedback on the RAF but we would be happy to discuss any aspects of our feedback with the RBNZ at any stage.

# **Contact the Westpac economics team**

Kelly Eckhold, Chief Economist 🐛 +64 9 348 9382

Satish Ranchhod, Senior Economist +64 9 336 5668

Darren Gibbs, Senior Economist +64 9 367 3368

Nathan Penny, Senior Agri Economist

+64 9 348 9114

Paul Clark, Industry Economist

+64 9 336 5656

Shania Bonenkamp, Graduate

shania.bonenkamp@westpac.co.nz

**Any questions email:** 

economics@westpac.co.nz

# **Disclaimer**

#### Things you should know

Westpac Institutional Bank is a division of Westpac Banking Corporation ABN 33 007 457 141 ('Westpac').

Disclaimer

This material contains general commentary, and market colour. The material does not constitute investment advice. Certain types of transactions, including those involving futures, options and high yield securities give rise to substantial risk and are not suitable for all investors. We recommend that you seek your own independent legal or financial advice before proceeding with any investment decision. This information has been prepared without taking account of your objectives, financial situation or needs. This material may contain material provided by third parties. While such material is published with the necessary permission none of Westpac or its related entities accepts any responsibility for the accuracy or completeness of any such material. Although we have made every effort to ensure the information is free from error, none of Westpac or its related entities warrants the accuracy, adequacy or completeness of the information, or otherwise endorses it in any way. Except where contrary to law, Westpac and its related entities intend by this notice to exclude liability for the information. The information is subject to change without notice and none of Westpac or its related entities is under any obligation to update the information or correct any inaccuracy which may become apparent at a later date. The information contained in this material does not constitute an offer, as officiation of an offer, or an inducement to subscribe for, purchase or sell any financial instrument or to enter a legally binding contract. Past performance is not a reliable indicator of future performance. Whilst every effort has been taken to ensure that the assumptions on which the forecasts are based are reasonable, the forecasts may be affected by incorrect assumptions or by known or unknown risks and uncertainties. The ultimate outcomes may differ substantially from these forecasts.

#### **Country disclosures**

Australia: Westpac holds an Australian Financial Services Licence (No. 233714). This material is provided to you solely for your own use and in your capacity as a wholesale client of Westpac

New Zealand: In New Zealand, Westpac Institutional Bank refers to the brand under which products New Zealand: In New Zealand, Westpac Institutional Bank refers to the brand under which products and services are provided by either Westpac or Westpac New Zealand Limited ("WNZL"). Any product or service made available by WNZL does not represent an offer from Westpac or any of its subsidiaries (other than WNZL). Neither Westpac nor its other subsidiaries guarantee or otherwise support the performance of WNZL in respect of any such product. The current disclosure statements for the NewZealand branch of Westpac and WNZL can be obtained at the internet address www.westpac.co.nz.

China, Hong Kong, Singapore and India: This material has been prepared and issued for distribution in Singapore to institutional investors, accredited investors and expert investors (as defined in the applicable Singapore laws and regulations) only. Recipients in Singapore of this material should contact Westpac Singapore Branch in respect of any matters arising from, or in connection with, this material. Westpac Singapore Branch holds a wholesale banking licence and is subject to supervision by the Monetary Authority of Singapore. Westpac Hong Kong Branch holds a banking license and is subject to supervision by the Hong Kong Mong Monetary Authority. Westpac Hong Kong branch also holds a license issued by the Hong Kong Securities and Futures Commission (SFC) for Type 1 and Type 1 regulated activities. This material is intended only to "professional investors" as defined in the Securities and Futures Ordinance and any rules made under that Ordinance. Westpac Shanghai and Beijing Branches hold banking licenses and are subject to supervision by the China Banking and Insurance Regulatory Commission (CBIRC). Westpac Mumbai Branch holds a banking license from Reserve Bank of India (RBI) and subject to regulation and supervision by the RBI.

UK: The contents of this communication, which have been prepared by and are the sole responsibility of Westpac Banking Corporation London and Westpac Europe Limited. Westpac (a) has its principal place of business in the United Kingdom at Camomille Court, 23 Camomile Street, London EC3A TLL, and is registered at Cardiff in the UK (as Branch No. BR00106), and (b) authorised and regulated by the Australian Prudential Regulation Authority in Australia. Westpac is authorised in the United Kingdom by the Prudential Regulation Authority. Westpac is subject to regulation by the Financial Coudc Authority and limited regulation by the Prudential Regulation Authority. Details about the extent of our regulation by the Prudential Regulation Authority are available from us on request. Westpac Europe Limited is a company registered in England (number 05660023) and is authorised by the Prudential Regulation Authority and regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority and the Prudential Regulation Authority.

This communication is being made only to and is directed at (a) persons who have professional experience in matters relating to investments who fall within Article 19(5) of the Financial Services and Markets Act 2000 (Financial Promotion) Order 2005 (the "Order") or (b) high net worth entities, and other persons to whom it may otherwise lawfully be communicated, falling within Article 49(2)(a) to (d) of the Order (all such persons together being referred to as "relevant persons"). Any person who is not a relevant person should not act or rely on this communication or any of its contents. The investments to which this communication relates are only available to and any invitation, offer or agreement to subscribe, purchase or otherwise acquire such investments will be engaged in only with, relevant persons. Any person who is not a relevant person should not act or rely upon this communication or any of its contents. In the same way, the information contained in this communication is intended for "eligible counterparties" and "professional clients" as defined by the rules of the Financial Conduct Authority and is not intended for "retail clients". With this in mind, Westpac expressly prohibits you from passing on the information in this communication to any third party, in particular this communication and, in each case, any copies thereof may not be taken, transmitted or distributed, directly or indirectly into any restricted jurisdiction. This communication is made in compliance with the Market Abuse Regulation (Regulation(EU) 596/2014).

#### Investment recommendations disclosure

The material may contain investment recommendations, including information recommending an investment strategy. Reasonable steps have been taken to ensure that the material is presented in a clear, accurate and objective manner. Investment Recommendations for Financial Instruments covered by MAR are made in compliance with Article 20 MAR. Westpac does not apply MAR Investment Recommendation requirements to Spot Foreign Exchange which is out of scope for MAR.

Unless otherwise indicated, there are no planned updates to this Investment Recommendation at the time of publication. Westpac has no obligation to update, modify or amend this Investment Recommendation or to notify the recipients of this Investment Recommendation should any information, including opinion, forecast or estimate set out in this Investment Recommendation change or subsequently become inaccurate.

Westpac will from time to time dispose of and acquire financial instruments of companies covered in this Investment Recommendation as principal and act as a market maker or liquidity provider in such financial instruments.

Westpac does not have any proprietary positions in equity shares of issuers that are the subject of an

Westpac may have provided investment banking services to the issuer in the course of the past 12

Westpac does not permit any issuer to see or comment on any investment recommendation prior to its completion and distribution

Individuals who produce investment recommendations are not permitted to undertake any transactions in any financial instruments or derivatives in relation to the issuers covered by the investment recommendations they produce.

Westpac has implemented policies and procedures, which are designed to ensure conflicts of interests are managed consistently and appropriately, and to treat clients fairly

The following arrangements have been adopted for the avoidance and prevention of conflicts in interests associated with the provision of investment recommendations.

- Chinese Wall/Cell arrangements;
- (ii) physical separation of various Business/Support Units;
- (iii) and well defined wall/cell crossing procedures;
- (iv) a "need to know" policy;
- documented and well defined procedures for dealing with conflicts of interest;
- steps by Compliance to ensure that the Chinese Wall/Cell arrangements remain effective and that such arrangements are adequately monitored.

U.S: Westpac operates in the United States of America as a federally licensed branch, regulated by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency. Westpac is also registered with the US Commodity Futures Trading Commission ("CFTC") as a Swap bealer, but is neither registered as, or affiliated with, a Futures Commission Merchant registered with the US CFTC. Westpac Capital Markets, LLC ("WCM"), a wholly-owned subsidiary of Westpac, is a broker-dealer registered under the U.S. Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority FinRA"). This communication is provided for distribution to U.S. institutional investors in reliance on the exemption from registration provided by Rule 15a-6 under the Exchange Act and is not subject to all of the independence and disclosure standards applicable to debt research reports prepared for retail investors in the United States. WCM is the U.S. distributor of this communication and accepts responsibility for the contents of this communication. All disclaimers set out with respect to Westpac apply equally to WCM. If contents of this communication. All disclaimers set out with respect to Westpac apply equally to WCM. If you would like to speak to someone regarding any security mentioned herein, please contact WCM on +1 212 389 1269. All disclaimers set out with respect to Westpac apply equally to WCM.

Investing in any non-U.S. securities or related financial instruments mentioned in this communication may present certain risks. The securities of non-U.S. issuers may not be registered with, or be subject to the regulations of, the SEC in the United States. Information on such non-U.S. securities or related financial instruments may be limited. Non-U.S. companies may not subject to audit and reporting standards and regulatory requirements comparable to those in effect in the United States. The value of any investment or income from any securities or related derivative instruments denominated in a currency other than U.S. dollars is subject to exchange rate fluctuations that may have a positive or adverse effect on the value of or income from such securities or related derivative instruments.

The author of this communication is employed by Westpac and is not registered or qualified as a research analyst, representative, or associated person under the rules of FINRA, any other U.S. self-regulatory organisation, or the laws, rules or regulations of any State. Unless otherwise specified ystated, the views expressed herein are solely those of the author and may differ from the information, views or analysis expressed by Westpac and/or its affiliates.