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Introduction

- Why has Banco de Mexico intervened in Interchange Fee (IF) setting?
- How has it intervened?
- Outcome of intervention on:
  - Market performance.
  - Translation of IF to Merchant Discount Rates (MDR)
  - Ceiling on IF for debit card transactions.
- Some lessons.
Why has Banco de Mexico intervened

- Banco de Mexico has legal responsibility:
  - Promote efficient payment systems.
  - Regulate commissions including IF.
- Evidence of market problems:
  - Limited network development.
  - Relatively few cards and very few POS.
  - Limited usage of cards at POS, particularly of debit cards.
  - Debit cards used at ATM almost exclusively.
  - High concentration on both issuing and acquiring markets (same banks dominant on both sides).
Why has Banco de Mexico intervened
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Why has Banco de Mexico intervened

- Institutional arrangements for IF:
  - Set by the Association of Mexican Banks (ABM), limited role of card associations.
  - Multilateral.
  - Same IF schedule for Visa and MasterCard.
  - Set in a non transparent manner.
  - Schedule had not changed in a long time.
  - Same for credit and debit: against debit card usage.
  - Schedules based on volume of sales: against small merchants.
  - Non banks do not participate on any side of the card market.
- MDR set freely by acquirers.
How has BM intervened

• Transparency:
  ➢ BM makes public IF and MDR.

• Eliminating restrictions to participation:
  ➢ Balance transfer for credit card payments is allowed.
  ➢ HCR: merchants may accept only credit, debit cards or both.

• Interchange fees (IF):
  ➢ The IF has not been directly regulated.
  ➢ BM has pressed on the ABM to adopt a more transparent mechanism for IF determination and to reduce IF.
  ➢ Schedule should be based on business type to promote small merchants entry.
  ➢ IF for Debit has to be lower than for credit.
  ➢ Set a ceiling on debit transactions IF.
How has BM intervened

- In 2006 & 2008 ABM has set IF schedules based on this mechanism.
  - **Balancing approach** to find a reference IF (RIF):
    \[
    \frac{R_i + a - C_i}{R_i + a} = \frac{R_A - a - C_A}{R_A - a}
    \]
    
    \(R_i, & C_i = \text{per transaction revenue \& costs (issuers and acquirers)}\)
    
    \(a = \text{average interchange income (expense) per transaction.}\)

  - Adjust around RIF to get IF schedule for 22 merchant categories.
  - The process was followed separately for debit and credit.
  - Ceiling on debit IF income of 13.5 pesos per transaction.

- RIF decreases whenever:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Issuer</th>
<th>Acquirer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost</strong></td>
<td>Diminishes</td>
<td>Increases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td>Increases</td>
<td>Diminishes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The Mechanism distributes rents, no costs.
- Network growth is not optimized: static model.
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### Market Outcome

Debit card transactions in POS / Total debit card transactions

Concentration in banking system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concepts</th>
<th>Payment cards</th>
<th>POS terminals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of banks</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market share-2 largest banks (%)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herfindahl Index</td>
<td>2,570</td>
<td>1,782</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There has been a significant merchant discount rates reduction.

Sample of over a 1000 firms that accept cards: MDR mean has fallen 35 bp and 59 bp for credit and debit, respectively, so has variance.
IF Transmission to MDR

- Pass-through Index defined by: \[ PI_i = \frac{MDR_i^{2008} - MDR_i^{2005}}{IF_i^{2008} - IF_i^{2005}} \]
- Partial transmission; greater in debit.
- Transmission is positively related to concentration.
Ceiling on IF on Debit Card Transactions

- A Ceiling was set in debit cards IF because costs do not seem to be related to transactions’ amount:
  - ✓ No financing costs nor payment risks.
  - ✓ No benefits (loyalty points) for consumers.
  - ✓ Several countries have set fixed fees for debit.

Interchange Income

Effect of ceiling over effective IF
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Ceiling on IF on Debit Card Transactions

- Ceiling on IF should be translated to MDR to generate benefits.
- All merchant categories are affected by ceiling in debit.
- The ceiling has not been translated to MDR:
  - Correlation between MDR and nominal IF: 0.72
  - Correlation between MDR and actual IF: 0.44
- Acquirers are the main beneficiaries from ceiling, not merchants.
- Is the ceiling efficient (from a Ramsey price perspective)?

Proportion of transactions number affected by ceiling in debit
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Lessons

- IF reductions in Mexico have been successful:
  - Infrastructure has grown: cards and particularly POS.
  - Transactions at POS have increased.
  - Debit card is more used now to pay at POS.

- Moral suasion and regulatory threat have worked.

- Setting IF schedule based on merchant categories works better than basing it on sales volume.

- It is necessary to improve IF translation to MDR.

- IF ceiling on debit card transactions has not been translated to MDRs.

- Need to build information mechanisms to assess that banks are complying with the agreements.