



21 July 2023

Ms Nghi Luu
Assistant Secretary
Capital Markets, Payments, and Financial Innovation Branch
The Treasury
Langton Crescent
Parkes ACT 2600
Submitted via email to: paymentslicensingconsultation@treasury.gov.au

Dear Ms Luu,

Re: Licensing of payment service providers – payment functions

The Australian Finance Industry Association (AFIA) is the only peak body representing the entire finance industry in Australia.¹ We appreciate the opportunity to respond to the Treasury's consultation on the Licensing of Payment Service Providers – Payments Functions ('the consultation paper').²

We represent over 150 members, including bank and non-bank lenders, finance companies, fintechs, providers of vehicle and equipment finance, car rental and fleet providers, and service providers in the finance industry. We are the voice for advancing a world-class finance industry and our members are at the forefront of innovation in consumer and business finance in Australia. Our members finance Australia's future.

We collaborate with our members, governments, regulators and customer representatives to promote competition and innovation, deliver better customer outcomes and create a resilient, inclusive and sustainable future. We provide new policy, data and insights to support our advocacy in building a more prosperous Australia.

¹ [Australian Finance Industry Association \(afia.asn.au\)](http://afia.asn.au).

² <https://treasury.gov.au/consultation/c2023-403207>

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

On 7 June 2023, the Treasury released their consultation paper *Payments System Modernisation (Licensing: Defining Payment Functions)*.³ This paper puts forward a proposed licensing framework for Payments Service Providers (PSPs).⁴

In releasing the consultation paper, the Treasurer, the Hon. Dr Jim Chalmers MP, noted the Government has the following objectives in modernising the payments system:⁵

1. Promoting a safe and resilient payments system by reducing scams, strengthening cyber-security, and updating the RBA's supervision frameworks.
2. Updating the payments regulatory framework including a new licensing framework, more competition and transparency across systems, more collaboration amongst regulators, and steps to reduce small business transaction costs.
3. Modernising payments infrastructure by phasing out cheques and supporting the industry's transition to the New Payments Platform.
4. Uplifting competition, innovation and productivity by aligning the payments system with other reforms including the Consumer Data Right framework, Digital ID, and the skills agenda.
5. Making Australia a leader in global payments, including through work in the G20 and the Pacific to improve the availability of fast, low-cost international transfers, and piloting a central bank digital currency.

The Treasurer further emphasised the Government's understanding of the changing payments landscape, stating:⁶

*New digital products are **changing the way we make payments and the way businesses provide payments services.** The Government is acting to ensure Australia's payments system remains **fit-for-purpose now and into the future.***

AFIA understands these issues deeply as our members regularly interact with the payments system in innovative and dynamic ways. It is of great importance to their business models.

We support the Government's aim to modernise the payments infrastructure, so long as any changes in regulation remain cognisant of the following principles:

1. changes avoid duplicating regulatory obligations for entities who hold existing licenses, like Australian Credit Licenses (ACLs) or Australian Financial Services licenses (AFSLs).⁷

³ Treasury, [Payments System Modernisation \(Licensing: Defining Payment Function\)](#) ('The Consultation Paper').

⁴ Treasury, [Payments System Modernisation \(Licensing: Defining Payment Function\)](#), 35.

⁵ Dr Jim Chalmers (Treasurer of Australia), *Modernising Australia's Payment System* (7 June 2023).

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Treasury, [Payments System Modernisation \(Licensing: Defining Payment Function\)](#), 23.

2. they are, as much as is practicable, aligned with international standards and obligations in comparative jurisdictions such as the United Kingdom (UK) and European Union (EU), to facilitate compliance for companies operating internationally.⁸
3. insofar as a tiered licensing regime is applied, higher obligations should be applied to larger entities, with more significant risks, and less onerous obligations should be applied to smaller and medium sized entities, with lower risks, depending on their function.⁹

AFIA welcomes Treasury's recognition of these principles in their consultation paper as important to ensuring any future licensing framework for PSPs is fit for purpose and adaptable to future developments in this fast-moving space.

Our detailed comments can be found in **Attachment A** below and relate to the following topics:

1. the proposed principles for introducing the licensing framework for PSPs.¹⁰
2. the list of payments functions to which such licensing obligations would apply.¹¹
3. Treasury's proposed tiered licensing framework.¹²
4. proposed exclusions and exemptions.¹³

AFIA strongly supports Treasury's acknowledgement that it must take care to 'avoid duplication' of existing regulatory obligations. Given this, AFIA strongly recommends it would be unnecessarily duplicative to require entities who already hold ACLs to obtain an AFSL. ACL licensees already comply with many of the same obligations required under AFSLs. Therefore, requiring a second license would create unnecessary compliance burdens without any additional risk mitigation benefits.¹⁴

Instead, AFIA recommends it should be sufficient that PSPs hold either an ACL, or an AFSL, not both.

AFIA notes that this consultation paper is part of the overarching and ongoing process related to the reform of the payments system, which also includes:

- the *Review of the Australian Payments System* by Dr. Scott Farrell, released in August 2021 ('The Farrell Review')¹⁵
- Treasury's separate consultation on *Reforms to the Payment Systems (Regulation) Act 1998* (PSRA) (Cth), to which AFIA provided a separate submission¹⁶
- a further Treasury consultation on the precise regulatory obligations to apply to PSPs which will occur later in 2023.¹⁷

⁸ Treasury, [Payments System Modernisation \(Licensing: Defining Payment Function\)](#), 26-28.

⁹ Treasury, [Payments System Modernisation \(Licensing: Defining Payment Function\)](#), 35.

¹⁰ Treasury, [Payments System Modernisation \(Licensing: Defining Payment Function\)](#), 5-8.

¹¹ Treasury, [Payments System Modernisation \(Licensing: Defining Payment Function\)](#), 9-12.

¹² Treasury, [Payments System Modernisation \(Licensing: Defining Payment Function\)](#), 35.

¹³ Treasury, [Payments System Modernisation \(Licensing: Defining Payment Function\)](#), 19-23.

¹⁴ Treasury, [Payments System Modernisation \(Licensing: Defining Payment Function\)](#), 23.

¹⁵ [The Farrell Review](#) (30 August 2021).

¹⁶ [The PRSA Consultation](#).

¹⁷ Treasury, [Payments System Modernisation \(Licensing: Defining Payment Function\)](#), 5-8.

- a further planned consultation on specific legislation to implement the licensing regime for PSPs which will occur in 2024, after all the above.¹⁸
- a review of the ePayments Code in or after 2024.¹⁹

AFIA looks forward to ongoing engagement with the Government throughout all these consultations to ensure Australia can maintain a world class payments system.

CLOSING COMMENTS

We would appreciate the opportunity to discuss our recommendations and provide further information.

Please feel free to contact AFIA Senior Policy Adviser, Sebastian Reinehr at sebastian.reinehr@afia.asn.au.

Yours sincerely



Roza Lozusic
Executive Director, Policy and Public Affairs

¹⁸ Treasury, [Payments System Modernisation \(Licensing: Defining Payment Function\)](#), 5.

¹⁹ Treasury, [Payments System Modernisation \(Licensing: Defining Payment Function\)](#), 5.

ATTACHMENT A – AFIA’s DETIALED COMMENTS

1. The proposed principles for introducing the licensing framework for PSPs²⁰

The consultation paper details a series of principles for the implementation of a licensing framework for PSPs.

AFIA members support Treasury’s acceptance that any regulation of PSPs needs to promote the following objectives:²¹

1. improved regulatory certainty for PSPs by making it clear when a PSP is providing a payment service needing a licence and what the associated regulatory obligations are.
2. support a more level playing field for PSPs seeking to access payment systems.
3. promote greater competition, diversity and innovation within the ecosystem.
4. better target regulatory obligations based on the level of risk posed to end users by PSPs, balancing protections for consumers and businesses.
5. streamline the process for businesses that require multiple licences or authorisations to minimise the regulatory burden.
6. better align Australia’s payments regulatory framework with international jurisdictions.
7. reduce barriers to entry for providers seeking to enter the Australian market.

AFIA supports these principles and specifically the targeting of regulatory obligations and avoiding any unnecessary duplication. As Treasury notes in their consultation paper:²²

*[N]ot all risks that a PSP presents will be addressed by the proposed payment licensing framework if it would result in **duplication of existing regulatory obligations**, or if it is **more appropriately addressed elsewhere**.*

AFIA recommends that PSPs should only have to hold either an ACL or an AFSL, but not both, to avoid duplication of both compliance burdens and undue costs that would provide no additional risk mitigation benefits.

For example, holders of ACLs are currently mandated to meet requirements for internal dispute resolution processes, access to the Australian Financial Complaints Authority (AFCA), compensation arrangements, ePayments Code compliance and the requirement for licensees to comply with general conduct obligations.²³

²⁰ Treasury, [Payments System Modernisation \(Licensing: Defining Payment Function\)](#), 5-8.

²¹ Treasury, [Payments System Modernisation \(Licensing: Defining Payment Function\)](#), 6-7, 19-23.

²² Treasury, [Payments System Modernisation \(Licensing: Defining Payment Function\)](#), 23.

²³ See the *National Consumer Credit Protection Act 2009* (Cth) and ASIC’s RG205 ([1 April 2020](#)).

Requiring PSPs who already hold ACLs to also hold an AFSL would unnecessarily duplicate the obligations outlined above, without providing additional improvement in consumer protections.

2. The list of payments functions to which such licensing obligations would apply²⁴

Treasury proposes that the licensing framework for PSPs should apply to the list of payments functions outlined on Table 1 of the consultation paper, which is extracted below.²⁵

Table 1. List of Payment Functions

Type	Payment function	Proposed Definition	Potential entities
Stored-value facility	Issuance of payment accounts or facilities ('traditional SVFs')	Providers of payment accounts or facilities that store value for more than two business days and can be used for the purpose of making payments. ¹⁰	ADIs, including entities currently regulated as Purchased Payment Facilities, ¹⁴ digital wallets that store value, issuers of pre-paid accounts.
	Issuance of payment stablecoins ('payment stablecoin SVFs')	Issuers of payment stablecoins that store value and control the total supply of payment stablecoins through issuance and redemption activities.	Payment stablecoin issuers.
Payment facilitation services	Issuance of payment instruments	Issuers of a payment instrument that is unique to a customer and can be used to make a transaction or provide instructions on their account or facility.	Issuers of payment instruments (such as cheques and digital and physical cards). This includes Buy Now Pay Later providers that issue a virtual card. Issuers of a set of procedures/credentials (such as a PIN, password, biometric data) to initiate a payment instruction order.
	Payment initiation services	Services that allow the instruction of a payment transaction at the request of the customer (payer or payee) with respect to a payment account or facility held at another PSP, or from some other source of value or a credit facility.	Services that allow a customer to request a payment transaction be initiated. Examples include recurring payment services and third-party payment initiation services.
	Payment facilitation, authentication, authorisation and processing services	Services that enable payment instructions to be transferred (facilitation), provide the verification of customer credentials (authentication), payment authorisation, and/or processing of payment instructions.	Pass-through digital wallets, merchant acquirers, card issuers, payment gateways and processors, and payment routing.
	Payments clearing and settlement services	Services for clearing or settlement of payment obligations or for the exchange of payment messages for the purposes of clearing or settlement of payment obligations, including clearing and/or settling account to account payments.	Payments clearing and/or settlement providers.
	Money transfer services	Services that send or receive money overseas or within Australia for a customer, including through the creation of a payment account or without a payment account.	Remittance service providers and domestic money transfer providers.

²⁴ Treasury, [Payments System Modernisation \(Licensing: Defining Payment Function\)](#), 9-12.

²⁵ Treasury, [Payments System Modernisation \(Licensing: Defining Payment Function\)](#), 10.

In relation to Table 1 above, AFIA members seek the following further information:

- Further examples of the types of potential entities which will be covered by each category of payment function being proposed. This would help to clarify which specific regulatory obligations apply to which payment type. Further examples are particularly sought in relation to how this system would apply to Buy Now, Pay Later (BNPL) providers.
- Further detail on which types of entities which will be covered by each payment type and how that aligns with comparable jurisdictions. For example, it would be helpful to clarify how the proposed definition of ‘payment facilitation’ or ‘payment authentication’ aligns with best practice in the UK, EU, the United States (US), Canada and New Zealand. This clarification would assist in ensuring streamlining of regulation for entities operating across multiple jurisdictions.
- The consultation paper suggests PSPs wishing to perform several functions would need to apply for authorisations in respect of each discrete payment function.²⁶ If the obligations applicable to licensees offering payment facilitation services are to be identical across all five sub-categories, it would increase efficiency if the authorisation covers ‘payment facilitation services’ generally, without reference to the sub-categories. This would enable PSPs flexibility to expand and pivot their business activities across the five sub-categories within the payment facilitation function, without the need to seek variation. This reduces the risk of PSPs making errors due to uncertainty.
- Alternatively, clear and detailed regulatory guidance is needed to ensure that PSPs don’t misinterpret the intended scope of the sub-categories and inadvertently omit a required authorisation.
- Obligations applicable for each of the sub-categories should be considered in developing the list of payment functions. For example, if the obligations applicable across two or more sub-categories are largely the same, consideration should be made on the necessity of distinguishing between them from a licensing perspective.
- It may be appropriate to include carve-outs to the scope of certain sub-categories on policy grounds.
- AFIA represents 90 percent of the BNPL sector in Australia, who have significant concerns with the inclusion of BNPL as a payment facilitation service under the

²⁶ Treasury, [Payments System Modernisation \(Licensing: Defining Payment Function\)](#), 28-9.

proposed licensing regime. The following points should be noted regarding if BNPL should be included in the licensing regime:

- BNPL providers have noted that credit facilities ‘storing value’ are proposed to be regulated differently because they are ‘concerned with customers’ own money that they have transferred as opposed to credit’. This same logic applies to BNPL cards and accounts. They should arguably be excluded or have specific obligations apply to them.²⁷
- in the UK, authorised credit institutions can carry on payments activities without further licensing.²⁸

BNPL providers therefore seek further consultation on their inclusion in the scheme.

Consultation Question 3 asks -- Should all payment functions be treated as financial products under the corporations legislation or should some be treated as a financial service?²⁹

In response to this question, AFIA members have the following comments:

- Payment facilitation services could fit as a new category under the ‘financial services’ definition. SVFs could fall under the current definition of ‘financial product’ as it is a facility through which a person makes non-cash payments.
- Payment clearing and settlement services could fit as a new category under the ‘financial services’ definition.
- If SVFs are regarded as ‘financial products’, more clarity is required in relation to the consequential impacts for disclosure obligations. For example, would SVF providers need to issue Financial Services Guides and Product Disclosure Statements?

3. Treasury’s proposed tiered licensing framework and AFIA’s response³⁰

3.1 Outlining the proposed framework

Treasury’s proposed tiered licensing regime is in Appendix 2 of the consultation paper.³¹ It would require that **all payment functions** adhere to the following baseline requirements:

- obtain an AFSL and comply with the general financial services obligations.
- comply with the client money rules (where relevant).
- comply with the ePayments Code (where relevant)
- comply with standards set by the industry bodies authorised by the RBA.

²⁷ Treasury, [Payments System Modernisation \(Licensing: Defining Payment Function\)](#), 12.

²⁸ Bank of England, [How Banks Are Authorised in the UK](#) (2019).

²⁹ Treasury, [Payments System Modernisation \(Licensing: Defining Payment Function\)](#), 33.

³⁰ Treasury, [Payments System Modernisation \(Licensing: Defining Payment Function\)](#), 35.

³¹ Treasury, [Payments System Modernisation \(Licensing: Defining Payment Function\)](#), 35.

It would further require **major stored-value facilities** to comply with prudential regulation by the Australian Prudential Regulation Authority (APRA), in addition to the baseline requirements.

Major stored-value facilities are defined as ‘issuance of payment accounts or facilities that:³²

- store more than \$50 million in customer funds;
- offer customers the ability to store more than \$1,000 for more than 31 days, **and**
- allow customers do redeem funds on demand in Australian Dollars.

Non-ADI payments clearing and settling facilities would have to adhere to the baseline requirements and also, the ‘common access requirements’, which Treasury has suggested will likely involve:

*Governance, risk management, compliance, financial and operational capacity, business continuity and security obligations.*³³

3.2 AFIA’s position on the proposed framework

AFIA welcomes the fact that the proposed licensing model is tiered, recognising that different entities carry different levels of risk.

However, as Treasury acknowledges, it must take care to ‘avoid duplication’. It would be unnecessarily duplicative to require entities who already hold ACLs to obtain an AFSL, as they currently comply with many of the same obligations. Therefore, acquiring a second license would lead to an unnecessary compliance burden without the mitigation of any additional risk.³⁴

As Treasury suggests, in certain contexts it may be important to ‘switch off’ certain requirements for certain functions and activities.³⁵ This is a welcome acknowledgement of the need for flexibility in this context.

AFIA recommends PSPs should require to only obtain either an AFSL or an ACL, not both.³⁶

We seek further clarification on what is included in the ‘common access’ requirements applied to ‘payments clearing and settling facilities’ and how these would vary from or add to the

³² Treasury, [Payments System Modernisation \(Licensing: Defining Payment Function\)](#), 35.

³³ Treasury, [Payments System Modernisation \(Licensing: Defining Payment Function\)](#), 31.

³⁴ Treasury, [Payments System Modernisation \(Licensing: Defining Payment Function\)](#), 23.

³⁵ Treasury, [Payments System Modernisation \(Licensing: Defining Payment Function\)](#), 23.

³⁶ For further reasoning, see page 4 of this submission.

standard license obligations. We look forward to consulting further on the ‘common access requirements’ and note that they will be the subject to a separate consultation in or after 2024.³⁷

AFIA supports **Consultation Questions 24 and 25**, insofar as they suggest the need for the streamlining of guidance between various regulators and support the centralisation of guidance in a single point of contact.

AFIA recommends:

- Streamlining of applications for SVF providers that are already licensed as ‘standard’ SVF providers would be beneficial. While businesses may have projections on user numbers and stored value balances, the market trajectory may not align, and in some cases may outperform projections.
- It is critical for businesses to have the ability to pivot from a ‘standard’ to ‘major’ SVF provider within a reasonably compressed timeframe to minimise business disruption due to nearing or reaching threshold for ‘major’ category.
- Treasury could consider a shift from ‘major’ back to ‘standard’ category if an SVF provider finds itself with reduced stored balances after a period of time. Given the additional prudential requirements associated with the ‘major’ category, it would be desirable to have a way to revert to the ‘standard’ obligations while balances are less than the \$50 million threshold.
- An additional benefit of streamlining is that it will remove the need to provide duplicate information as part of the various application processes. For example, both AFSL and AUSTRAC registrations require fit and proper person information to be submitted.

4. Changes to the existing arrangements for exclusions and exemptions³⁸

4.1 The current arrangements for exclusions and exemptions from regulation for PSPs

Treasury indicates one of the significant reasons for the need for regulatory reform is the lack of clarity on the type of regulation that applies to which type of PSP.

The current regulations that can apply to PSPs include:

1. regulation as a ‘financial product’ under s 763A of the *Corporations Act 2001* (Cth).³⁹
2. regulation as a Purchased Payment Facility (PPF) under the *Payment Systems (Regulation) Act 1998* (Cth) (PSRA).⁴⁰

³⁷ Treasury, [Payments System Modernisation \(Licensing: Defining Payment Function\)](#), 19-23.

³⁸ Treasury, [Payments System Modernisation \(Licensing: Defining Payment Function\)](#), 19-23.

³⁹ Treasury, [Payments System Modernisation \(Licensing: Defining Payment Function\)](#), 6.

⁴⁰ Treasury, [Payments System Modernisation \(Licensing: Defining Payment Function\)](#), 6.

PPFs are jointly regulated by the Australian Securities and Investments Commission (ASIC), the Australian Prudential Regulation Authority (APRA) and the Reserve Bank of Australia (RBA), creating significant regulatory overlap which Treasury notes may be better addressed through a 'single point of contact' for authorisations.⁴¹

However, these regulations are subject to a myriad of exemptions and exclusions, as detailed in Appendix 3 of the consultation paper.⁴²

In Treasury words, there is currently a 'lack of clarity around the scope of the existing regulatory permitter' which can mean:

[T]wo businesses providing functionally equivalent payment services to customers may not be regulated consistently.

4.2 The proposed path forward on exclusions and exemptions for PSPs from regulation

Treasury proposes to maintain all the exemptions and exclusions currently contained in Appendix 3, except for those outlined below which will either be removed or moved into primary law/regulations.⁴³

Treasury proposes to remove the existing exemptions outlined below:⁴⁴

1. the exemption for exchange and settlement between non-cash payment providers.
2. the exemption for certain electronic funds transfers.
3. the exemption unlicensed product issuers that use licensed intermediaries.
4. ad hoc relief to specified entities and non-cash payment facilities.

Treasury suggests maintaining the following exemptions but moving them into primary law or regulations:

1. The carve-out for 'low-value' facilities, where:⁴⁵

- the total amount available for the making of non-cash payments under all facilities of the same class held by any one client does not exceed \$1,000 at any time
- the total amount available for making non-cash payments under all facilities of the same class does not exceed \$10 million at any time
- the facility is not part of another financial product.

⁴¹ Treasury, [Payments System Modernisation \(Licensing: Defining Payment Function\)](#), 31.

⁴² Treasury, [Payments System Modernisation \(Licensing: Defining Payment Function\)](#), 36.

⁴³ Treasury, [Payments System Modernisation \(Licensing: Defining Payment Function\)](#), 19.

⁴⁴ Treasury, [Payments System Modernisation \(Licensing: Defining Payment Function\)](#), 19.

⁴⁵ Treasury, [Payments System Modernisation \(Licensing: Defining Payment Function\)](#), 20. Consistent with the existing principles in ASIC Corporations (Non-cash Payment Facilities) Instrument 2016/211.

2. The carve-out for 'limited purpose' facilities:⁴⁶

ASIC currently grants conditional relief for the following products where they constitute non-cash payment facilities and are not part of other financial products, this would be maintained. Examples of 'limited purpose' facilities include:⁴⁷

- gift facilities (e.g. vouchers or cards)
- prepaid mobile phone accounts
- loyalty schemes
- electronic road toll devices.

4.3 AFIA's position on the proposed future exclusions and exemptions

AFIA's position is that all the suggested changes to exclusions and exemptions in the current law must be implemented carefully to avoid unintended consequences.

Furthermore, there should be a significant lead time of 12 months after the passage of legislation until the effective date of any legislated variation to these exemptions or exclusions commences, to allow entities sufficient time to prepare.

AFIA would recommend against any changes to the exemption for 'non-cash payment facility if payments are debited to a credit facility'.⁴⁸

AFIA believes the definition of 'non low value non-cash payment facility' could benefit from updating to clarify:

- The meaning of the reference to 'total amount available for making non-cash payments...held by any person at any one time does not exceed \$1,000'.⁴⁹
- We seek clarification as to if this refers to the total amount available 'in stored value' (and not in any external accounts that could be linked to the stored value).
- The meaning of the phrase: 'the facility is not a component of another financial product'.⁵⁰
- For example, would the SVF be considered a component of the payment service (if the payment service is treated as a financial product)?

⁴⁶ Treasury, [Payments System Modernisation \(Licensing: Defining Payment Function\)](#), 21.

⁴⁷ Consistent with existing principles in ASIC, [Regulatory Guide 185: Non-cash payment facilities](#), ASIC, 200.

⁴⁸ Treasury, [Payments System Modernisation \(Licensing: Defining Payment Function\)](#), 20.

⁴⁹ Treasury, [Payments System Modernisation \(Licensing: Defining Payment Function\)](#), 20

⁵⁰ Treasury, [Payments System Modernisation \(Licensing: Defining Payment Function\)](#), 20

Consultation Question 14 asks: Should the exclusion for low value facilities apply to any Payment Facilitation Service (PFS), such as money transfer services? If so, what thresholds should be considered a low value PFS?⁵¹

AFIA recommends it appears appropriate to have de minimis amounts that apply to other PFS. For example, the s 6 of the *Anti-Money Laundering / Counter-Terrorism Financing Act 2007* (Cth) ('the AML/CTF Act') has carve-outs for stored value card holding value less than \$1,000. The low value non-cash payment exemption also has a \$1,000 limit. Therefore, a person providing a PFS that relates to these types of stored value card or stored value facilities should also benefit from corresponding exemption.

Consultation Question 15 asks: Should any other exclusions or exemptions be provided?⁵²

AFIA recommends that:

- For SVFs, replicating current relief under PPF regime for stored value liabilities that are guaranteed by an ADI - the ADI guarantee mitigates against solvency and liquidity risk.
- Table 2 of Appendix A indicates that 'prudential regulation and/or AFSL protections (including client money rules) would apply to address the risk of customers losing funds'. The *Corporations Act 2001* (Cth) currently includes some exemptions from client money provisions as set out in s. 981A. We recommend these exemptions continue to apply.
- It would reduce barriers to entry to have de minimis amounts before SVF providers were required to hold AFSLs.
- On Authorised representatives - the ability for grouped companies to be able to rely on a licence held by another group company, rather than requiring each company within the corporate group to obtain a separate AFSL/payments licence for different businesses.

⁵¹ Treasury, [Payments System Modernisation \(Licensing: Defining Payment Function\)](#), 33.

⁵² Treasury, [Payments System Modernisation \(Licensing: Defining Payment Function\)](#), 33.