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Introduction

- Very impressive paper for thoroughness of analysis and data
- 3 major parts
  - Effects of introducing an additional means of payment
  - Effects of banning an existing means of payment
  - Measure of loss of consumer surplus from ban on using cash as payment
Introducing additional means of payment

- Event study: effects of removing ban on cash in 15 cities
  - Find trips and fare more than double
  - Slightly more than 1/2 due to existing riders making more trips
  - Price roughly unaffected
  - Highly elastic supply of Uber drivers
Introducing additional means of payment

- Event study: effects of removing ban on cash in 15 cities
  - Find trips and fare more than double
  - Slightly more than 1/2 due to existing riders making more trips
  - Price roughly unaffected
  - Highly elastic supply of Uber drivers

- Neighboring regions: Mexico City, cash banned; State of Mexico, cash allowed
  - Share of trips paid in cash negatively related to income
  - Use matching census tracts: Trips and fares double once cash allowed
Banning an existing means of payment

- Puebla permitted cash payments 3/17 to 12/17; then cash banned
- Two types of evidence
  - “Synthetic Puebla”
  - Coarsened Exact Matching – census blocks in Puebla with comparable in State of Mexico
    - Decrease of >50% in number of trips and fares
    - 35-40% of pure cash users ended up adopting credit
    - ≈ 65% pure cash stop using Uber after cash ban
    - Mixed users also decreased number of trips
Loss of Consumer Surplus

- Three experiments to provide data for calculation of consumer surplus loss
  - Experiment I: Mixed users given different price incentives
  - Experiment II: Pure cash users given different price incentives
  - Experiment III: Incentives for credit adoption, pure cash users
    - Larger migration for larger incentives
    - Mostly for users already with credit card
    - Increase in adoption rate < 5%
Loss of Consumer Surplus

Findings:

- For mixed users, cash and credit far from perfect substitutes
  Elasticity of substitution between trips with cash and credit $\approx 3$
- Overall CS loss (%age of yearly expenditure on Uber):
  $0.45\%$ pure cash; $25\%$ for mixed
- Combining: lower bound: CS loss $50\%$ from ban
- Cost of cash ban falls mostly on poor
Discussion

- Really liked paper
- Estimate of consumer surplus is difficult exercise
  - More guidance through sections 7 and 8 would have been very helpful
- So many results: Result summary at end would be useful
Paper is contribution to study of “optimal choice of means of payment”

Such studies particularly relevant now given
  - Plethora of new possible means of payment
    - over 2,000 cryptocurrencies
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- Such studies particularly relevant now given
  - Plethora of new possible means of payment
    - over 2,000 cryptocurrencies
  - Possible launch of Libra in 2020 (Facebook stablecoin)
  - Advancements in digital ledger (blockchain) technology
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- History shows that new means of payment arise to deficiencies of existing
  - (Good money drives out bad?)

- Many historical examples – here are two:
  1. Stockholms Bank notes 1661 - 1664
    - Deficiency: Sweden on copper standard – coins heavy and large
      “even the payment of small sums made the use of carriers and horses necessary”
    - Small premium on notes
  2. Enskilda banknotes, Sweden 1831 - 1900
    - Deficiency: Limited denomination choices
    - Issued in more convenient denominations than Riksbank notes
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- What about today?
- Current sovereign fiat currencies have deficiencies, examples:
  - Two decimal places could be too large for IotF
  - Buying digitized assets difficult because not on existing digital ledgers
  - Remittances also difficult
Discussion

- What about today?

- Current sovereign fiat currencies have deficiencies, examples:
  - Two decimal places could be too large for IoT
  - Buying digitized assets difficult because not on existing digital ledgers
  - Remittances also difficult

- Two views of current situation:
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- Two views of current situation:
  
  “It appears . . . highly improbable that any privately-created electronic currency will displace fiat money as a widespread means of payment and exchange.”

  “. . . conventional fiat currencies are staring at a bleak future. In fact, their fate could be sealed in a couple of years from now . . .”
Given current state, studies like AA could be useful for thinking about design of CBDCs. Aside: Would have been great if AA had info on when mixed users chose cash and when chose credit.
Given current state, studies like AA could be useful for

- Thinking about design of CBDCs
  - Aside: Would have been great if AA had info on when mixed users chose cash and when chose credit
- Measuring costs of bans on Libra and other cryptos
  - Much of current argument for ban is to prevent money laundering and other criminal activity
  - Disadvantages to consumers in terms of fewer means of payment choice not mentioned much
Discussion

- Bottom line: Great paper; significant contribution