



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL
TAXATION AND CUSTOMS UNION

Questions and Answers

Central Electronic System of Payment Information (CESOP)

Date: 09/10/2023

Version: 2

Author: TAXUD C4, B4, CESOP Expert Team,
Expert Group

Approved by: DG TAXUD

Contents

INTRODUCTION	6
1.1 Document purpose.....	6
1.2 Abbreviations & acronyms.....	6
2 GENERAL QUESTIONS	7
2.1 The entities in scope.....	7
Are PSPs in the Member States identified by the tax administration or by PSPs associations?.....	7
2.1.1 Territorial scope.....	7
2.1.1.1 Do the general obligations of PSPs pursuant to Section 2a of Chapter 4 of Title XI of the VAT Directive apply to PSPs in third territories or third countries?.....	7
2.1.1.2 Will Northern Ireland be treated as part of the EU for reporting requirements?.....	8
2.1.1.3 Will payments made to/from United Kingdom Sovereign Base Areas of Akrotiri and Dhekelia, and Monaco need to be reported in CESOP?.....	9
2.1.1.4 Should payment transactions be reported by the payer's PSP if the payee's PSP is in an EEA country?.....	9
2.2 Payments and PSPs in scope.....	10
2.2.1 Do only e-commerce transactions need to be reported or also payments at the physical premises of the merchant (POS)?.....	10
2.2.2 Are payments in cryptocurrencies under the scope of the reporting obligation pursuant to Article 243b of the VAT Directive?.....	10
2.2.3 Do payments made to escrow account, mortgage accounts, or accounts connected to credit cards fall under the reporting obligation?.....	10
2.2.4 Are MT202 transactions in scope of the VAT Directive?.....	11
2.2.5 Do cross-border payments need to be reported when the payer and the payee are the same person holding different payment accounts?.....	11
2.2.6 Are intra-group payments in the scope of the reporting obligation?.....	11
2.2.7 Are payments from/to non-taxable persons (e.g. non-profit institutions, individuals, etc.) also included in the scope of the reporting obligation?.....	11
2.2.8. Are winnings made from betting according to Directive 2020/284 payment refunds of the initial wager?.....	11
2.2.9. Is a payment intermediary that collects cross-border payments from different payers (using different payment's methods e.g. cards, credit transfers, e-wallet etc...) and then transfers those payments to the payees is to be considered as a PSP that has CESOP reporting obligations?.....	11
2.3 Card Payments.....	12
2.3.1 Do chargebacks to cardholders need to be considered for the reporting?.....	12
2.3.2 Who is responsible for the reporting of data in a 3 - party card scheme?.....	12
2.3.3 How should location rules apply in card payments?.....	13
2.4 ELECTRONIC MONEY.....	14
Does a PSP which is an e-wallet provider and allows e-money transfers between payers and payees in different countries potentially have CESOP reporting obligations?.....	14
3. MONITORING AND TRIGGERING OF THE REPORTING OBLIGATION	16
Is there a minimum materiality monetary amount for triggering the reporting obligation?.....	16
3.1 Cross-border payments - Location rules of article 243c.....	16
3.1.1 Do payments between payers located in any Member State and payees located in any other Member State (intra-EU payments) trigger the reporting obligation?.....	16
3.1.2 What is the overriding indicator between the IBAN, the BIC and other identifiers to determine the location of the payee/payer when the different identifiers might lead to different location? e.g. an account in an EU bank of a non-EU person?.....	16

3.1.3	If both the payer and the payee are located outside the EU, is there still a reporting obligation of the PSP?.....	17
3.2.	THRESHOLD OF MORE THAN 25 CROSS-BORDER PAYMENTS UNDER ARTICLE 243b (2)18	
3.2.1	When the threshold is reached, does each single payment need to be reported, or just the ones above the threshold?	18
3.2.2	Do PSPs need to aggregate every kind of payment in scope of the legislation (transfers, cards etc.) for the same payee to calculate the threshold?	18
3.2.3	Which data elements should be used by payers' PSPs to aggregate payment information referring to the same payee?.....	18
3.2.4	Is it true that the aggregation of payment accounts in application of Article 243b (2) VAT Directive should only be performed in relation to the calculation of the threshold, but the data of different payment accounts should never be aggregated?	19
3.2.5	What are the principles for counting payments and calculate the thresholds when a PSP operates cross-border, having both branches and subsidiaries?	20
3.2.6	Where the payee has branches in several countries, and each branch has a separate payment account, do these branches need to be considered as separate payees (with their respective location) or as one payee together with the head office (and one location, i.e., of the head office) for the aggregation rule?.....	20
3.2.7	Are refunds included in the calculation of the thresholds?.....	20
3.2.8	When the payer' PSP is reporting, should the PSP determine the 25 transactions threshold based on number of payments made by one payer only?	21
3.2.9	When the payer' PSP is reporting, should that PSP include payments to payees located in the EU in the calculation of the 25 transactions threshold?.....	21
3.2.10	Payments from a payer located outside the EU should not be reported to CESOP. Does this mean that they should not even be included in the calculation of the 25 transactions threshold?21	
3.2.11	Should part payments have to be calculated as one single transaction or separate transactions?	21
4.	REPORTING.....	22
4.1	A Payer's PSP will not have to report intra-EU payment transactions because they are reported by the payee PSP. Does the payer's PSP have to keep the records of these transaction for the three years period?.....	22
4.2	Payments from payers located outside the EU do not have to be reported. Does the payee PSP have to record these transactions?	22
4.3	If there are no transactions to be reported, what (level of) documentation should a PSP have available in its files to evidence this?	22
4.4	Data protection principle: is the transmission of data below the threshold in line with personal data protection?	22
4.5	What if a PSP reports on a payee less than 25 payments? Will CESOP reject this report?22	
4.6	How often shall the data be reported?	22
4.7	Will there be cases in which more than one PSP may be obliged to report? How can double reporting be avoided?	23
4.8	Are branches obliged to report on their own the payment data to the tax authority of the respective host Member State?	23
4.9	Are branches obliged to report on their own the payment data to the tax authority of the respective host Member State even when they have no physical presence in the host Member State?23	
4.10	PSPs with a branch/subsidiary in another MS: how should the data be submitted by the headquarter or by the branch/subsidiary?	24
4.11	Can a group arrange to have all information on the payee addressed to one (preferred) Member State?	25
4.12	Will there be a One-Stop-Shop solution for streamlined reporting?	25
4.13	When the requirements for the reporting obligation laid down in Article 243b of the VAT Directive apply, if in a payment transaction a PSP is acting on behalf of both the payer and the	

	payee, is it correct to state that the PSP only needs to report the payment transactions once?	25
4.14	Similarly to 4.13, when a PSP has different roles in one and the same payment transaction, is it correct to state that the PSP only needs to report the payment transaction once?	25
4.15	What is the payment amount to be reported for CESOP? Is this the amount paid by the payer or the amount actually received by the payee?	25
4.16	Should payment transactions be reported by the payer’s PSP if the payee’s PSP is in an EEA country?	26
4.17	Should refunds be reported?	26
4.18	Should rejected payments be reported?	27
4.19	Should a refund be reported if the original payment was not reported?	27
5.	DATA ELEMENTS	28
5.1	Can the payment transactions to be reported be broken down according to the type of transaction (cards/credit transfers/direct debits/instant payment)?	28
5.2	No information about the payer should be reported, except that relating to his/her state of origin. In this regard, should records be kept with more details about the payer if needed for investigation?.....	28
5.3	Is the “accounting date” or the “value date” relevant for the purpose of detecting the transactions to be reported?	28
5.4.	Which information has to be kept in the records of the PSPs, according to Art. 243d (2) point d (“any reference which unambiguously identifies the payment “)? Would the payment reference given by the payer fall under this point?.....	28
5.5	Is it mandatory for a PSP to submit a nil reporting to the CESOP information system? ..	28
5.6	For a card issuer in a Member State with several cardholders located in a Member State that send payments to payees located in several Member States: is there a need to produce several sets of data?	29
5.7	Do PSPs have to send separate files depending on whether they act as payee’s PSP or as payer’s PSP?	29
5.8	Is it necessary to report the payee’s address received on the transaction to be reported or the payee’s address stored in the bank records?	29
5.9	If a PSP needs to make corrections to the file and, in the meantime, there are changes in the name of the payee, is it supposed to report the name as it was originally, or as it is now, or does it not matter at all?	29
6.	TECHNICAL QUESTIONS.....	30
6.1	Regarding the XSD and XSD User Guide versions, in case of any changes, how these will be communicated and be put into action at EU and MS level?	30
6.2	Regarding the MessageRefId defined by the PSPs, is there a standard to be followed to guarantee uniqueness of the ID, time and space? Where can I find more information on the MessageRefId?	30
6.3	What happens in the case that within a reporting period, there is no data for the PSP to report? For instance, when PSPs do not have any payments under the VAT Directive 2020/284 in a given quarter or the thresholds are not exceeded in a given quarter? Will nil reporting be implemented in the XSD file, or will there be a simpler option available?.....	30
6.4	As for the type of reporting data: are special characters, negative values and national characters accepted by CESOP?	30
6.5	How the PSP knows that the report submitted is correct? Is there any validation on behalf of MS or CESOP?	30
6.6	Are there some minimum quality reporting standards used by CESOP in case a PSP has not information like TIN, VAT number, Address, etc?	30
6.7	For transactions in third countries, the identifier of the payee may be different from IBAN. Will the XSD tracking allow non-IBAN values to be captured?.....	31
6.8	Is CESOP going to adopt ISO 20022 standard for more structured reporting?	31

6.9 How are the main CESOP system IT and the individual MS IT teams connecting to ensure successful submissions? 31

6.10 Can a PSPs send several files (also below the theoretical maximum size of 1GB) for the same reporting period? 31

INTRODUCTION

This document has been drafted based on the questions that DG TAXUD received by Payment Service Providers and Member States authorities. DG TAXUD grouped the questions per topic, and the answers have been drafted in cooperation with the CESOP Expert Group, composed of representatives from the Member States' authorities and Payment Service Providers.

1.1 DOCUMENT PURPOSE

The purpose of this document is to complement the CESOP Guidelines with a number of Frequently Asked Questions related to CESOP (Central Electronic System of Payment Information). It provides practical information and explanations on the reporting of payment data by payment service providers and on their collection by Member States. They do not have legal value and only serve to explain the legal obligation without going against it.

1.2 ABBREVIATIONS & ACRONYMS

For a better understanding of the present document, the following table provides a list of the principal abbreviations and acronyms used.

Abbreviation/Acronym	Definition
BIC	Bank Identifier Code
CESOP	Central Electronic System of Payment Information
DG TAXUD	Directorate-General for Taxation and Customs Union
IBAN	International Bank Account Number
PSP	Payment Service Provider
TIN	Taxpayer Identification Number
VAT Directive	Directive 2006/112/EC EUR-Lex - 32006L0112 - EN - EUR-Lex (europa.eu)

Table 1: Abbreviations and acronyms

2 GENERAL QUESTIONS

This list of answers and questions is based on the “*Guidelines for the reporting of payment data from payment service providers and transmission to the Central Electronic System of Payment information (CESOP)*”

<https://taxation-customs.ec.europa.eu/system/files/2022-10/CESOP-%20Guidelines%20for%20reporting.pdf>

2.1 THE ENTITIES IN SCOPE

Are PSPs in the Member States identified by the tax administration or by PSPs associations?

Lists of PSPs that provide for payment services in the Member States are available to, updated and managed by the national competent authorities which are either National Banks or National Supervisory Authorities. National Tax authorities will gather the lists at national level.

2.1.1 Territorial scope

2.1.1.1 Do the general obligations of PSPs pursuant to Section 2a of Chapter 4 of Title XI of the VAT Directive apply to PSPs in third territories or third countries?

The obligations laid down in Section 2a of Chapter 4 of Title XI of the VAT Directive apply to the PSPs that provide for payment services in the Member States as defined in Article 5 of the VAT Directive. Namely each Member State to which the Treaty establishing the European Community is applicable, with the exception of any territory referred to in Article 6 of the VAT Directive.

Pursuant to Article 6 of the VAT Directive, the VAT Directive does not apply to the following third territories forming part of the customs territory of the Community:

- (a) Mount Athos;
- (b) the Canary Islands;
- (c) the French territories referred to in Article 349 and Article 355(1) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (Guadeloupe, French Guiana, Martinique, Mayotte, Réunion, Saint-Martin);
- (d) the Åland Islands;
- (e) the Channel Islands ;
- (f) Campione d'Italia;
- (g) the Italian waters of Lake Lugano.

Furthermore, the Directive does not apply to the following territories not forming part of the customs territory of the Community:

- (a) the Island of Heligoland;
- (b) the territory of Büsingen;
- (c) Ceuta;
- (d) Melilla;
- (e) Livigno.

The French Overseas Territories, the Netherlands Antilles, Faroe Islands and Greenland are treated as third countries and VAT rules do not apply to them either.

Therefore:

- payments from payers located in the third territories mentioned above (listed in Article 6 of the VAT Directive), are outside the scope of the reporting obligation.
- payments from a payer in a third territory to a payee in its mainland would not fall under the reporting obligation because this is to be considered as a domestic payment. The same applies for payments from a payer in a Member State (mainland) to a payee in a third territory of that Member State,
- payments to payees located in whatsoever third territories mentioned above, from payers located in whatever Member State (different than the third territories' mainland), are in the scope of the reporting obligation. These payments must be reported by the payer's PSP.

In order for the payer's PSP to determine the location of the payee's PSP it is recommended to take into account the payee's account number such as the International Bank Identification Number (IBAN) or the Business Identifier Code BIC of the payee's PSP, which is based on the international standard ISO 9362. However, the location of a branch in a third territory of a Member State might be difficult based on IBAN and BIC. Only in some cases, an 11 characters BIC might include an element that identifies the specific location of a branch. Still, sometimes even the 11 characters BIC does not give the indication of the third territories that falls in the exception under Article 6 of the VAT Directive.

Even in such a case, it is still recommended that the payer's PSP will take into account the IBAN of the payee and/or the BIC of the payee's PSP to determine the location of the payee's PSP. In case those two indicators will not allow the localisation in a third territory, the payments have to be considered to the mainland. Therefore, neither the payer's PSP nor the payee's PSP will report those payments. In fact, the payer's PSP will consider the payee's PSP as established in another Member State and thus will not report that payments. On the other hand, the payee's PSP or the payee account are actually in one of the third territories listed in Article 6 of the VAT directive, and thus outside the territorial scope of the reporting obligation.

Other information that might identify the exact location of a PSP or its branch might be misleading (e.g. the address might be not updated). Therefore, in case of doubts on the best way to determine the location of the payee's PSPs, the payers' PSPs should address their national authority.

Section 2a of Chapter 4 of Title XI of the VAT Directive applies to PSPs as defined under the Payment Service Directive (Directive (EU) 2015/2366 of 25 November 2015), to payment services provided within the Union. Therefore, PSPs outside the EU (namely those PSPs that provide payment services only outside the EU) are outside the scope of the reporting obligations. That is why, when the payee's PSP is located outside the EU the payer's PSP will be subject to the obligations laid down in Section 2a of Chapter 4 of Title XI of the VAT Directive.

2.1.1.2 Will Northern Ireland be treated as part of the EU for reporting requirements?

The VAT Directive is still applying in Northern Ireland but only concerning goods (see Annex 3 of the Protocol on Ireland and Northern Ireland [EUR-Lex - 12020W/TXT - EN - EUR-Lex \(europa.eu\)](#)). Therefore, PSPs located in Northern Ireland must be considered as established in a third country and are not subject to the reporting obligation pursuant to Section 2a of Chapter 4 of Title XI of the VAT Directive.

For more details of the application of that Section to third countries see 2.1.1.1.

Therefore, for payments to payees located in Northern Ireland, the payer's PSP located in any Member State will have the reporting obligation as long as the conditions established under Article 243b of the VAT Directive are fulfilled.

2.1.1.3 Will payments made to/from United Kingdom Sovereign Base Areas of Akrotiri and Dhekelia, and Monaco need to be reported in CESOP?

Pursuant to Article 7 of the VAT directive “*in view of the conventions and treaties concluded with France [...] and Cyprus respectively*”, the Principality of Monaco [...] and the United Kingdom Sovereign Base Areas of Akrotiri and Dhekelia shall not be regarded, for the purposes of the application of this Directive, as third countries.

Therefore, only a specific convention or agreement concluded on bilateral basis (and not by EU agreements) respectively with France and Cyprus would result in the application of the new obligations for PSPs (laid down in Section 2a of Chapter 4 of Title XI of the VAT Directive) in Monaco, Akrotiri and Dhekelia. Without a specific convention or agreement, this new obligation cannot be imposed on the mere basis of Article 7 of the VAT Directive.

In conclusion, Monaco, Akrotiri and Dhekelia must be considered as third countries for the application of Section 2a of Chapter 4 of Title XI of the VAT Directive.

For more details of the application of that Section to third countries, see 2.1.1.1.

Therefore, for payments to payees located in Akrotiri, Dhekelia and Monaco, the payer’s PSP located in any Member State will have the reporting obligation as long as the conditions established under Article 243b of the VAT Directive are fulfilled.

2.1.1.4 Should payment transactions be reported by the payer’s PSP if the payee’s PSP is in an EEA country?

It depends.

PSPs in EEA countries can obtain a payment licence in their home country and use passporting rules to provide for payment services in the EU even without a physical presence in any of the Member States. In that case, PSPs in EEA country might be subject to the reporting obligation when they provide payment services in the EU Member States.

Here we can see the following situations:

- the EEA PSP acting as payer’s PSP in Member State 1: that PSP will report in Member State 1 the payments from that payer to any third country (including EEA countries);
- the EEA PSP acting as payee’s PSP in Member State 1: that PSP will report in Member State 1 the payments received from other Member States.

Case: Direct Debit system. The payee’s PSP is in a) Norway or b) Poland and payer account is in Estonia. Who reports in a) and b)?

The general rule is that when the payee’s PSP is in one Member State, then the reporting obligation is up to the payee’s PSP. When the payee’s PSP is in a third territory or third country then the payer’s PSP will report. Norway is an EEA country and payments to EEA countries shall be considered as payments to third countries. In such cases, the PSP of the payer located in a Member State will report the payment in the Member State of the payer. So, for case a) the report must be done in Estonia by the payer’s PSP as the payment is done to a bank account in Norway. For case b) the report must be done in Poland by the payee’s PSP as the payment is done to a bank account in Poland.

2.2 PAYMENTS AND PSPs IN SCOPE

2.2.1 Do only e-commerce transactions need to be reported or also payments at the physical premises of the merchant (POS)?

The conditions are those defined in the legislation and could include all kind of transactions (e-commerce and/or physical), see Art. 243a (3) of Directive 2006/112/EC. Where applicable, the PSP shall indicate whether the payment is initiated at the physical premises of the merchant (Article 243d(2)(e)).

2.2.2 Are payments in cryptocurrencies under the scope of the reporting obligation pursuant to Article 243b of the VAT Directive?

No, they are not in scope.

2.2.3 Do payments made to escrow account, mortgage accounts, or accounts connected to credit cards fall under the reporting obligation?

The Payment Service Directive defines the payment account as an account held in the name of one or more payment service users, which is used for the execution of payment transactions.

As long as an account is used with that purpose, then payments to or from that account are in the scope of the reporting obligations regardless the name of that account, or whether that account is used for other purposes as well. The name of an account is not relevant as such.

This principle applies also to the following cases that are to be considered as examples and are not exhaustive.

Escrow

Escrow is a financial agreement whereby an asset or money is held by a third party on behalf of two other parties that are in the process of completing a transaction.

Escrow accounts are managed by the escrow agent. The agent releases the assets or funds only upon the fulfilment of predetermined contractual obligations (or upon receiving appropriate instructions). Money, securities, funds, and other assets can all be held in escrow.

Escrow accounts – as such – are excluded from the application of the Payment Service Directive (Directive (EU) 2015/2366) pursuant to Article 3 (h) and (i). In fact, the Directive does not apply to payment transactions related to security assets servicing, including dividends, income or other distributions, or redemption or sale, carried out within a payment or securities settlement system or by investment firms, credit institutions, collective investment undertakings or asset management companies providing investment services and any other entities allowed to have the custody of financial instruments.

As such, any funds or assets flows in that account are not in the scope of the reporting obligation. However, in case that account is also used to execute and receive payments then those payments are in the scope of the obligations under Article 243b of the VAT Directive.

Loan

In a case where the loan account also qualifies as a payment account pursuant to the PSD2, these payments are in the scope of the reporting obligations when all the other conditions laid down in Article 243b of the VAT Directive are fulfilled.

Accounts connected to credit card

The payments to accounts connected to credit cards are included in the reporting obligations. For more details see section 2.4.4. of the guidelines for the reporting of payment data.

2.2.4 Are MT202 transactions in scope of the VAT Directive?

MT202 is a SWIFT message format for financial settlements between financial institutions. It is used to order the movement of funds to the beneficiary institution via another financial institution/Intermediary Bank. As such, they do not fall under the reporting obligation.

2.2.5 Do cross-border payments need to be reported when the payer and the payee are the same person holding different payment accounts?

If both accounts are held by the same person, in most cases the payment will not be regarded as cross-border as one and the same person will of course be located in the same location.

However, if based on the location identifiers that best represent the locations, the payment is considered a cross-border payment in line with article 243c, and if the payee receives more than 25 cross-border payments in the reporting period then it must be reported.

2.2.6 Are intra-group payments in the scope of the reporting obligation?

Only when the intra-group transactions fulfil the conditions defined under Article 3(n) of the Payment Service Directive (PSD2) ((Directive (EU) 2015/2366) are excluded from the application of the PSD2 and, thus, from the scope of the reporting obligation.

2.2.7 Are payments from/to non-taxable persons (e.g. non-profit institutions, individuals, etc.) also included in the scope of the reporting obligation?

The legal form or status of the payers and payees are not relevant for the reporting obligations of PSPs under the VAT Directive. Therefore, the payments to or from non-taxable persons will need to be reported if all conditions defined under Article 243b of the VAT Directive are fulfilled.

CESOP Guidelines section 3.2.

2.2.8. Are winnings made from betting according to Directive 2020/284 payment refunds of the initial wager?

No, these kinds of payments are to be considered as payment transactions as such and follow the reporting rules accordingly.

2.2.9. Is a payment intermediary that collects cross-border payments from different payers (using different payment's methods e.g. cards, credit transfers, e-wallet etc...) and then transfers those payments to the payees is to be considered as a PSP that has CESOP reporting obligations?

Payment intermediaries, such as Collecting payment service providers (cPSP), are intermediaries between the merchant and the payer PSPs (which could be banks or credit card issuers or others). The payers' PSP transfer

the payments to the cPSP's account and subsequently the cPSP transfers the funds to the merchant's account in one settlement.

Following their payment license, the cPSP can act as both payer's PSP and payee's PSP, and the cPSP will report the payments when the conditions laid down under Article 243b of the VAT directive are fulfilled.

2.3 CARD PAYMENTS


2.3.1 Do chargebacks to cardholders need to be considered for the reporting?

Yes, see tables in the CESOP Guidelines, sections 4.5.2 and 4.5.2.4. If a reference to the original payment is included, it should be reported as part of the transaction ID in box 7 and 14.

2.3.2 Who is responsible for the reporting of data in a 3 - party card scheme?

The normal rules apply in order to determine the reporting PSPs. If the payee's PSP is in a third country or third territory the payer's PSP in the Member State will report the payment transactions. If the payee's PSP is in a Member State it will report the payment transaction (and not the payer's PSP)

Please also note that as highlighted in the graph below, 3-party card payments generally involve other payment services providers (such as banks) to fund the card's credit line or to receive the funds from the commercial acquirer. For these PSPs the transactions will look like a payment to the card issuer (for the payer's payment service provider) or a transaction from the commercial acquirer to the payee (for the payee's payment service provider). These transactions, although different from the one between the payer and the payee, are in scope of the reporting obligation and should be reported with either the card issuer as the payee, or the commercial acquirer as the payer. Indeed, they do not fall within the exclusion of article 3 (m) PSD2 for transaction between payment service providers for their own activities, since they do not serve the activities of the payment service providers involved but are part of the agreement between the payer/payee and the card issuer/commercial acquirer.



Example:

A payee X with a bank account in Ireland (merchant) receives payments via cards (both at the point of sale – POS- and online payments) and has an Acquirer in Luxembourg for the collection of such payments.

Each day the payee X receives 300 POS payments (200 are from cards issued in Ireland and 100 from other EU Member States cards) and through its online portal receives another 200 payments (150 are from cards issued in Ireland and 50 from other EU Member State cards).

Therefore, the payee X receives daily 500 payments, 350 domestic and 150 cross-border.

As these are card payments, while the payee X receives 500 card payments a day, he does not receive 500 individual payments to its bank account. Instead, his Acquirer will do a daily bulk credit for the total value (e.g. €8,000) and then provide a report of what the €8,000 is made up of.

Therefore, the payee X bank in Ireland will see a single bulk payment from the Acquirer in Luxembourg, and not all the 500 payments.

Bank in Ireland	Acquirer in Luxembourg
If in quarter 1, the bank in Ireland receives let's say 10 of such bulk payments from the Acquirer in Luxembourg, the 25 cross-border threshold is not exceeded, and then the bank in Ireland has no reporting obligations.	The Acquirer will transmit to Ireland the reports on the 150 cross-border payments a day.
If in quarter 2, the bank in Ireland received let's say 30 of such bulk payments from the Acquirer in Luxembourg, the 25 threshold is exceeded, and then the Bank in Ireland will report these 30 payments that the payee in Ireland has received from the Acquirer in Luxembourg.	The Acquirer will transmit to Ireland the reports on the 150 cross-border payments a day.

2.3.3 How should location rules apply in card payments?

See the following examples:

- A) Payer, payee, and payment service providers in different Member States: In this situation the payer and the payee are both located in different Member States and use the services of payment service providers from their respective Member States to execute a card payment. For card payments, the most relevant identifiers to use would be the BIN range of the payer's card for the payer's location, and the address or identifier of the merchant for the payee's location. Both these identifiers will

locate the payer and the payee in different Member States. The payment is thus cross border and subject to reporting by the payee's PSP.

- B) Payer, payee in same Member State: In this situation the payer and the payee are both located in the same Member State, but the payee uses the services of a payment service provider in another Member State to execute a card payment. Given that both the BIN range and the merchant identifier or address will refer to the actual position of respectively the payer and the payee, the payment will be considered as a national payment and will not be reported.
- C) Issuer and Payer in different Member States: In this situation the payer and the payee are in different Member States while both the payer and the payee's payment service providers are in the same Member State. The payer uses the services of a card issuer in the Member State of the payee to execute a card payment. For such cases, the BIN range must use the data on where the card has been issued and not the data on where the card issuer is located. As such, the BIN range should indicate that the payer is in a different Member State than the payee and the payment should be considered as cross-border and be reported by the payee's PSP.

In general, it should be noted that if a payment service provider has different identifiers available that provide a different location, it must choose the identifier that best reflects the location of the payee or payer. This is particularly relevant where the payer or the payee may be using the services of an e-Money facility for the issuing of a virtual card. In such cases, the identifier that is selected must be that which best reflects the real location of the payee or payer. For example, a PSP performing KYC (Know Your Customer) and AML (Anti Money laundering) checks on the account data indicating a different address. In that case, the PSP may consider the address of that account to be a better reflection of location and use that identifier instead.

CESOP Guidelines, sections 3.1.2.4, 3.1.2.5 and 3.1.2.6.

2.4 ELECTRONIC MONEY

Does a PSP which is an e-wallet provider and allows e-money transfers between payers and payees in different countries potentially have CESOP reporting obligations?

Yes, it does. If the payer is located in the EU and the payee is located in another country than the payer (EU country or non-EU country), the e-money transfer from the payer's e-wallet to the payee's e-wallet must be considered as a cross-border payment and in scope of CESOP. Whether or not the PSP actually will need to report these transactions depends on several other criteria, such as the 25 transactions threshold.

Example: A PSP established in Germany offers e-money services to customers and merchants in all EU countries (using passporting). On the website of a merchant in France, the possibility of paying to the e-wallet of the merchant (with the PSP in Germany) is offered to customers when buying a product. A customer in Belgium has an e-wallet with the same PSP in Germany and uses the e-wallet payment option at check out when ordering with the merchant in France. As a result, the PSP in Germany moves e-money from the e-wallet of the customer in Belgium (the payer) to the e-wallet of the merchant in France. This qualifies as a cross border payment, done by a payer in an EU country (Belgium), and hence in scope of CESOP reporting obligations. In case the merchant in France receives more than 25 cross border payments in a given calendar quarter, the PSP in Germany will need to report these payments for CESOP to the French tax authorities.

The funding of an e-wallet via a bank transfer involves a movement of money from the payer's bank account to the e-wallet provider's bank account. This transaction might need to be reported for CESOP (e.g. when cross border and more than 25 transactions per quarter) by either the bank of the e-wallet provider (which acts as the payee in this funding) or by the bank of the payer.

Similarly, the pay-out from an e-wallet via a bank transfer involves a movement of money from the e-wallet provider's bank account to the payee's bank account. This transaction might need to be reported for CESOP (e.g. when cross border and more than 25 transactions per quarter) by either the bank of the payee, or the bank of the e-wallet provider (which acts as the payer in this pay-out).

CESOP Guidelines, sections 2.1 and 3.1.2.7.

3. MONITORING AND TRIGGERING OF THE REPORTING OBLIGATION

Is there a minimum materiality monetary amount for triggering the reporting obligation?

No.

Will the registration for CESOP reporting by a non-established payment service provider in a host Member State where the payment service provider operates potentially trigger other (tax related) reporting obligations?

No.

3.1 CROSS-BORDER PAYMENTS - LOCATION RULES OF ARTICLE 243C

3.1.1 Do payments between payers located in any Member State and payees located in any other Member State (intra-EU payments) trigger the reporting obligation?

Yes, as long as the payers are located in a Member State and the payee receives more than 25 cross border payments in a given calendar quarter, all cross-border payments are in the scope of the calculation of the threshold and of the reporting obligation. Payments executed from a payer in a Member State and a payee in the same Member State (domestic payments), do not fall under the reporting scope.

3.1.2 What is the overriding indicator between the IBAN, the BIC and other identifiers to determine the location of the payee/payer when the different identifiers might lead to different location? e.g. an account in an EU bank of a non-EU person?

The indicator or identifier to be used must be that which best reflects the actual location of the payee or payer in line with Article 243c of the Directive.

As such, each payment service provider will need to analyse its own processes and payment products to determine which indicator(s) to use that best reflects the actual location of the payee or payer. It is recommended that the payment service provider documents this analysis and the conclusions made for further reference. All analysis should focus on confirming the most accurate proxy to be used in line with Article 243c.

By way of illustration, for bank transfers, it will be accepted that the IBAN is a good indicator to use for the location of the payer/payee. For other types of payment transactions however, if a payment service provider has different indicators available which provide a more accurate location of the payee or payer, the PSP must choose the identifier that, in its specific situation, best reflects the actual location of the payee and payer. The correct location of the payer is required to confirm the “country of origin” of the transaction in line with Article 243c.

For example: An E-money provider must choose the location that best reflects the location of the payee or the payer. E-money institutions will have accurate location information gathered at onboarding for their clients. Although E-money providers may provide different payment services and give access to different types of payment method (E-wallet, E-voucher, E-cards, etc.) with different identifiers for each of them, they are required to always choose the identifier or information which will best confirm the actual location of the payee and/or payer in line with Article 243c.

This obligation forbids payment service providers which have access to multiple identifiers to use only those that give a less accurate location of the payer or payee for the purpose of simplifying where the reporting obligation should occur.

The below provided table is only indicative and other elements could be used by the PSP to locate the payer and payee if deemed more relevant. PSPs should refer to their national authorities in case of doubts.

Table of identifiers to determine the location of the payer and payee

Payment Method	Payer's PSP reporting (Extra-EU)		Payee's PSP reporting (Intra-EU)	
	Payer Location	Payee Location	Payer Location	Payee Location
Credit transfer	- IBAN - (BIC of the PSP)	- IBAN - BIC of the PSP ¹⁰ - Payment account number ¹¹	- IBAN - (BIC of the PSP)	- IBAN - (BIC of the PSP)
Direct Debit ¹²	- IBAN - (BIC of the PSP)	- IBAN - BIC of the PSP - Payment account number	- IBAN - (BIC of the PSP)	- IBAN - (BIC of the PSP)
Card payments	- BIN	- Merchant address - Card Acceptor location	- BIN	- Merchant address
E-money	- Payer e-account (location captured at onboarding) - IBAN - E-vouchers: seller country code	- Payee e-account (location captured at onboarding) - IBAN	- Payer e-account (location captured at onboarding) - IBAN - E-vouchers: seller country code	- Payee e-account (location captured at onboarding) - IBAN
Money remittance	- Payer Location (own records) - IBAN	- BIC of the disbursement partner	- BIC of the disbursement partner	- Payee location (own records)

¹⁰ To be used when no IBAN is available

¹¹ This identifier does not necessarily contain a country code, and will often be linked to the BIC of the payment service provider.

¹² There is currently no international scheme applicable to direct debit. As such, the identifiers listed here for the payer's payment service provider reporting are mainly theoretical.

3.1.3 If both the payer and the payee are located outside the EU, is there still a reporting obligation of the PSP?

If both payer and payee are considered as located outside the EU based on the identifiers mentioned above, the transaction is not in scope.

3.2. THRESHOLD OF MORE THAN 25 CROSS-BORDER PAYMENTS UNDER ARTICLE 243B (2)

3.2.1 When the threshold is reached, does each single payment need to be reported, or just the ones above the threshold?

Each single payment must be reported.

3.2.2 Do PSPs need to aggregate every kind of payment in scope of the legislation (transfers, cards etc.) for the same payee to calculate the threshold?

Yes. The payment method used does not impact for that purpose. All the payments should be considered regardless the payment method used. In addition, where the payment service provider has information that the payee has several identifiers/accounts, the calculation shall be made per payee.

3.2.3 Which data elements should be used by payers' PSPs to aggregate payment information referring to the same payee?

Preliminary remark: we mention below a non-exhaustive list of use cases to demonstrate on which basis the decision to aggregate could potentially be made. In general, however, where there is a reasonable doubt on whether it actually is the same payee, no aggregation should take place. This should be analysed based on the information available to the payment service provider and based on the specific circumstances of the payment service provider.

Case 1: payment accounts with the same name but different VAT/tax numbers.

In order to determine whether a payee behind multiple payment accounts is actually a single entity, payment service providers have some information at their disposal, including information collected during the creation of the payment account. While the information at disposal of the payee's PSP might be accurate and allow the precise identification of different accounts opened by the same payee, the payer's PSP have less certainty as regard the real identity of different payees. Therefore, it is reasonable not to proceed to any aggregation if there is no strong indication that the payee is actually a single entity. A VAT/tax number is a data element with a higher degree of uniqueness than a name. As such, accounts with the same name and different VAT/tax number should not be aggregated. See the franchise case in section 3.2.3.3 of the guidelines.

Case 2: The payee's name is the same, but the payee's IBAN is different.

Names can be subject to mistake, and companies could switch between their legal and business name. However, the name remains a strong indicator that two payees might be a single entity when coupled with the address or other information available to the payment service provider.

Case 3: What rules should be applied to determine if the payee with the account in a third country is the same as the payee with the account in a Member State?

The payers' PSP might have little information in order to aggregate different payees. In case of uncertainty, it is reasonable to treat different payees as different entities, and not to proceed with the aggregation.

Case 4: The address is different, but the name is exactly the same.

It would be reasonable to treat the payee with the same name but different addresses as two separate entities, unless there are other elements that indicate that it is the same payee (e.g. same mail address, or same account number etc...).

Case 5: the name is slightly different: how to find out if it is the same person, or completely different individuals/entities?

It would be reasonable for the PSP to not proceed with fuzzy matching, unless there are other elements that indicate that it is the same payee (e.g. same mail address, or same account number etc..).

Case 6: Same VAT number.

The same VAT number is generally a good indication that it concerns the same payee. However, there might be use cases where different payees share the same VAT number (e.g., VAT grouping). The VAT group is a VAT concept where several entities can decide to form a single VAT group and be regarded as a single taxable person for VAT purposes ⁽¹⁾. However, for all other purposes, each company maintain its legal status and therefore each company under the VAT group is to be considered as an individual legal entity and, as such, as individual payee.

However, when sending the records to Member States for the CESOP, the data should not be aggregated per payee nor changed or altered (the aggregation only applies for the calculation of the threshold).

Case 7: Same BIN or IBAN and slightly different names.

The same BIN or IBAN are strong indicators of the same payee.

Still PSPs can use the information available in their records to proceed with the aggregation of payees for the calculation of the threshold, when they are aware that different payees are actually the same entity.

However, when sending the records to Member States for the CESOP, the data should not be aggregated per payee nor changed or altered (the aggregation only applies for the calculation of the threshold).

Finally, aggregating (for threshold calculation) is expected to be a best effort obligation for PSPs. Due to the multitude of elements and fuzziness of many, PSPs are expected to do a best effort, but it would be difficult for any PSP to do aggregating conclusively without demanding disproportionate efforts from the PSPs. Therefore, in case of uncertainty, it is reasonable to treat different payers or payees separately for CESOP reporting, and not to proceed with the aggregation.

3.2.4 Is it true that the aggregation of payment accounts in application of Article 243b (2) VAT Directive should only be performed in relation to the calculation of the threshold, but the data of different payment accounts should never be aggregated?

The aggregation pursuant to Article 243b (2) is needed in order to monitor and determine the threshold of more than 25 cross-border payments per payee.

When that threshold is reached (more than 25 payments per payee), the PSP shall transmit the “detailed” information indicated in Article 243d of the VAT Directive to the Member States.

Therefore, the reporting under Article 243d will be detailed (at the level of single payments received) per each payee identified based on the “aggregation” carried out pursuant to Article 243b(2).

CESOP Guidelines section 3.

⁽¹⁾ Judgment of 22 May 2008, *Ampliscientifica and Amplifin*, C-162/07, EU:C:2008:301

3.2.5 What are the principles for counting payments and calculate the thresholds when a PSP operates cross-border, having both branches and subsidiaries?

According to Article 243b(2) second subparagraph and (4), the number of cross-border payments should be calculated by each PSP per Member State in which services are provided.

Accordingly, each branch and subsidiary will have to calculate its own threshold based on their own payment transactions.

Some cooperative banking structure can have separate banks inside this cooperative with separate reporting obligations and separate calculation of their own threshold.

3.2.6 Where the payee has branches in several countries, and each branch has a separate payment account, do these branches need to be considered as separate payees (with their respective location) or as one payee together with the head office (and one location, i.e., of the head office) for the aggregation rule?

According to point (9) of Article 4 of Directive (EU) 2015/2366, ‘payee’ means a natural or legal person who is the intended recipient of funds which have been the subject of a payment transaction. As a branch is not a separate legal person, it should be considered for CESOP reporting (and threshold determination) together with its head office where the payment service provider has sufficient information to clearly identify that it concerns the same legal person. For example, a Dutch company has a legal branch in Belgium. They have two bank accounts with a Dutch bank’s establishment in the Netherlands – one used for the activities in the Netherlands and the other for the activities in Belgium. For the calculation of the threshold, payments to both bank accounts should be regarded as payment to one payee, i.e., the Dutch company, where the payment service provider has clear indications the branch and the head office are one and the same legal entity.

On the other hand, using the same example, where the company’s Dutch head office has a bank account with the Dutch bank’s establishment in the Netherlands, and its branch in Belgium has a bank account with the Dutch bank’s branch in Belgium, payments to the Dutch bank account of the company’s head office should not be aggregated with the payments to the Belgian bank account of its Belgian branch, for the calculation of the threshold (see point 3.2.3.6 and figure 37 of the guidelines).

3.2.7 Are refunds included in the calculation of the thresholds?

“Technical” refunds as defined in Article 76 of the PSD2 are always in the records of the PSPs (e.g. refunds due to technical errors in the original payment transaction).

Other kind of refunds (for instance due to goods returned to the seller) are not always in the records of the PSPs. When a PSP is not aware of the refund, it is not asked to verify whether any given payment is a refund or not. As such, evidently this will be computed in the calculation of the threshold.

Still, there are cases where PSPs have this information at their disposal.

For instance, a payment through an e-wallet could be refunded by the seller to the consumer using the same e-wallet and referring to the original purchase. In such a case, most likely the e-wallet will have the necessary information to link the refund to the original payment.

Therefore, when a PSP is aware of the refund, this refund is not computed in the calculation of the threshold. This rule applies both when the refund is in the same reporting period of the original payment and when the refund is in a subsequent reporting period of the original payment.

The known refunds shall be reported as indicated in the Guidelines, section 4.5 and in the User guide point 3.3.4.

3.2.8 When the payer' PSP is reporting, should the PSP determine the 25 transactions threshold based on number of payments made by one payer only?

No, the payer PSP must determine the threshold considering all transactions made to the same payee.

3.2.9 When the payer' PSP is reporting, should that PSP include payments to payees located in the EU in the calculation of the 25 transactions threshold?

Article 243b (3) defines the obligations for the PSP of the payer: the requirement laid down in paragraph 1 shall not apply to payment services provided by the payer PSP as regards any payment where at least one of the PSPs of the payee is located in a Member State, as shown by that PSP's BIC or any other business identifier code that unambiguously identifies the PSP and its location. The PSPs of the payer shall nevertheless include those payment services in the calculation referred to in par. 2.

Example: A payment service provider from Member State 1 (payer PSP) executes payment transactions to a payee that has a payment account in Member State 2 and another in a third country. Over a given quarter, the PSP of the payer executes: 200 payments to the payment account in MS 2, 20 payments to the payment account in the third country. Pursuant to Article 243b, all the conditions to trigger the reporting obligation are fulfilled. However, the PSP of the payer will not report the payments to the payment account in MS 2, as those will be reported by the PSP of the payee in MS 2.

It will however have to report the payments to the payment account in the third country, as the threshold must be calculated inclusive of the payments to the payment account in Member State 2 and is therefore exceeding 25 cross-border payments.

Finally, the payer PSP in calculating the threshold will have to consider all transactions made to the same payee, both intra and extra EU.

CESOP Guidelines section 4.3.

3.2.10 Payments from a payer located outside the EU should not be reported to CESOP. Does this mean that they should not even be included in the calculation of the 25 transactions threshold?

Payment transactions from a payer located in a third country to a Member State are not included in the reporting obligation. Therefore, such transactions should not be included in the threshold calculation.

3.2.11 Should part payments have to be calculated as one single transaction or separate transactions?

Example: a payer borrows a credit from a PSP to pay a product or service. The payer pays a "part payment credit" to that PSP that in that case is also a credit institution. That PSP will settle the whole amount to the payee (merchant) at once.

For the calculation of the threshold, that PSP will consider one single payment. In fact, the payment from the PSP to the merchant is the transaction that matters on the calculation of the threshold, while the credit from the PSP to the payer is a loan contract between the consumer and the PSP/financial institution and not a payment transaction.

4. REPORTING

4.1 **A Payer's PSP will not have to report intra-EU payment transactions because they are reported by the payee PSP. Does the payer's PSP have to keep the records of these transaction for the three years period?**

No. The legal requirement of three years detention period applies only to the information that is transmitted, and not to the information used for the monitoring of the threshold.

4.2 **Payments from payers located outside the EU do not have to be reported. Does the payee PSP have to record these transactions?**

No. The three years detention period applies only to the information that is transmitted.

4.3 **If there are no transactions to be reported, what (level of) documentation should a PSP have available in its files to evidence this?**

None on EU level. PSPs are advised to consult their national authorities on that.

4.4 **Data protection principle: is the transmission of data below the threshold in line with personal data protection?**

No. PSPs cannot transmit payment data if the thresholds are not exceeded. However, the data reported per payee can have less than 25 transactions (see example in section 4.3. of the Guidelines and the example in the answer under question 3.2.9 above).

4.5 **What if a PSP reports on a payee less than 25 payments? Will CESOP reject this report?**

The submission of data under the threshold shall be considered as non-compliant with the rules established by Art. 243b of Directive 2006/112/EC. However, there could be cases where – even though the 25 threshold is exceeded, still less than 25 transactions are reported (see question 3.2.9).

Furthermore, there might be national arrangements and legislation addressing the reporting of less than 25 payments. PSPs are advised to consult their national authorities on that. CESOP will receive data from national authorities and not from the PSPs. Therefore, CESOP as such will not reject the file.

CESOP Guidelines sections 4.1 and 4.2 and XSD User Guide section 3.2.1.1.

4.6 **How often shall the data be reported?**

PSPs are required to keep sufficiently detailed records of the payees and the payments they receive each calendar quarter to enable the competent authorities of the Member States to carry out controls of the supplies of goods and services, which are deemed to take place in a Member State, in order to achieve the objective of combating VAT fraud. Each Member State shall collect the information from PSPs no later than by the end of the month following the calendar quarter to which the information relates.

This constitutes the period over which information shall be collected and referred to. There is no specific reference to monthly count.

CESOP Guidelines section 4.2.

4.7 Will there be cases in which more than one PSP may be obliged to report? How can double reporting be avoided?

Article 243b does not create a limit regarding the number of PSPs that should report the transaction. Therefore, based on their business model, if more than one PSP is involved in the payment from the payee's side (for example because of subcontracting, or card payment), then all PSPs of the payee shall be responsible to report data. Double reporting as such is not something to be avoided and might increase the overall quality of the information in the CESOP.

CESOP Guidelines, section 4.3.

4.8 Are branches obliged to report on their own the payment data to the tax authority of the respective host Member State?

According to Article 243b(4)(b), PSPs shall report the payment data per Member State where they provide for payment services. Thus, the registered office or the head office will report to the home Member State. A branch or an agent will provide information to the host Member State(s). PSPs should follow the actual use of their payment license to determine where they provide services.

4.9 Are branches obliged to report on their own the payment data to the tax authority of the respective host Member State even when they have no physical presence in the host Member State?

According to Article 243b(4)(b), PSPs shall report the payment data per Member State (MS) where they provide for payment services, regardless of whether there is any kind of physical presence or not, and including the scenario where the payment services are actually provided in a Member State other than its home Member State on the basis of the right of establishment or the freedom to provide services ('passporting').

In order to establish to which Member State the information should be transmitted, and which PSP has the reporting obligation, the rules of Article 243b of the VAT Directive apply. For example, if the payer is located in a Member State and the payee is located in another Member State and the PSP of the payee is providing payment services making usage of passporting rules in the payee's Member State, this PSP has reporting obligation in the Member State of the payee.

A PSP must inform the authority of the host Member State before it can provide payment services in its territory based on the payment license, which is then documented in the register of PSPs of that Member State. If the passport mentioned in that register is actually being used, and using the information available from its client database, a PSP should be able to clearly identify which services are provided and where.

List of typical scenarios:

- a) Headquarter in one Member State, no branches, no activity under passporting regime: All applicable CESOP reporting will take place within that Member State.
- b) Headquarter in Member State 1, branches in Member State 2 and 3: according to Article 243b of the VAT Directive, that PSP should report either in Member State 1, or 2 or 3 (or in the 3 Member States) depending on whether the payment services are provided.
- c) Headquarter of PSP in Member State 1, branch in Member State 2, providing services under passporting regime into the rest of EU (other 25 MS): according to Article 243 b of the VAT Directive, the PSP will report to the home Member State and to the other Member States where the payment services are provided.

Under scenarios b) and c) the PSP can decide whether the Headquarters will submit the report to all the relevant host Member States (on behalf of the branch). See Question 4.10 below.

CESOP Guidelines sections 4.4, 4.4.1.

4.10 PSPs with a branch/subsidiary in another MS: how should the data be submitted by the headquarter or by the branch/subsidiary?

According to the definition of the PSD2, the home Member State will be the Member State where a payment service provider has requested and obtained its payment license, which should correspond to the Member State in which it has its registered office or head office.

The host Member State on the other hand will be any Member State other than the home MS in which the payment service provider is providing payment services.

Pursuant to Article 243b(4)(b) the records shall be made available to the home Member State of the payment service provider, or to the host Member States when the payment service provider provides payment services in Member States other than the home Member State. It should be noted that the use of identifiers for determining the location of payee or payer in line with Article 243c cannot be used to simplify the obligation of a PSPs to provide the records to the home or host member state in line with Article 243 (4)(b). PSPs are obliged to follow their payment licence and report in each jurisdiction where it provides services pursuant to Article 243b(4)(b).

CESOP Guidelines sections 4.4, 4.4.1.

- Examples:**
- 1) A PSP has a payment license from Member State 1 and also supplies payment services in Member State 2 via a branch, and Member State 3 via an agent. In application of the rules, this PSP will have to report the payments it executes in Member State 1 to Member State 1, the payments it executes in Member State 2 to Member State 2, and the payments it executes in Member State 3 to Member State 3.
 - 2) An e-money provider has a payment license to provide payment services from Member State 1. It then uses passporting rules to provide payment services in all other Member States of the EU. According to the rule of Article 243b(4), it will report data in all Member States for the respective payments it executes in each one of them.
 - 3) An e-money provider has its payment license in Member State 1 and also provides payment services in Member State 2 and 3. In order to determine what data should be reported in each Member State, it will look at its payment license and where its clients are located in accordance with Article 243c. As such, if the e-money provider acts as the PSP of the payer for payments going from Member State 1 to a third country, it will report these payments in Member State 1. If it acts as PSP of the payee for payments going from Member State 3 to Member State 2, it will report these payments in Member State 2.
 - 4) If an EU e-money provider acts for both the payer and the payee in case of a cross-border transaction within the EU, the e-money provider shall report this transaction in the Member State where he provides the payment services to the payee in accordance with article 243b, 3.

However, the Directive does not specify whether the headquarters or the branch must transmit the information to the home or host Member State.

Therefore, the PSPs can decide that the headquarter will report in the Member State where it is established, while the branches report in the MSs where they operate. In case a PSP has branches/subsidiaries in more Member States, the data should be provided in each of the Member States where the payment services are provided.

On the other hand, the PSPs might also decide that the headquarters submit the records also on behalf of the branches or subsidiaries as long as the information is transmitted to the right host Member State(s) (where the branches and subsidiaries provide payment services). Should this be the case, the Headquarters should clearly indicate its identifier and the identifier of the branch or subsidiary on which behalf is submitting the report.

PSPs transmit the records to the national authorities and not directly to the CESOP. Therefore, it is advisable that PSPs consult the national authorities for practical details.

4.11 Can a group arrange to have all information on the payee addressed to one (preferred) Member State?

No, it is not possible to do any aggregation at one MS level only.

As mentioned above, the PSP will have to report the payments it executes in Member State 1 to Member State 1, the payments it executes in Member State 2 to Member State 2, and the payments it executes in Member State 3 to Member State 3.

See Article 243b(4)(b) and CESOP Guidelines section 4.4.

4.12 Will there be a One-Stop-Shop solution for streamlined reporting?

No, there will not be any One-Stop-Shop (OSS). Data are reported to the home and host MSs depending on where the headquarter, branch or agent is located and where payment services are provided.

4.13 When the requirements for the reporting obligation laid down in Article 243b of the VAT Directive apply, if in a payment transaction a PSP is acting on behalf of both the payer and the payee, is it correct to state that the PSP only needs to report the payment transactions once?

Yes, that is correct. The PSP is not required to report the same payment transaction multiple times. The country in which the PSP should report will depend on where the PSP provides the payment services to the payee in accordance with article 243(b)(3) which is in most cases, linked to the location of the payee but not necessarily.

When the payee is located inside the EU, the PSP will report in the EU country of the payee, when the payee is located outside EU, the PSP will report in the MS where the PSP provides the payment services to the payer in accordance with article 243(b)(3) which is in most cases, linked to the location of the payer but not necessarily.

4.14 Similarly to 4.13, when a PSP has different roles in one and the same payment transaction, is it correct to state that the PSP only needs to report the payment transaction once?

Yes, that is correct. A Payment Service Provider might have different roles in one and the same payment transaction. It can for example be a card acquirer and also the e-money and e-wallet provider. The payment transaction for which the PSP fulfils different roles, only needs to be reported for CESOP once by this PSP, and not separately for each of its roles (see XSD User guide).

4.15 What is the payment amount to be reported for CESOP? Is this the amount paid by the payer or the amount actually received by the payee?

The amount to be reported for CESOP is the amount actually paid by the payer (in the currency of this payment) before any deductions by the PSP like the take rate, currency conversion fee, etc. The amount reported for CESOP might therefore be higher than the amount actually received by the payee in his account. Also, it should not be considered by the PSP whether the amount paid by the payee includes VAT or not.

Example:

A customer in Germany is ordering a new tablet from a merchant in Sweden. The price is 120 EUR (including VAT) plus 10 EUR (including VAT) for the transportation. The PSP involved in the payment of this purchase

collects 130 EUR from the customer. After deduction of its payment fees (2% or 2.6 EUR), the PSP debits 127.4 EUR on the account of the merchant. The payment amount to be taken into account for CESOP is 130 EUR which is the total amount paid by the customer.

4.16 Should payment transactions be reported by the payer's PSP if the payee's PSP is in an EEA country?

It depends.

PSPs in EEA countries can obtain a payment licence in their home country and use passporting rules to provide for payment services in the EU even without a physical presence in any of the Member State. In that case, PSPs in EEA countries might be subject to the reporting obligation when they provide payment services in the EU Member States

Here we can see the following situations:

- the EEA PSP acting as payer's PSP in Member State 1: that PSP will report in Member State 1 the payments from that payer to any third country (including EEA countries);
- the EEA PSP acting as payee's PSP in Member State 1: that PSP will report in Member State 1 the payments received from other Member States

Case 1: Direct Debit system. The payee's PSP is in a) Norway or b) Poland and payer account is in Estonia. Who reports in a) and b)?

The general rule is that when the payee's PSP is in one Member State, then the reporting obligation is up to the payee's PSP. When the payee's PSP is in a third territory or third country then the payer's PSP will report. Norway is an EEA country and payments to EEA countries shall be considered as payments to third countries. In such cases, the PSP of the payer located in a Member State will report the payment in the Member State of the payer. So, for case **a)** the report must be done in Estonia by the payer's PSP as the payment is done to a bank account in Norway. For case **b)** the report must be done in Poland by the payee's PSP as the payment is done to a bank account in Poland.

4.17 Should refunds be reported?

“Technical” refunds as defined in Article 76 of the PSD2 are always in the records of the PSPs (e.g. refunds due to technical errors in the original payment transaction).

Other kind of refunds (for instance due to goods returned to the seller) are not always in the records of the PSPs. When a PSP is not aware of the refund, it is not asked to verify whether any given payment is a refund or not. As such, evidently this will be computed in the calculation of the threshold as a payment, and they will be reported in case the threshold is exceeded.

Still, there are cases where PSPs have this information at their disposal.

For instance, a payment through an e-wallet could be refunded by the seller to the consumer using the same e-wallet and referring to the original purchase. In such a case, most likely the e-wallet will have the necessary information to link the refund to the original payment.

Therefore, when a PSP is aware of the refund, this refund is not computed in the calculation of the threshold. The known refunds shall be reported as indicated in the Guidelines, section 4.5. and in the User guide point 3.3.4.

This rule applies both when the refund is in the same reporting period of the original payment and when the refund is in a subsequent reporting period of the original payment.

4.18 Should rejected payments be reported?

Rejected payments, or “technical” refunds as defined in Article 76 of the PSD2 are always in the records of the PSPs (e.g. refunds due to technical errors in the original payment transaction).

Both the original payment and the technical refund are reported by the PSPs. This rule applies both when the refund is in the same reporting period of the original payment and when the refund is in a subsequent reporting period of the original payment.

The technical refunds must be reported as indicated in the Guidelines, see section 4.5.1, boxes 7 and 14 and in the User guide point 3.3.4.

Technical refunds are not computed in the calculation of the thresholds.

Payment transactions that are not completed, for example a credit card transaction that is not authorised because of lack of available funds on the payer’s payment account, should never be reported as they are not payment transactions.

4.19 Should a refund be reported if the original payment was not reported?

No. If a PSP is **aware** that a refund refers to an original payment (even processed in a precedent reporting period) that was not reported, then the refund does not need to be reported.

5. DATA ELEMENTS

5.1 Can the payment transactions to be reported be broken down according to the type of transaction (cards/credit transfers/direct debits/instant payment)?

Yes, this can be done. But as indicated above, all transactions made to the same payee need to be accumulated for the purpose of calculating the threshold.

5.2 No information about the payer should be reported, except that relating to his/her state of origin. In this regard, should records be kept with more details about the payer if needed for investigation?

The list of data that needs to be reported is laid down in Article 243d of Directive 2006/112/EC. Point 2. (c) lists the details that shall be contained in the information.

Regarding the payer location information, the information used to determine the origin of the payment, or the destination of the refund shall be provided in accordance with Article 243c. The information can include any data element available to the PSP, as described in box 11 (IBAN, address, card number, etc.). It is important to note that this field shall only indicate what data was used, the data itself must not be transmitted.

This implies that PSPs will for example indicate that the location of the payer was established in a Member State using the IBAN of the payer's payment account. The IBAN of the payer itself, however, shall never be transmitted. No other data must be retained at this regard. For national record keeping rules PSPs should refer to national authorities.

CESOP Guidelines, section 4.5.1.

5.3 Is the "accounting date" or the "value date" relevant for the purpose of detecting the transactions to be reported?

The date to be reported depends on the payment method. In box 8 of the different tables in section 4.5.2. of the CESOP Guidelines there is a detailed indication of the dates to report per payment methods.

5.4 Which information has to be kept in the records of the PSPs, according to Art. 243d (2) point d ("any reference which unambiguously identifies the payment ")? Would the payment reference given by the payer fall under this point?

Payments and references must be unique, and it can be a code from 1 up to 40 characters granting any reference which unambiguously identifies the payment for the PSP. This "payment unique identifier" should not be confused with the description of the payment (which is normally a free text where the payee might indicate the underlining purchase or other personal information) that must not be reported.

Reference is made to box 14 of the tables in section 4.5.2 of the CESOP Guidelines.

The name of the payer is never part of the reporting.

5.5 Is it mandatory for a PSP to submit a nil reporting to the CESOP information system?

Article 243b(4)(b) states that information must be made available to Member States when the requirements of paragraph 1 are fulfilled. Therefore, nil reporting cannot be mandatory, but can be allowed on voluntary basis. PSPs should address their national authorities.

5.6 For a card issuer in a Member State with several cardholders located in a Member State that send payments to payees located in several Member States: is there a need to produce several sets of data?

The PSP, in this case the card issuer, must calculate the threshold per different payees. When the conditions laid down in Article 243b of the VAT Directive are fulfilled, that PSP must submit different reports per each payee. However, if the payee's PSP is in another Member State, then the payer's PSP does not have to report the payment transactions. Basically, the payer's PSP must report only when the payee's PSPs are in third countries or third territories.

5.7 Do PSPs have to send separate files depending on whether they act as payee's PSP or as payer's PSP?

No. There is only one format to be used by PSPs acting as both, payer and payee PSPs.

See XSD User Guide.

5.8 Is it necessary to report the payee's address received on the transaction to be reported or the payee's address stored in the bank records?

If available, all addresses of the payee in the PSP's records shall be reported.

Information and overview are given in the CESOP Guidelines section 4.5.3, Table 9 – Overview of data and expected data quality levels.

5.9 If a PSP needs to make corrections to the file and, in the meantime, there are changes in the name of the payee, is it supposed to report the name as it was originally, or as it is now, or does it not matter at all?

The data must be reported as in the record of the PSP at the precise moment of the transmission.

If that change happens during the period, and VAT/TIN remained the same, the name change is not that crucial. The PSP can just correct the mistake and always report at least the most up-to-date name in its records. PSPs can also send both names if they have them both in their records.

6. TECHNICAL QUESTIONS

6.1 **Regarding the XSD and XSD User Guide versions, in case of any changes, how these will be communicated and be put into action at EU and MS level?**

The XSD and its User Guide are published on CESOP europa.eu website. In case of changes, they will be communicated by Commission and compatibility with the previous version will be maintained for a period, when possible, to allow all stakeholders to adapt their systems.

6.2 **Regarding the MessageRefId defined by the PSPs, is there a standard to be followed to guarantee uniqueness of the ID, time and space? Where can I find more information on the MessageRefId?**

Yes. However, with a very low probability, it is possible that two IDs generated/built as suggested in the XSD UG are the same. Detailed information can be found in the [R01] XSD User Guide.

6.3 **What happens in the case that within a reporting period, there is no data for the PSP to report? For instance, when PSPs do not have any payments under the VAT Directive 2020/284 in a given quarter or the thresholds are not exceeded in a given quarter? Will nil reporting be implemented in the XSD file, or will there be a simpler option available?**

It is not mandatory to report in case of no transactions, or transactions below the threshold. Further information can be found in the [R01] XSD User Guide.

6.4 **As for the type of reporting data: are special characters, negative values and national characters accepted by CESOP?**

For some elements, special characters are allowed, but in other elements the input is limited. Detailed information is given in the [R01] XSD User Guide.

6.5 **How the PSP knows that the report submitted is correct? Is there any validation on behalf of MS or CESOP?**

Yes, validation messages are produced by CESOP. The detailed answer to such question can be found in [R01] XSD User Guide.

6.6 **Are there some minimum quality reporting standards used by CESOP in case a PSP has not information like TIN, VAT number, Address, etc?**

The answer to such question can be found in [R01] XSD User Guide; mandatory elements are the one for which the value of 'Mandatory nature' column equals 'Mandatory'.

6.7 For transactions in third countries, the identifier of the payee may be different from IBAN. Will the XSD tracking allow non-IBAN values to be captured?

Yes, the detailed answer to such question can be found in [R01] XSD User Guide.

6.8 Is CESOP going to adopt ISO 20022 standard for more structured reporting?

CESOP will not use this structure.

6.9 How are the main CESOP system IT and the individual MS IT teams connecting to ensure successful submissions?

Data will be submitted via a secure and encrypted channel.

6.10 Can a PSPs send several files (also below the theoretical maximum size of 1GB) for the same reporting period?

Yes, according to XSD Guide, when a PSP has a large amount of data to report the reporting shall split the data over several payment data messages, in respect of the two following rules:

1. Each message cannot exceed the size of 1GB
2. Each message must be compliant with the XSD.

It is worth noting that some Member States could have lower limitations (than 1GB). In such a case, the PSP would have to split the submission into smaller parts.